

DATA OF KNOWN QUALITY CONFORMANCE/NON-CONFORMANCE SUMMARY QUESTIONNAIRE

Laboratory Name : Alliance Technical Group LLC Client : Environmental Restoration, LLC

Project Location : Long Valley NJ Project Number : CC2-16

Laboratory Sample ID(s) : Q2799 Sampling Date(s) : 7/14/2025

List DKQP Methods Used (e.g., 8260,8270, et Cetra) **,200.7,245.1,SOP**

1	For each analytical method referenced in this laboratory report package, were all specified QA/QC performance criteria followed, including the requirement to explain any criteria falling outside of acceptable guidelines, as specified in the NJDEP Data of Known Quality performance standards?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
1A	Were the method specified handling, preservation, and holding time requirements met?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
1B	EPH Method: Was the EPH method conducted without significant modifications (see Section 11.3 of respective DKQ methods)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
2	Were all samples received by the laboratory in a condition consistent with that described on the associated chain-of-custody document(s)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3	Were samples received at an appropriate temperature (4±2° C)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
4	Were all QA/QC performance criteria specified in the NJDEP DKQP standards achieved?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
5	a)Were reporting limits specified or referenced on the chain-of-custody or communicated to the laboratory prior to sample receipt? b)Were these reporting limits met?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
6	For each analytical method referenced in this laboratory report package, were results reported for all constituents identified in the method-specific analyte lists presented in the DKQP documents and/or site-specific QAPP?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
7	Are project-specific matrix spikes and/or laboratory duplicates included in this data set?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Notes: For all questions to which the response was "No" (with the exception of question #7), additional information should be provided in an attached narrative. If the answer to question #1, #1A, or #1B is "No", the data package does not meet the requirements for "Data of Known Quality."

Cover Page

Order ID : Q2799

Project ID : Cooper Chemical - Long Valley NJ 2-COOP-ANS

Client : Environmental Restoration, LLC

Lab Sample Number

Q2799-01

Client Sample Number

CC-071325-RW

I certify that the data package is in compliance with the terms and conditions of the contract, both technically and for completeness, for other than the conditions detailed above. Release of the data contained in this hard copy data package has been authorized by the laboratory manager or his designee, as verified by the following signature.

Signature : _____

Date: 8/13/2025

NYDOH CERTIFICATION NO - 11376

NJDEP CERTIFICATION NO - 20012



284 Sheffield Street, Mountainside, NJ 07092 Phone: 908 789 8900 Fax: 908 789 8922

CASE NARRATIVE

Environmental Restoration, LLC

Project Name: Cooper Chemical - Long Valley NJ 2-COOP-ANS

Project # N/A

Order ID # Q2799

Test Name: Mercury, Metals ICP-TAL

A. Number of Samples and Date of Receipt:

1 Water samples were received on 07/14/2025.

B. Parameters:

According to the Chain of Custody document, the following analyses were requested: Mercury, Metals ICP-TAL and METALS-TAL. This data package contains results for Mercury, Metals ICP-TAL.

C. Analytical Techniques:

The analysis and digestion of Metals ICP-TAL was based on 200.7 and The analysis and digestion of Mercury was based on 245.1.

D. QA/ QC Samples:

The Holding Times were met for all analysis.

The Blank Spike met requirements for all compounds.

The Duplicate analysis met criteria for all compounds.

The Matrix Spike analysis met criteria for all compounds.

The Matrix Spike Duplicate (EFF-WASTE WATERMSD) analysis met criteria for all compounds except for Magnesium, Potassium and Zinc due to Chemical Interference during Digestion process.

The Blank analysis did not indicate the presence of lab contamination.

The Calibration met the requirements.

The Serial Dilution met the acceptable requirements.

E. Additional Comments: The temperature of the samples at the time of receipt was 24.2°C.

The Post Digest Spike (EFF-WASTE WATERA) analysis met criteria for all compounds except for Potassium due to unknown chemical interference of matrix with the addition of spike amount after digestion and before analysis; matrix has suppression effect during addition of spike.



I certify that the data package is in compliance with the terms and conditions of the contract, both technically and for completeness, for other than the conditions detailed above. The laboratory manager or his designee, as verified by the following signature has authorized release of the data contained in this hard copy data package.

Signature_____

DATA REPORTING QUALIFIERS- INORGANIC

For reporting results, the following “ Results Qualifiers” are used:

J	Indicates the reported value was obtained from a reading that was less than the Contract Required Detection Limit (CRDL), but greater than or equal to the Instrument Detection Limit (IDL).
U	Indicates the analyte was analyzed for, but not detected.
ND	Indicates the analyte was analyzed for, but not detected
E	Indicates the reported value is estimated because of the presence of interference
M	Indicates Duplicate injection precision not met.
N	Indicates the spiked sample recovery is not within control limits.
S	Indicates the reported value was determined by the Method of Standard Addition (MSA).
*	Indicates that the duplicate analysis is not within control limits.
+	Indicates the correlation coefficient for the MSA is less than 0.995.
D	Indicates the reported value is from a secondary analysis with a dilution factor. The original analysis exceeded the calibration range.
M	Method qualifiers “P” for ICP instrument “PM” for ICP when Microwave Digestion is used “CV” for Manual Cold Vapor AA “AV” for automated Cold Vapor AA “CA” for MIDI-Distillation Spectrophotometric “AS” for Semi -Automated Spectrophotometric “C” for Manual Spectrophotometric “T” for Titrimetric “NR” for analyte not required to be analyzed
OR	Indicates the analyte’s concentration exceeds the calibrated range of the instrument for that specific analysis.
Q	Indicates the LCS did not meet the control limits requirements
H	Sample Analysis Out Of Hold Time

APPENDIX A

QA REVIEW GENERAL DOCUMENTATION

Project #: Q2799

Completed

For thorough review, the report must have the following:

GENERAL:

Are all original paperwork present (chain of custody, record of communication,airbill, sample management lab chronicle, login page)

✓

Check chain-of-custody for proper relinquish/return of samples

✓

Is the chain of custody signed and complete

✓

Check internal chain-of-custody for proper relinquish/return of samples /sample extracts

✓

Collect information for each project id from server. Were all requirements followed

✓

COVER PAGE:

Do numbers of samples correspond to the number of samples in the Chain of Custody on login page

✓

Do lab numbers and client Ids on cover page agree with the Chain of Custody

✓

CHAIN OF CUSTODY:

Do requested analyses on Chain of Custody agree with form I results

✓

Do requested analyses on Chain of Custody agree with the log-in page

✓

Were the correct method log-in for analysis according to the Analytical Request and Chain of Custody

✓

Were the samples received within hold time

✓

Were any problems found with the samples at arrival recorded in the Sample Management Laboratory Chronicle

✓

ANALYTICAL:

Was method requirement followed?

✓

Was client requirement followed?

✓

Does the case narrative summarize all QC failure?

✓

All runlogs and manual integration are reviewed for requirements

✓

All manual calculations and /or hand notations verified

✓

QA Review Signature: SOHIL JODHANI

Date: 08/13/2025