# DATA OF KNOWN QUALITY CONFORMANCE/NON-CONFORMANCE SUMMARY QUESTIONNAIRE

| Labora  | atory Name :                    | Alliance Technical Group LL   | <u> </u>                     | Client :   | VERINA CONSI   | ULTIN                   | IG GR | OUP,                    | LLC  |       |
|---------|---------------------------------|---|------------------------------|--|----------------|-------------------------|-------|-------------------------|------|-------|
| Projec  | t Location:                     | NJ  |                              | Project Number :                                 | 5183.0001      |                         |       |                         |      |       |
| Labora  | atory Sample ID                 | (s): Q3020  |                              | Sampling Date(s):                                | 9/04/2025      |                         |       |                         |      |       |
| List DI | KQP Methods U                   | sed (e.g., 8260,8270, et Cetr   |                              | ,6010D,SM2540 D,S<br>20 D,SOP                    | M4500 CI G,SM4 | 500-N                   | NH3,S | M5210                   | 0 B, |       |
| 1       | specified QA/C explain any crit | rtical method referenced in thi<br>C performance criteria follow<br>teria falling outside of accepta<br>f Known Quality performance | ed, includin<br>ble guidelir | g the requirement to<br>nes, as specified in the |                | <b>V</b>                | Yes   |                         | No   |       |
| 1A      | Were the meth                   | od specified handling, preser   | ation, and                   | holding time require                             | ments met?     |                         | Yes   | $\checkmark$            | No   |       |
| 1B      |                                 | Was the EPH method conductor frespective DKQ methods)   | ed without                   | significant modificati                           | ons (see       |                         | Yes   |                         | No   | ✓ N/A |
| 2       |                                 | les received by the laboratory<br>ne associated chain-of-custoo   |                              |  | at             | $\overline{\checkmark}$ | Yes   |                         | No   |       |
| 3       | Were samples                    | received at an appropriate te   | nperature (                  | 4±2° C)?   |                | V                       | Yes   |                         | No   | □ N/A |
| 4       | Were all QA/Qe standards ach    | C performance criteria specifi<br>nieved?   | ed in the N                  | JDEP DKQP  |                |                         | Yes   | $\checkmark$            | No   |       |
| 5       |                                 | ng limits specified or referenc<br>to the laboratory prior to sam   |                              |  |                | V                       | Yes   |                         | No   |       |
|         | b)Were these r                  | reporting limits met?   |                              |  |                | $\overline{\checkmark}$ | Yes   |                         | No   | □ N/A |
| 6       | results reporte                 | rtical method referenced in thi<br>ed for all constituents identifie<br>e DKQP documents and/or s                                   | d in the met                 | thod-specific analyte                            |                | <b>V</b>                | Yes   |                         | No   |       |
| 7       | Are project-spe                 | ecific matrix spikes and/or lab   | oratory dup                  | licates included in th                           | is data set?   |                         | Yes   | $\overline{\mathbf{V}}$ | 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."



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

# **Cover Page**

**Order ID:** Q3020

**Project ID:** Rotor Clip NJ WTD - 2025

Client: VERINA CONSULTING GROUP, LLC

#### **Lab Sample Number**

#### **Client Sample Number**

| Q3020-01 | WATER-TREATMENT DISCHARGE    |
|----------|------------------------------|
| Q3020-02 | WATER-TREATMENT DISCHARGE    |
| Q3020-03 | WATER-TREATMENT DISCHARGEMS  |
| Q3020-04 | WATER-TREATMENT DISCHARGEMSD |

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 :  |          |           |
|--------------|----------|-----------|
| orginature i | <br>ate: | 9/15/2025 |

NYDOH CERTIFICATION NO - 11376

NJDEP CERTIFICATION NO - 20012



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

# **CASE NARRATIVE**

**VERINA CONSULTING GROUP, LLC Project Name: Rotor Clip NJ WTD - 2025** 

Project # N/A Order ID # Q3020

**Test Name: Metals Group4** 

#### A. Number of Samples and Date of Receipt:

4 Water samples were received on 09/04/2025.

#### **B. Parameters:**

According to the Chain of Custody document, the following analyses were requested: Ammonia, BOD5, Chlorine Demand, COD, Metals Group4, Metals Group5, Oil and Grease, Residual Chlorine and TSS. This data package contains results for Metals Group4.

# C. Analytical Techniques:

The analysis of Metals Group4 was based on method 6010D and digestion based on method 3010 (waters).

## 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 analysis met criteria for all compounds.

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:**

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  |      |      |  |
|------------|------|------|--|
| Digilatale | <br> | <br> |  |
|            |      |      |  |



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

# **CASE NARRATIVE**

**VERINA CONSULTING GROUP, LLC Project Name: Rotor Clip NJ WTD - 2025** 

Project # N/A Order ID # Q3020

Test Name: Ammonia, BOD5, COD, Oil and Grease, Residual Chlorine, TSS

# A. Number of Samples and Date of Receipt:

4 Water samples were received on 09/04/2025.

#### **B. Parameters:**

According to the Chain of Custody document, the following analyses were requested: Ammonia,BOD5,COD,Oil and Grease,Residual Chlorine,TSS. This data package contains results for Ammonia,BOD5,COD,Oil and Grease,Residual Chlorine,TSS.

## C. Analytical Techniques:

The analysis of Oil and Grease was based on method 1664A, The analysis of TSS was based on method SM2540 D, The analysis of Residual Chlorine was based on method SM4500 Cl G, The analysis of Ammonia was based on method SM4500-NH3, The analysis of BOD5 was based on method SM5210 B and The analysis of COD was based on method SM5220 D.

#### D. OA/ OC Samples:

The Holding Times were met for all samples except for WATER-TREATMENT DISCHARGE of Residual Chlorine as sample was receive out of holding time.

The Blank Spike met requirements for all compounds.

The Duplicate (WATER-TREATMEN DISCHARGEDUP) analysis met criteria for all compounds except for Residual Chlorine due to sample matrix interference.

The Matrix Spike analysis met criteria for all compounds.

The Matrix Spike Duplicate analysis met criteria for all compounds.

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

The Calibration met the requirements.

#### E. Additional Comments:

| 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  |  |  |  |
|------------|--|--|--|
| 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  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  |
| Н  | Sample Analysis Out Of Hold Time  |





APPENDIX A

# **QA REVIEW GENERAL DOCUMENTATION**

Project #: Q3020

|  | 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) | <u> </u>     |
| Check chain-of-custody for proper relinquish/return of samples   | <u> </u>     |
| Is the chain of custody signed and complete  | <u> </u>     |
| Check internal chain-of-custody for proper relinquish/return of samples /sample extracts   | <u> </u>     |
| Collect information for each project id from server. Were all requirements followed  | <u> </u>     |
| COVER PAGE:  |              |
| Do numbers of samples correspond to the number of samples in the Chain of Custody on login page                                      | <u>✓</u>     |
| Do lab numbers and client Ids on cover page agree with the Chain of Custody  | <u> </u>     |
| CHAIN OF CUSTODY:  |              |
| Do requested analyses on Chain of Custody agree with form I results  | <u> </u>     |
| Do requested analyses on Chain of Custody agree with the log-in page   | <u> </u>     |
| Were the correct method log-in for analysis according to the Analytical Request and Chain of Castody                                 | <u>✓</u>     |
| Were the samples received within hold time   | <u>✓</u>     |
| Were any problems found with the samples at arrival recorded in the Sample Management Laboratory<br>Chronicle                        | <b>√</b>     |
| ANALYTICAL:  |              |
| Was method requirement followed?   | ✓            |
| Was client requirement followed?   | <del>_</del> |
| Does the case narrative summarize all QC failure?  | <del>_</del> |
| All runlogs and manual integration are reviewed for requirements   | <del>_</del> |
| All manual calculations and /or hand notations verified  | <del>'</del> |
|  | <del></del>  |

| QA Review Signature: | SOHIL JODHANI | Date: | 09/15/2025 |
|----------------------|---------------|-------|------------|
|----------------------|---------------|-------|------------|