Florida Department of

Memorandum Environmental Protection

To: Nicanor Madrid
Hazardous Waste Permitting Section

From: Thomas Deck
Environmental Assessment Section

Date: May 6th 2005

Subject: Field Sampling Performance Audit Report
Lockheed Martin
Ocala, Florida

Please see the attached report and checklist for the field sampling performance audit conducted at Lockheed Martin in Ocala, Florida on April 14th 2005. The audit was conducted by the Environmental Assessment Section (EAS) and included a subsequent review of sampling logs and other documentation for the audit day that were submitted by the permittee's consultant.

Sampling activities were audited using the DEP SOP ("Standard Operating Procedures for Field Activities", DEP-SOP-001/01), revision February 1, 2004. The consultant indicated the intention to follow this document for the audited sampling event.

Summary of audit deficiencies

1. Calibration:
   - Sampling team used a pH 4 buffer as the first of two standards when calibrating pH. A pH 7 buffer should always be used as the first standard when performing a pH calibration
   - Dissolved oxygen calibration was done based on percent dissolved oxygen and was not checked against theoretical values. The dissolved oxygen reading at a given temperature should be compared to theoretical values to insure that the 0.3 mg/L acceptance criteria is accomplished.
   - Sampling team used a two point calibration for conductivity using air as a zero standard. An air calibration at zero is not acceptable. A single point calibration with a primary KCl standard should be used for the initial calibration and then a second standard should be read in order to provide a quantitative bracket.
   - Sampling team was unable to calibrate the turbidity meter.

2. Quantitative and Chronological bracketing:
   - Sampling team was unable to chronologically or quantitatively bracket the pH, and turbidity calibrations after the first monitoring well.
   - Sampling team was unable to chronologically bracket the Dissolved Oxygen measurement after the first monitoring well

3. Documentation:
    - Preservation records should include the identification of ice when samples are thermally preserved.
    - Unit for dissolved oxygen verification were not recorded. Appropriate units were not circled.
    - The failure of the pH verification and the recalibration after the first monitoring well were not recorded
    - Preservation verification for metals was not recorded.
    - Standards were not document in accordance with DEP-SOP-001/01 FD4000.

4. See other deficiencies noted in the attached report.

Response requirements
The permittee or the permittee's consultant should be asked to respond to the audit report by addressing each deficiency noted in the attached checklist, as explained by the checklist legend. The response should include the specific corrective actions to be taken. Some checklist items may indicate that additional information should be provided in order to determine whether the audit criterion is applicable or was satisfied. The response may include discussion of any items in the report for the purposes of clarification or rebuttal.

Issuance of final audit report
When the response has been received from the permittee (or its consultant), the EAS will review it to determine if appropriate corrective actions have been taken and issue a report providing an evaluation of the submitted response.

If modifications to the proposed corrective actions are required, the permittee should be given another opportunity and additional time to propose acceptable corrective actions before the final audit report package is issued.

When all responses have been reviewed, the EAS will issue the final audit report package consisting of the preliminary audit report, the response(s) from the permittee (or consultant) and the EAS evaluation of all responses.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need further assistance.

Field Performance Audit of Sampling Procedures
Lockheed Martin
Ocala, Florida

Audit performed by
Environmental Assessment Section
Bureau of Laboratories

Audit Date
4/14/05

DEP Auditor
Thomas Deck
Environmental Assessment Section

Sampling Team Personnel and Affiliations
Bob Cassesse, HSW Engineering
Tim Easter, HSW Engineering

Field Performance Audit Location (Site Location)
Lockheed Martin
498 Oak Road
Ocala, FL 34472

Field Sampling Locations (Sample Points or Sources)
Monitoring wells PZ22-UF and PZ2

Parameter Groups/Analytes Sampled
PZ22-UF – Samples were collected for. DEP split samples with HSW Engineering sampling team for VOCs.
PZ2 – Samples were collected for. DEP split samples with HSW Engineering sampling team for VOCs.

Summary of Audit

A staff member of the DEP Environmental Assessment Section (EAS) conducted a field performance audit of groundwater sampling and field testing procedures executed by the permittee's consultant, who collects samples on behalf of the facility in response to RCRA permit requirements.

This audit was conducted in support of the DEP Hazardous Waste Regulation program.

The purpose of the audit was to determine if HSW Engineering, the permitted facility's consultant, was capable of properly collecting samples according to established DEP criteria.

This audit of sampling procedure performance was designed to assist DEP staff in determining whether the permitted facility is reporting data that:

- are useable by the Hazardous Waste Regulation program; and,

- are of verifiable and acceptable quality according to criteria outlined in the DEP Quality Assurance rule, 62-160 FAC.

An exit meeting was held at the field audit sampling location with the samplers where the auditor summarized the major deficiencies observed.

A detailed list of audit findings concerning procedural and documentary deficiencies is provided in the remainder of this report.

Sampling and Field Testing Performance Criteria
Audit Findings and Observed Deficiencies

Note: The audit criteria are derived from the "DEP Standard Operating Procedures for Field Activities", January 1, 2002. (DEP-SOP-001/01). Where applicable, the citations for the criteria appear after each criterion statement.

Legend for audit findings:
Y= The audit criterion was met. No further response is necessary.
N=The audit criterion was not met. The item is an observed deficiency and a response is required.
NR= The criterion was not audited for performance and/or documentation. No further response is required.
?= It is uncertain whether the audit criterion was met or is applicable to the audited event. A response is required for clarification.

Preliminary activities

1. Y Equipment construction was appropriate for the analytes of interest. (FS 1001, section 2.2 and Tables FS 1000-1, FS 1000-2 & FS 1000-3)

2. Y Equipment was brought precleaned to the field. (FS 1001, section 2.3)

3. NR Dedicated equipment was decontaminated prior to use. FS 1001, section 3.4

4. Y Sample container construction and materials were appropriate for the analytes collected. (FS 1001, section 4.1 and Table FS 1000-2)

5. Y All containers and container caps were free of cracks, chips, discoloration and other features that might affect the integrity of collected samples. (FS 1001, section 4.2)

Use of protective gloves

6. Y Gloves were worn by all samplers handling purging equipment, sampling equipment, measurement equipment and sample containers as applicable. (FS 1003, section 2)

7. Y Care was taken to avoid contact with samples and sample container interiors. (FS 1003, section 3)

8. Y New, clean unpowdered gloves were used for each glove change. (FS 1003, section 4 – 4.3)

9. Y Gloves were worn and changed as needed to avoid sample contamination and personal exposure. (FS 1003 sections 5 & 6)

Use of fuel-powered equipment and vehicles

10.Y All fuel-powered equipment was placed and vehicles were parked downwind of or well away from sampling locations where fuel contamination of samples, purging equipment or sampling equipment may have interfered with representative sample collection. (FS 1005, section 1)

Handling of hazardous waste (HW) and other investigation-derived waste (IDW)

11.Y Wastes generated as a result of the sampling project were containerized and stored for proper disposal according to applicable local, state and federal regulations. (FS 1011, sections 1 – 1.4)

Contamination prevention and equipment rinsing

12.Y Every effort was made to prevent cross-contamination of samples and contamination of environment. (FS 1002, section 1.1)

*13.*Y *Sample containers containing premeasured preservatives were not rinsed with sample prior to collection. (FS 1004)*

Sample preservation and preservation verification

*14.*Y *All sample preservation conformed to DEP SOP requirements. (FS 1006, sections 1 – 1.2 and Tables FS 1000-4 through FS 1000-8)*

*15.*NR *One sample per analyte group requiring pH adjustment was tested for proper pH preservation during repeat sampling for the project. FS 2000, section 1.4.2.2*

*16.*Y *All grab samples were preserved within 15 minutes of collection. (FS 1006, section 2)*

Collection of VOC samples

*17.*Y *Bubbles present in the VOC sample comprised a combined volume of less than 5mm in diameter. (FS 2004, section 4.4.1)*

*18.*Y *VOC sample containers were kept removed and protected from any fuel sources and fuel-powered equipment. (FS 1005, section 1)*

*19.*Y *VOC sample containers remained capped until just prior to sample collection and remained capped after sample collection. (FS 1005, section 1)*

Well head inspection and water level measurement

*20.*Y *Water levels were measured to the nearest 0.01 foot. (FS 2211, section 3.2.)*

General purging procedures

*21.*Y *Well casing volume was correctly determined. (FS 2211, section 5)*

*22.*Y *The pump, tubing or bailer was not allowed to drop to the bottom of the well. (FS 2201, section 1)*

*23.*Y *Depth to groundwater was measured at frequent intervals during purging. (FS 2213, sections 2.1.6, 2.2.6, 2.3.5, 2.4.5, 3.1.3 and 3.2.3)*

*24.*Y *The placement of the pump or tubing intake was correctly determined according to the position of the water level in relation to the well screen interval and the purging procedure used. (FS 2213 sections 1.1 – 1.3)*

*25.*Y *The placement depth of the pump or tubing intake was recorded for each instance of positioning.*

General procedures for purging with a pump

26. Y *Drawdown was stabilized so that the pumping rate matched the formation recharge rate. (FS 2213, sections 2.1.8, 2.2.8, 2.3.7, 2.4.7, 3.1.*5 and 3.2.5)

Purging from the top of the water column with a pump(PZ22-UF and PZ2)

27. Y *The pump or tubing was placed at the top of the water column above the submerged well screen and a minimum total of 1½ well volumes was purged (FS 2212 section 2.1)*

28. NR *The pump or tubing was placed at the top of the water column in the partially submerged well screen interval and a total of at least one well volume was purged prior to commencing measurement of stabilization parameters (FS 2212 section 2.3)*

Frequency of measurement for purge stabilization parameters

29. Y *A flow cell was used to measure stabilization parameters during purging.*

30. Y *If the well was purged from the top of the water column above a fully submerged screen, at least one well volume was purged prior to commencing purge stabilization measurements and at least ¼ well volume was purged at the stabilized pumping rate between consecutive purge stabilization measurements. (FS 2212 section 2.1)*

PZ22-UF, PZ2

Determination of purging completion

31. Y *Three (3) consecutive measurements of the three parameters listed below were within stated limits. (FS 2212, section 3.1 and 3.2)*

32. Y *Temperature: ±0.2° C*

33. Y *pH: ±0.2 standard pH units (MW-44D had a difference of 0.3)*

34. Y *Specific Conductance: ± 5.0% of reading (MW-44D had a 10% difference one more set of readings should have been taken)*

35. Measured dissolved oxygen and turbidity were below the following thresholds. (FS 2212, section 3.1)

36. N *DO ≤20% saturation at the measured temperature*

37. N *Turbidity ≤20 NTU*

38. For wells where DO and turbidity thresholds could not be met for justified reasons, consecutive measurements were within the above stated limits for pH, conductivity and temperature; and, DO and turbidity measurements were within the following stated limits. (FS 2212 section 3.2)

39. Y *DO: ±0.2 mg/L or 10%, whichever is greater*

40. Y *Turbidity: ±NTUs or 10%, whichever is greater*

General requirements for groundwater sample collection equipment

41. Y *Pump tubing was decontaminated or replaced between wells.*

42. Y *Material construction of pumps, tubing and bailers conformed with requirements of Tables FS 1000-1 through FS 1000-3 and Table FS 2200-1 for the analytes collected. (FS 2201, sections 1 & 2, and FS 2230, section 3.1)*

Collecting samples with pumps

43.NR Collection of volatile organic (VOC) samples with peristaltic pumps employed the "straw technique" for collection from the well and either gravity or reverse pumping for container filling. (FS 2221 section 1.1.1 – 1.1.1.16)

*44.*NR *Peristaltic pumps were used with an organic trap assembly to collect extractable organics samples. (FS 2221 section 1.1.2.2)*

Field quality control samples

45.NR Precleaned equipment blanks were collected if equipment was cleaned by sampling organization or if equipment vendors did not certify cleanliness of equipment for the specific uses for the project. . (FQ 1230, section 3.1.2)

46.Y Where applicable to the project, one trip blank was transported in each storage container, shipping container or ice chest containing empty, clean VOC sample containers or VOC samples. (FQ 1213, section 4 and FQ1230, section 4.2

General requirements for calibration activities

47.N All field-testing equipment and instruments brought to the field appeared to function properly. (FT 1000, section 2.1

*48.*N *All sample measurements were chronologically bracketed between calibration verifications. (FT 1000, section 2.2.1)*

*49.*N *All sample measurements were quantitatively bracketed with an appropriate choice of calibration standards for calibrations or verifications. (FT 1000, section 2.2.1)*

*50.*N *Instruments failing to meet calibration verification acceptance criteria were recalibrated or removed from service. (FT 1000, section 2.4.4.1*

*51.*Y *The time interval between calibration verifications did not exceed one month, or, if less, the life of the sampling project (except for temperature measurements). (FT 1000, section 2.2.5.2)*

pH calibrations and measurements

*52.*Y *The pH meter and electrode system met DEP SOP specifications for accuracy, reproducibility and design. (FT 1100, section 1.1)*

*53.*Y *All measurements were manually or automatically corrected for temperature. (FT 1100, sections 1.1 and 2.2.3)*

*54.*Y *The temperature sensor calibration was verified according to FT 1400.*

*55.*N *A pH 7 buffer was used as the first calibration standard for the initial calibration. (FT 1100, section 2.3.3)*

*56.*N *All sample measurements were chronologically bracketed with calibration verifications. (FT 1100 section 2.3.2)*

Sampling crew was unable to verify the pH after the first well. Likely due to calibrating with a pH 4 buffer first.

*57.*N *All sample measurements were quantitatively bracketed with an appropriate choice of at least two calibration buffers for calibrations or verifications. (FT 1100, sections 1.2, 2.3.3 & 2.3.4)*

Sampling crew was unable to verify the pH after the first well. Likely due to calibrating with a pH 4 buffer first.

*58.*N *All calibration verifications met the acceptance criteria of ± 0.2 standard pH units. (FT 1100, sections 2.1.2 & 2.3.4.1)*

Sampling crew was unable to verify the pH after the first well. Likely due to calibrating with a pH 4 buffer first.

59.? *The meter system was checked on a weekly basis to ensure a ≥90% theoretical electrode slope. (FT 1100, section 2.1.3*

*60.*Y *The pH electrode was rinsed with deionized or distilled water between buffer solutions and between sample measurements. (FT 1100, sections 2.3.6 & 2.4.4)*

*61.*Y *The instrument pH readings stabilized before pH values were recorded. (FT 1100, section 2.4.6)*

Specific conductance calibrations and measurements

*62.*Y *The specific conductance meter and electrode system met DEP SOP specifications for accuracy, reproducibility and design. (FT 1200, section 2.1)*

*63.*N *All sample measurements were quantitatively bracketed with an appropriate choice of calibration standards for calibrations or verifications. (FT 1200, section 3.2.1)*

Sampling team used a two point calibration using air as a zero standard and a Horriba multi-cal solution (at 4.49 mS/µm). An air calibration at zero is not acceptable.

*64.*N *All continuing calibration verifications were performed using standards within the range of sample measurements. (FT 1200, section 3.2.4)*

See above (63).

*65.*Y *All calibration verifications met the acceptance criteria of ± 5% of the verification standard value. (FT 1200, sections 3.2.2 & 3.2.4)*

*66.*N *All measurements were manually or automatically corrected for temperature.(FT 1200, sections 1.2, 3.2.3 & 3.4)*

Sampling team was correcting the conductivity for temperature compensation. On further inspection it appears that the instrument automatically corrects for temperature.

67.? *The temperature sensor calibration was verified according to FT 1400. (FT 1200, section 3.1.2)*

*68.*Y *The conductivity electrode was rinsed with deionized or distilled water between standard solutions and between sample measurements. (FT 1200, section 3.3.8)*

*69.*Y *The instrument conductivity readings stabilized before measurement values were recorded. (FT 1200, sections 3.3.3 & 3.5.1)*

Temperature calibrations and measurements

*70.*Y *The temperature measurement device met DEP SOP specifications for design and measurement resolution. (FT 1400, section 1.1)*

71.? *All sample measurements were quantitatively bracketed with calibration verifications of the temperature measurement device at a minimum of two temperatures using the NIST-traceable thermometer. (FT 1400, section 2.2.2)*

72.? *All sample measurements were chronologically bracketed with acceptable calibration verifications. (FT 1400, section 2.2.1)*

73.? *Historical, device-specific data justified calibration verification intervals of greater than one month. (FT 1400, section 2.2.3.1)*

*74.*Y *The temperature device readings stabilized before measurement values were recorded. (FT 1400, section 2.3.2)*

*75.*Y *Groundwater samples were measured in situ (downhole) or by using a flow-through container. (FT 1400, section 2.3.2.1*

Dissolved oxygen calibrations and measurements

*76.*Y *The dissolved oxygen meter and electrode system met DEP SOP specifications for accuracy, reproducibility and design. (FT 1500, section 1.1)*

*77.*N *All sample measurements were chronologically bracketed with calibration verifications. (FT 1500, sections 2.2 & 2.3)*

Sampling crew was unable to verify the DO after the first well.

*78.*N *All calibration verifications met the acceptance criteria of ± 0.3 mg/L dissolved oxygen when compared to the table of theoretical values for water-saturated air. (FT 1500, sections 1.1., 2.2.2.2,. 2.3.1., 2.4.1, 2.4.2 and 2.4.3)*

Theoretical values were not used to calibrate

*79.*Y *All measurements were manually or automatically corrected for temperature. (FT 1500, sections 1.1 & 2.5.4)*

80.? *The temperature sensor calibration was verified according to FT 1400. (FT 1500, section 1.1)*

*81.*Y *The dissolved oxygen electrode was rinsed with deionized or distilled water between sample measurements. (FT 1500, section 2.5.2)*

*82.*Y *The dissolved oxygen electrode was stored in a water-saturated air environment when not in use. (FT 1500, sections 2.1.2 & 2.5.2)*

*83.*Y *The instrument dissolved oxygen readings stabilized before measurement values were recorded. (FT 1500, sections 2.3.1.3, 2.4.6 & 2.5.3)*

Turbidity calibrations and measurements

*84.*N *All sample measurements were chronologically bracketed with calibration verifications. (FT 1600, section 3.2.1)*

Sampling crew was unable to calibrate or verify the turbidty meter.

*85.*N *All sample measurements were quantitatively bracketed with an appropriate choice of calibration standards for calibrations and verifications. (FT 1600, section 3.2.1)*

Sampling crew was unable to calibrate or verify the turbidty meter.

*86.*Y *Initial calibration of the turbidimeter was performed using formazin or styrene divinylbenzene primary standards, whichever was required by the manufacturer of the instrument. (FT 1600, section 2.3)*

*87.*N *All calibration verifications met the DEP SOP acceptance criteria applicable to the NTU ranges associated with the verification standard values. (FT 1600, section 3.2.2)*

Sampling crew was unable to calibrate or verify the turbidty meter.

Universal documentation requirements

*88.*Y *Waterproof ink was used for all paper documentation. (FD 1100, section 2.5)*

*89.*N *Errors in documentation were corrected without obliteration. (FD 1100, section 2.6)*

*90.*N *All instrument calibrations were properly documented. (FD 4100, sections 1 – 2.7)*

Failure in pH verification was not recorded.

*91.*Y *Names of all sampling personnel were recorded. (FD 5000, section 2.1)*

*92.*Y *The type(s) of sampling equipment used to collect all samples was recorded in the field record. (FD 5000, section 2.10)*

*93.*Y *Date of sample collection was recorded for all samples. (FD 5000, section 2.2)*

*94.*N *Ambient field conditions were recorded for all samples. (FD 5000, section 2.3)*

*95.*Y *A specific description of all sampling locations (sources) was recorded. (FD 5000, section 2.4)*

*96.*Y *The matrix collected was recorded for all samples. (FD 5000, section 2.6)*

97.? *The types, number, collection location and collection sequence of all field quality control samples was recorded in the field record. (FD 5000, section 2.11)*

*98.*N *Preservation information and verification was recorded for each sample, as applicable. (FD 5100, section 1 – 1.4)*

Use on ice for thermally preserved samples was not recorded

*99.*Y *Each sample container or group of containers was tagged or labeled with a unique field identification code that distinguishes the sample from all other samples. (FD 5000, section 1.1)*

100. Y Sample containers and labels were attached so as to prevent contact between the sample and the label or tag when pouring or dispensing from the container. (FD 5000, section 1.2)

101. Y The unique identification codes for samples were recorded in a manner that linked the codes to all other field records associated with the samples. (FD 5000, sections 1.1.1 & 1.3)

Documentation for groundwater monitoring well purging and sampling

102. Y Purging equipment is recorded(FS 5100, sections 2.1 – 2.3)

103. Y Purging procedure is recorded(FS 5100, sections 2.1 – 2.3)

104. N Well casing composition is recorded(FS 5100, sections 2.1 – 2.3)

105. Y Well diameter is recorded(FS 5100, sections 2.1 – 2.3)

106. Y Water table depth is recorded(FS 5100, sections 2.1 – 2.3)

107. Y Depth of well is recorded(FS 5100, sections 2.1 – 2.3)

108. Y Volume of water in the well is recorded(FS 5100, sections 2.1 – 2.3)

109. Y Purge volume calculations is recorded(FS 5100, sections 2.1 – 2.3)

110. Y Total volume of water purged is recorded(FS 5100, sections 2.1 – 2.3)

111. Y Total well volumes or equipment volumes purged is recorded(FS 5100, sections 2.1 – 2.3)

112. Y Date of purging is recorded(FS 5100, sections 2.1 – 2.3)

113. Y Starting and ending times for purging is recorded(FS 5100, sections 2.1 – 2.3)

114. Y Purging rate (pumping or flow rate) and associated calculations is recorded(FS 5100, sections 2.1 – 2.3)

115. Y Stabilization measurements for purge completion criteria is recorded(FS 5100, sections 2.1 – 2.3)

116. Y Elapsed time for one well volume or equipment volume purge at stabilized flow rate is recorded(FS 5100, sections 2.1 – 2.3)

117. Y Water level drawdown measurements during purging (depth to water table) is recorded(FS 5100, sections 2.1 – 2.3)

Documentation for Field-Testing Instrument Calibrations

118. N Unique identification (designation code) for the instrument calibrated is recorded (FD 4100, sections 2.1 - 2.11)

119. Y Date and time of each calibration or calibration verification is recorded (FD 4100, sections 2.1 - 2.11)
120.

121. N Instrument reading or result (display value) for all calibration verifications, with appropriate measurement units is recorded (FD 4100, sections 2.1 - 2.11)

Units for DO verification were not recorded

122. Y Names of analysts performing each calibration for the instrument is recorded (FD 4100, sections 2.1 - 2.11)

123. N Designation of each calibration standard used to calibrate or verify the instrument, linked to the associated records for the calibration standard is recorded (FD 4100, sections 2.1 - 2.11)

Only the value of the standard was recorded. No additional information provided (e.g. Lot number, expiration date)

124. N The acceptance criteria for each calibration and verification used to accept the instrument calibration or verification. (FD 4100, sections 2.1 - 2.11)

Not recorded

125. Y Positive indication in the record of acceptable (successful) initial calibration and acceptable initial and continuing calibration verifications is recorded (FD 4100, sections 2.1 - 2.11)

126. N A description or citation of the specific calibration and verification procedures used for the instrument (DEP SOP or internal SOP) is recorded (FD 4100, sections 2.1 - 2.11)

Not recorded

127. Y All acceptable initial calibrations and calibration verifications were documented and linked to the field measurements for the sampling project. (FD 4100, section 2)

Documentation for field calibration standards and reagents

128. N Information about all calibration standards and reagents used for field testing were linked to the calibration information associated with the field testing measurements for the project. (FD 4000)

Not recorded

129. N The concentration or other assay value, the vendor catalog number and the description of the standard or reagent were recorded for all preformulated solutions, neat liquids and powders. (FD 4100, sections 1.1 – 1.1.1)

Not recorded

130. N Certificates of assay, grade and other vendor specifications for all standards and reagents were retained and recorded for the standards and reagents linked to the sampling project. (FD 4100, sections 1.1.2 – 1.1.2.1)

Not recorded; Only information for Turbidity was avaliable

131. N Expiration dates for all calibration standards and reagents used on the sampling project were recorded. (FD 4100, section 1.3)

Not recorded

Documentation of equipment and instrument maintenance

132. N Each applicable instrument or equipment unit (inventory item) was identified with a unique designation or identification code that distinguishes the unit from all others. (FD 3000, section 1.3)

Not recorded

133. NR Manufacturers' operation & maintenance manuals and instructions were retained for all equipment and instruments associated with the sampling project. (FD 3000, section 4)

Documentation for field testing measurements (field analysis of samples)

134. Y All field measurement tests and related data were recorded and linked to the project, the date and the sample source. (FD 5000, section 2.7)

135. Y All field measurements were recorded with the appropriate reporting units, the value of the test result, the parameter measured or tested, the name of the analyst performing the test, the time of the measurement and the unique identification for the test instrument used. (FD 5000, section 2.7)