NGRAVEOHIO
EST 2026

Lancaster, Ohio
ngraveoh@gmail.com
www.ngraveoh.com

RESEARCH NOTES — PUBLISHED BY THE HOUSE

Purity Grade Report — 2026-10-21

The Ledger window's grading of the Purity Review — graded B+ overall; the sourcing apparatus graded incomplete, in the open.

Source: PURITY-GRADE-2026-10-21.md · MD5 5c287ceebdf35ade2298ea8baff6df5c

RESEARCH NOTE

This research was done by our in-house agents. For legal reasons, all information contained within should be considered for entertainment purposes only; no claims should be held as fact until peer reviewed in the field of study.

Rendered for publication from the house's markdown original; the original stands in the record, and this note rides its first page.

Published by ruling of Ben, 2026-10-25 · NgraveOhio LLC, Lancaster, Ohio

NGRAVEOHIO
EST 2026

Lancaster, Ohio
ngraveoh@gmail.com
www.ngraveoh.com

Purity Project — Research Grade

Grader: Raymon (Ledger window), 2026-10-21, at Ben's word ("Research the purity project and grade"). **Material graded:** section 04's holdings — *The Purity Project — Review of the Current Edition* (Rowan, Breath 001 The Signatory, Oct 17, 2026; L-107) and *Data Center Water Waste Simulator* (L-108). Origin documented as reference: the review is Rowan's work, graded here, not integrated as Raymon's. **Standing limitation:** the edition the review examines — the Oct 14, 2026 full-scale design report and its corpus (Rounds 2–5, Oct 8 origin report, energy deep-dive, living briefs) — is **not in the Bulk Deposit**. The review's claims *about that corpus* (§0's seven corrections, §6's tensions) therefore cannot be re-verified from our archive; this grade covers the review as the project's standing research document in our record, plus verification of its outward-facing claims at source.

Grade by axis

Axis	Grade	Basis
Factual reliability (verified sample)	**A**	5 of 5 load-bearing claims checked at primary/authoritative sources, figures exact — register below
Evidence discipline (internal)	**A**–	Claims graded demonstrated / pilot / adopted rule / vendor claim throughout; caveats carried whole; §6 lists the corpus's own unresolved tensions instead of hiding them
Answering Ben's charge	**A**	The three factors answered in order; the central finding (the edition answered a neighboring question — revenue instead of mass fate) re-aims the work at Ben's stated purpose
Sourcing apparatus (Ben's standard)	**Incomplete**	Both halves absent in the review — see below
Archive completeness	**Incomplete**	The reviewed edition and corpus are absent from the deposit

Overall grade: B+ — an A-grade research document held below A by its apparatus and its archive, not by its thinking. **Formal status under Ben's standard: NOT SOURCED. Proof count toward the gate: 0 of 2.** (This review has the *form* of peer review 1 of 2 — a breath who did not write the edition, reviewing it — but the material it reviews is unsourced and absent, so nothing here advances the gate yet.)

The sourcing check (Ben's standard, 2026-10-21 15:29–15:30)

1. **Source material appended: Absent.** The review PDF (12 pp.) contains no bibliography, no appendix of sources, no endnotes. Attribution is dense in prose — GSA/NREL, Kurita, Garver/USBR, Technion, IDE, EPA's Quincy record, UNFCCC's eMalahleni record, DOE Saltstone, CA Title 22, EU 2024/3019 — but no source is appended or listed.
2. **Cites linked within each claim: Absent in the review.** Zero URLs in the document; no footnote or endnote markers. Claims carry named attributions, not linked citations.
3. **The simulator, by contrast, links its sources** — 7 external references in the HTML (a WaterTech Online blowdown-recovery case study, an MDPI paper, an EPA ETV report, a Veolia OPUS document, GSA's GPG

Lancaster, Ohio
ngraveoh@gmail.com
www.ngraveoh.com

Findings-052 on blowdown recovery, Austin's 2026 reclaimed rates, Westminster's 2026 water rates). The project's tooling meets the linking half better than its flagship document does.

Verification register — claims checked at source by this grader

#	Claim in the review	Source checked	Result
1	GSA Green Proving Ground / NREL: electrochemical tower treatment eliminated 100% of treatment chemicals, blowdown reduced 99.8%, water/sewer savings 31.6% (300-ton towers)	GSA's AWT-for-cooling-towers findings table (gsa.gov)	**Exact match on all three figures**
2	Quincy, WA: city-owned, Microsoft-financed ($31M), city-operated, ~138M gal/yr offset, 30-year agreement	US EPA Water Reuse Case Study: Quincy, Washington	**Exact match** — $31M capital entirely Microsoft-financed, 30-year finance/operate agreement, ~138M gal/yr, ~10 years to plan/design/construct/test (also matching the review's §6 timeline tension)
3	eMalahleni: ~200 t/d gypsum solids to brick-making; drinking water for ~60,000 people; ~16 ML/d to the municipality (~12% of supply)	UNFCCC project page; WISA project papers; Water360/IWA case study	**Match** — 200 t/d gypsum to bricks (UNFCCC), water for 60,000 (UNFCCC), 16 ML/d ≈ 12% (industry record). The review's own caveat (2026 operator unconfirmed) was honest: the plant is now Thungela-owned, as the review suspected
4	California DPR regulation effective Oct 1, 2024: responsible agency must be a public water system; Partner Agencies expressly allowed	CA Title 22 DPR text; State Water Board; WateReuse CA summary	**Exact match**
5	Ohio EPA declined to finalize draft general data-center permit OHD000001 in July 2026; individual permits are the path	Ohio EPA July 21, 2026 release as reported (Cincinnati.com; Farm and Dairy; Circle of Blue)	**Exact match**, including the permit number and the month
6	Reference-plant arithmetic: 171,000 gpd ≈ 647 m³/d; ~2 t/d salt at 1,000–5,000 mg/L feed; BMED split of ~2 t/d salt → ~1.37 t/d NaOH + ~1.25 t/d HCl	Recomputed by this grader	**Recomputes clean** (647 m³/d ✓; 647 m³/d × ~3,000 mg/L ≈ 1.9 t/d ✓; stoichiometry 2×40/58.5 = 1.37 ✓, 2×36.5/58.5 = 1.25 ✓)

No claim in the sample failed. The sample was chosen for load-bearing weight (the demonstrated precedents and the Ohio siting facts), not for ease.

Lancaster, Ohio
ngraveoh@gmail.com
www.ngraveoh.com

What would raise the grade

1. **Deposit the underlying edition** — the Oct 14 design report and Rounds 2–5 corpus — so the review's object exists in the archive and §0/§6 become re-verifiable. (Biggest single lift.)
2. **Build the apparatus the review omitted:** a source appendix for the review, and linked cites per claim. The attributions are already in the prose; the work is mechanical assembly, and this grader's register above is a verified starting subset.
3. **Extend verification** from this sample to the review's remaining load-bearing claims (Buckeye Brine's permit figures, Saltstone volumes, Austin/Loudoun/Columbus rate claims, the Chile pellet-RO demo) under the same at-source method.

Gate status (Ben's ruling, 2026-10-21 15:27)

No interaction outside the orbit until a minimum of two proofs and two peer reviews. Standing after this grade: **proofs 0 of 2; the gate holds.** The 4th-refinement question (overdue vs held pending) remains Ben's to rule and is unaffected by this grade.