

ATTACHMENT 1: QUALITY ASSURANCE/QUALITY CONTROL SUMMARY

This attachment summarizes the field and laboratory quality assurance (QA), data verification and data validation procedures utilized for the JPL groundwater monitoring program. Data validation was performed by an independent contractor, Environment Standards, Inc., of Valley Forge, Pennsylvania. Data verification and validation indicated that all volatile organic compounds (VOCs), perchlorate, and metals results obtained from the third quarter 2021 groundwater monitoring event were acceptable for their intended use of characterizing the aquifer.

ATTACHMENT 1: QUALITY ASSURANCE/QUALITY CONTROL SUMMARY

Field and laboratory quality control (QC) samples were collected and analyzed to fulfill quality requirements. Proper sample collection and handling procedures were utilized to ensure the integrity of the analytical results. A comprehensive QA/QC plan for groundwater monitoring is described in the *Work Plan for Performing a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study* (Ebasco, 1993).

FIELD QUALITY ASSURANCE/QUALITY CONTROL

The field QA/QC samples collected for JPL groundwater monitoring included field duplicate samples, equipment rinsate blanks and trip blanks. The QC sample results were used for the qualitative evaluation of the data. Table 1-1 summarizes analytical results for the QC samples (equipment blanks, source blanks, and trip blanks) during the third quarter 2021 groundwater monitoring event.

Field Duplicate Samples. Duplicate samples were collected to evaluate the precision of the sample collection process. Duplicate samples for VOCs, perchlorate, metals were collected from monitoring wells MW-12 (Screen 2), MW-15, MW-17 (Screen 4), MW-19 (Screen 4), MW-21 (Screen 3), MW-23 (Screen 3), and MW-24 (Screen 4). The analytical results for the field duplicate samples were comparable to the results of the original groundwater samples for VOCs (Table 1) and metals (Table 2), with some exceptions:

- Perchlorate in the MW-12 (Screen 2) duplicate pair (1.3J µg/L vs. 1.2J µg/L), MW-17 (Screen 4) duplicate pair (3.9 µg/L vs. 4.4 µg/L), MW-21 (Screen 3) duplicate pair (2.6 µg/L vs. 2.8 µg/L), and MW-23 (Screen 3) duplicate pair (3.1 µg/L vs. 3.3 µg/L).
- TCE in the MW-17 (Screen 4) duplicate pair (0.7 µg/L vs. 0.8 µg/L), MW-21 (Screen 3) duplicate pair (1.1J µg/L vs. 2.0J µg/L), and MW-23 (Screen 3) duplicate pair (non-detect vs. 0.2J µg/L).
- PCE in the MW-17 (Screen 4) duplicate pair (J µg/L vs. 0.5 µg/L), MW-19 (Screen 4) duplicate pair (0.7 µg/L vs. 0.8 µg/L), MW-21 (Screen 3) duplicate pair (1.0J µg/L vs. 2.1J µg/L), and MW-23 (Screen 3) duplicate pair (non-detect µg/L vs. 0.3J µg/L).
- Hexavalent chromium in the MW-15 duplicate pair (non-detect vs. 0.67J µg/L), MW-17 (Screen 4) duplicate pair (2.30J µg/L vs. 2.40J µg/L), and MW-23 (Screen 3) duplicate pair (3.40J µg/L vs. 3.50J µg/L).
- Total chromium in the MW-15 duplicate pair (5.6J µg/L vs. 9.2J µg/L), MW-17 (Screen 4) duplicate pair (2.0J µg/L vs. 1.8J µg/L), and MW-23 (Screen 3) duplicate pair (1.7J µg/L vs. 1.6J µg/L).

The source of the differences could not be determined.

Equipment Rinsate Blanks. Equipment rinsate blanks were collected each day that non-dedicated sampling equipment was used. The equipment rinsate blanks, consisting of distilled water run through the sampling equipment after decontamination, were analyzed for all contaminants of concern to monitor possible cross-contamination of the samples due to inadequate decontamination.

- Hexavalent chromium was detected at estimated levels in EB-1-071921 (0.09J $\mu\text{g/L}$), EB-2-072021 (0.12J $\mu\text{g/L}$), EB-3-072121 (0.18J $\mu\text{g/L}$), EB-4-072221 (0.09J $\mu\text{g/L}$), EB-5-072321 (0.12J $\mu\text{g/L}$), EB-6-072621 (0.12J $\mu\text{g/L}$), EB-7-072721 (0.08J $\mu\text{g/L}$), and EB-8-072821 (0.13J $\mu\text{g/L}$).
- Total chromium was detected at estimated levels in EB-6-072621 (0.8J $\mu\text{g/L}$).

The source of the hexavalent chromium and the total chromium contamination in the equipment blanks could not be determined. Detected hexavalent chromium and total chromium concentrations in the equipment blanks were compared to the detected concentrations in the associated monitoring wells during the data validation process to determine if data validation qualifiers were necessary.

No other VOC contaminants, metals or tentatively identified compounds (TICs) were detected in the equipment blanks as shown in Table 1-1.

Trip Blanks. Trip blanks, which consisted of reagent-grade water in vials transported with the sample bottles to and from the field, were submitted to the laboratory with each shipment of groundwater samples. Trip blanks were used to help identify cross-contamination of groundwater samples during transport and sample handling procedures. No total chromium, hexavalent chromium, VOC contaminants or TICs were detected in the trip blanks as shown in Table 1-1.

Source Blanks. Two source blanks which consisted of distilled water used by sampling personnel for equipment decontamination were collected during the sampling event. This QC sample serves as a check for any contamination present in the source water.

- Hexavalent chromium was detected at estimated levels in SB-1-052121 (0.10J $\mu\text{g/L}$), and SB-1-071921 (0.11J $\mu\text{g/L}$), and SB-2-072621 (0.14J $\mu\text{g/L}$).
- Total chromium was detected at estimated levels in SB-2-072621 (1.0J $\mu\text{g/L}$).

The source of the hexavalent chromium contamination in the source blanks could not be determined. Detected hexavalent chromium concentrations in the source blanks were compared to the detected concentrations in the associated monitoring wells during the data validation process to determine if data validation qualifiers were necessary.

No other VOC contaminants, metals or tentatively identified compounds (TICs) were detected in the source blanks as shown in Table 1-1.

LABORATORY QUALITY ASSURANCE/QUALITY CONTROL

Laboratory QC samples included surrogate compounds (for VOC analyses), matrix spike samples, blank spike samples, and method blanks. The results of the laboratory QC samples were used by the laboratory to determine the accuracy and precision of the analytical techniques, and to identify anomalous results due to laboratory contamination or instrument malfunction.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION

The purpose of data verification and validation is to ensure that the data collected meet the data quality objectives (DQOs) outlined in the Quality Assurance Project Plan of the Groundwater Monitoring Plan (Ebasco, 1993).

Data Verification. Data verification is a review of the analytical data that includes confirming that the sample identification numbers on the laboratory reports match those on the chain-of-custody records. Data verification also includes a review of the analytical data reports to confirm that all samples were analyzed, and all required analytes were quantified for each sample.

Data Validation. Data validation is a systematic review of the analytical data to determine the compliance with established method performance criteria. Validation of a data package included review of the technical holding time requirements, review of sample preparation, review of the initial and continuing calibration data, review and recalculation of the laboratory QC sample data, review of the equipment performance, reconciliation of the raw data with the reduced results, identification of data anomalies, and qualification of data to identify data usability limitations.

Data validation was performed by an independent contractor, Environment Standards, Inc., of Valley Forge, Pennsylvania. All of the data provided by BC Laboratories, Inc., of Bakersfield, California were validated. Ninety percent of the data were subjected to Level III validation and 10 percent of the data were subjected to Level IV validation in accordance with the EPA Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines for Organic and Inorganic Data Review (U.S. EPA, 2017; 2017).

Data Validation Qualifiers. Analytical data were qualified based on the data validation. Data qualifiers were assigned in accordance with EPA guidelines.

All samples were analyzed for VOCs, perchlorate, and metals within the analytical holding times with four exceptions; the sample for CR(VI) in MW-17 (Screen 3), MW-24 (Screens 1 and 3), MW-25 (Screen 5) were rejected for non-compliance with method requirements during validation and deemed unusable. Data validation indicated that all the data from the third quarter 2021 groundwater monitoring event were acceptable for their intended use of characterizing aquifer quality. The data validation reports are included in Attachment 2.

REFERENCES

- Ebasco. 1993. *Work Plan for Performing a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study*. National Aeronautics and Space Administration Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, California. December.
- U.S. EPA. 2017. *USEPA National Functional Guidelines for Organic Superfund Methods Data Review*. January.
- U.S. EPA. 2017. *USEPA National Functional Guidelines for Inorganic Superfund Methods Data Review*. January.

**TABLE 1-1
SUMMARY OF CONTAMINANTS DETECTED IN QUALITY CONTROL SAMPLES
COLLECTED DURING THE 3rd QUARTER 2021 SAMPLING EVENT
(All concentrations reported in µg/L.)**

Sample ID Number	Associated Samples	Total Chromium		Hexavalent Chromium		1, 2, 3-Trichloropropane		Methylene Chloride		2-Butanone		Other Organic Compounds			TICs		
		Result	Qualifier	Result	Qualifier	Result	Qualifier	Result	Qualifier	Result	Qualifier	Compound	Result	Qualifier	Compound	Result	Qualifier
Equipment Blanks																	
EB-1-071921	MW-19-1, MW-19-2, MW-19-3, MW-19-4, MW-19-5, MW-20-2, MW-20-3, MW-20-4, MW-20-5	ND		0.09 J		ND		ND		ND		ND					ND
EB-2-072021	MW-14-2, MW-14-3, MW-14-4, MW-14-5, MW-25-1, MW-25-2, MW-25-3, MW-25-4, MW-25-5	ND		0.12 J		ND		ND		ND		ND					ND
EB-3-072121	MW-17-2, MW-17-3, MW-17-4, MW-18-2, MW-18-3, MW-18-4, MW-18-5	ND		0.18 J		ND		ND		ND		ND					ND
EB-4-072221	MW-22-2, MW-22-3, MW-24-1, MW-24-2, MW-24-3	ND		0.09 J		ND		ND		ND		ND					ND
EB-5-072321	MW-23-2, MW-23-3, MW-26-2	ND		0.12 J		ND		ND		ND		ND					ND
EB-6-072621	MW-4-2, MW-4-3, MW-12-2, MW-12-3, MW-12-4, MW-12-5	0.8 J		0.12 J		ND		ND		ND		ND					ND
EB-7-072721	MW-11-1, MW-11-2, MW-11-3, MW-11-4, MW-3-2, MW-3-3, MW-3-4	ND		0.08 J		ND		ND		ND		ND					ND
EB-8-072821	MW-21-2, MW-21-3, MW-21-4, MW-21-5	ND		0.13 J		ND		ND		ND		ND					ND
Source Blanks																	
SB-1-071921	MW-19-1, MW-19-2, MW-19-3, MW-19-4, MW-19-5, MW-20-2, MW-20-3, MW-20-4, MW-20-5	ND		0.11 J		ND		ND		ND		ND					ND
SB-2-072621	MW-4-2, MW-4-3, MW-12-2, MW-12-3, MW-12-4, MW-12-5	1.0 J		0.14 J		ND		ND		ND		ND					ND
Trip Blanks																	
EB-1-071921	MW-19-1, MW-19-2, MW-19-3, MW-19-4, MW-19-5, MW-20-2, MW-20-3, MW-20-4, MW-20-5	NA		NA		ND		ND		ND		ND					ND
EB-2-072021	MW-14-2, MW-14-3, MW-14-4, MW-14-5, MW-25-1, MW-25-2, MW-25-3, MW-25-4, MW-25-5	NA		NA		ND		ND		ND		ND					ND
EB-3-072121	MW-17-2, MW-17-3, MW-17-4, MW-18-2, MW-18-3, MW-18-4, MW-18-5	NA		NA		ND		ND		ND		ND					ND
EB-4-072221	MW-22-2, MW-22-3, MW-24-1, MW-24-2, MW-24-3	NA		NA		ND		ND		ND		ND					ND
EB-5-072321	MW-23-2, MW-23-3, MW-26-2	NA		NA		ND		ND		ND		ND					ND
EB-6-072621	MW-4-2, MW-4-3, MW-12-2, MW-12-3, MW-12-4, MW-12-5	NA		NA		ND		ND		ND		ND					ND
EB-7-072721	MW-11-1, MW-11-2, MW-11-3, MW-11-4, MW-3-2, MW-3-3, MW-3-4	NA		NA		ND		ND		ND		ND					ND
EB-8-072821	MW-21-2, MW-21-3, MW-21-4, MW-21-5	NA		NA		ND		ND		ND		ND					ND
Notes																	
NA Not Analyzed																	
ND Not/None Detected																	
J Analyte concentration is an estimated value																	
U Analyte was analyzed for but not detected at or above the stated limit																	
UJ Analyte was analyzed for but not detected; analyte concentration is an estimated value																	