

## QAPP and SAP Summarized Comments

### QAPP

- General comments:
  - Tighten up the language, be consistent with definitions and terminology; especially the identification of the team members and organizations involved with the activities.
  - Clarify the organization chart and responsibilities. For example the SRRTTF (Task Force) provides oversight and direction but the SRRTTF-ACE manages contract activities. Clarify how the data/results of the project are communicated from SRRTTF-ACE to the SRRTTF.
  - Review QAPP, SAP, Confidence Testing memo, and RFQQ for consistency with each other.
  - SOPs have not been provided and should also be reviewed for consistency with the project requirements.
  - QAPP will require review/approval by Ecology (EAP QA officer and WQ Eastern Region) before data collection begins.
- Need to also include the titles of those approving the QAPP as well as signature dates.
- Hasn't Lab2 been determined to be Manchester Laboratory? If so, consider including the specific details throughout the QAPP for Manchester lab.
- Consider defining the responsibilities of the Sampling CONTRACTOR.
- Need a brief statement in introduction explaining why other listed parameters (dioxins?) besides PCBs are not included in the assessment.
- No discussion of confidence testing. Should provide a statement saying this is occurring and include a reference for the confidence testing memo.
- Consider providing intent of the synoptic study. From the SRRTTF "Monitoring Strategy" document (1/6/14), consider including the following: The Synoptic Survey is designed to build upon the existing Ecology mass balance assessment and address data gaps related to groundwater and the nature of upstream sources of PCBs.
- Looks like Figure 4 was not entirely captured within the document.
- May also want to add that all labs that will be used for the project will be certified (e.g., state certification, NELAP, etc.).
- Serdar et al 2011 missing from the reference list
- No analytical methods listed for parameters. Section 2.4 says they are shown in tables 4 and 5 but they are not included in these table.
- What type of QA/QC will be performed on the sample bottles prior to use?
- May also want to provide a description of the report that will be produced at the conclusion of this project.
- Laboratory Data Sheet Reviews: Make correction, there are no plans to take equipment blanks.
- They longer-term plan for data storage and accessibility beyond the project life is not mentioned (i.e. are you planning to put this data in Ecology's EIM system). Entering it into EIM would make the data accessible to a broader audience.

## QAPP and SAP Summarized Comments

- No mention of 303(d) listings for the Spokane River. What happened to the table that summarized toxics listings for the river?
- I thought we discussed putting appendices A, C, and D on a website rather than including in the document to make it shorter?
- SAP
- No analytical methods listed in the document
- SOPs for the most part have not been customized to reflect sampling for this project. The last revision was 2008.
- SOPs for conventional parameters don't look like they reflect the use of Hydrolabs.
- 303(d) listings are briefly mentioned in the text, but the table showing them has been deleted.
- Is it necessary to include a copy of the QAPP as an appendix?
- Should reference confidence testing memo in the SAP. Confidence testing is mentioned on page 10 but it has no explanation of what this is about.