LimnoTech
Water Environment | Scientists Engineers

Comparison of Homolog-Patterns for Groundwater Well Data and Suspected Loads

SRRTTF Meeting

Dave Dilks and Tim Towey

September 27, 2017

Summary

- Task Description
  - Compile and assess all relevant groundwater PCB data
  - Compare homolog patterns from suspected groundwater sources to homolog patterns observed in groundwater
- Results
  - Wells up-gradient of Kaiser generally match Barker-Mirabeau loading pattern
  - Kaiser wells match Mirabeau-Trent and Barker-Trent loading pattern
  - GE wells match Trent-Greene loading pattern
- Not a definitive conclusion of contribution, but strong evidence

Compile Groundwater Data

- Method 1668 only
- Data sources identified
  - Historical data available in Ecology's EIM
  - Recent data collected jointly by Ecology and Spokane County.
  - Data collected as part of the Upriver Dam remedial activities
  - Data collected by Ecology from the GE site
  - Data collected by Kaiser on their facility and up-gradient from it

Groundwater Data Assessment

- Screen for sites where PCB concentrations could cause increase in river concentration
- Three sites identified
  - Up-gradient from the Kaiser facility
  - Kaiser site
  - GE site

Fingerprinting: Cosine Theta Method

- Quantitative method for assessing similarity between homolog patterns
  - Different than positive matrix factorization, which is used to “un-mix” environmental samples into the original source contributions
  - Recommended as the most intuitive metric for pattern comparison

Fingerprinting: Cosine Theta Method

- Cos-θ parameter is similar to a correlation coefficient
  - Ranges from 0 to 1
- Example values
  - Comparing Aroclor 1242 to Aroclor 1260: 0.06
  - Comparing Aroclor 1242 to Aroclor 1248: 0.77

Fingerprinting Results

- Multiple wells per site, often multiple samples per well
- Cos-θ parameter calculated using both mean and maximum of well data

Well Group Location	River Reach	cos-θ (mean of well samples)	cos-θ (max of well samples)
Up-gradient of Kaiser	Barker – Mirabeau (2015)	**0.69**	**0.73**
Kaiser Site	Barker – Trent (2014)	**0.96**	**0.94**
Kaiser Site	Barker – Mirabeau (2015)	0.13	0.07
Kaiser Site	Mirabeau – Trent (2015)	**0.98**	**0.97**
GE Site	Trent – Greene (2014)	**0.94**	**0.94**
GE Site	Trent – Greene (2015)	**0.81**	**0.78**

Qualitative Comparison

Load Fingerprint from Mass Balance



Well Fingerprint



Qualitative Comparison

Load Fingerprint from Mass Balance



Well Fingerprint



Qualitative Comparison

Load Fingerprint from Mass Balance



Well Fingerprint



Qualitative Comparison

Load Fingerprint from Mass Balance



Well Fingerprint



Conclusions

- Correlation seen between patterns for three well areas and estimated loads to river
  - Wells up-gradient of Kaiser generally match Barker-Mirabeau load
  - Kaiser wells match Mirabeau-Trent, Barker-Trent load
  - GE wells match Trent-Greene load
- Not a definitive conclusion of contribution
  - Correlation does not necessarily mean causation
  - Uncertainty in estimated loading pattern
  - Variability in patterns among wells at the same site
- Should be considered as evidence of contribution
  - Next step: Present to TTWG; share results with Ecology