

SRRTTF - Tech Track Work Group
September 21, 2022 Meeting Summary

Meeting Materials–

1. Powerpoint presentations – see posted TTWG meeting materials

ACTION ITEMS IN RED

Attendees

Brandee Era-Miller, WA Dept of Ecology
Dave Dilks, LimnoTech
Doug Krapas, IEP
Vikki Barthels, Spokane County Health
Kris Holm
Lisa Dally Wilson, Dally Environmental
Alyssa Gersdorf, City of Post Falls
Jeff Donovan, City of Spokane
Bill Fees, WA Dept of Ecology
Cheryl Niemi, Ecology
Holly Davies, WA Dept of Health
Gary Jones
Scott Wade, LimnoTech

Monica Ott, Avista
Doug Austin, Chesapeake Bay Program
Jeremy Schmidt, WA Dept of Ecology
Sandy Treccani, WA Dept of Ecology
Ken Windram, HARSB
Robert Mott
Ben and Lara Floyd, White Bluffs
Brian Nickel, USEPA
Annie Simpson, WA Dept of Ecology
Noemi Barabas, LimnoTech
Joyce Duncan, LimnoTech
Tim Towey, LimnoTech

Summary Notes

NOTE THAT TTWG MEETINGS ARE SHIFTING TO THE 3RD TUESDAY OF THE MONTH

I. Next-level Historical Review

The TTWG discussed and finalized the prioritization approach for the Next-Level Historical Review.

Site Identification - Brandee requested that **Dave check TCP Memo by Pam Marti to see if we are missing any sites.** Also, **Brian Nickel requested a check of 3 or 4 entities in the EPA published database of PCB sites that are near the Spokane Industrial Park.** Holly Davies mentioned the database might be outdated given the address on East Crescent has no PCBs. **Suggestion for Dave Dilks to check with Holly Davies regarding the applicable entries in the EPA PCB database.** Decision not to include City Parcel or junkyard sites as they are outside of the 1/2 mile boundary from the river, despite high release potential and being near the boundary. Request for a map of all sites combined (eg., Sanborn maps, whats in my neighborhood, EPA database (if applicable)).

Prioritization – North side sites are being eliminated based on assumptions that groundwater flows away from the river on the north side. This might not always be the case given the temporal nature of the groundwater surface water interaction. CHANGE proposed delivery potential scoring system to +2, +1, 0, -1 and re-run prioritization. TTWG members were agreeable with other scoring recommendations.

LimnoTech will provide a draft Technical Memo with prioritization results to the TTWG for review on October 11th (one week before the October TTWG meeting). PLEASE REVIEW IN ADVANCE of October 18th TTWG meeting.

What do we do with high priority sites – save discussion for October TTWG meeting, consider fingerprinting

II. Project Updates - Field work

Recently completed and ongoing monitoring

1. Expanded Synoptic Survey/Artesian Well/Stormwater Catch Basin
 - Synoptic survey conducted August 28 - September 2
 - Storm basin sampling conducted September 7
2. Sediment/Biofilm Monitoring
 - Completed September 3 - 7
3. Water Column/Trend Assessment
 - SPMDs deployed August 30
 - Due for retrieval September 28

Fish Tissue Trend Assessment – Confirmation of revised sampling frequency

TTWG approved recommendation that the QAPP go out for signature this week with fish tissue sampling in Reach 6 to include 15 fish rather than 25, and after sampling in 2022, fish tissue trend assessment sampling will move to a four-year frequency in the future.

III. Future Project Topics

1. Groundwater and surface water fingerprinting of PCB data at GE site

LimnoTech prepared a project scope and budget to address the EPA scope of work to “ascertain whether the ambient water and biofilm data indicate a release of PCBs to surface water from the GE NPL Site”. The EPA contractor had a conflict of interest and the Task Force has shown interest in conducting this work. See ppt presentation (TTWG_GEFingerprint_09212022). TTWG discussed two proposed approaches to this fingerprinting work (Cosine Similarity Assessment and Polytopic Vector Analysis (PVA)) and determined that the additional cost for the PVA fingerprinting methodology would be appropriate. LimnoTech will prepare a formal scope of work using the PVA method and the TTWG will recommend approval at the September SRRTTF meeting for a total cost of \$45,000.

There was some concern expressed regarding the Task Force’s authority to address a closed site if TF related work results in proof that a closed toxics site is still contaminating

groundwater and the Spokane River in a way that results in an exceedance of water quality standards and fish contamination. What can the Task Force do with this type of information? Is it worth analyzing? 'There are re-opener clauses in the consent decree.' Bill Fees sates that the site could be Re-opened, but there is a very high bar and he's not aware of when Ecology has done that in the past. But it is possible that industrial and residential clean up levels are not protective of groundwater or surface water quality in the Spokane Basin. Brian Nickel stated that the work will also be useful for the TMDL. **Brian will talk with the Superfund group and bring information to the next TTWG meeting.**

IV. Next Month

- Further discussion and development of new projects including:
 - Compilation of groundwater monitoring well data to assess connectivity to SR
 - Calculation of PCB loading from GE site based on 1668 gw and water level data
 - Additional Canine Detection work
- Consider new Task Order for LimnoTech to cover Project Development (to preserve discretionary funding)
- Discuss Prioritization Memo and finalize
- What to do with high priority sites?
- Input from EPA Superfund group on re-opening sites

