

SRRTTF - Tech Track Work Group
November 22, 2022 Meeting Summary

Meeting Materials– Posted under TTWG Meeting materials on TF website

1. Powerpoint presentation – see posted TTWG meeting materials
2. Spokane River Historical PCB Source Review Memo – Final Draft
3. Revisiting Superfund Sites – Talking Points by Brian Nickel, USEPA
4. PCB Program – Talking Points by Brian Nickel, USEPA

ACTION ITEMS IN RED

Attendees

Brandee Era-Miller, WA Dept of Ecology
Dave Dilks, LimnoTech
Lisa Dally Wilson, Dally Environmental
Alyssa Gersdorf, City of Post Falls
Jeff Donovan, City of Spokane
Holly Davies, WA Dept of Health
Joyce Duncan, LimnoTech
Jeremy Schmidt, WA Dept of Ecology
Sandy Treccani, WA Dept of Ecology
Bryce Robbert, Avista

Ben Floyd, White Bluffs
Mike Anderson, City of Coeur d’Alene
Lara Floyd, White Bluffs
Brian Nickel, USEPA
Gunnar Johnson, USEPA
Amy Sumner, Spokane County
Rob Lindsay, Spokane County
Doug Krapas, IEP
Gary Jones
Doug Austin, Chesapeake Bay Program

Summary Notes

NEXT TTWG MEETING – December 20, 10 am – noon, Pacific Time. To be confirmed by doodle poll. (note – Confirmed!)

FINAL DRAFT: Spokane River Historical PCB Source Review

- Discussed final review comments/changes. Approved for recommendation to TF with two corrections to Table 3. **Sandy Treccani will check with coordinator of 24-28 E Spokane Falls Blvd site to determine whether there are any PCB data for that site.**

NEXT STEPS: Spokane River Historical PCB Source Assessment – Confirmation Sampling

- What do we do with high priority sites? For now, stick with the top eleven as summarized in Table 3 of the Memo. Options for further analysis include
 1. Deeper dive (digging for additional historical information)
 2. Comparison of fingerprints between the site and hotspots nearby – consider connectivity to river
 3. Monitoring (via Jasper, targeted grab samples, where accessible)

Jeremy suggested that the TF consider empirical evidence in receiving waters as part of the next work on these sites. Move backwards from surface water to groundwater to soil. Suggestions also made to use piezometers along the river bank and groundwater monitoring wells.

- Consider parallel paths for analysis. If there are PCB data for a site that indicate PCB presence, then move forward with #2, #3 above (including additional sampling, fingerprinting, canine detection). If there are no data and potential PCB presence at the site is based on Sanborn maps, then do deeper dive for historical information.

Further discussion ensued regarding next steps and confirmation sampling. Given the TF sunset date, lack of authority in toxics control, and the difficulty in re-opening closed sites, it was suggested that the TTWG take the discussion to the full SRRTTF. The TTWG will request direction from full SRRTTF on Nov 30 regarding what further work to do with highest ranking sites in the Historical Assessment. Request guidance – if we have data (eg., Inland Metals site) and there is no current cleanup, does the Task Force want to move forward with confirmation sampling. Should the TF move forward with a deeper dive for sites without PCB data? Although the GE Site is not within the boundary of the Historic Assessment site review, the TTWG has discussed further confirmation sampling at the GE site as well. **The TTWG will request direction from the TF for both suggested confirmation sampling in wells on City property at the GE site as well as the top sites in the Historic Assessment.**

Brian Nickel stated that the GE site is a state-led CERCLA site. The five year periodic review on the GE site was recently completed. The EPA RPM did not see any “evidence” of uncontrolled release according to the periodic review. Brian stated that the Task Force did not comment on the site during the periodic review public comment period.

Doug Krapas asked whether the recent change in the PCB WQS from 170 to 7 pg/l would change anything in the periodic review. It was pointed out that cleanup levels at the GE site were not based on a pathway of contamination to surface water. If it was determined that surface water concentrations of PCB were impacted by the GE site, the site would need to be re-opened as part of a legal process. GE is an NPL site.

Brian then presented information on re-visiting Superfund sites. See speaker notes.

Project Updates

It was noted that the TF continues to wait for SGS-AXYS laboratory results from the first round of field work this summer as well as the following rounds. The status of these 2023 projects are listed in the Table below.

Project	Status
Expanded synoptic survey (plus catch basins and artesian well)	Monitoring completed, awaiting lab results
Sediment/biofilm	Monitoring completed, awaiting lab results
Long term water column trend assessment	First round of monitoring completed, preparing for second deployment in December-January
Fish tissue trend assessment	Sampling completed by WDFW, samples pending shipment to laboratory
GE fingerprinting	Awaiting 2022 synoptic survey lab results

3rd Round (High Flow)- SPMD water column sampling for 2022-2023 Trend Assessment

The 3rd and final round of SPMD water column sampling for the 2022 – 2023 Trend Assessment requires funding through fall of 2023 . Rob Lindsay and Jeff Donovan are comfortable moving forward with the trend analysis. Plan for an interim deliverable that covers Gravity sampling and shipment to the Lab prior to June 30, 2023. Costs associated with work on the project post June 30th can be covered by non-Ecology funding within ACE assuming the final report is approved prior to the end of 2023. Ben Floyd said there could be a Virtual Task Force meeting in fall 2023 to approve the report as necessary. **The third round of SPMD water column sampling needs to be scoped, budgeted and budget approved by TF.**

Data Loggers near Hamilton Bridge site – Preliminary Analysis and future plans

LimnoTech has assessed a subset of the data the County has collected at the Hamilton Bridge site. This includes surface water level elevations at Hamilton St Bridge from November 24, 2021 to August 2022, and monitoring well data for 4 wells from November 24, 2021 to March 2, 2022. The assessment over this short time period indicates the direction of flow is essentially always out of the river into groundwater (from 24-Nov-21 to 2-March-22). LimnoTech recommends continued monitoring to see if this conclusions changes for other times of year.

There was discussion that groundwater may be more likely to flow into the river during summer flow periods, due to lower river stage. Dave Dilks shared Mike Hermanson's graph of historic aquifer and river levels that showed that the periods where groundwater flowed into the river happened at different times of the year. The graph appears to indicate that changes in groundwater flow direction often occur in conjunction with precipitous declines in river level. There was a request to assess whether observed periods of the river level being lower than the aquifer level corresponded to periods of dam maintenance activities. **LimnoTech will perform**

this assessment after the remaining 2022 data are downloaded. Bryce Robberts at Avista is the contact.

The TTWG concurred that the water level data should be downloaded in December and the data loggers be left in until the access agreement requires removal in April.

A comment was made that the “TF is just tip-toeing around this and we should just sample the wells for PCBs”.

Future Project Topics

The group discussed the following future project topics.

- Compilation of groundwater monitoring well data to assess connectivity to SR
Two projects will be scoped by LimnoTech for consideration by the TTWG and TF.
(1) Assessment of 1668 PCB data and water level data at the GE site monitoring wells (note this is a first step in determining whether calculations of PCB loading from the GE site based on 1668 PCB data and groundwater level data are possible), and
(2) a paper study of monitoring well data in the Mission Reach
- Confirmation Sampling (200K budget placeholder)
The TTWG will look to the full SRRTTF for direction on moving forward with confirmation sampling.
- Additional Canine Detection work – hold on this for now.

Brain Nickel discussed the PCB Regulatory program under TSCA (see talking points handout). He suggested the SRRTTF ask property owners to sample their building based on the Canine Detection work conducted last year. It was suggested that the TTWG wait to discuss this until the results from the Springfield catchment sampling are available. Brian agreed.

ZOOM CHAT NOTES:

11:00:46 From Brian Nickel to Everyone:

Just want to put in a plug for the "further reading" links on both of the talking point documents I shared. Lots of good information in there.

11:01:11 From Lisa Dally Wilson to Everyone:

Thanks Brian

11:45:28 From Brian Nickel to Everyone:

Here's a table of the monthly mean gauge heights at the Spokane Gauge.

https://nwis.waterdata.usgs.gov/nwis/monthly/?referred_module=sw&site_no=12422500&por_12422500_149641=1180230,00065,149641,2000-03,2021-12&format=html_table&date_format=YYYY-MM-DD&rdb_compression=file&submitted_form=parameter_selection_list

11:46:13 From Brian Nickel to Everyone:

Generally, the lowest levels are in July and August.

11:50:41 From Brandee Era-Miller to Everyone:

I have to leave the meeting now. I'd be happy to talk about possible future studies anytime. Thanks all. Have a good Thanksgiving.

11:51:21 From Lisa Dally Wilson to Everyone:

Thanks Brandee. It would be good to discuss future monitoring at GE and Mission Reach. Happy Thanksgiving

