

# 2024-05-09\_Gasco OU: Dissolution Model Meeting

Meeting Title:	Gasco OU: Dissolution Model Meeting
Date/Time:	May 9, 2024 / 11:00 am - 12:30 pm
Attendees:	AQ: Halah Voges, Matt Davis, Mike Gefell EE: Rob Ede DEQ: Wes Thomas, Dan Hafley, Heidi Nelson
Location:	DEQ NW Region Office

## Meeting Notes:

- EE provides a high level summary of meeting objectives.
- DEQ confirms high level objectives and provides additional background information:
  - During a recent meeting with NW Natural, EE, and AQ, AQ proposed a revised draft FS schedule that extended into early 2025. The schedule indicated that one of the critical path drivers was a robust modeling evaluation to determine restoration timeframes for each remedial alternatives. DEQ questioned whether the proposed level of effort for the modeling was necessary to accomplish the draft FS objectives.
  - The need to evaluate groundwater restoration timeframes are primarily related to the identification of groundwater hot spots.
  - EE and AQ had indicated that NW Natural planned to use the Fill WBZ as the basis for establishing that groundwater restoration could not occur within a reasonable time period. DEQ had responded that Alluvium WBZs across much of the site is already below PRGs or are close to achieving PRGs. We requested that NW Natural evaluate groundwater on a finer scale to support the FS.
  - Goal of the meeting today is to discuss the appropriate level of effort for defining groundwater hot spots for the FS.
  - Some of the more detailed modeling could be postponed to RD.
- AQ questions the purpose of deferring estimating restoration timeframes to RD
  - DEQ clarifies that more detailed evaluations in RD could be tailored specifically to the selected remedy with a focus on informing timeframes for ISS barrier wall breaching.
- AQ discusses some prepared remarks for the meeting. Topics identified by AQ for discussion are consistent with those mentioned by DEQ.
  - Would like to understand purpose/purposes of model and recap previously discussed approach
  - Would like to discuss general approach to modeling: generic? Heterogeneous? Site-wide? Which areas? Which WBZs? How many scenarios?
  - How to apply effective solubility data?
  - Need to simulate desorption of COCs from TOC in relatively clean areas?
  - What datasets to use?
- AQ summarizes potential purposes for modeling:
  - Estimating total groundwater cleanup time for the site
    - DEQ does not think this is an objective.
  - Compare cleanup times for different alternatives
    - DEQ recognizes some value in the ability to compare alternatives on a relative basis, but should not warrant a high level of effort.
  - Test for hot spots (reasonable cleanup times; e.g., less than 100 years)
    - DEQ confirms this is the primary objective.
- AQ confirms primary objective. AQ discusses three scenarios:
  - areas where DNAPL is absent and GW is likely to be restored,
  - areas where a lot of DNAPL is present in inaccessible areas where groundwater is not likely to be restored,
  - areas where residual DNAPL is present (or where remediation could create a residual DNAPL condition), where the ability to restore groundwater in a reasonable time period is uncertain.
- AQ proposes some initial simple 2D modeling in three areas (Upper Alluvium WBZ along southern face of DNAPL in Siltronic GSA, Upper Alluvium WBZ in Koppers, Upper (but relatively deeper) residual DNAPL in the FAMM area)
  - DEQ agrees that these could provide a high level estimate of remediation timeframes.
  - AQ will do modeling and discuss results with DEQ to inform the approach in the draft FS.
- Next step is to meet to discuss proposed model results and establish path forward and schedule for draft FS.