

## Minutes

### Spokane River Regional Toxics Task Force

Liberty Lake Water and Sewer District Office

February 28, 2012, 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Conference bridge: 800-704-9804 Pin Code: 34863442#

**Present:** Dave Moore, Doug Krapas, Bud Leber, Tom Agnew, Bart Mihailovich, Rick Eichstaedt, Diana Washington, Sarah Hubbard-Gray, Carrie Holtan, Galen Buterbaugh, Mike Petersen, Lynn Schmidt, Neil Kersten, Dave Moss, Jani Gilbert, Brian Crossley, Mike Neher, Dale Arnold, Bruce Rawls, Dan Redline, Dave Wells, Kathryn Van Natta, Richard Koch, Sandy Phillips, Meghan Lunney, Jon Welge, Harvey Morrison, Ken Windram, Rebecca Stevens, and Mary Lou Soscia

**On Phone:** Environmental Issues, Dave McBride

**Facilitator:** Don Martin

**SRF Staff:** Andy Dunau and Tonilee Hanson

#### Materials Available on-line at [srrttf.org](http://srrttf.org):

Agenda

Technical Track Work Group – Purpose Statement

Technical Track Work Group PowerPoint Presentation

Task Force Draft RFP Narrative RE: Facilitation Services

The William D. Ruckelshaus Center – WSU and UW

Kelsey Gray Facilitator Vita

#### Welcome and Introductions

Facilitator Don Martin welcomed everyone to the Task Force meeting and invited everyone to introduce themselves.

#### MOA Update

Diana Washington provided an update. Six MOA signatures and one letter of support from the Spokane Tribe of Indians have been received. Three additional signatures are in the mail. Signature pages or letters of support brought to the meeting were collected and the rest are requested by the next meeting. The next round of MOA signatures will occur when Idaho NPDES permits are issued. EPA and the Spokane Tribe will actively engage in the Task Force but finalize signatory decision until Idaho permits are issued.

#### Technical Track Work Group

Bud Leber provided a PowerPoint presentation which detailed the Technical Track Work Group planning process and areas that request feedback from the entire Task Force.

### **TTWG Draft Purpose Statement (motion for acceptance will require a vote)**

Guidance was requested on whether the existing work group would be a “single task” work group or become a standing group. Guidance was also requested on the Technical Consultant Interface for Task Force. Discussion followed with these key points

- Work groups should initially be “single focus,” concentrating on getting the technical workshop started. Additional duties, however, may be assigned, e.g.-- focus on the detail oriented technical processes needed for the work plan. If this occurs, additional opportunities will be provided for task force members (or their representative) to join the work group.
- The technical consultant is not built into the purpose statement. It is premature to include the technical consultant in the purpose statement because that person has not been hired and there are still questions about funding.

Don Martin called for consensus that the technical track work group is a single task group and is the interface with the Task Force. Unanimity was reached. Additions or deletions to the TT Work Group Purpose were called for and there were no changes requested.

### **TTWG Workshop**

#### Purpose Statement

*To: Provide a forum for the open exchange of information on the current state of knowledge both nationally and locally to address water quality issues and sources.*

The Workshop Purpose Statement was discussed and amended as follows:

*To: Provide a forum for the open exchange of information on the current state of knowledge both nationally and locally **in PCBs and other related toxins with regard to** water quality issues and sources.*

Don Martin called for and received consensus to approve the Workshop purpose statement. The consensus reflects an on-going conversation regarding how narrow or broad to focus efforts. While the task force considers PCBs the primary driver of activities, many acknowledge there are other constituents located in the same sites/river reaches that may require short or long term attention. Given uncertainties, there is a need to be comprehensive, open minded and work in cooperation. The technical track will need to consider how/if to use available resources to gather information on these constituents.

### **Technical Workshop Development**

Participation: The workshop will be a highly technical conversation. As such, it will be by invitation only. Invitations may be extended to the Palouse and other areas in the region with similar interests.

Location: Rick Eichstaedt offered to see if space for the workshop is available at Gonzaga University at no cost.

Agenda Development: This workshop is mainly to educate the Task Force about what we know and what we don't know. It will serve as a spring board to development of the technical plan. To

better assess topics of interest, Bud asked members to complete and return a survey by the following Monday. A couple of final revisions were made and SRF agreed to repost the survey on-line by the end of the day.

Beyond the survey topics, the following guidance was provided:

- Try to include discussion/presentations of all toxins associated with a specific location, e.g.-- associated organics located where PCBs are found.
- Treatment schemes. Ask presenters to talk about treatments that may affect more than one toxin, e.g.—membrane technology for PCBs that may also reduce other chemicals of concern.
- Source identification: What are the pathways for how PCBs, PBDEs, dioxins and furans got where they are? What are the big contributors?
- What are the lessons learned that are potentially relevant to the Spokane River.
- Look for presenter(s) with PCBs reduction success story.
- Ask potential presenters, "What did we not ask that you think we should hear"?

The process for determining presenters will be by invitation, rather than a call for abstracts, which should help speed up the process.

The workshop will be two full days with working sessions, presentations, and dialogue built into the format.

Timing: A workshop target date of no later than June 15th was set. This conformed with participant experiences that at least three months is needed for preparation. It was also mentioned that the group does not want to wait for the fall because of organizations that hold yearly fall conferences.

Labor: It was recommended that a lead administrative person be identified, and that support should include time needed to support event logistics, facilities, securing presenters, outreach, etc.

Funding and Sponsorship: Discussion resulted in consensus on the following points:

- SRRTTF members will need to identify sponsors to support core costs, e.g.— development, outreach, some travel, etc.
  - Sponsorship may come from members, engineering firms, etc.
  - Businesses may be asked to “buy a table” as part of being part of the conference. Businesses may include technical firms, those with PCBs in their product (e.g. PCBs in paints and pigments), etc.
  - Sponsors will receive recognition but not be offered an opportunity to provide a “sales pitch.”
- Whenever possible, existing contracts of members will be used to support travel costs of speakers.
- Registration costs will be used to fund food and incidentals.

Outreach: The e-mail lists for Task Force development will be combined with task force member contacts to develop initial invitation and sponsorship lists. It was also noted a financial commitment is needed and date selected before contacting presenters.

Don Martin called for and received a consensus to authorize the work group to continue moving forward with workshop planning, date selection and content.

### **Administrative Track Work Group (ATWG)**

Ecology is serving as the fiscal and administrative agent to support hiring of an SRRTTF facilitator/coordinator. The related funding agreement with those providing financial support is in place and some funds received. A couple of technical pieces will be resolved to receive the full complement of pledged support. For instance, City of Post Falls questioned whether or not the city can do a direct bill or invoice.

Dave Moore discussed the process for developing the RFP for the SRRTTF facilitator / coordinator. The ATWG referenced the RFP template provided by Sarah Hubbard Gray and the standard Ecology legal document to create an RFP that meets the needs of the Task Force. The first four pages are the ones relevant to discussion. The RFP also allows for a team approach. Ecology will be the initial contractor and down the road will transfer the contract to another entity with administrative capacity.

Finalizing details and distribution was postponed pending outcome of Ruckelshaus Center update.

### Ruckelshaus Center Conversation

Two handouts were distributed providing background on Ruckelshaus Center services. The Center has offices at UW and WSU. They do not respond to RFPs. Rather, they are invited to work on specific initiatives with multiple interests, e.g.—critical area ordinances, agriculture, etc.

A conference call was held to discuss services they could provide the Task Force. They are interested in facilitating, and believe there is a possibility of drawing on other UW resources. There is also a possibility of tying together facilitator with technical consultant needs.

Because the Center does not respond to RFPs, the discussion centered on if the Task Force should explore this option before fully engaging in the RFP process. To summarize discussion points and outcomes:

- The Task Force would like to receive a proposal, and the RFP can be used as guide to request what should be in as well as vet the proposal. An interview date will be selected as well.
- There is concern whether it is appropriate to enter into the equivalent of a sole source contract (non-competitive bid process). If the Center is preferred option, one way to resolve is for Ecology to enter into an inter-local agreement rather than contract with WSU.
- Be it contract or inter-local agreement, all costs (including in-direct) must be known for initial services and possibility of expanded services, e.g.—technical track support.
- An RFP will not be sent out for distribution until a decision on the Center option is made.
- Use of the Center does not require an immediate decision on whether, or how, to contract with an independent technical consultant.

- Regardless of if it's the Center or private contractor, EPA experience is that the scope of work and hours associated with tasks needs to be very detailed, including not to exceed funding. The danger of funding being quickly depleted and/or time spent on non-essential tasks rises significantly without detailed scope of work.
- If the Center option is selected, the reasonable time to consider on-going commitment is when Ecology hands administrative, fiscal agent responsibility off to future administrative entity.

Don Martin called for and received a consensus by the group to continue exploring the Ruckelshaus Center option and put the RFP on hold.

### **Ecology Staff Update**

March 1, 2012, Adrienne Borgias will begin as an Ecology employee. Dave Moore and Diana Washington will start the transfer of SRRTTF responsibility to Adrienne. SRF will send out information on Adrienne's background to the Task Force.

### **Next Meeting Topics**

- Review of Ruckelshaus Center Proposal, including interview
- Technical work group progress report re workshop development

### **Other**

EPA Urban Waters Small Grant Update: Mary Lou Soscia reported that EPA Region 10 received 51 applications for the Urban Waters Small Grant. EPA Region 10 will award 4 grants of \$60,000 each. The grant approval process will make its decisions by mid-March. Notification of awards will occur by April.

Dave Moore, Bijay Adams, Dave McBride, Mike LaScoula, Rachel Pascal Osborne, and Rob Lindsay will participate in a water quality panel discussing lakes, health, general water quality, and toxics. The panel is organized by KSPS and will be held on March 13 6:30 at City Hall,

### **Meeting Adjourned**