

SRRTTF Technical Track Work Group

June 21, 2012

Meeting Notes

Attendees:

Bud Leber/Kaiser
Galen Buterbaugh/Lake Spokane Association
Mike Petersen/Lands Council
Arienne Fernandez/Ecology
Adriane Borgias/Ecology
Don Martin/EPA

Lynn Smith/City of Spokane*
Sarah Hubbard Gray/SRSP*
Kevin Booth/Avista*
Dave Moss/Spokane County*
* On phone

1) Spokane River Toxics Workshop Summary and Review

Handouts: Workshop Evaluation Summary; Brainstorming and Discussion with Speakers Summaries: June 5, 2012 and June 6, 2012.

- 91% said they have a better understanding of the toxics-related issues
- 96% rated the workshop good to excellent

Summary of key comments (in no particular order):

- Acronyms and Definitions sheet would be useful.
- Modeling and data for modeling is needed in order to move forward
- Format of the workshop was good but there were some logistical changes that could be beneficial: Softer chairs, better food, shorter blocks of time, more breaks, and coffee all day.
- It was helpful to talk to outside experts
- Having the brainstorm session at the end of the day was good.
- Modeling, source identification, and tracking information is important
- Look at non-traditional source of toxics
- This type of workshop should be done on a regular (annually) basis
- Would presentations be summarized?
- PCB 101 (the analytical presentation) should have been first
- We achieved the goal of bringing members up to a common body of knowledge with respect to toxics issues

Action Item: TTWG to report out at the next SRRTTF meeting (in August, date TBD). Report to include:

- *Key points from each session*
- *Summary of feedback and evaluations*
- *Summary of brainstorming session "take aways"*
- *Budget status*

2) Path Forward from Workshop

The comments and feedback can be used as the SRRTTF moves forward on the work plan.

Action Item: TTWG members to review the workshop evaluations and brainstorming summaries in order to identify work plan short term and long term objectives. TTWG members to provide their feedback to Bud Leber no later than July 12th, in order to prepare for the next TTWG meeting on July 19th, 2011.

Action Item: Adriane Borgias to request speakers to submit expenses for reimbursement no later than June 30, if they have not done so already (complete) and follow up with Bart Mihailovich for budget summary.

3) Scope of work for Technical Consultant

There was general discussion about the technical consultant and what that means. The questions that were raised include:

- What does this look like in terms of consultant and team participation?
- What are the roles and responsibilities of individual task force members (agencies, members, consultants of member organizations, etc.)?

- What capabilities are expected of the technical consultant? Is it one consultant or more?
- What is the role of the TTWG in preparing the RFP, selection, management, and participation with the consultant?
- What is the meaning of the permit term “independent community advisor(s)”?
- Is the advisor a researcher? Does the work? A “team” advisor?

Action Item: Adriane Borgias to review with the Ecology permitting section the intent of the language in this section.

Several interpretations were put forth:

- The DO TMDL process involved agency modelers and individual organizations used their own technical expertise
- The technical consultant serves as a “science advisory” consultant
- The technical consultant serves in a technology or modeling role
- The technical consultant is a hybrid of the two: perhaps an organization with community advisory type skills as well as technical knowledge or expertise
- The technical consultant is an organization with community advisory skills and able to pull in or coordinate other contractors/expertise
- The independent consultant makes sense of the technical information and then makes it accessible/understandable to the public.

General ideas:

- The Task Force has a need for a technical consultant to develop and implement the Task Force work plan. Dischargers have their own work plan responsibilities which are independent but need to be coordinated with the larger effort.
- The ideal consultant has experience (i.e., managed a similar work plan in another city), is a people person who has worked with others. This is different than facilitating the Task Force, but this distinction needs to be worked out.
- The ideal consultant should be able to “cross-over,” i.e., be able to talk to the community and also understand the science OR could be a modeler or technical expert (it would be difficult to find both skills in one consultant)

Action Item: Adriane Borgias to review the Ruckleshaus Center Scope of Work regarding the overlap between this and the technical consultant responsibilities.

Action Item: Sarah Hubbard Gray to put together a “straw man” document for discussion purposes summarizing the discussion points of the workgroup. The ideal consultant would be someone with technical experience, preferably in other geographic areas; able to assist with work plan development and implementation; could coordinate with other consultants and Kelsey Gray; could be part of a team concept; needs to have good people and communications skills.

4) Introduction to Long-Term Toxics Monitoring Program, Mainstem Spokane River

Brandee Era-Miller with Ecology’s Environmental Assessment Program prepared a draft “Recommendations for the Design of a Long-term Toxics Monitoring Program in the Mainstem of the Spokane River.” This document was provided for review by the SRRTTF/TTWG.

Action Item: Adriane Borgias to distribute the “Recommendations for the Design of a Long-term Toxics Monitoring Program in the Mainstem of the Spokane River” to the TTWG for comments. TTWG to provide comments to Adriane Borgias / Brandee Era-Miller no later than July 9th, 2012.

Action Item: Brandee Era-Miller to be available at the next TTWG meeting (July 19th, 2012) to discuss comments.

The next SRRTTF TTWG meeting is scheduled for July 19th, 2012 at the Department of Ecology offices.