

# Spokane River Regional Toxics Task Force Technical Track Work Group

Wednesday, August 03, 2016 | 10:00 am – 12:00 pm  
Department of Ecology | 4601 N. Monroe, Spokane, WA

**Meeting Documents:** <http://srtrtf.org/?p=6800>

## Attendees:

John Beacham (Phone) –City of Post Falls  
Kevin Booth –Avista  
Adriane Borgias –WA Department of Ecology  
Ben Brattebo –Spokane County  
Patrick Cabbage –Ecology  
Lisa Dally Wilson (Phone) –Dally Environmental  
Dave Dilks (Phone) –LimnoTech  
Joyce Dunkin (Phone) –LimnoTech  
Ted Hamlin –WA Department of Ecology  
Mike Hermanson –Spokane County  
Kris Holm (Phone) –City of Coeur d’Alene  
Doug Krapas –Inland Empire Paper

Bud Leber –Kaiser Aluminum  
Pam Marti (Phone) –Department of Ecology  
Dave McBride (Phone) –WA Dept of Health  
Dave Moss –Spokane County  
Brian Nickels –Environmental Protection Agency  
Chris Page (Video) –Ruckelshaus Center  
Adrienne Pearson –City of Spokane  
Sandy Phillips –Spokane Regional Health District  
Jeremy Schmidt –Ecology  
Kara Whitman –Ruckelshaus Center  
Ken Windram –Hayden Area Regional Sewer Board

## Introductions and Agenda Review

After a round of introductions, Chris Page went over the agenda. No changes were made.

## Workshop “Buckets”

The group provided input on how to include the different buckets in the Comprehensive Plan. The following bullets provide highlights of the discussion, questions, and comments

- **C.** Call bucket A “ongoing and effective.”
- **Q.** Can Bucket A actions be clarified, what is meant by “track and address PCBs”? **A.** Bucket A was designed to explain ongoing, effective actions; actionable recommendations focused on enhancements to those actions. New actions that would be done were moved into other buckets.

**Action Item:** Dave Dilks/LimnoTech to clean up the spreadsheet document prior to the Task Force meeting in August. (COMPLETE)

- **C.** Bucket A – “remediate contaminated sites” – Interface more with Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA), move to Bucket C.
- **C.** “Compliance with PCB regulations” – we have focused on inadvertent PCBs, but there is still use of PCB-containing materials above the standard. Don’t only focus on inadvertent, address legacy PCBs. This is somewhat captured in the demolition controls actions, but there is more (paint on buildings etc.). EPA responsibility: how can the Task Force engage or enhance this effort?
- **C.** Actions and Recommendations need to have clear actionable implementation steps. Avoid generic descriptions. Also need timelines for completion.
- **C.** LimnoTech will spend much of the month of August fleshing out these recommendations, adding in timelines, monitoring requirements, and other detail. At the August 24<sup>th</sup> Task Force meeting, they will engage in a discussion on timelines and effectiveness monitoring.
- **C.** Expand “Building and Demolition” to cover renovation and demolition and permits.
- **C.** MTCA and Ecology’s Toxics Cleanup Program (TCP) regulatory framework may preclude dealing with some potential sources; build this into compliance.

- A-C in Plan, D are the ones that are identified as needing more consideration, prioritize and include as future actions.
- Level D spreadsheet, please send comments to Dave Dilks.

### **TCP/MTCA:**

Jeremy Schmidt and Patrick Cabbage from the TCP program provided some background information on the program and how it might work with the Task Force. The Task Force is concerned that even if a site has been cleaned to MTCA/TCP standards, PCBs from the site may still put the river out of compliance as the water quality standards may not match with the site cleanup standards. For new site discovery, groundwater concentrations would have to exceed a threshold level that indicates a need for cleanup, and this depends on receptors (cleanup levels, type of surface water etc.) If a site is identified they will move forward to try to identify responsible parties and work with them to clean up the site. When the responsible party is not known, state money is used (until identification of a responsible party).

Sites get discovered in a few different ways: could be a spill, or water testing reveals an issue, and many other ways. Often a site is discovered during the development of land or during property transactions. **Q.** Can a site be re-discovered? **A.** Liability is dissolved with the State if there is a Consent decree, or an agreed order, and conditions of the decree are met based on a defined threshold. It is difficult to reopen a site once this happens. However, there is a nuance to this, an agreed order does not have the same liability protective nature as a consent decree, it is easier to go back in later and reopen. If the cleanup level changes (i.e. becomes a more stringent standard) they may not have legal liability.

This program monitors downgradient with method 8082, which is the most stringent test method they can make a responsible party use. The MTCA/TCP program has requested a policy change. MTCA/ Ecology would like the ability to use the newest and best technology; 1668 can be used for compliance (even though EPA has not promulgated it). The Task Force could drill wells/buy wells, or get permission to sample privately-owned wells, to identify new sites (if it wanted to do so to try and identify up-gradient sources between Barker and Trent).

### **LimnoTech Presentation: “Updated High Level Scoping for Groundwater”**

Dave Dilks explained that the background well (9f) on the Kaiser site, did not truly represent the background. LimnoTech has updated calculations using a different background well. Bud Leber provided LimnoTech with additional data on six other background wells, up-gradient of the casting area plume. They verified that these wells do represent background concentrations. There appear to be different homolog patterns between the PCB data from the casting plume area and the background wells.

Magnitude: up-gradient loading estimated at 14-55mg/day (14 if data spikes get dismissed; 55 if average well concentration data is assumed). The 2015 synoptic survey data may lend credence to the data spikes being real river PCB concentrations. The high data point at Mirabeau Park may not be an anomaly. Conclusions: the analysis is not rigorous enough to “prove” there is an up-gradient groundwater signal, but does merit further investigation.

### **Q&A/Comments**

- **Q.** If a new up-gradient source is found, how feasible is it to remediate, and who is responsible?
- **Q.** Does the homolog/congener data from the background wells show similarities to historical aroclors? **A.** Have not done in-depth analysis on the congeners to see if they match the aroclors. If a pattern or product is identified, it might help to define up-gradient source. It does not exactly match a specific pattern. It might help to have Lisa Rodenburg analyze this pattern/weathering etc. LimnoTech PCB expert said the data show two distinct patterns – data in background wells are real.

- **Q.** Are there MTCA/TCP cleanup sites up-gradient of Kaiser, and if so, did they use 1668 analysis? Could the Task Force compare homologs from the site and the data from the background wells? **A.** The only site using 1668 is Kaiser. Jeremy Schmidt explained there is a site along Sullivan (coffee shop), a former transformer site, another GE Site, and BPA main sub-station. There is also an Army depot on the other side.
- **Q.** Are there existing wells to be sampled? **A.** Some, but they belong to private property owners. The Task Force is encouraged to look to the document Pam Marti put together regarding TCP sites.
- **C.** Discussion in past about outliers in the 2014 and 2015 data. This includes the river sample value, river flow, and the groundwater elevation. Are there outliers because of one or both of these elements? Is there a pattern?
- **C.** Jeremy Schmidt explained that based on modeling produced by Kaiser, they would be hard-pressed to believe the spikes are not real. The Task Force should consider this data.
- **Q.** Is there land between BPA and Kaiser that could be accessed to test, to get legitimate information for that zone? There may be enough evidence to do further study to have hard evidence to look at properties that may contribute.
- **C.** Challenge: Ecology's Environmental Assessment (EAP) program would see data as "in the noise".
- **C.** We don't know anything about the gaining reach north of Kaiser. Well would need to be right on top of the source, because the aquifer moves so fast. Could be a large aerial source to be this dispersed.

### Funding Request Letter

Put for decision at the August 24<sup>th</sup> Task Force meeting. Items to include:

- Comprehensive Plan
- Actions ready to implement
- Measurable Progress

**C.** grammatical errors need fixed. Add in the additional items discussed.

**C.** ACE to look at, and justify a dollar amount. Look at average spending, what ACE is contracted to pay, and implementation costs projected – look at dollar figures for actionable items in the comp plan list.

**ACTION ITEM:** Doug Krapas to coordinate with Bud Leber and Dave Moss to come up with a dollar figure and to fine tune the funding request letter and make available for a decision at the August 24<sup>th</sup> Task Force Meeting. Chris Page to send some language over to Doug. (COMPLETE)

### Solid Waste Rulemaking

Ecology – Solid Waste Draft Rule has been issued. Jeff Donovan has looked through the proposed rule and made some written observations. Chris Page gave the Task Force an overview of Jeff's observations and asked if sending a letter to the rulemaking body had merit. Jeff may be willing to write a letter on behalf of the TF. **Q.** Disposal rule? If it is about landfill, then it is not about a cleanup standard. **C.** street contaminated waste be used for highway construction, not just landfill disposal. Comment deadline of Sept. 6<sup>th</sup>. Not a formal rule making timeline, but this gives the TF a bigger edge to get comments in.

**ACTION ITEM:** Ruckelshaus Center to ask Jeff Donovan to draft a letter for Task Force to consider. (COMPLETE, update: Task Force decision not to send this letter).

**ACTION ITEM:** Ruckelshaus Center to ask Marni Solheim to present at August 24<sup>th</sup> Task Force meeting regarding the solid waste rulemaking. (COMPLETE, update: Marni was unavailable for the August 24<sup>th</sup> meeting.)

-----  
 The next Task Force Meeting is August 10, 2016 from 9 am am – 12:30 pm at the Liberty Lake Sewer and Water District  
 There is another Task Force Meeting on August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2016 at the Liberty Lake Sewer and Water District  
 The next TTGW Meeting is September 7<sup>th</sup>, 2016 from 10am – 12 pm at the Department of Ecology