

Spokane River Regional Toxics Task Force

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Facilitated by Kelsey Gray & Aubri Denevan
January 30, 2013 | 9:00am – 12:30pm
Spokane Water Resources Center
1004 N. Freya Street | Spokane, WA 99202

Attendees

Voting Members and Alternates

Galen Buterbaugh*; Lake Spokane Association
Bruce Rawls*, David Moss, Rob Lindsay; Spokane County
Mike LaScoula*, Kim Papich; Spokane Regional Health District
Bart Mihailovich* (on phone); Spokane Riverkeeper
Dale Arnold*, Mike Cannon, Jeff Donovan; City of Spokane
Mike Peterson*; The Lands Council
Doug Krapas*; Inland Empire Paper Company
Lee Mellish*, Tom Agnew; Liberty Lake Sewer and Water District

**Denotes Voting Member*

Advisors

Jim Bellatty, Brook Beeler, Adriane Borgias, Ben Jarvis; WA Dept. of Ecology
Dan Redline; IDEQ-CDA
Bryce Roberts (on phone); Avista

Public

Kris Holm (on phone); City of Coeur d'Alene
Lisa Dally Wilson; Dally Environmental
Greg Lahti, Washington Dept. of Transportation
Craig Janis; Fusion
Mike Neher, Kit Hoffer; City of Post Falls
Ken Windram; Hayden Area Regional Sewer Board

Introductions: Get Started & Review Agenda

Kelsey Gray reviewed the agenda and asked for any changes. Bart Mihailovich requested that the updates on the Technical Advisor, funding work group and lobbying efforts be wrapped into one agenda item.

Updates: Technical Advisor, Funding Work Group, & Lobbying Efforts

Technical Advisor - Bruce Rawls gave the Task Force an update on the Technical Advisor contracting process. Adriane Borgias, Rick Eichstaedt, and Bruce have had several calls/meetings. They now have a clean scope of work and refined budget. There are 10 work items: 1) Update of the technical consultant work plan; 2) data request; 3) standard procedures; 4) collection of existing data; 5) data review; 6) gap

analysis; 7) review of modeling tools; 8) data collection strategy; 9) prep of quality assurance plan; and 10) scoping for phase 2 and beyond. The estimated budget for meetings and coordination comes to \$151,800 (the goal is \$150K). They are prepared to start in late February or March. By this time next year, they should be done with phase 1, and ready to move into phase 2. They have requested \$75,000 from Dept. of Ecology. The first \$75K is being raised by the dischargers now. There's \$350,000 request from the Governor's office for the next biennium, but its use purpose is unclear. The phase 1 period will be used to plan longer term financing.

ACTION ITEM: On the next Tech Advisor Contracting call with Adriane Borgias, Bruce Rawls, and Rick Eichstaedt on Thursday, January 21, they will talk about how to engage Limno Tech in the planning process ASAP (COMPLETE)

Funding Work Group - At the last work group meeting, they talked about funding and communication planning. They are challenged by both right now. There was agreement on the need for a communications plan. They also talked about several action items – one was talking to Tanya Riordan in Sen. Maria Cantwell's office. She's scheduled to attend the February 27 meeting. Also as a reminder, both the Ruckelshaus Center & the Department of Ecology cannot participate in lobbying or lobbying activities.

Lobbying Effort - Doug Krapas reminded the group the original request for \$1.2 million came from the Dept. of Ecology. DoE developed a focus sheet for this request in January. The state is facing another budget deficit this fiscal year, so the \$1.2 million has been reduced \$350K. He is hearing from his lobbyist, the original focus sheet developed by DoE is missing a clear outline of what the money will go towards. That information is key for the Task Force members lobbyists. He also mentioned that another hot button issues – one the business community is particularly nervous about – is the reference to green chemistry. That should be something our PIO/Communication discussions should consider and address later in this meeting.

Summary – Tomorrow Bruce will complete contract, scope and budget for the discussion next week. At the joint work group meeting next week, the agenda will focus on the scope of work, budget, and funding sources starting with the \$75K, moving to the \$350K, and a longer term supplemental budget.

ACTION ITEM: Combine two work group meetings on February 6 to work through the contract, what needs to be accomplished, put the communications on the back burner for now. (COMPLETE)

ACTION ITEM: Bruce will call Limno Tech to see if they are willing to do a 1.a. portion because of a cash flow issue right now. (COMPLETE)

ACTION ITEM: Bring a lunch to the Feb. 6 WG meeting (COMPLETE)

Update ACE Meeting

Bruce Rawls announced that the ACE group met for the first time on January 18, 2013. They talked about the bylaws, the technical consultant's contract, budget and funding issues. The second ACE meeting is scheduled for February 14, 2013 at Water Resources Center. At that meeting they will discuss filling several leadership positions, including the chair, vice chair, secretary, and treasurer. They will also consider setting up a bank account with a local credit union. Rick will invite Steve Goust (Gonzaga University) to talk about the business logistics of a non-profit. Next meeting focus on the bylaws (posted

on SRRTTF.org, send input to Bruce in the next 5 business days-by Monday, Feb. 4). ACE will try to send out all meeting materials 5 days before the meeting. They will also send a meeting notice by email and post it on the srrttf.org website.

ACTION ITEM: Send Bruce Rawls input on the bylaws by Monday, Feb. 4 (COMPLETE)

DECISION: The Task Force approved the use of the SRRTTF letterhead for ACE communications, as needed.

Governor Inslee Energy and Environmental Priorities (Discussion)

Bart Mihailovich explained in early January, they got word of Governor Inslee's report on energy and the environment. There was no mention of Spokane River in that report. However, the report did mention recovery efforts the Columbia River and Puget Sound. Rick Eichstaedt was able to get a full page about the Spokane River added to the final report. Need to make this an all-out blitz to get this issue elevated as a priority. This will help with the funding issues. The report is not binding by any means. We could create a delegation to go to Olympia and have a lobby day. He asked the Task Force to think about what other strategies they could come up with and what do they look like.

When Bart was at the Columbia River meeting in Hood River, a subgroup broke off to discuss funding. That group is looking at how they get their priorities in a Federal bill that was originally placed in 2010 and may be reintroduced this year. He also wondered how the Task Force could get into that or something similar in Spokane. Spokane Riverkeeper has been asked to send in a letter of support for this effort. But Spokane River wasn't included in that Legislation. Bart doesn't want to send a letter of support if that doesn't change.

Bart has Inslee's transition committee's report on the environment but hasn't sent it yet (it's too large to email). He also has the legislation on the Columbia River Gorge, but needs permission to send it out to everyone.

ACTION ITEM: Bart will draft a letter for the group to look at. Once approved it will go on SRRTTF Letterhead.

ACTION ITEM: Kelsey will send Tanya Riordan the email from EPA prior to the February 27 meeting.

Development of a Communication Plan (Discussion)

Introductions – Kelsey asked each voting member of the Task Force to talk about what they would like to have in a communication plan and anything having to do with timing. Then Kelsey will turn the meeting over to the PIOs for their thoughts, suggestions, and how much assistance they can give the TF in developing and implementing a communication plan.

Going around the room, each member of the Task Force voting member introduced themselves, their organization, and answered the following questions:

1. Each organization has a constituency and audiences they feel are important to reach. Who are these audiences?
2. Although each entity has its own constituency and may want to provide an individualized message, what are the key elements of an over-arching message from the Task Force?

3. Are there specific time frames that the Task Force should meet with respect to the public information/ educational outreach effort?

Panel Discussion of PIOs

In response to the introductions, the PIOs asked several questions of the Task Force:

Question: Does this group have authority over products and implementation suggestions/ideas?

Answer: They were tasked with results. Looking at being able to move water quality standards.

Question: What about outcomes? Best practices of what to do in this watershed?

Answer: Each of the dischargers has regulations from EPA, but other results will come from lobbying EPA for changes, educating the public, etc. The Task Force is in the 'learn by doing' mode. Most of group was involved in the process that got phosphorus banned in dishwashing detergent. All of the municipal dischargers have industrial treatment plants. In theory we could limit the number of waste that comes out of commercial sites.

Question: PIOs, based on what you heard today, how important is it that the public be part of that audience? Or who do you see as most important?

Answer: Everyone is important. Tier your audiences, and start planning it out. First go to 10,000 foot level and message it out. Then the next level is local leaders, then technical audiences talking about getting.

It sounds like what you really want from the PIOs is to lobby the Legislature and EPA, educate and inform public about problems with the Spokane river, and educate local Government. Doug explained, that's why the PIOs were brought in. To take the information from the level the Task Force knows, to the public--by helping to develop a plan, timing, when to release information, who's the audience, and what's the message. The Task Force has lobbying efforts to help attain the funding to support this group, but that is also an area needing help from the PIOs.

PIO Suggestions:

- Create a general message explain what the problem is, then let the PIOs red line it for a clearer message
- Do a road show (dog and pony show), with slides and other examples take members with this group to get more than 3 people show up. Give them food. Lose the buzz words. Explain with charts and graphs very simply.
- Figure out audience segments – there are several easy templates out there to help determine audience segments.
- Tier your audience.
- Keep thinking, PCB needs to become the PBA.
- Leveraging media relationships (PIOs can help with this). That's how you can get people to the road shows.
- Public awareness campaigns at the health district. Goal of these campaigns are to turn the finger at themselves to see what they have done.

- Friends and family campaigns, email that takes flight. A place to go to get more information about general information.
- Consider making the website more general or starting a new one.
- Create a repository to get involved.
- Matrix of all measures of the federal, state, and local governments. Legislative updates sent every other week.
- Try not to use consultants.
- Can create 30 and 60 second PSA in house.
- Facebook ads very successful.
- Think about the tools at the table. Support the programs that are already out there. Shared messages.
- Consider removing the word “toxics” from the name of the TF. Could be scary to the public. Focus on making it positive.
- How much does the public think about the river? The river connects with the aquifer. Important to remember that, and could make it a more powerful message to the public.
- Think about what will encourage the public to pursue our message rather than other message.
- Right now there isn’t a clear, focused message coming out of this group right now. What is that? Need the start of that message.
- What can individuals do? Environmental Stewardship.
- Not the despair of “it’s everywhere.”
- A huge component of the legitimacy of this can be seen through the health issues related to PCBs. How safe is safe? How harmful is harmful?
- Is it effective to the fear campaign? Well if it’s done the right way it can be, but for the most part ‘no.’

For example, one key target audience is rate payers. They need to know specifics for media sound bites, and other messaging. Talk about the cost to the rate payer. This could be a very costly undertaking. They would rather have the support of the community (rate payers) and awareness of this before it happens. Look at the lessons learned from the ban on phosphorous in dish washer detergent. The immediate need is the awareness of cost increases. Issue transparency is important. Short term goal was the funding; the legislature and rate payers that will be packing the rooms after they will see the cost changes. They need a short term goal. Assistance with ‘how to contact the legislature,’ do you need ID to be on the bandwagon sending letters. Explaining to the rate payers why it will be costing them so much more. They need the TF help explaining this to the public.

Next steps –

- ID audience, tier groups
- Look at social marketing, go through hour exercise
- TF comes up with key messages
- ID PCBs, where are they found?

ACTION ITEM: Kelsey will get back in touch with the PIOs shortly (COMPLETE)

ACTION ITEM: Identify a smaller group to work through the messaging exercise.
ACTION ITEM: Send the PIOs the first page of the MOA (COMPLETE)
ACTION ITEM: Kelsey/Aubri to email the PowerPoint Adriane put together (COMPLETE)

February Agenda Items

- Cynthia Wall will present funding opportunities from Ecology
- Technical Advisor Contract
- Communications Strategic Plan
- Tanya Riordan: Discussion on funding strategies
- Adding Hayden Area Regional Sewer to the MOA, deciding the formal procedure to add new signators to the MOA
- Line item on funding status
- Fact sheet/lobbying efforts timeline
- March 26-27 Spokane River Forum Presentations

Discussion:

March Meeting - The March Task Force meeting has been cancelled but Limno Tech will most likely want to have a kick off meeting which could be the March TF meeting.

Spokane River Forum Presentations - When the forum agenda is publicized, it's important that the SRRTTF have a presence on it. Adriane will talk to the Spokane River Forum organizer tomorrow about why the TF isn't already on the agenda. Two presentations – P pie chart, given current estimates. Other presentation should be a pie chart on PCBs (second one would fall into the presentation done by Rick). Any presentation done at the forum on behalf of the task force should be viewed by TF prior to the presentation.

Technical Consultant Contract – It's most important to get the Task Force approval on the technical advisor contract. Bruce will draft the contract, scope of work, and revise the budget. If everything's ready for approval, Kelsey will call a special TF conference call the morning of the February 14 ACE meeting to approve the contract by quorum.

Public Comment

No comments.

The next SRRTTF Task Force meeting is February 27, 2013 at the Water Resource Center

The next Funding and Technical Work Group meetings are February 6, 2013.

Please note that the March 27th SRRTTF meeting will be cancelled and members are encouraged to attend the Spokane River Forum that will be held on March 26th and March 27th.
