

Spokane River Regional Toxics Task Force Technical Track Work Group (TTWG)

Wednesday | June 7, 2017 | 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Department of Ecology | N. 4601 Monroe St. | Spokane, WA 99205

Meeting Documents: <http://srtrtf.org/?p=8069>

Attendees:

Karin Baldwin –WA Department of Ecology
Kevin Booth –Avista
Jeff Donovan –City of Spokane
Brandee Era-Miller –WA Department of Ecology
Don Keil (Phone) – City of Coeur d’Alene
Doug Krapas –Inland Empire Paper
Sarah Hubbard Gray (Phone) –Spokane River
Stewardship Partnership (SRSP)
Greg Lahti –WA Department of Transportation

Rob Lindsay –Spokane County
Dave McBride (Phone) –LimnoTech
Cadie Olsen –City of Spokane
Monica Ott –City of Post Falls
Chris Page (Video) –Ruckelshaus Center
Kara Whitman –Ruckelshaus Center
Ken Windram (phone)

Introductions and Agenda Review:

After a round of introductions, Chris Page went over the agenda. The Toxics Control Program (TCP) discussion was shifted to a later time in the meeting. No other changes were made to the agenda.

Future PCB sampling

Chris Page reminded the group that with many uncertainties (funding, permits, etc.) it may be premature to make a recommendation on future sampling. Dave Dilks noted the Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) says that monitoring will occur on the river every five years to determine if concentrations/loads are changing. Load assessment is covered by existing programs. Monitoring will be needed, but who will do it is not mandated.

Brandee Era-Miller explained that the Environmental Assessment Program (EAP) could potentially begin additional PCB studies again in the summer of 2018. Brandee encouraged Adriane Borgias to submit a proposal on monitoring.

- **Q.** Will EAP accept proposals this fall? **A.** Yes, then EAP will do a planning phase, and start developing Quality Assurance Project Plans (QAPPs) in spring 2018. EAP can do on groundwater and/or in-river sampling, and has hired a hydrogeologist. EAP may have more capacity as of July 1, 2018. As of August 2018, Brandee will have some time for Task Force support, or for periphyton monitoring if the Task Force would like.
- **C.** LimnoTech may want to draft some options to put a placeholder in the SRRTTF budget. **A.** Can do, if LimnoTech includes a range of costs until there is more detail.
- **C.** Rob Lindsay: looking forward, should the Task Force consider adding a sampling point below Upriver Dam (down through Greene and into town)? This is a good location to consider for future monitoring.

CDM SMITH: Database Task 1&2 Tech Memo

CDM Smith can attend the July 26th, 2017 Task Force meeting. Some takeaways from their Task 1-2 memo:

1. **Datasets coming from Pacific Rim and from AXYS.** AXYS data can be easily input into the system; however, they will need to coordinate with Pacific Rim to provide the data in a more useable/comparable format.
2. **Blank correction needs a consistent protocol.** Different entities using different methodologies (3x, 5x, and 10x). **C.** the correction depends on the intent/use of the data. Perhaps no blank correction should be reported from lab, so database user can plug in whatever (3x/5x/10x) they want?

- **C.** Dave Dilks said CDM Smith wants to give options for how data gets corrected, so blank acceptability and homolog-specific criteria are not flushed out at this point in the memo. The Delaware River Basin Commission (DRBC) database has specific acceptability criteria for data.
- **Q.** Could automatic blank correction be in the database? There nuances in the correction that need to be standard (lab blank vs field blank, NJ use, order of operations etc). What would be the order of operations to set up data? Example: if using NJ-flagged data, then those should be used in lab blanks. This impacts how results are censored. The data management work group needs to work with CDM Smith to figure out these details.
- **Q.** Could these kinds of options be in the database? For example, using the NJs? More flexibility the better. **A.** It can be programmed to do all these things. Inconsistency comes in to play when looking at documents (such as Comp Plan) and data from different entities (dischargers, LimnoTech, Ecology etc.).
- **C.** The work group did work on definitions not included in the memo. They defined the fields, and this would be worthwhile to share with CDM Smith.
- **C.** Brandee suggested the Task Force/CDM Smith develop a template for labs that covers all fields needed for the database (even for different projects with different objectives).
- **Q.** What is the expectation for data from other databases to fit into this one and vice versa? Could Ecology follow the same requirements? **A.** To some degree, but different Ecology studies have different purposes (there is flexibility, but it is a large state agency). **C.** Need consistency between EIM and the Task Force database; the database can have more than EIM requires, but it would help if data from the Task Force database would easily feed into EIM (for reporting requirements).
- **C.** EIM data would comprise a subset of the comprehensive SRRTTF database, so we need to make sure the key EIM fields are in the Task Force database. Once the SRRTTF settles on a template (in QAPP), EAP projects could use that.

ACTION ITEM: Karin Baldwin to coordinate with CDM on the recommendations from the TTWG. Mike Hermanson and Rob Lindsay to set up a meeting with CDM Smith to discuss the memo and invite TTWG. Proposal to move the Tech Track meeting to the 12th, have CDM Smith attend via conference call if the Task Force feels it would be useful.

ACTION ITEM: Kara to send email requesting Task Force submit comments/questions to Mike Hermanson and Rob Lindsay by June 16th on CDM Memo and send EIM template to CDM for Export function. (COMPLETE)

ACTION ITEM: move July TTWG meeting to 7/12/17 and lengthen to three hours (9:30 to 12:30). (COMPLETE)

Toxics Cleanup Program (TCP) Process:

Chris Page discussed the flow chart submitted by TCP staff outlining the process for working with TCP on investigating potential PCB-contributing sites TCP oversees. The homolog mass balance memo to potentially assist in locating groundwater PCB sources will be ready by the June 2017 Task Force meeting. Dave Dilks is matching river data to downstream data, and this will be done in July 2017.

Q. If a source (upgradient of Kaiser, GE site others) is found and it is not large/significant – is it worth the time and resources to pursue? How does the magnitude compare? **A.** Too early to know, until the fingerprinting analysis is completed—no need to spend time discussing until this is completed.

Technical Workshop timing:

Conferences scheduled for the same week as regularly-scheduled Task Force Meeting: “Our Gem”: Nov. 14th, Spokane River Forum: November 15th and 16th. **Q.** When and should SRRTTF hold November 2017 meeting? Could they expand the conference or SRRTTF meeting to include tech info? Or separate workshop? Brandee Era-Miller has a half days’ worth of study results/data to present, and can attend any time in the fall.

Potential workshop info

- Dates: November 13th or 17th, 2017? (And hold Task Force meeting on 11/29/17?)
- Attendees? TBD.
- Potential Topics: Richard Jack (with King County on the Duwamish River cleanup) on urban ecosystem PCB movement; CDM Smith work to be complete in late 2018; Task Force tasks—next steps for sampling: Is November the time for this?

ACTION ITEM: Brandee to check on EAP staff availability for November 13th, 2017. (COMPLETE)

ACTION ITEM: Rob Lindsay to check with Andy Dunau on scheduling a room on Monday at the Coeur d'Alene Resort prior to the River Forum conference. (COMPLETE)

ACTION ITEM: Kara to contact Spokane County Water Resource Center to change Task Force meeting from November 15th to November 29th. (COMPLETE, November 29th scheduled)

The next Full Task Force Meeting is Wednesday July 26, 2017 at Spokane County Water Resource Center
The next Technical Track Work Group meeting is Wednesday July 5, 2017 at Ecology

DRAFT