

Spokane River Regional Toxics Task Force

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Facilitated by Chris Page & Aubri Denevan

September 25, 2013 | 9:00am – 12:30pm

Spokane County Water Resource Center

1004 N. Freya Street | Spokane, WA 99202

Attendees

Voting Members and Alternates

Tom Agnew* – Liberty Lake Sewer and Water District

Galen Buterbaugh*, Lake Spokane Association

Bud Leber* – Kaiser Aluminum

Doug Krapas* – Inland Empire

David Moss* – Spokane County

Mike Peterson* – Lands Council

Mike LaScuola*, Sandy Phillips – Spokane Regional Health District

Dale Arnold*, Lynn Schmidt, Elizabeth Schoedel, Jeff Donovan – City of Spokane

**Denotes Voting Member*

Advisors

Adriane Borgias, Jim Bellatty, Dale Norton (*on phone*), Dave Knight, Arianne Fernandez – WA Dept. of Ecology

Kevin Booth – Avista

Greg Lahti – Washington State Department of Transportation

Mary Lou Soscia (*on phone*), Tom Eaton (*on phone*) – EPA

Public

Lisa Dally Wilson – Dally Environmental

David Dilks, Tim Towey – LimnoTech

Mike Neher – City of Post Falls

Introductions: Get Started & Review Agenda

Facilitator Chris Page (Ruckelshaus Center) welcomed everyone to the meeting. No changes were made to the agenda.

LimnoTech & Technical Topics

Review of work products: memos on conceptual models, modeling tools, data gap analysis (see presentation at <http://srrtf.org/?p=2045>)

Tim Towey provided an overview of the collection of existing data. In outlining the data sets LimnoTech has compiled, Tim noted that there may be some data missing from the effluent data set. The SRRTTF database is a living Access data base, hosted on Share File, which will continue to be updated as new sets come in. At the moment there is not a mapping function, but they hope to add that in the future. All collected data will go into this as well. They have also compiled literature as well. Links to relevant

literature are listed in the database. They will be making updated versions of this available quarterly. They have made a few changes since July and will post it online again in late October.

Discussion of conceptual modeling, monitoring plan concepts

David Dilks talked about the conceptual modeling of how PCBs get into the Spokane River, explaining the various possible PCB source pathways first with a high-level overview and then in more detail.

He moved onto the data gap assessment, noting “known significant contributor” delivery pathways along with “known insignificant contributor” pathways as well as the unknowns, either “potentially significant” or “likely insignificant” contributors. In the “Data Gap Assessment: What processes can we quantify?” slide, the ‘atmosphere’ represents the atmosphere to river directly, not atmosphere’s impact on the watershed. That potentially could be a very significant contributor.

LimnoTech would like to add Idaho into these categories. They will need that data. Other data gaps: what is in the sediments? Is there certain data we need to collect that will help with the sediment collection?

Other questions and discussion:

- Questions about data review and modeling
 - The effect of the time value of the data
 - Addressing uncertainty of measurements in the modeling results: how to represent this in the end results discussion
- How to measure the impact to fish in the modeling results. Question about the end use of the modeling results: is the model to evaluate which source reduction strategies get the best value, or is the model a water quality compliance tool?
- Questions about PCBs in wells/pumps/groundwater (is this a data gap?)
- Other comments and questions about data gaps:
 - Impact of motorized vehicles (PCB in oil) on roads and in water
 - How to handle tributaries such as Little Spokane River and Hangman Creek
 - What is the Idaho contribution, and how should this be handled with existing monitoring data?
 - Agricultural runoff/silviculture/pesticide residuals: What do these mean, especially with the tributaries?
 - Road oiling
 - Impact of fish (from within and without system) and relevance to the Water Quality Standard end point. Do we need to evaluate the Bioconcentration Factor (BCF) for PCB? The real BCF under-represents PCB concentrations.
 - Hayden Lake contribution to the aquifer as well as other lake contributions
 - What is in the sediment and what is the contribution to the watershed and impact on fish?
 - Atmospheric sources, global and urban, and impact areas away from the urban boundaries
 - What are the boundary conditions for the model? Where is the control point? Are there significant sources downstream? Does boundary go to Lake Roosevelt?

Need to revisit the purpose of the model and what is the question we are trying to answer?
Then compare the model results to what we find during monitoring.

ACTION ITEM: LimnoTech/David Dilks will add a number of new sources to their analysis: 1). Ag; 2). Silviculture; and 3). Fish (hatchery).

ACTION ITEM: All comments from the Task Force on the draft memos are due to Bud Leber two weeks from today.

Next steps –

- Draft data collection strategy due Oct. 15. Current thinking:
 - Four dry weather “backbone” morning events
 - Four Lake Spokane surveys
 - Two wet weather events
 - Coordinate with Urban Waters Initiative on stormwater sampling
 - Atmospheric research handled via separate mechanism and/or later

LimnoTech plans to have the modeling done by the end of the year; sampling will start next summer.

Bud suggested holding a workshop to go through everything. It would help to get some outside input from other areas (SF Bay, Delaware) to see what their experience could help us here. Then get into the details of the Quality Assurance plans.

Action item: TTWG to focus on developing a workshop for December 4, 2013.

Huge cost driver is the testing for PCBs. Analyzing cost in lab is the highest. CEREO researcher, Manual Perez-Garcia expressed interest in starting a lab at WSU to test for this. There was also some state interest in this as well.

Chris asked LimnoTech if they had heard enough to go on in the monitoring plan. Yes.

Chris asked if the Task Force needed more time to look at tasks 6 & 7. The memos are still in draft form. Would it be valuable to extend the comment period on the memos before they bring them back to finalize? Yes. LimnoTech will take the input received today, and then send out a revised memo for another round of comments.

ACTION ITEM: LimnoTech will take a week to revise the memos with comments from today (COMPLETE)

ACTION ITEM: Task Force member can send in additional comments to LimnoTech if needed. (COMPLETE)

ACTION ITEM: LimnoTech will send out the revised memos will for another round of comments (COMPLETE)

Doug – we need to start working really diligently on the testing and modeling. If we're going to do dry weather sampling, we need to move on that quickly. The WSU lab will need to be certified at a high level which will take a bit of time.

Variance in agency procedures (lab reporting limits, # quality control samples, method for assessing blank contamination): subcommittee?

There was a suggestion to put together a small group to look at the variances. LimnoTech can work on this, but would prefer help from others to give them guidance. Arianne Fernandez volunteered to spearhead it. She was going to bring in Karin Pedersen and possibly Keith Seiders from Ecology. She also wanted to talk with Spokane County. Dave Moss will vet this through his office before committing to joining the group. David Dilks would like to sit in and participate on these meetings.

It might not be feasible to expect that WSU would be up to speed by the time we need to get this done. Will this be a part of a consistent QAPP? Yes.

DO TMDL modeling inquiry

Doug Krapas explained to the group they are looking at what needs to be done in the ten year assessment for Dissolved Oxygen in the Spokane River. LimnoTech was originally very involved with the testing at that time. They are asking LimnoTech to look at the sampling monitoring parameters now. He posed two questions: 1) could we ask LimnoTech to do this for us; and 2) he remembers this discussion when LimnoTech was originally being considered as a technical advisor. He would like this on record moving forward.

Adriane Borgias only remembers item two being discussed in regards to their past work—which is posted on the SRRTTF website. She reminded the Task Force about the conflict of interest flow chart. The first box asks if there would be a perceived conflict of interest. If yes, then posting on the website asking for any conflicts. If not then you can move forward without further review.

ACTION ITEM: ACE will write a conflict of interest statement that will include a wide scope of activities for LimnoTech and follow the Conflict of Interest posting procedure.

ACE/FWG Report, Budget & Work Plan, and Legislative Allocation

Chis asked if Task Force thought the document outlining priority tasks for the scope of work looked good. This is bigger than ID data gaps; it's all of LimnoTech's scope. Plus there's a lot of work underneath each of these.

Adriane suggested adding phase four of the LimnoTech scope (comprehensive plan), since there are already more tasks than funding can cover and it would allow the group to go after more funding by showing what they've already done and where they are headed.

This could become the Task Force budget. The next step is to carve out the \$350K piece from this. Doug's lobbyists feel there will be another opportunity to get further funding in the next budget cycle (that's why he asked LimnoTech to provide a cost estimate for monitoring).

Is the Task Force okay with ACE hammering out the details with Ecology? Adriane has been doing research into what is required from the state. The information given at the Funding Work Group was incorrect. Ecology cannot give the money directly to ACE. The contract needs to be an activity-based budget. She wants to spend time thinking about how to make this a simple, activity-based contract to move it forward. The Task Force can simply take the LimnoTech tasks and flesh them out into more details and take a couple of the lower-hanging fruit items already discussed.

Doug recommends that ACE work directly with Ecology to hash out the details. Keep in mind the tasks must be completed before they're billed.

Lisa can make the changes needed. Adriane suggested that the most efficient way to do this from the Ecology contracting perspective is to stay within the format of the sample contracts provided. If the Task Force approves this as a guideline, then we can use this as a larger picture. Phase four would have to be added. Lisa will leave the budget blank for now.

ACTION ITEM: Lisa Dally Wilson will be making the requested changes to the document

DECISION: Task Force approved ACE and Ecology to negotiate the Work Plan and final Contract, with a November 1 goal.

Meeting Report: CEREO (Center for Environmental Research, Education & Outreach)

The Ruckelshaus Center helped set up three meetings between the Task Force and CEREO to discuss potential research partnership areas of interest. Over the past two weeks Bud Leber, Adriane Borgias and other member of the Task Force meet with the CEREO Aerial Disposition, BioChar, and Stormwater teams in Pullman.

Aerial Deposition – Member of the Task Force met with the aerial deposition researchers at CEREO on the 12th. They discussed the following items:

- A general overview of the SRRRTF organization and goals
- Overview of river status relative to applicable PCB WQ standards
- Overview of current data on sources and indicators of potential impact of aerial deposition
- Ecology's literature review and conclusions about stormwater
- Summary of current technical activities
- Summary of aerial deposition questions/interests

The CEREO team appeared to be interested and is going to do some thinking about how they might contribute (use of existing regional modeling for PCB deposition). The CEREO team was invited to attend a future Task Force meeting to present how they think they may be able to contribute. We could ask them to work up a proposal with cost estimate for consideration.

ACTION ITEM: Invite CEREO team to Technical Track Workshop scheduled for December 4, 2013.

BioChar - Manual Perez-Garcia is heading up the effort on extracting. They took a tour of the facility in Pullman. They talked a little bit about what it takes to do the testing. This group is used to working

collaboratively (UI & WSU). They have a handle on funding opportunities, but they would still need help from this group on establishing partnership funding. Work them into the modeling/sampling in July. It would be interesting to get a proposal from them as to cost and what they had in mind. This group might find benefit in attending the upcoming workshop.

Stormwater – The Stormwater meeting was less popular because it was on a Friday afternoon. John Stark from WSU was able to join the call. His team’s work now doesn’t directly relate to PCBs, but it might in the future. Matt Mora didn’t feel this was a good fit for his research. Arianne Borgias recommended waiting until they know what LimnoTech is doing before making a proposal.

Updates & Announcements

EPA Letter – The draft letter to EPA was posted on the Task Force website a week ago. It addresses the enforcement of existing regulations. Adriane Borgias took the comments received and merged them into the current version of this document. The Task Force tabled this discussion for later in the meeting, but did not get an opportunity to make a decision on the document.

Outreach Calendar – Adriane Borgias clarified that members of the Task Force were invited to the National Tribal Toxics Council meeting on October 7, 2013 from 1-2pm. Members attending do not need to register or pay the fee. Adriane will send out another email with the specifics. Several members are planning to attend.

Doug Krapas and Bart Mihailovich recently gave presentations to the sustainable business meeting/conference. They were met with good feedback. About 40-50 people attended.

On Monday, Kelly Susewind testified at the State Legislature. The first few minutes focused on what’s going on in the river. Sen. Erickson gave a great call out to the Task Force, and Doug Krapas as an environmental steward.

The Community Indicators Initiative of Spokane (www.communityindicators.ewu.edu/) will be adding new indicators later this fall, including one for PCBs under the Environment section.

ACTION ITEM: Adriane Borgias to send out an email with the National Tribal Toxics Council meeting specifics. (DONE)

ACTION ITEM: Adriane will post the link to Senator Erickson’s interview on the website.

City of Spokane Application – Lynn Schmidt, City of Spokane, put together a grant application on “Stormwater Pollution Prevention: PCBs in Municipal Products.” The City of Spokane asked members of the Task Force to join the application. This grant application wasn’t posted a week in advance of the meeting, but there is a conference call scheduled on Friday to approve this application. We will need a quorum (six people). The City of Spokane will put together the grant and do most of the work. The deadline is Oct.1, 2013.

ACTION ITEM: Conference call on September 27th to for SRRTTF endorsement of grant application.

Meeting Topics: October – December '13 – Chris Page asked if the Task Force wanted to add an additional Tech Track Work Group meeting this fall, possibly in November. Bud felt that scheduling them at this point might not be the best planning wise, they should do this after the TTWG meeting on October 2nd. The Task Force agreed to have the TTWG decide if they need another meeting between now and the end of the year.

Public Comment

No comments.

The next SRRTF Task Force meeting is October 23, 2013 at Spokane County Water Resource Center
The next Tech Track Work Group meeting is October 2, 2013 from 10am – 12pm, and the next Funding Work Group meeting is November 6, 2013 from 10am – 12pm at the Department of Ecology
