

# Spokane River Regional Toxics Task Force

## DRAFT Workshop AGENDA

Wednesday, December 4, 2013 | 9:00 am – 4:00 pm; Thursday, December 5, 2013 | 8:30 am – 12:30 pm  
 Spokane County East/West Conference Room at WSDOT | 2714 N. Mayfair Street, Spokane, WA  
 (First floor of Engineering Building)

**Purpose:** *To provide a forum for the open exchange of information on the goals for and the design of a comprehensive monitoring plan for (a) establishing the current state of PCB in the Spokane River Watershed and (b) designing activities related to source identification.*

### Wednesday

<b>9:00</b>	<b>Introductions &amp; Agenda Review</b>	<b>Chris Page</b>
<b>9:10</b>	<b>Briefing Session #1: SRRTTF – Background, Issues, Goals Overview of Technical Work</b>	<b>Tom Eaton Dave Dilks</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q&amp;A with guest experts</li> </ul>	
<b>10:00</b>	<b>Briefing Session #2: PCB Experiences from Other Watersheds</b>	<b>Greg Cavallo Lester McKee Joel Baker</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guests (at right: Delaware River, San Francisco Bay, and Puget Sound Institute) will deliver “lessons learned” as pertinent to the Spokane River watershed. They’ll get info on key characteristics of Spokane River system, e.g. what is known about PCB sources/ pathways/ loading/ quantities, relevant water quality standards, hydrological features, etc.</li> <li>• Q&amp;A with SRRTTF</li> </ul>	
<b>11:30</b>	<b>Lunch Break</b>	<b>On your own</b>
	<i>Groups will be encouraged to eat together (e.g. modelers, QAPP and data management specialists, BMP and source reduction people)</i>	
<b>1:00</b>	<b>Work Session #1: Source Identification &amp; Reduction</b>	<b>Doug Krapas, Tim Towey (LimnoTech)</b>
	<p>NOTES for all work sessions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide available budget info for this body of work.</li> <li>• Panel of relevant guest experts address key questions (on screen). SRRTTF lead will have second-tier questions prioritized to pose if key Qs done.</li> <li>• Task Force members get sticky notes to write questions, to collect and address either at end of session or later (as appropriate).</li> <li>• Guest experts mixed throughout room. Facilitator/s limit questions to come from experts or SRRTTF members who need to make the decision.</li> <li>• Two flipcharts: one for decisions, action items, key points; the other for “parking lot” topics that come up but are better addressed later</li> <li>• Last 15 minutes: LimnoTech-Task Force check-in (LimnoTech reflect back decisions and guidance they heard; Task Force clarify and add to it)</li> </ul>	
<b>2:30</b>	<b>Break</b>	
<b>2:45</b>	<b>Work Session #2: QAPP and Data Management</b>	<b>Arianne Fernandez (Ecology), Tim Towey (LimnoTech)</b>
	<p>NOTES: Bullets from first work session apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working list of guest experts: Christine Grosso, Don Yee (SF Bay), Karin Fedderson (ECY Manchester lab QA lead, by phone), Rebecca Stevens (Coeur d’Alene Tribe).</li> </ul>	
<b>4:00</b>	<b>Adjourn</b>	<b>Chris Page</b>
<b>5:00</b>	<b>Happy Hour → Dinner</b>	<b>Luigi’s</b>

## Thursday

- |              |  |  |
|--------------|--|--|
| <b>8:30</b>  | <b>Work Session #3: Modeling</b><br>NOTES: Bullets from first work session apply.  | <b>Dale Norton<br/>(Ecology),<br/>Dave Dilks<br/>(LimnoTech)</b> |
| <b>9:45</b>  | <b>Work Session #4: Monitoring Plan for Loading Assessment<br/>(Sampling—Who, What, When, Where, How)</b><br>NOTES: Bullets from first work session apply. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Generate a map of all current or planned monitoring locations BEFORE the workshop. This should be available to LimnoTech prior to their generation of the work plan.</li><li>• Arianne Fernandez drafting an inquiry form to be sent ahead of time to all entities to create an inventory of what is being done and what is planned. This inventory would be mapped against the draft monitoring plan as outlined by LimnoTech before the workshop, making clear what data collection still needs to be assigned.</li><li>• <i>What is the timeline for this Phase 1 monitoring effort (which will inform Phase 2 of monitoring)?</i></li></ul> | <b>Bud Leber,<br/>Dave Dilks<br/>(LimnoTech)</b>                 |
| <b>10:45</b> | <b>Break</b>   |  |
| <b>11:00</b> | <b>Work Session #4 continued</b>   |  |
| <b>12:00</b> | <b>LimnoTech-Task Force check-in</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LimnoTech summarize findings from workshop and what it means for monitoring plan; Task Force clarify and add to it</li></ul>  | <b>Guest Experts</b>   |
| <b>12:30</b> | <b>Adjourn</b>   |  |

## Workshop Purpose Statement

**To:** Provide a forum for the open exchange of information on the goals for and the design of a comprehensive monitoring plan for (a) establishing the current state of PCB in the Spokane River Watershed and (b) designing activities related to source identification.

**In a way that:** Allows those involved (i.e. - regulators, academia, and consultants) in PCB water quality in other geographic areas to discuss their activities and provide insights into what they have learned from their efforts in areas applicable to Spokane River issues.

Provides input on approaches for the design of a river monitoring plan that identifies sampling locations, sample collection methods, frequency of sampling, analytical methods to be used, and other related data collection and management activities.

Provides input on approaches for gathering potential “true” source identification and location information in support of the river monitoring plan.

Provides the opportunity for SRRTTF members to have discussions with presenters and among themselves.

Provides input to all stakeholders on the development of management options.

Provides the opportunity for SRRTTF members to “brainstorm” how learnings can best be used to identify near term and long term actions.

**So that:** All SRRTTF members have the opportunity to provide input and direction for the development of the Task Force’s monitoring plan, conceptual model, source reduction actions, and Comprehensive Plan.

## **Briefing Session #2: Experiences in Other Watersheds**

*(Note: This is the only session that is presentation style vs. working session style)*

### **Session Focus:**

To present how other watersheds have:

- Characterized PCB water quality conditions
- Identified PCB sources
- Addressed source reduction
- Identified and implemented BMPS
- Addressed data management and accessibility
- Modeled current conditions

### **Session Specifics:**

What experiences (positive and negative) have you had in your watershed that may be applicable to the Spokane River Watershed?

- What type of monitoring plans and sampling and analytical methods were used and what processes were followed for source identification and for prioritizing source reduction actions?
- What types of sources were found and how was the magnitude of their contribution determined?
- Were any source reduction efforts developed for the types of sources identified and how successful were they? How did you determine the priority for any actions taken?
- What specific programs were undertaken to address the sources identified?
- In hindsight, were there any early action BMPs that could have been implemented? Are there any BMPs that you would recommend be implemented now in the Spokane Watershed?

## **Working Session #1: Source Identification & Reduction**

Doug Krapas & Tim Towey

### **Session Focus:**

Craft a detailed scope of work for identifying potential upland or in-river PCB sources in support of the comprehensive monitoring plan.

*“This is about what’s going on, on the ground or on the river that may be a potential source of PCBs to the river”*

### **Session Specifics:**

Based on the design of the river monitoring plan, what is the inventory of potential PCB sources in each river segment? What other appropriate data on potential PCB sources should be collected to define the current state? (Consider land use, aerial deposition, and other factors in determining the rationale for the monitoring plan.) What data about potential sources other than their existence should be collected?

What specific types, and if possible the volumes, of potential sources are present in areas that could contribute (surface or groundwater discharge) to each river segment?

What level of aerial deposition exists in each river segment and what is it relative to regional background? What is contributing, wet deposition, dry deposition, gaseous flux or a combination? Over what duration, frequency, and periods should samples be collected? How should samples be collected and analyzed?

What are the concentrations and congener distribution patterns at various locations?

Is there a good inventory of hazardous waste sites (e.g., Superfund and state sites) that have known or suspected PCB contamination? Are their pathways from these sites to the river?

## **Working Session #2: QAPP and Data Management**

Arianne Fernandez & Tim Towey

### **Session Focus:**

Identify the details that need to be addressed in the quality assurance plan for PCB samples that are collected under the comprehensive monitoring plan.

### **Session Specifics:**

What method(s) will be required, and for what purpose(s)?

What project specific requirements will be specified where a method provides options or recommendations?

How will laboratory blank contamination be evaluated with respect to data acceptance?

When will transfer (trip) blanks and rinsate (equipment) blanks be necessary and how will they be evaluated with respect to data acceptance?

What instructions or requirements need to be provided to potential contract accredited laboratories and what information is needed to qualify them?

## **Working Session #3: Modeling**

Dale Norton & David Dilks

### **Session Focus:**

Discuss modeling concepts and the PCB data collection needed to define the current state of the river and identifiable contributing sources (loading assessment).

### **Session Specifics:**

What is the expected outcome of the modeling activity?

What types of models have been used in other watersheds and what was the purpose of the modeling?

What model(s) would work for source identification and development of Best Management Practices? What models(s) would work for loading assessment?

What types of data are needed for the various types of models and when would it be collected? What level of quality is required of the data (accuracy, precision, repeatability)?

When would the models be employed and when would the data be used?

What are the relative costs of employing different types of models? How often would a modeling run need to be conducted? How would the modeling run be conducted?

## **Working Session #4: Monitoring Plan for Loading Assessment**

Bud Leber & Dave Dilks

### **Session Focus:**

Discuss and craft a detailed scope of work for conducting PCB data collection to define the current state of the river and identifiable contributing sources (loading assessment).

### **Session Specifics:**

Where, when, and how should PCB samples be taken on the river and from point sources?

At what specific locations should river water samples be collected? What companion data should also be collected to define the current state?

How should wet weather and dry weather conditions (sources) be addressed in the loading assessment?

At what times of the year should samples be collected in order to understand seasonal variability in the river? How many sampling events should take place during each specific condition?

How many sampling events should take place at point sources for each river sampling event?

How should each type of sample (river and point sources) be collected and analyzed? What protocols are needed for sampling? How can sampling efforts be coordinated or shared?