

## Spokane River Regional Toxics Task Force

### DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Facilitated by Chris Page & Aubri Denevan

December 18, 2013 | 9:00am – 12:30pm

Liberty Lake Water & Sewer District Office

22510 E. Mission Ave | Liberty Lake, WA 99019

#### Attendees

##### *Voting Members and Alternates*

Tom Agnew\*, BiJay Adams – Liberty Lake Sewer and Water District

Galen Buterbaugh\* – Lake Spokane Association

Bud Leber\* – Kaiser Aluminum

Doug Krapas\* – Inland Empire

Bart Mihailovich\* – Spokane RiverKeeper

David Moss\* – Spokane County

Mike LaScuola\*, Sandy Phillips – Spokane Regional Health District

Lynn Schmidt\*, Ashley Marshall – City of Spokane

*\*Denotes Voting Member*

##### *Advisors*

Kevin Booth – Avista

Adriane Borgias, Arianne Fernandez – WA Dept. of Ecology

Greg Lahti – Washington State Department of Transportation

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

##### *Public*

Lisa Dally Wilson – Dally Environmental

Mike Neher – City of Post Falls (*on phone*)

#### Introductions: Get Started & Review Agenda

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

#### TTWG Report & Technical Topics

*Recap of the Technical Workshop* – Bud Leber reported that LimnoTech thought the workshop was very productive, and they got what they needed out of it. They came away with the understanding that the monitoring will need to be a phased approach. LimnoTech had a conference call with the San Francisco Bay Estuary experts about sampling analysis. LimnoTech also wanted to look at the schedule going forward to see if there are changes needed. The Delaware Basin expert, Greg Cavallo, thought the Task Force is on the right track. He was happy to see where we were starting, and all of three of the experts at the workshop volunteered to be an ongoing resource as the Task Force moves forward.

After the workshop, Arianne Fernandez showed Lester McKee, the expert from the San Francisco Bay Estuary, around the watershed and what we have already done. He revised what he recommended: the Task Force should sample for wet weather now, not later as he recommended at the workshop.

Dave Dilks (LimnoTech) sent an email to Bud Leber with his takeaway messages:

- Using a phased approach to collect river data is “ok”
- LimnoTech will revisit the data collection strategy and revise based on input
- LimnoTech will have a conference call with San Francisco group regarding sampling and analysis
- LimnoTech will provide more information on sampling
- Need to look at the schedule going forward with Phase II. Also, to take a closer look at what can be done with respect to mining existing data: historical land use, fish tissue data, patterning.

**ACTION ITEM:** Bud will write up and provide Adriane Borgais with feedback from LimnoTech to post on the website.

**ACTION ITEM:** Bud and Adriane would like to still consider aerial deposition despite what outside experts recommended.

*ArcGIS Mapping & Database* – Chris Page relayed the recommendation to build a comprehensive map in a form similar to a GIS system. The GIS map would serve two purposes: 1) ability to drill down into the data; and 2) marking where things are located. Chris asked everyone to think about how that would get created, where it would be housed, and who would run it. He asked for thoughts from members.

Lisa Dally Wilson said that she has been hearing two things: 1) a detailed data space, and 2) a straightforward map of the watershed. She wondered if it is in LimnoTech’s scope to put together a map. They might be the best group to put that together for the Task Force.

Arianne Fernandez explained the difference between an Access DBs and SQL server. Access gives more flexibility in data content, while SQL server can handle more people using it. She also mentioned that all of the agency Task Force members here have robust GIS groups. Rather than look for outside help, she recommends using the expertise in house.

*Future “put the pin on the map” session* – Adriane Borgias requested the Task Force hold a session with a large map on the wall and pin suspected PCB sources. That session will help clarify where the Task Force should focus resources in testing. There also might be some areas and potential sources that have been forgotten about. She recommended doing this during the January or February SRRTTF meeting. Chris asked if others like that idea. Adriane thinks it would take about 100 pins. There was a recommendation to use three colors: 1) green – not significant, 2) red – is significant, and 3) yellow – unknown. Mike LaScuola gave a presentation years ago that did a good job mapping locations; this presentation is readily available now. Bart Mihailovich has a 12 foot map of the river available to use. Arianne also recommended doing this by scale—putting in maps of the different cities along the river.

Tom Agnew recalled Tom Eaton's comment about the pie chart in the presentation, which gives the impression that the Department of Ecology assumes we know 100% of the sources. Adriane explained: there are two pie charts in the presentation; the first one states we don't know 57% of the sources.

**ACTION ITEM:** Adriane will come up with the map for the pinning exercise. She will work with Bart to put together the map for an upcoming meeting.

*Additional Workshop Follow-up* – The Task Force will need to go out to contract for the lab analysis and for the samplers, so will need to develop a scope of work and training requirements. Adriane heard a need for a group to develop the scope of work for each of these components: lab, sampling, training, data management, and others articulated at the workshop.

Adriane recalled what Dale Norton said about the shared responsibility. Ecology might be responsible for certain areas and other organizations for different areas so the work is appropriately parsed out. Doug also reminded that this needs to be operated under one management 'umbrella' so the sampling methodology, lab analysis, data protocols, etc. are the same.

This ties into the allocation of the \$350K. It is anticipated that scopes of work will be developed. These would include separate tasks for laboratory costs, sampling costs, training, and data management.

**ACTION ITEM:** Assign the contracting process to the TTWG.

Doug Krapas mentioned that he has created a "menu of options" that illustrates the various costs based on variations. For example, number of samples, size, composites; types of samples like surface water, groundwater, and replicates. Tom Agnew said that he would like to see Ecology more assertive in establishing QAPPs and procedures.

Doug K. expects LimnoTech to manage and select participants in the sampling effort, in cooperation with Ecology and EPA. Ecology would not lead the process.

Arianne F. stated that the process to gather data for "data mining" underway and she has had conversations with David Dilks about the QAPP. Ecology policy will have the Task Force QAPP "written in." A preliminary draft has been prepared. She stated that Ecology gets push back when the agency does the work. However, Ecology would like to see the work happen. Ecology can assist with training, has the equipment to do sampling, and can work with others on this. The question is how much control does the SRRTTF want over the work? If SRRTTF wants Ecology to help, then ask for it.

### **Ecology's Environmental Assessment Program (EAP)**

Adriane invited the Task Force to submit ideas to put forward to the state and talked about the timing and process. She presented two project ideas sent by the Task Force, two suggested by EAP, and two submitted last year that are still in system. Project forms need to be submitted by Jan 8. Proposals get

prioritized at the system level then go to the EAP staff at Ecology for them to organize. Once a proposal is in the system, it stays in the system. The two from last year are good examples. They may need to be reframed from year to year. If you have other ideas, you still have time to submit them.

**Prioritize possible 2014 monitoring project requests (order below reflects SRRTTF decision on ranking):**

Number 1: C. Project Title: *Sampling Activities for Spokane River Synoptic Studies*

- Description: Assist the Spokane River Regional Toxics Task Force with the collection of samples associated with Spokane River Baseline and source identification studies.
- Discussion: Request this extend beyond 2015. Also, sampling equipment, proper maintenance of equipment, and ensuring there is adequate equipment to do concurrent sampling is important.

Number 2: D. Project Title: *Spokane River Water Quality Monitoring Long Term Trends Analysis*

- Description: Establish a relevant long-term Spokane River Water Quality monitoring plan for the purpose of trends monitoring in the Spokane River Main Stem. Obtain baseline information at reference points.
- Discussion: This is long term and would start July 1 2015 but extend beyond 2015. Consider combining with Project C.

Number 3: A. Project Title: *Wet and Dry Deposition of PCB in the Spokane River Watershed*

- Description: The current assessment report by Ecology for the Spokane River showed that the largest identifiable contributor of PCB to the river was stormwater. A 2011 literature review prepared by Ecology included information of the level of PCB in stormwater samples at levels thousands of times higher than the Tribal water quality standard. One of the potential contributors of PCB in stormwater is likely wet and dry deposition. The collection of wet and dry deposition data for PCB would provide information on PCB levels that would actually be reaching runoff surfaces. If coordinated with wet weather river sampling, this data could provide some perspective on the relative amount of PCB in runoff that may originate from deposition as opposed to existing land use sources. In addition, if multiple locations were monitored for wet and dry deposition, a better understanding of local source contribution could be gained.
- Discussion: this refers to atmospheric deposition studies, similar to Project F. Combine F with A.

*COMBINED WITH:* F. Project Title: *Aerial Deposition of PCB*

- Description: This project is a follow up to the 2011 literature review about the contribution to loading in the Spokane River by deposition of toxics (PCB, PBDE, PCDD/Fs, and mercury). Sources can be local, regional, or global and transported in the atmosphere before deposition. There is limited data on this for Washington state and none for Eastern Washington. This project would coordinate with other Ecology departments and the local air pollution control district to collect data about PCB deposition. Existing air monitoring locations can be used to collect ambient air samples. 1) An initial assessment of PCB quantities and types (congeners) of PCB in the air can be made using filters that are already being collected by the local air district. This information could be used to characterize PCB being deposited in the watershed and/or identify if

alternative sampling methods are warranted. 2) Other sampling protocols may be warranted (such as collecting air samples on XAD resin) depending on the initial assessment. The goal is to obtain a congener analysis for atmospherically deposited PCB, which would assist in source identification. This information would be used to identify the specific actions needed to significantly reduce these toxic materials from the watershed.

Number 4: B. *Project Title: Seasonal Variability in Spokane River Headwaters PCB Loading*

- Description: The current assessment report by Ecology for the Spokane River contains SPMD data at specific locations at varying times of the study year. If this concentration data is paired with the actual flow data for the SPMD deployment period a very high percentage of the mass loading of PCB occurred during the spring snowmelt runoff period. In order to gain a better understanding of season variability in PCB river levels, weekly grab samples could be collected at the Lake Coeur d'Alene discharge gauging station on a weekly basis. These samples could be composited into a monthly average PCB river concentration on a flow proportional basis using the gauging station data on flow.
- Discussion: Question about whether this can be done by Washington as the sampling location is Lake Coeur d'Alene. Possibly something the EPA can fund?

Number 5: E. *Project Title: Assessment of PCB Concentrations in Spokane Valley Groundwater*

- Description: The Spokane River Regional Toxics Task Force is in the process of assessing the contributions of PCB to the river load. More than half of the PCB loading to the river is unaccounted for. A better understanding of the effect of groundwater on PCB loadings to the river is needed. Monitoring wells are already in place in the Spokane aquifer that could be used to sample and evaluate levels of PCB in groundwater. This project would consist of two parts:
  - I) Planning phase (year 1): Identify and evaluate existing data and data resources; coordinate with the recommendations from the SRRTTF Technical Consultant regarding PCB model inputs and data availability from other monitoring efforts (i.e., USGS NAWQA) and data gaps/needs; define the scope and SOP's (i.e., coordinate with the SRRTTF on methodologies); so data can be used to identify/estimate PCB inputs and loads to the Spokane River from ground water.
  - II) Implementation phase: This phase would be best completed beginning year two in order to coordinate with the recommendations of the SRRTTF Technical consultant regarding data gaps and modeling of the PCB inputs to the river. Focus initial efforts on monitoring/sampling locations that are the most relevant for estimating PCB loading (i.e., gaining reaches). Funding will be needed for project design, sampling, chemical analysis, and characterization of the PCB in the groundwater. This would be better done later, possibly FY 2016, after the dry weather sampling is completed. That might give us a better idea of where to focus on isolating river sources.

Adriane asked the group to rank these and asked for a volunteer to help her with the forms. This is an extremely flexible process. Once chosen, they will work with us to make sure it's still appropriate. It's

not our funding, it's Ecology's. Also takes a while to get the data back. But these are highly experienced folks.

**ACTION ITEM:** Adriane to prepare project sheets and send to Doug K. and Greg Lahti, who will review.

**ACTION ITEM:** Doug and Greg will review the worksheets Adriane puts together for the EAP proposals.

**ACTION ITEM:** Post that list to the group. Background as to how PCBs affect the state of Washington.

### **Administrative and Contracting Entity (ACE) Update**

*General Information* – ACE agreed to raise operating funds to pay for invoices including the Ruckelshaus Center and LimnoTech. Idaho (ID) agreed to pay into these funds. They need to put together a system for ID until their permits are out. \$115 of \$175K has been spent. ACE just invoiced the Spokane River Stewardship Partners for \$200K, so cash flow is positive. Task 7 of the Work Plan is complete and will be invoiced through the County, to be paid by the interagency agreement with Ecology. Ecology encourages ACE to complete the contracting process for the \$350K.

**ACTION ITEM:** Bud Leber/ACE to provide schedule for completing the \$350K scope of work, which is estimated to be by the end of January after hearing from David Dilks about recommended strategy (Dilks would like more discussion about what Phase II will look like).

Ecology is contributing \$40K for the technical portion. All the pieces are in place to get the cost recovered.

*Conflict of Interest Discussion* – ACE met before the last SRRTF meeting. There is no conflict for LimnoTech to do the DO TMDL work for the monitoring studies they may be considering. Activities outside of that would need to get reviewed. They passed that back to Ecology. Adriane reported there is not concern now.

### **Updates & Announcements**

*Process & Possible Changes to Task Force MOA* – Chris Page suggested talking about the process of reopening the MOA. EPA (Don Martin) submitted comments on the MOA in 2011. When Tom Eaton became the EPA representative to the Task Force, Mary Lou Soscia provided the 2011 EPA comments. Several were related to process and are no longer relevant to the group. EPA will need some language changed.

Bart Mihailovich suggested tabling this until the next Task Force meeting so everyone is able to review the comments. When does EPA expect to sign the MOA? Mary Lou was under the impression that would happen when the ID permits are approved. Tom also brought up the need for the ID attorney's review of the MOA. Mike Neher doubts it can be done by the February meeting. They will need to see what the final permits say before they can make comments or review the MOA.

Bart recommended that we review the general EAP comments at the January meeting, then review the comments from Task Force attorneys.

**ACTION ITEM:** Mary Lou & Tom Eaton to review 2011 EPA comments and MOA approved January 23, 2012 and send us clarification as to what we need to review.

**ACTION ITEM:** Adriane will post and send out the comments from the EPA lawyers to be reviewed by the County's and City's attorneys.

**ACTION ITEM:** Adriane to distribute the original comments prior to the January date so that some of the important changes can be reviewed, specifically EPA comments #10-11 on the MOA, which is standard language that will need to be included in order for EPA to sign the document.

*Outreach Calendar – Spokesman Review Interview* - There was a group interview (Tom Eaton, Mike Peterson, Mike LaScuola, Dale, Kevin Booth, Sandy Phillips) at the end of the workshop with Becky Kramer from the Spokesman Review. Adriane reported that Becky is planning to do a series of articles.

Adriane and Arianne spoke about the SRRTTF at a source control conference. There was a lot of discussion about cleanup standards. Adriane noted that the Task Force is doing a lot with very little funding. Other watersheds have millions of dollars' worth of funding.

*Funding* – Doug K. went to Olympia the day after the workshop. He took a copy of the menu he created for the monitoring/sampling needs and costs that conveyed how much is needed. They are concerned that we haven't spent the \$350K yet. He thinks that helped a lot for them to see the interworking over here. He thinks it might be helpful for us to go over there again in the next session. Funding for the SRRTTF is not in the governor's budget, but it could make it into the legislature's eventual budget. Thanks for the letters from the city of Spokane and Liberty Lake.

*EPA Grant Opportunity: "Systems-Based Research for Evaluating Ecological Impacts of Manufactured Chemicals"*- Adriane Borgias sent this over to Brian Lamb at WSU CEREO (Center for Environmental Research, Education and Outreach). This is STAR (science to achieve results) funding, which has a regulatory and research agenda with very specific topics. She asked Brian to look at this to see if this would work for him. Adriane will follow up with him. She thinks this would be a good way to get into the EPA funding conversation. This is another avenue for funding where we need to start laying the foundation. It's not geographically limited. Brian understands air quality modeling better than anyone. They have done work specific to sulfates and nitrates specifically. He would have to figure out how the PCB aspect comes into play. Only Universities can apply for this funding.

**ACTION ITEM:** Adriane Borgias to follow up regarding status.

**ACTION ITEM:** Adriane Borgias to distribute the draft PCB Chemical Action Plan.

*Suggestion to Switch TTWG & FWG meetings in Jan. & Feb.* – At the end of the workshop, the idea of flip-flopping the TTWG with the FWG to keep the workshop activities moving forward. After some discussion, the Task Force decided there was no imminent need right now for the FWG to meet in Jan.

No one was opposed to the swap. Doug suggest that we might even need to forgo the Feb. FWG meeting because of the activities coming out the TTWG. He thinks they should be meeting at least once a month. But that doesn't need to be decided now.

*Ruckelshaus Center Evaluation (Midpoint Check ins)* – Chris Page stated that Ruckelshaus Center will contact Task Force members as a mid-point check in and to provide an evaluation of services.

**Public Comment**

No comments.

-----  
**The next SRRITF Task Force meeting is January 22, 2014 at Spokane County Water Resource Center**  
The next Tech Track Work Group meeting is January 8, 2014 from 10am – 12pm, and the next Funding Work Group meeting is February 5, 2014 from 10am – 12pm at the Department of Ecology  
-----