

Spokane River Regional Toxics Task Force (SRRTTF)
Technical Track Work Group (TTWG) Meeting
July 6, 2016 | 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Department of Ecology | N. 4601 Monroe St. | Spokane WA 99205
Meeting Documents posted <http://srرتtf.org/?p=6668>

Attendees:

John Beacham –City of Post Falls
Adriane Borgias –Department of Ecology
Ben Brattebo –Spokane County
Lisa Dally Wilson (Video) –Dally Environmental
Dave Dilks (Phone) –LimnoTech
Jeff Donovan –City of Spokane
Ted Hamlin –Department of Ecology
Kris Holm (Phone) –City of Coeur d’Alene
Doug Krapas –Inland Empire Paper

Mike LaScuola –Spokane Regional Health District
Bud Leber –Kaiser Aluminum
Dave Moss –Spokane County
Chris Page (Video) –Ruckelshaus Center
Adriane Pearson –City of Spokane
Jerry White (Phone) –RiverKeeper
Kara Whitman –Ruckelshaus Center
Ken Windram (Phone) –Hayden Area Regional
Sewer Board

Introductions and Agenda Review:

After introductions, the group opted not to make any changes to the agenda.

Chris Page explained that SRRTTF participants had contacted him to request that the SRRTTF consider how PCB-related conditions in the draft National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits for the Spokane River tie to the SRRTTF Comprehensive Plan. Since August 29th is the deadline for comments on the draft permits, the Task Force could move its August meeting to the 10th (or hold an additional meeting) to facilitate a presentation on the NPDES permit conditions with enough time for open dialogue. The TTWG agreed to suggest to the full Task Force to have a meeting on the 10th, with the decision to hold the additional meeting made at the July 27th full Task Force workshop.

NPDES permits will inform the progress that will be made in cleaning up the river. Setting aside time now to learn about PCB-related conditions in the permits can aid to goals of the Task Force and how those are addressed in the Comprehensive Plan. A public hearing on the draft permits is scheduled for August 2nd in Spokane.

ACTION ITEM: Ruckelshaus Center to request space to hold a meeting on August 10th from 9 am to 12:30 pm. (COMPLETE, scheduled for the Liberty Lake Sewer and Water District office)

**LimnoTech Presentation: Updates on Memos
Cost/Effectiveness of Control Actions memo**

In response to Task Force comments on the Jun 22nd version of this memo, Dave Dilks added a new evaluation factor and a “time frame” for when each control action could show results. The memo now explicitly states that most of the control actions address pathways of uncertain magnitude. Other additions: more detailed descriptions in the fact sheets, strengths and weaknesses of “lessons learned from other sites”, and a future steps section (reminder that the Comp Plan will include timelines, milestones, and effectiveness monitoring.

Dave asked the group to consider merging similar control actions, such as street sweeping and catch basin clean out. The TTWG suggested that makes sense if the merge can help manage the actions in a holistic approach including separate actions under a single “concept” (i.e. Road Maintenance); street

sweeping and catch basin cleanup are completed by different crews, so this must be considered. The group discussed the addition of Education about Filtering of Post-Consumer Paper Products”
Dave requests Feedback on the memo before July 20th.

Monthly Monitoring Update

Dave Dilks explained that the May sampling results have arrived and the River shows somewhat higher PCB concentrations than it did in April; however, the lab blanks are also higher in this batch. LimnoTech will distribute the data to the Task Force after completing the initial Quality Assessment. LimnoTech will make recommendations regarding fall monitoring after receiving and assessing the June data.

Q&A/Comments

- **C.** Idaho dischargers jointly sampled on one of the May sample dates, collecting four grab single samples. What format would be useful to LimnoTech? **A.** Send the AXYS spreadsheet to Dave Dilks.
- **Q.** Sampling issues with AXYS, explain? **A.** AXYS used to run two samples and one blank, now, during the monthly sampling, they are doing three lab blanks for each sample.
- **Q.** How do you do blank correction with three lab blanks? **A.** We don’t have a protocol in place. At this point different methods are not driving the results much. Ultimately, we know more having three blanks, now they are trying to figure out how to process it.
- **Q.** What would happen if there was a high one out of the three blanks? **A.** I don’t know. So far we see pretty tight numbers across the three blanks for each event. There is day-to-day variability, but not in any set of three yet. **NOTE: Next QAPP should address the issue of three blanks.**

PCB Control Action Workshop

Can the Control Action factsheets in Appendix B, and matrix in Appendix A, guide the SRRTTF in screening control actions and developing actionable recommendations? Can these serve as an acceptable information base? **A.** Some may require recommendations to gather more data. All the actions not already being implemented address source pathways of unknown magnitude. The group needs to consider how to prioritize them, given the lack of information on a number of control actions.

- **Q.** Can the relative magnitudes be used (rather than “unknown”), so some prioritization can happen? **A.** Only to a weak extent.
- **Q.** Is this a topic for discussion at the workshop or elsewhere: best possible treatments for solids left from what comes out of decant facilities—what is the fate of PCBs, and how should the decant facility products get managed? Actionable recommendation could be to measure each technique to see what the best possible action is.

Homolog Analysis

Dave Dilks explained the data shows a consistent pattern year to year, and this should be considered in the Comprehensive Plan as another groundwater source. Dave explained that the analysis is done and is in the 2015 synoptic report (LimnoTech confirmed Mike Hermanson’s analysis). **Q.** Should this inform prioritization at workshop? **A.** If the workshop gets to “where to collect data next.” Could possibly do an overview with slides at the workshop to show main findings.

Workshop

Chris Page gave an overview of the proposed draft agenda for the July 27th Task Force workshop.

- **Draft WORKSHOP GOAL:** *For SRRTTF members and participants to use existing information to discuss and, ideally, reach consensus on a prioritized suite of PCB Control Actions including “actionable*

recommendations” in its Comprehensive Plan to bring the Spokane River into compliance with applicable PCB water quality standards.

- **Draft PURPOSE:** *This prioritized list of recommended PCB control actions will guide the SRRRTF and its member and partner entities in seeking funding, requesting policy changes, conducting outreach, collecting data, implementing programs, and other steps needed to reduce PCB loading to the Spokane River.*
- **Draft OBJECTIVES:** *Select top tier of PCB Control Actions, identify interim step/s needed and any other actionable recommendations including responsible entity/entities, sort those actionable recommendations into “buckets” (implement near-term; implement longer-term; idea needs more work). Discuss plan for lower-priority actions.*

After discussion the group made some recommendations for the format of the workshop: Condense to the 29 control actions (groupings) as proposed in the Appendix A, and place into “buckets” prior to the workshop (by the July 20th TTWG meeting).

Q&A/Comments on Workshop:

- **C.** Difficult to cover all control actions (CA) in one day. Start and go through a whole CA (30 second intro, look at factsheet, concerns, then to actionable recommendations), looking at who would implement and how, then confirm which “bucket” (rather than separating each question). Group similar control actions.
- **C.** Near-term actions may largely involve data collection to better define pathways. Dave does not believe that there are any near-term actions the Task Force could take beyond current efforts that would show a significant reduction in PCBs.
- Workshop Purpose should make clear what the Comp Plan will and won’t do. It must make clear the Task Force does not have the authority (or the intention) to force individual entities to adopt certain control actions.
- Prioritization will happen with the individual entities based on what works for them. The Task Force can learn more, find more pathways, etc.
- Can we look into a cost/benefit analysis?
- We should consider whether things are being handled in the best way to prevent re-exposure.
- Actionable recommendation can have the Task Force develop a study or make suggestions to individual entities, also to encourage entities to continue doing the work.

ACTION ITEM: Ruckelshaus Center to revise the workshop agenda and pull together a matrix for Control Action evaluation based on the factsheets from LimnoTech. (COMPLETE).

The next full Task Force Meeting is July 27, 2016 from 8:30 am – 5 pm at the Spokane Water Resource Center
The next TTGW Meeting is July 20th, 2016 from 10am – 12 pm at the Department of Ecology