

Spokane River Regional Toxics Task Force

Facilitated by the William D. Ruckelshaus Center (Chris Page and Kara Whitman)

February 22, 2017 | 9:00 a.m. -12:30 p.m.

Liberty Lake Sewer and Water District | 22510 E. Mission Ave. | Liberty Lake, WA

Meeting Documents: <http://srtrtf.org/?p=7644>

Attendees

*Voting Members and Alternates (*Denotes a Voting Member)*

Tom Agnew*, BiJay Adams –Liberty Lake Sewer and Water District
Galen Buterbaugh*(phone) –Lake Spokane Association
Doug Krapas*, Ryan Ekre –Inland Empire Paper
Don Keil*, Kris Holm (phone) –City of Coeur d’Alene
Mike LaScoula* –Spokane Regional Health District
Bud Leber*, Brent Downey –Kaiser Aluminum
Lisa Manning* (phone) –Kootenai Environmental Alliance
Dave McBride* (phone) –Washington Department of Health
Dave Moss*, Rob Lindsay –Spokane County
Mike Petersen* –Lands Council
Elizabeth Schoedel*, Mike Coster, Jeff Donovan –City of Spokane
Jerry White* (phone) –Riverkeeper

Advisors

Jim Bellatty, Adriane Borgias (phone), Bill Fees, Ted Hamlin, Grant Pfeifer, Sandy Treccani –Washington
Department of Ecology (Ecology)
Kevin Booth -Avista
Brian Nichols, Lucy Edmonson (phone) –Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Public/Interested Parties

Lisa Dally Wilson –Dally Environmental
Dave Dilks (phone) --LimnoTech
Paul Klatt (phone) –J-U-B Engineering
Monica Ott –Post Falls
Eric Williams –Gallatin
Ken Windram –Hayden Area Regional Sewer Board

Introductions and Agenda Review

After introductions, no changes were made to the agenda.

DECISION: The Task Force approved the January 25th, 2017 notes with minor edits as discussed at the meeting.

ACTION ITEM: Kara Whitman to make the edits and post the final notes on srtrtf.org (COMPLETE)

Update from Lucy Edmonson (EPA)

EPA would like to meet with the Task Force (as requested) to discuss Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA); folks from EPA Region 10 will attend in person and EPA representatives from D.C. will attend by phone. They would like to talk through the challenges, and discuss options and strategies for addressing them. They would like the meeting to happen soon – possibly late March or April. They will coordinate with the TSCA work group to set up the meeting. Pending the availability of the D.C. staff, the TSCA subcommittee could meet before or after the March or April Task Force meeting. **Update: EPA’s key D.C. staff did not have availability after the March 22, 2017 Task Force meeting. They will be available after the April 26th meeting.**

Columbia River Restoration Act

Mary Lou Soscia was not available to call in to the meeting. This agenda item will be moved to the March 22, 2017 meeting.

Policy 1-11 Webinars: Report on 1/19/ and 2/9 Discussions

Bud Leber attended both meetings, at which he tried to convey what the Task Force has learned concerning variability in fish PCB levels at different points in the river (as compared to in-river PCB levels). He requested that before policy is decided, they should dig deeper into this. He asked them to sample fish and sediment and water at the same time, to adopt an integrated sampling approach instead of sampling fish or water concentrations in silos. Kris Holm called the group's attention to a 6-page summary of issues discussed at the meetings. Ecology will present options for category determinations at the next Policy 1-11 meeting (late March). After the last meeting, the policy will go out for public comment before Ecology finalizes it (summer 2017). Note: this is not a rulemaking process, this is policy formation.

Monthly In-River PCB Sampling

Dave Dilks explained that the data is 3-4 weeks out because AXYS had to rerun the samples using archive samples (initial samples run had high lab blank contamination and were not in compliance with the criteria in the Quality Assurance Project Plan, QAPP). A few of the archive sample bottles collected by Gravity broke in December. Results will hopefully be ready by the March 22, 2017 Task Force meeting. The Technical Report will be out within a week of getting the December results back from AXYS.

Update on Data Management Contractor from the SRRTTF Administrative & Contracting Entity (ACE)

ACE sent a draft contract to CDM Smith. That firm will send a response on terms and conditions in the contract.

ACE Financial Commitment

Given that the Task Force has a limited budget, ACE thought it would help to do a monthly budget report, including funds allocated and funds non-committed. This report will be part of each upcoming SRRTTF meeting.

Current Funds: End of December 2016, \$316,000. The summary includes the overall allocated funds (as of 12/31/16) and the balance of other contracts still in effect:

- CDM Smith contract (approved at the January Meeting)
- Ruckelshaus Center contract (through June 30th)
- Administrative costs.

ACE has received all the money allocated by the legislature to fund SRRTTF work through 6/30/17. All the work for the Comprehensive Plan contract is completed. The rest of allocated Comp Plan funds could go back into the ACE non-committed funds.

Tom Agnew informed the Task Force of the urgent need for Task Force members to contact local legislators (regarding funding for the SRRTTF): Tim Ormsby (Appropriations Committee Chair), Andy Billig (Ways and Means Committee), and Mike Volz (Appropriations Committee) because of their position on key committees. Task Force members are urged to contact each of them in the next 24 hours. Many Task Force members said they planned on contacting them if they had not done so already.

Comp Plan Implementation

Chris Page discussed challenges facing collaborative groups transitioning from planning to implementation. This whole new phase requires a new approach. To lay the groundwork, small groups have been doing lots of work.

Approach

Adriane Borgias provided an overview on how to approach implementation: using a scope, schedule, and budget:

- The scope is the Comp Plan itself, a complicated document *but with specific items succinctly defined*.
- The schedule can be done in multiple ways; Kara Whitman and Chris Page started this by developing a draft spreadsheet to track control actions. Adriane refined the spreadsheet to track Comp Plan control actions with responsibilities assigned. This spreadsheet could serve as the Comp Plan “implementation tracker” to allow people to look ahead and see what is expected and what the goals are. Task Force work groups could enhance this by developing logic flows for control actions (e.g., the logic flow Bud Leber did for data mining).
- The budgeting process could utilize the “Funding Strategies” document (created and approved by the Task Force), which Adriane recently updated with information from the Comp Plan. The schedule will help prioritize funding, while the Funding Strategies document can serve as a roadmap. Adriane suggested three categories of expense:
 - Things the Task Force wants to do with its own funds
 - Project-specific “opportunistic” costs, e.g. foundation or government grants (via ACE or nonprofit)
 - Individual organizations taking on specific projects (using their own funding).

As an example of the third category of project expense, Mike LaScuola discussed the Spokane Regional Health District’s Urban Waters local source program. This program is already doing quite a bit of work related to control actions in the Comp Plan (e.g. Waste Directory, EnviroStars). They want to make these programs/products inclusive and invite suggestions. ***The Task Force should consider how to quantify actions such as these working towards completing actions in the Comp Plan.*** Adriane Borgias explained that the Urban Waters program and Ecology support is important (Section 5.9), specific things called out in the Comp Plan.

ACTION ITEM: Technical Track Work Group (TTWG): Evaluate and determine the first steps, estimate how much they cost, and make recommendations to the Task Force. (COMPLETE)

ACTION ITEM: Lisa Dally Wilson: Put the data mining logic flow map into list form for the TTWG to prioritize. (COMPLETE)

ACTION ITEM: Comp Plan Work groups identify any anticipated expenditures.

Some Comp Plan actions may be better for other groups to do. Ecology’s Urban Waters program runs parallel to the Task Force work. Ted Hamlin said he has \$100,000 per year for related work. He is currently working on a PCB study on demolition debris, collecting almost 200 samples from soil and stormwater (direct discharge to Green Street). **Q.** Analyzing for PCBs? **A.** Soil samples will use Method 8082 (Manchester lab), water samples 1668-C (AXYS lab). Five samples each will be collected before and after demolition (surface flow to stormwater). **Q** for Task Force: What work would fit into this or other programs? *Note: Ted Hamlin retires April 28th, 2017.*

Green Chemistry: Adriane explained that the Green Chemistry work group will work on a quarterly basis on the following actions:

1. Communicate regularly with Ecology on current Green Chemistry efforts and report as needed to Task Force
2. Use available data (environmental, product testing, literature or screening) to identify opportunities for Green Chemistry research – and report to the Task Force
3. Support relevant Green Chemistry opportunities (by EPA, universities, and innovation challenges) and report to the Task Force.

Waste Disposal Assistance: There will be a quarterly report to Task Force.

Regulatory Rulemaking: TSCA Reform and “color-box” Rules for Road Paint. TSCA reform (discussed earlier, the group is setting up meeting with EPA region 10 and D.C. EPA). Greg Lahti could not attend this meeting, but sent email context for PCBs in road paint. His “back-of-the-napkin” calculation mentioned the 16 gallons of paint for one mile of solid yellow stripe to calculate PCBs contained WSDOT paint each year in the Spokane River basin:

- Yellow 5000 gal X 1.65 X 62.4= 515,000 lbs. = 23,360 kg x 1.44 ug/kg = 33640 ug = 0.03 g
- White 10,000 gal X 1.65 X 62.4 = 1,030,00 lbs. = 46,720 kg x 0.303 ug/kg = 14,150 ug = 0.014 g
- WSDOT contribution to Spokane River is fairly small. Even if doubled we are at just less than 0.1 grams/year.
- City of Spokane and others could figure their contribution if they know how much paint they buy each year.

Task Force members expressed skepticism about changing “color-box” requirements with many other roads to consider (look across the U.S. at other approaches, maybe experiment on lower PCB paints to test volatility (ambient deposition), durability, etc. Request to have Greg report to the Task Force quarterly.

- **Q.** Convert this to net increase in water?
- **Q.** Three decant facilities in Spokane County: does this count as removal? Need analytical work on this. How is this managed? Can we quantify what is being picked up off the street? Would an increase in sweeping help?
- **Q.** This data would be useful; can the City and the County quantify all of this?
- **C.** Product testing was done using 1668C, found similar numbers to what Greg Lahti calculated.
- **C.** If the product is not durable, PCB content may not matter.
- **C.** Department of Enterprise Services (DES) process on purchasing policy is the place to start. If it turns out that with the current color-box, there is no option, then at that point it would make sense to revisit the color-box rules.
- **Q.** Control Action 10.5.2 Category B extension on existing actions. Should the new action be, does this new action make sense? i.e. Green Chemistry, is this a safety issue? Need to frame this issue moving forward, not just the purchasing piece.
- **C.** Jeff Donovan explained that there is 10 mg/yr. of an unknown source load in 2014 synoptic survey. Based on these calculations by Greg, this would be only .02 percent of the unknown source load.

ACTION ITEM: Ruckelshaus Center send out Greg Lahti’s numbers on PCBs in WSDOT paint in Spokane River basin (COMPLETE) **Follow-up after email:** Kelle Vigeland (City of Spokane) checked the numbers and made some adjustments, but the answer ends up about the same. Yellow 5000 gal X 1.65 g/cc X **8.345 (lbs.*g)/(gal*cc)** ~~62.4~~ = ~~515,000~~ **68,846** lbs. = ~~23,360~~ **31,229** kg x 1.44 ug/kg = ~~33640~~ **44,969** ug = ~~0.03~~ **0.04** g

Fungi Study: The City of Spokane and The Lands Council are analyzing some vector waste. Results have come back, but have not yet been analyzed. They are meeting at the end of March, and should be able to report out on this by then. Dr. Rodenburg may be doing some fingerprint analysis.

ACTION ITEM: Jeff Donovan to give a report on the Fungi study at the TTWG meeting next week. (COMPLETE)

Data Mining: Bud Leber said the TTWG group needs to look at the logic flow on data mining, determine what route to take, and lay out the necessary activities and next steps. The TTWG can map out these various activities and prioritize and determine cost. This will help the SRRTTF to prioritize how to allocate its available funds.

Public Education and Outreach

The Education and Outreach work discussed the work plan. Kristen Zimmer (City of Spokane) drafted a mockup for a new web interface for education and outreach (it can be a new face for the existing internally-focused site or a new website). The idea behind the website landing page is to have a uniform message with links to other

sites and information. It could serve as a clearing house for all the organizations (e.g. PCB product testing, actions citizens can take, Waste Directory etc.).

Q&A/Comments

- Source categories on the mockup should be clear (not just industry). Add in the data in dimensions of the problem. Add conceptual model of PCB pathways.
- Ecology is updating their webpage to be compatible with mobile devices. WordPress is formatted to be viewable on mobile devices.
- For measurable progress: get data on traffic to current site (some data available from Constant Contact), then set up google analytics for the website and compare to a new website.
- Is this a Task Force website? If so, does this preclude this from being hosted by another entity?
- C. long term hosting, consider Spokane River Forum?
- C. Focus on good news. Links to partner pages.
- Individual entities have responsibilities for outreach in certain areas. Also, much work needs to happen at the TTWG for the Outreach work group to address.

ACTION ITEM: Rob Lindsay to suggest hosting of the PCB outreach website on the Spokane River Forum site.

Spokane River Forum: To occur on November 15th and 16th – Our Gem is on the 14th (coincides with the November Task Force meeting). Should the Task Force secure a room at the forum to meet anyway? The Task Force could hold a technical workshop the same week to take advantage of experts. River Forum agendas: general topics discussed at the board level, need to coordinate early with Andy Dunau. Also, could potentially move the November Task Force meeting to November 29th.

ACTION ITEM: Chris Page to connect with Andy Dunau to discuss the River Forum agenda and see if there is crossover with the Task Force work. (COMPLETE—no agenda yet for River Forum, dialogue to continue)

ACTION ITEM: Post meeting notes for ACE (ACE and Ruckelshaus Center to update to “final” notes)

Updates and Announcements

- The Association of Washington Business has submitted a Petition for Reconsideration of EPA's Partial Disapproval of Washington's Human Health Water Quality Criteria and Implementation.
- Jim Bellatty (Ecology) is retiring at the end of March 2017.

ACTION ITEM: Kara Whitman to send out information on the petition to EPA from the Association of Washington Business. (COMPLETE)

No Public Comment

The next Full Task Force meeting will be held on March 22, 2017 at Spokane County Water Resource Center
The next TTWG Meeting will be March 1, 2017 at the Department of Ecology from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.