

Spokane River Regional Toxics Task Force Technical Track Work Group Meeting

Wednesday | March 1, 2017 | 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Department of Ecology | N. 4601 Monroe St. | Spokane, WA 99205

Meeting Materials: <http://srtrtf.org/?p=7672>

Attendees:

BiJay Adams –Liberty Lake

John Beacham –City of Post Falls

Adriane Borgias –WA Dept. of Ecology (Ecology)

Lisa Dally Wilson –Dally Environmental

Dave Dilks (phone) –LimnoTech

Jeff Donovan –City of Spokane

Brandy Era- Miller (phone) –Department of Ecology

Kris Holm (phone) –City of Coeur d’Alene

Doug Krapas –Inland Empire Paper

Bud Leber –Kaiser

Pam Marti (phone) –Ecology

Dave McBride (phone) –Department of Health

Eric McConnell –Ecology

Dave Moss –Spokane County

Cadie Olsen –City of Spokane

Monica Ott –City of Post Falls

Chris Page (phone) –Ruckelshaus Center

Debbie Sargeant (phone) –Ecology

Sandy Trecanni –Ecology

Kara Whitman –Ruckelshaus Center

Introductions and Agenda Review

After introductions, no changes made. Introduction: Debbie Sargeant supervises the Ecology Toxics unit and has 25 years of experience with the Environmental Assessment Program (EAP).

Monthly Sampling 2016: Data Update

Dave Dilks explained that AXYS is rerunning analysis on the December 2016 monthly samples, with data expected back by next Task Force meeting. There was also in-river sampling in Idaho collected by Gravity. The final technical report for 2016 monthly sampling will include this data though in as much detail as the SRRTTF-collected data. There are four in-river Idaho locations where samples were collected the same week as Gravity collected Task Force data (this data is also being submitted to EPA).

Q&A/COMMENTS

- C. Kris Holm needs to talk to Don Keil before the Coeur d’Alene (CDA) data can be included in the report. They need to know how it would be qualified (what blank correction would be used). CDA would like it to appear the same as it would be submitted to EPA (there may not be an issue, just need to check).
- John Beacham explained that this data is only single samples taken in four locations, so not as robust as the rest of the sampling efforts. This qualification should be included if this data is included in the report.

White Rot Fungi Project (PCBs in Vector Waste Breakdown)

In partnership with The Lands Council, the City of Spokane collected samples of vector waste and grew White Rot Fungi samples (fungi) to test the effectiveness of the fungi to break down PCBs. Some samples were mixed with more or less sawdust for a growing material with the intention that the fungi would eat the material and hopefully the PCBs. They grew the fungi for 3-4 months, and sampled the jars of myceliated vector waste. The City just got results back. Initial results do not show promise for reducing or dechlorinating the PCBs. Lisa Rodenburg is going to look at the data to see if there is a change in the fingerprinting.

Comprehensive Plan Implementation

The work group discussed the data mining tasks toward identification of sites of concern for contaminated groundwater. Lisa Dally Wilson provided a list of activities for discussion (based on the logic flow diagram previously presented). Dave Dilks explained that some of the activities are short-term, less expensive activities

that can be done in the near term; but there is also a need for a more holistic look as specified in section 5.14.1a, which discuss investigating up-gradient of Kaiser. 5.14 is targeted; a quick assessment could be done to parcel out the contribution from Toxics Control Program (TCP) sites to gauge if they are large enough to contribute to PCBs in the River. The Task Force can reference Pam Marti's memo on TCP sites, as it could narrow down the search. That memo notes several sites with confirmed sources, but those have been cleaned up to a level not requiring further action by the TCP standards; however, it is important to note that these could still contribute PCBs at a level of concern for the Task Force due to the TCP cleanup standard (1ppm).

Discussion

- Kris Holm asked that the group focus on the specifics outlined in the Comp Plan. The Task Force does not have the authority to do anything about them, besides identify potential sites and then consult with TCP.
- Sandy Trecanni explained that TCP can consult with the Task Force to refine their investigation. Sites are source-driven, and TCP needs a specific location of interest in order to move forward. TCP does not have homolog data. TCP can look at the history of sites, included how the sites were sued. However, TCP can only go back into a cleaned site if something new is found (i.e. cleaned up for metals, now find PCBs). In the case where Ecology cannot act due to cleanup status, EPA may be able to provide assistance, as Ecology and EPA are acting under two different regulatory frameworks.
- There is flexibility built into the Comp Plan. Consider synergistic work that can enhance/compliment the work being completed.
- Adriane: Do specific, targeted analyses to hone in on sources. We found out we had data gaps and filled them. Now we can hone in on specific areas that could potentially lead to reductions in the river.
- Section 5.14 actions: take the next steps, also identified data gap on homolog analysis (listed elsewhere in the plan). Ask for a scope for each of these elements and then determine if the financial resources are there.
- Amend LimnoTech scope work? Take data that they already have and report it at the congener level. Dave Dilks explained that the technical reports do report at the homolog level, however the mass balance is not at the congener level. This would not be too expensive to do in the first part of this year.
- The Comprehensive Plan goes into another level of detail. Trent to Greene Street is a mixture of losing and gaining groundwater. Other reaches are all gaining or all losing. Need to determine the urgency on each of these studies. Are there cost efficiencies to doing things together?
- Ecology/County collected groundwater data can still be further analyzed. (e.g., data from GE site).

Data Driven Comp Plan Elements (from Lisa): Prioritize and pull a budget/scope together for (1-8 work items?).

1. Congener or homolog data summary for ambient station and point source locations identified in Comp Plan. (Box 1 and 2 in the logic flow diagram for data mining). Limnotech could scope the work to provide mass balance calculations at homolog level based on 5.14.1.a specifications.
2. Compiling groundwater data for congener/homolog analysis (5.14.1.a and 6.3.2): look at where data is available at homolog level. Precursor for mass balance calculations, identifying potential sources through consultation with TCP and/or EPA.
3. Ongoing technical process Support by technical advisor (LimnoTech): current funding ends March 31st.
4. Continued PCB Testing of Spokane River water column. Continue monitoring river column PCBs as the Task Force moves forward? What level of information is going to be needed to determine success? The group agreed to keep this on the radar and evaluate the need as time passes.
5. Compile available sediment data (Box 4 in Bud's logic flow chart) from other entities? Some Task Force members have concerns about the difference (relationship) between water quality data and fish tissue data. There is a fish advisory, and a water quality standard not being met related to fish tissue. If there is no connection between water column PCBs and fish tissue PCBs, are we looking down the wrong pathway? Research this to determine what type of analysis would answer it (literature search, to inform the questions

- asked, including Wenatchee report on this). Follow-up: After the meeting, Adriane sent a list of Ecology studies regarding sediment in the Spokane River: literature review? Non-Task Force funding for support?
6. Compile 2012 and other relevant fish data by congener, homolog, location, and fish type and age (Box 3 in work flow chart). Ecology task? Keith Seiders may have done this? Brandee Era-said Keith did a homolog analysis of the fish data; the pattern looked different for the Plante's Ferry reach, and this may be something to follow up on. Some work has been done (can we track down this report?) Literature review? Other non-Task Force funding for support?
 7. Continued Data base development. Project currently going on. What is the next step? The group agreed that the database pilot project completion will help determine the next steps.

Next steps: Item 1 would be easy for LimnoTech; LimnoTech could do Item 2 or it could go out to bid. Ted Hamlin retires in April, and he has funding (some of it is going to researching PCBs around building demolition). Could Ted put together a formal reference list of Ecology-gathered sediment data in Urban Waters' report? This data is being entered into EIM (much of it 1668). Adriane will provide a link to the report on this data.

Resources: EAP, Urban Waters, etc. SRRTTF should find specific studies or tasks that may be able to utilize these resources (make sure to work within Ecology's planning time frame and budgets).

ACTION ITEM: Adriane will look through the plan to see where Urban Waters can help.

ACTION ITEM: Dave Dilks will add questions raised by the data and how future monitoring would play into this in the Monthly sampling report.

The group discussed next steps for moving components of the items forward. They need a scope, budget, timeline. The group identified items 1-3 as priority and decided to evaluate if 4 is a necessity. 5 and 6 may need more literature review to determine if this would yield useful information. And next steps for 7 will be more clear after pilot project is complete.

EAP Presentation in Late October 2017? Brandee Era-Miller explained that in the fall or winter, perhaps the Task Force would be interested to have EAP present all the data they are collecting, then brainstorm what other questions EAP could address. EAP could come and do a half or full day in late October.

Prioritization: The group agreed that continued technical support from Limnotech is a priority. The Task Force could use a month-to-month budget in lieu of an annual contract. LimnoTech has been including "as needed" support in the past. LimnoTech can do a baseline monthly cost for basic duties, anything above and beyond could be done as subtasks to the data management CDM Smith work.

ACTION ITEM: LimnoTech to pull together scope and budget and timeline for 1, 2, 3 support by March 15th, 2017. (COMPLETE) Task Force to decide whether to continue process support with LimnoTech.

PCB Control Actions Spreadsheet: Tool to Track Comp Plan Implementation

Chris Page and Adriane gave an overview of a multi-tab spreadsheet developed to manage the implementation work. The spreadsheet could help focus on tasks and help facilitators plan upcoming meetings.

ACTION ITEM: Present to SRRTTF, ask Work Group leads to give feedback on the tracking document (and anticipated budget requests). Adriane to communicate with team leads and use feedback to update worksheet.

Next full Task Force meeting is March 22, 2017, 9:00am-2:30 pm, at Spokane County Water Resource Center
The next scheduled TTWG meeting is April 5, 2017 from 10:00am-12:00 pm at Dept. of Ecology