

Spokane River Regional Toxics Task Force (SRRTTF)
Technical Track Work Group (TTWG) meeting
Wednesday, February 7, 2018 | 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Department of Ecology | N 4601 Monroe St. | Spokane, WA 99205
DRAFT Meeting Notes

Attendees:

Karin Baldwin –WA Dept. of Ecology (Ecology)	Mike LaScuola –Spokane Regional Health District
Vikki Barthels –Spokane Regional Health District	Rob Lindsay –Spokane County
Ben Brattebo (phone) –Spokane County	Monica Ott –City of Post Falls
Lisa Dally Wilson (phone) –Dally Environmental	Dave McBride (phone) –WA Dept of Health
Dave Dilks (phone) –LimnoTech	Chris Page (Video) –Ruckelshaus Center
Chris Donley (phone) –WA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife	Bryce Robbert –Avista
Jeff Donovan –City of Spokane	Jeremy Schmidt –Ecology
Brandee Era-Miller (phone) –Ecology	Sandy Trecanni –Ecology
Mike Hermanson (phone) –Spokane County	Bruce Williams –Spokane Regional Health District
Doug Krapas –Inland Empire Paper	Kara Whitman –Ruckelshaus Center
Bud Leber –Kaiser	

Introductions and Agenda Review

After a round of introductions, no changes were made to the agenda.

Fish Sampling Work Group (FSWG):

Chris Donley recapped the FSWG meeting. The group identified two general study concepts:

1. Design a study (data/models) to further understanding of what is driving PCB concentrations in fish in the River. If we can determine the source(s) and avenues of exposure, we can focus future efforts on controls designed to reduce concentrations of PCBs in fish tissue. This study would start with the question, “What does the existing data tell us?”
2. We need a yardstick. Design a monitoring plan that can provide an adequate baseline data set that could eventually allow demonstrated reduction of PCBs in fish tissue. We need a study design to coordinate fish sampling locations with water column and potential sediment sources.

Action Item 1, FSWG Meeting: Jerry White to clarify River Mile where storm water outfall enters river.

Action Item 2, FSWG Meeting: Schedule a meeting for Dave Dilks to educate the work group on how bioaccumulation and bioaccumulation models work. This would use some Task Force/2012 fish data by congener to test drive the Dave Serdar model “Spokane River PCB Source Assessment 2003-2007” (at <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/1103013.pdf>. (The Bioaccumulation model is described in Appendix H.) Ecology staff are invited to engage (i.e., Will Hobbs, Brandee Era-Miller). This presentation should drive our understanding to better design studies focused on the two study concepts above.

Brandee added that once the group works through the food web model and finds the data gaps, the information can guide Brandee and Siana Wong when they do a biofilm study this summer (they are working on their quality assurance project plan (QAPP) now. Brandee asked that the meeting include discussion of the food web modeling and give guidance on what the summer sampling should look like.

Dave Dilks: Available March 9th (at Department of Fish and Wildlife) to do a bioaccumulation work shop.
Q. Do we need authorization from the Task Force to go ahead? **A.** Can use previously-allocated technical support funds to do this. All it takes is an ACE concurrence to authorize the work.

ACTION ITEM: Bud can send a note to ACE on what LimnoTech is asked to do, to run by the ACE board members. He will send it to Dave with what is authorized under that task.

ACTION ITEM: Brandee will work with Will Hobbs and Siana Wong about coming in person. Chris Donley will look into Skype option and Karin Baldwin to look into the availability of the Ecology room. If this does not work out, then Kara Whitman can look into WSU Spokane options. (COMPLETE, Update: Brandee, Will and Siana will attend in person, no need for SKYPE or video conference.)

Meeting Structure and Content

As the Task Force continues to evolve from the planning phase to Comp Plan implementation, it could make things more efficient to change what meetings are held, and what their structure is. There could be alternating meetings of project leads and TTWG meetings (every other month), or the Task Force could do a short Technical Track session as needed, followed by work sessions for specific projects.

Discussion:

- **C.** Some of these tasks may generate technical memos that would need TTWG review.
- **C.** The purpose of the TTWG is to be the technical decision/evaluation arm of the Task Force. Perhaps fewer meetings are needed; we could always call a meeting if needed.
- **C.** Specific workgroup products (i.e. memos, reports) could go directly to the Task Force.
- **C.** We don't need TTWG meetings unless there is a technical topic needing discussion, at which time a meeting could be pulled together.
- **C.** In the bigger picture of the Task Force, in implementation, what is the right structure to move the Task Force forward as a whole? This may be a larger full Task Force question.

ACTION ITEM: TTWG (and SRRTTF) meeting structure to go on next Task Force agenda for discussion. Could leave the meeting timeslot on the calendar to accommodate workgroup meetings. Project Leads could also meet during this time to discuss scopes, contracts, action steps, deliverables, etc.

Update on CDM Smith: Bud still has not reached Richard Grace at AXYS to complete the needed steps. AXYS was taken over by SGS and apparently several people have left. Mike Hermanson has contacted Rao Sangarmanchi at CDM Smith to find out if there is a way to proceed without getting the information from AXYS (awaiting response). Perhaps the Task Force contact (Bud Leber) could try another contact in AXYS to get a hold of Richard Grace.

ACTION ITEM: Bud Leber will try another avenue/contact at AXYS to track down Richard Grace and get the electronic data deliverables (EDDs) for CDM Smith.

Q. Is the Hatchery Case Study Report to be out this month? **A.** Yes, Siana Wong is finishing up internal comments and will have this out soon. Ruckelshaus will send this out as soon as it is ready. Overall picture is that Hatchery operations are less than 1% of the load to the larger Spokane river system. Based on numbers that they had with loading into lower lake Spokane, did loads for fish and effluent leaving the facility.

Product Testing Ideas: to help move the Green Chemistry work group forward.

The group had a general discussion about product testing. This included brainstorming ideas for what should be tested and the cost benefit of testing certain things based on their pathway and exposure to

the river. This topic needs further discussion. Doug Greenland with the City proposed the additional testing on Deicer. The testing showed low levels, but there was a lot of variability and more testing would help to narrow this. This also had direct contact with stormwater. Deicer had detections in them (5-gram extract) – noisy data on the instrument – are they real detections or not. (had done more samples to narrow things down)

Discussion:

- C. The Comp Plan said to review Ecology’s Environmental Assessment Program (EAP) product testing reports. The ACE/Ecology contract funds product testing. Suggestion: ask EPA reps for suggestions.
- C. Yellow Road Paint: there are options, and it is in WSDOTs hands to decide whether they would like to adopt them as the new paint of choice.
- C. Inks: Doug Krapas is working with the Color Pigments Manufacturers Association (CPMA) to see if ink manufacturers will work on a pilot study to find low-PCB alternatives. He would like to pull in the Green Chemistry folks (e.g. Lauren Heine).
- Q. What do we know about product testing for coal tar derivatives: asphalt, roofing, motor oil etc.? The City did asphalt sealant. Permitted stormwater agencies may need to become part of this group. For Municipal wastewater treaters, it is outside their purview.
 - C. What would this mean, what purpose would it serve? Testing asphalt, oil, etc. would be only informative, since we can’t really effect a change to address it if it is found? Need to think about ground rules on what products get tested: what is the pathway to the river, and can we affect it to have an outcome?
- C. The PCB Chemical Action Plan (CAP) lists products that can contain PCBs (i.e. gas lines.). Chris Page asked Anne Knapp (Ecology) if the Task Force could provide input on the updated PCB CAP. She is looking into this.
- C. Laundry rinse water is a potential source to wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs); can we test along these lines? In general, can we focus more on what goes into sewers (toilet paper, soaps/surfactants, personal care products, rinse water, food (fats, oils, and greases)—are there alternatives for dyes, etc.? The City did test a few personal care products and soaps.
- C. We could use a strong-arm tactic to get manufacturers of these folks to the table (e.g. threaten public campaign to disclose PCB content of products), but so far trying diplomacy. Having product testing info (for *potential* outreach) could help motivate them!
- C. Consider what is unique to the Spokane region for products to test—and other sources, e.g. the ALCOA plant, use of electrical equipment, past industrial uses.
- C. To save testing costs, can we characterize what enters WWTPs by using test method 8082 first as a screening study? WWTP operators can provide info on what is coming into their systems.
- C. WWTPs cannot go away, people will continue to put water down the drain and WWTP operators don’t get support from federal government. Need to be clear that testing itself will not move the needle, but it may provide info to give leverage to other organizations with more clout to make bigger change, i.e. reform of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA).
- C. We should do our best to characterize which products PCBs come from and then inform the public. If we have the data to support it, we can hopefully create a groundswell.
- C. Is the focus to reduce PCBs in influent? Shouldn’t it focus on what PCBs are coming out in the effluent—those that don’t get removed during treatment?
- C. Task Force members are implementing change: industrial pretreatment program. If we wind up having stringent limits as a facility, the limits will go upstream to the businesses.
- C. PCBs are ubiquitous. How can we reliably know what the ambient concentration is in air, stormwater, rivers, etc.? How do we establish background? The Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA)

has an explicit process for determining this WAC 177340 (would not apply to stormwater). A. Brandee Era-Miller has done a literature review on air deposition. Air deposition of PCBs varies highly in urban areas AND in rural and wilderness areas. There is a lot of info in the literature, but not specific to Eastern Washington and Spokane. We are working to fill this data gap.

ACTION ITEM: SRSP to discuss focus for product testing at next meeting to assist Green Chemistry workgroup (or a product testing workgroup – which does not currently exist). Task Force to consider creating product testing workgroup to put define the scope (develop a problem statement) to direct screening-level product testing. \$20,000 currently in contract to spend by June 30th, 2018.

Project Lead Work Session:

ACE is waiting on an invoice for Ruckelshaus Center work done in November/December 2017. ACE will then know where to draw the line on needs to be spent by June 30th, 2018. They have dollars set up for the first part of the groundwater piece and can get this moving forward into a contract. Karin Baldwin will check what flexibility exists to move money around (i.e. a certain percentage); this may require that Ecology's Polly Zimm approve changes.

PCB mass balance is in ACE/Ecology contract as Task 3, while it has a different task number in the LimnoTech contract. We have a budget, scope, and timing for this work.

- Need QAPPs for the tasks. Second bullet of Task 3 addresses this. Would also like to see the QAPP for what would be considered. There is a sampling and analysis plan through Ecology and the Toxic Cleanup Program (TCP).
- Groundwater sampling (opportunistic) needs a QAPP amendment. Ecology data collected would be under a previous QAPP.

Mike Hermanson provided a brief groundwater sampling report. Basically, they found that PCB levels were very low, after three different sampling events. They sampled wells near gaining reaches of the River and sampled three different springs. LimnoTech conducted a Quality Assurance (QA) review of the data. The one thing we were interested in was whether this report needed to go through some sort of Task Force review. The County prepared the report and Jim Ross has looked at it.

ACTION ITEM: Kara Whitman to send the SRRTTF the groundwater report with a request for folks to review and send comments to Mike Hermanson. (COMPLETE)

ACTION ITEM: Groundwater upgradient of Kaiser: Karin to verify the dates in the Ecology contract with the dates of deliverables in the LimnoTech contract.

ACE/Ecology Contract

- Groundwater upstream of Kaiser and PCB Mass Balance assessment – dates in contract are okay.
- Education and Outreach workgroup: three projects (\$10,000); contracts in place by the end of June.
- PMF Analysis – does a date need to be changed? Could get a scope within the next month with Dr. Rodenburg (\$20,000). The challenge is identifying how much money spend at what time.
- Green Chemistry: Karin Baldwin has a call with Dr. Lauren Heine to discuss the idea and flesh out the elements needed for a contract.

Next Task Force meeting: February 28th, 2018, Liberty Lake Sewer & Water District, 8:30 am to 12:00 pm.

Next TTWG meeting: March 7, 2018 at Ecology from 10:00 am to 12:00 pm (*pending Task Force discussion of meetings moving forward*)