

**Spokane River Regional Toxics Task Force
Conference Call Meeting (prior to TSCA Work Group Meeting)**

DRAFT Meeting Summary

Thursday, May 3, 2018 | 10:00 am – 10:40am

Meeting Documents: <http://srtrtf.org/?p=9196>

Attendees: *voting member

Tom Agnew*—Liberty Lake Sewer and Water District
Mike Anderson*—City of Coeur d'Alene
Adriane Borgias—WA Department of Ecology (Ecology)
Sharon Bosley*—Kootenai Environmental Alliance
Galen Buterbaugh*—Lake Spokane Association
Lisa Dally Wilson—Dally Environmental
Brent Downey*—Kaiser Aluminum
Lucy Edmondson—U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Mike LaScuola*—Spokane Regional Health District
Chris Page, Kara Whitman—Ruckelshaus Center
Mike Petersen*—Lands Council
Elsa Pond—Washington Department of Transportation
Doug Krapas*—Inland Empire Paper
Jerry White*, Rick Eichstaedt—Riverkeeper

*Quorum reached (9 voting members on phone, with 7 of 13 needed)

Task Force Letter to EPA Region 10 Regional Administrator

Chris Page walked the group through proposed changes to the issues letter. Lisa Dally Wilson gave background: before putting the letter together, she talked with some Task Force entities and then sent it to the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) work group for review. Three suggested changes need resolution before the Task Force votes. The letter also needs a cc list to send the letter too (EPA Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, Erin Chancellor, Ecology, etc.)

1. Under “our issues,” Riverkeeper requests a wording change for clarity. Everyone is okay with the change.
2. Under “what can EPA do,” Riverkeeper asked to remove the second bullet, since they feel the letter should focus strictly on TSCA reform and bullet two gets into an area where there is not necessarily Task Force agreement. The second bullet verbiage: *“EPA should provide support and flexibility for WA Department of Ecology and local dischargers as they develop regulatory mechanism(s) that allow time to achieve these water quality standards that cannot currently be achieved with state-of-the-art technology.”* Riverkeeper commented that it is cleaner to say we need TSCA fixed; let’s focus on that ask to make the letter stronger.
 - Lucy Edmondson does not feel that bullet 2 is necessary, as this is already happening. EPA has written a letter to the State senator.
 - Tom Agnew said one of the things EPA could do is include this flexibility. Doug added that the letter was meant to provide all the challenges, not just TSCA. They need EPA to be part of the solution.
 - Mike Petersen: this bullet muddies the water and there is not agreement on it, so I would support not having this in the letter.
 - Adriane, if bullet 2 is about permits and variances and what Ecology and EPA are doing, that is not part of the Task Force’s focus. Ecology is still exploring what the options look like, and variances are complicated. They are having conversations with EPA on the process. Ecology has not yet decided about using a variance or not.

- Sharon, Galen, and Mike LaScuola also support removal of bullet 2.
3. Lucy Edmondson had asked for the third bullet, related to toxicity assessment of PCB congeners associated with consumer products, to be added. She noted that they are all working in “an interesting regulatory environment.” Not knowing how EPA headquarters will respond to the request, are there other things they could ask that would help advance the science on PCBs that might help headquarters prioritize toxicity research? Is there something that could be done to “wiggle” this work to the forefront? This request might help the people in the research office to prioritize this.
- Riverkeeper feels that this bullet is not appropriate for this letter. Perhaps the Task Force could draft a separate, in-depth letter around this bullet. This is a separate ask.
 - Lisa discussed the letter the Task Force previously sent to EPA, and the EPA response that alluded to an intention to do a risk assessment. We have asked for this in previous letters. Lucy: could ask for an update on that assessment from their letter from 2015.
 - Adriane: Follow-up on the letter is a reasonable request. However, there is not a lot of information about the presence of PCBs in products. We could ask for assistance for this. Take this bullet and turn it into two bullets, one requesting follow-up on the 2015 EPA letter and the other asking for help understanding the sources of PCBs in consumer products.
 - Mike Petersen: I agree with Ecology. For the time being it would be useful to understand what products contain PCBs and would help to educate the public.
 - Brent from Kaiser agrees.
 - Elsa Pond explained that this is needed to help them make actionable change, as they don’t have the scientists to do this work. EPA could provide data to help address the TSCA issue. The two issues go hand in hand. Toxicity assessment is complicated, expensive, and time consuming. Identifying products that contain them, and what congeners they are, could provide a good short-term step.
 - Riverkeeper would support this change to bullet 3, to reframe it into two asks.

The group agreed to rework the third bullet requesting toxicity assessment as follows: Task Force requests EPA provide information on products containing PCBs and congeners present to help identify sources—AND the SRRTTF would like a follow-up on PCB-11 risk assessment, as EPA referred to in the 2015 response letter (date Feb 24th 2015).

ACTION ITEM: Chris Page to craft the language for the reframed bullet 3. (COMPLETE)

With those changes substantively agreed on, the Task Force agreed by consensus to send the letter.