

# Tech Track work group Meeting

## Meeting Notes

Facilitated by White Bluffs Consulting (WBC) (Ben and Lara Floyd)

Wednesday, November 28, 2018 | 10:00 am – 12:15 pm

Department of Ecology | 4601 N Monroe Street, Spokane, WA

### Attendees:

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

Doug Krapas\* – Inland Empire Paper (IEP)

Bud Leber\* – Kaiser Aluminum

Rob Lindsay\*, Mike Hermanson – Spokane County

Jeff Donovan – City of Spokane

*Advisors*

Brandee Era Miller(phone), Jim Ross, Jeremy Schmidt, Sandra Treccani, Robin Dunlap – Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)

Joel Breems - Avista

*Interested Parties*

Lisa Dally Wilson – Dally Environmental and Spokane River Stewardship Partnership

Dave Dilks (phone) – LimnoTech

Kris Holm (phone)

### Introductions and Agenda Review:

After a round of introductions, Ben Floyd went over the agenda.

### Synoptic Sampling Results

Dave Dilks gave the presentation on the synoptic sampling results. The data was received from AXYS in the last couple of days but LimnoTech has not completed data validation on it yet.

### Questions/comments (and responses):

- Doug asked if the timeframe for sampling from data that was collected in 2014/15 around the same time of year of this study? *Yes, within a week.*
- Could the lighter- end homologs be absorbing to the cap? *Yes, that may be possible.*
- Doug asked between Trent and downstream of Upriver dam, are the lower congener PCBs from IEP? He commented that IEP's discharge is within a losing reach and wondered if they are losing those lower level congeners in the losing reach. *It does not explain why concentrations are lower in river than upstream.*
- Jeff asked Doug if their discharge is consistent? Doug replied it is not consistent because it depends on how much recycling is being done at the time and how much colored paper there is. Dave said that could be a partial explanation but concentrations are lower at Upriver dam than at Trent. The concentrations in river go down and maybe IEP could explain a piece of it.
- Mike said the PMF analysis has a dissolve phase that is different than other factors vs effluent so is the thinking that all homologs will dissolve equally? *They are not that far apart in range where partitioning is that much different, so it is not enough to explain a sample result going up or down as we go downstream.*
- Mike commented when it goes through the Spokane County filter there is a big dissolved piece and the dissolved matter gets through the membranes, which may be more telling.
- Doug said they saw the same thing with pilot trials with membranes and 50 percent of what was remaining was dissolved phase. Dave said he would like to see what the homolog distribution is of the dissolved matter

that is coming through. Mike said they have a thorough review of it in their analysis and this information can be provided to LimnoTech. Doug said he could provide information specific to IEP's effluent also.

- Jeff said the report showed loadings for all data but were the flows and concentrations similar to previous studies? *There was one other outlier in Hangman Creek but flows were so low it didn't effect loading analysis. Barker and Mirabeau were less than 50 ppm and from Trent down less than 100 ppm.*

## 2018 Accomplishments

### Table 1 discussion:

- Lisa commented on Control Action 5.2.2, Maintain Protections of GE site, and if we have these other sources do we want to measure more clearly if they are impacting the river? Jeremy, Ecology, said the site should be ready for the 5-year review. He will follow up with Ecology's Toxics Control Program to see if the review was completed in 2018.
- Mike replied that Ecology sampled this site (wells on GE site and down gradient of it in 2014 or 2015). Lisa asked if this data is on the Task Force (TF) website? WBC will follow up on this to verify.
- Lisa noted the group has the option of diving into small uncertainties or looking at some of these obvious larger sources.
- Ben asked if the Category A control actions should be included in the Task Force's 2018 Implementation Summary? This remained an open question. Bud replied there is an annual implementation review summary and then a 5-year review. The 5-year review is where all of the annual information is considered along with a review of the impacts on the River, etc. Doug asked if a measurable progress determination is made based on the 5-year review and Bud replied yes, it is.
- Doug noted that the one year summaries will feed into the 5-year assessment
- Ben asked Sandy and Jeremy if it is possible to receive a status report from Ecology on all of the known contaminated sites, and they replied yes. It was recommended that a representative of the Task Force request a status from Ecology on the 5-year reports for the known contaminated sites. Ben and Lara will follow up with Ecology on this topic.

**ACTION:** WBC will follow up to see if past GE site sampling data is on the TF website, and on the 5-year reports with Ecology

- Ben asked what would the city say on the status of stormwater controls (5.3)? City of Spokane will get back to us with additional information.
- Ben asked about low impact development ordinances (5.4) and if there is anything to report on this control action? Ben asked whether we should include a summary of ordinances in place and how they are being implemented? How about Spokane County? Rob replied that stormwater is managed on site. Ben asked if the county has implemented other LID practices? Rob said probably not as most of their stormwater management focus has been on getting out of the river, but he can check into it. He commented that other utilities have built decant facilities for pumping out dry wells, which is an option.
- Ben asked if there is interest in summarizing some of these efforts? Rob replied that he does not know how they would quantify it. Ecology does not require sampling of stormwater but it is a concern. Doug suggested the TF could look at suspected stormwater problem areas going forward? Lisa said there could be one or two dry wells in places along the river that could be a PCB source to the river. Future characterization of stormwater was noted as a potential follow up item.

## Table 2 discussion:

Ben said that the TF will likely focus 2018 accomplishments on those Control Actions listed in Table 2 and that an action plan is needed on how to get the information updated in that table.

- Lisa commented that support of Green Chemistry (GC) Alternatives (5.7) needs to include a note on integration with both TSCA Work Group activities and GC activities. Doug said to be careful though to not merge TSCA Work Group and GC activities under one action.
- Lisa said to change the Phase 2 GC deliverables workshop referenced to just one workshop - TSCA workshop to address inadvertent PCBs in pigments. This workshop is being sponsored by the TSCA Work Group in coordination with the GC Work Group.
- Doug said Regulatory Rulemaking (5.10) on page 4 of the Implementation Summary Table is more specific to the TSCA Work group
- Lisa commented that for PCB product testing (5.8) it is not clear what the Task Force (TF) wants to do regarding this. Follow up with Ecology on whether this should be modified and verify it is still relevant.
- Ben said he has similar questions on Compliance with PCB Regulations (5.11) and Emerging End of Pipe Stormwater Technologies (5.12).

**ACTION:** WBC will follow up with Ecology on product testing (5.8) and can document, as appropriate, whether this part of the plan has been modified. WBC will also follow up with the Spokane Regional Health District on the description of the use of their construction flyer for Waste Disposal Assistance (5.9).

- 5.10 - Regulatory Rulemaking - Doug will get more information to WBC about the status of activities done under this task.
- 5.11 - Compliance with PCB regulations - Ben asked if Brandee can help us understand these action items. Jeff said the plan in section 5.2 says the TF will review. Lisa commented that this was already done. Brandee said the report has not been published yet but has been done for a month now and comments were incorporated but nothing has been done beyond completing the study. Ben asked Brandee to provide a paragraph on 5.11.2 and then next steps can be outlined.
- 5.12 - Emerging End of Pipe Stormwater Technologies - Ben asked who has the lead for this action item? Bud replied that it is a Lands Council project. Jeff said Lands Council did Phase 1 but they have not heard back on Phase 2 yet. Ben asked if it should be housed under a work group and Bud replied no, it was a contract.

**ACTION:** WBC will talk to Mike or Amanda from Lands Council about Emerging End of Pipe Stormwater Technologies (5.12) regarding Phase 1 and Phase 2 results and next steps. Doug and Brandee to provide follow up information.

- 5.14 – Identify Site of Concern for Contaminated Groundwater - Ben asked Brandee, Bud and Dave Dilks to review this section and let us know if the information is accurate.

**ACTION:** WBC will follow up with Chris Donnelly and Dave Dilks on the section 6 items involving fish sampling.

- 6.3 – Studies to Address Data Gaps - Mike Hermanson and Bud Leber will provide information

**DECISION/ACTION:** The work group agreed to prepare a short summary of text that would go with the 2018 actions summary, and primarily focus updates on Table 2, as these are the actions the Task Force has some control over, and to get WBC any updates to the draft information in Table 2 by next Tuesday, December 4. Table 2 will then be updated and share with the TF at the December 12 meeting. WBC will present the draft, with support from the Tech Track work group and receive input from the TF. WBC will send an updated draft out to Tech Track work group for discussion at their next meeting, and then the updated report will go to the TF before the February TF meeting.

### **Discuss 2019 – 2021 Draft Actions**

Doug asked if there was anything in the list of potential future actions in the TF Comprehensive Plan that is not in the table and it was determined that sections 5.15 and 6.1 weren't included in the table and Lisa commented there was more detail from the plan that could be added into the list of potential future actions.

- The group discussed the timeframe focus would be from January 1, 2019 and go into 2020. Bud noted contracts are prepared on an annual basis. There is nothing magical about the biennium except asking for money. Doug replied that we need to wait to see what we get from the state legislature first and then we need to match the budget to projects by prioritization from January 1, 2019 going forward. Ben asked are we going to look out two years or just one? Lisa commented that in the past they would compile the list of projects and do a survey and then prioritize the projects and look at budget and funding. Doug commented that we will not know until at least March on legislative funding.
- What budget funding sources do we have to work with? ACE receives funding from the permittees and from the state legislature and has the opportunity to receive grants from various sources.

### **Key Projects/Activities for 2019 and Beyond:**

- LimnoTech support for ongoing Task Force support, including participating in Task Force and work group meetings, reviewing results from Ecology studies and providing other general support (*Bud noted that Limnotech contract still has \$18,000 in their current contract, as of end of October 2018*)
- Support the Fish Sampling work group in designing a study (data/models) that will further our understanding of what is causing the PCB concentrations in fish that we are observing in the river (yardstick of fish sampling). Determine the source(s) and avenues of exposure to focus future efforts on controls that will likely lead to a reduction in concentrations of PCBs in fish tissue.
- Integrate biofilm results with 2012 Serdar modeling work on the Spokane River.
- Conduct additional biofilm and sediment sampling, based on review and evaluation of 2018 sampling results. These and results from other studies will determine the additional sampling needs and where data should be collected. This could be a recurring activity.
- Design and implement a recurring annual instream monitoring program where results can be compared from year to year (6.1)
- Follow up on questions from previous synoptic sampling results, and design future studies as appropriate to address key data gaps
- Plan and implement PCB Mass Balance next steps (work with Bud to develop)
- Education and Outreach support for Spokane River Forum media outreach, draft action plan and website updates (work with Vikki to develop)
- Design and implement a TSCA pigment manufacturer's workshop

- Follow up on atmospheric deposition study findings and outline appropriate next steps, as applicable. Determine if the fingerprinting is indicating specific patterns?
- Plan and conduct a Tech Track Work Group-sponsored technical workshop. At this 2-day workshop, participants would review the past 5 years data and summarize what has been learned, identify key data gaps and characterize other big picture findings (*and include PMF data and analysis*). LimnoTech would play a key role in planning and supporting this workshop.
- Funding for CDM Smith to provide annual Database Management system maintenance and on-call technical support (\$15k)
- Review PMF study findings and outline next steps for better understanding likely PCB sources
- Identify activities and objectives for Green Chemistry next steps (*7/1/19 forward*)
- Coordinate with Ecology Green Chemistry group in Lacey and TSCA to identify planned next steps on product testing. Based on this coordination, determine next steps.
- Follow up on known contaminated sites – Spokane River Upriver Dam and Donkey Island, GE site near Spokane River and City Parcel – to confirm most recent and planned performance reviews. Make recommendations to Ecology on next steps

Ben asked if we could take this list and ask the TF if everything is covered. Are we missing anything? Lisa commented that each of these actions needs purpose and intended outcome descriptions also.

**ACTION:** WBC will send out a doodle poll for the late January or early February Tech Track meeting