

Tech Track Work Group Meeting

Meeting Notes

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

Tuesday, February 5, 2019 | 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

Cadie Olsen* – City of Spokane

Vikki Barthels – Spokane Regional Health District

BiJay Adams – Liberty Lake Sewer & Water District

Craig Borrenpohl – City of Post Falls

Advisors

Brandee Era Miller, Siana Wong and Debby Sargeant (phone), Karl Rains, Jim Ross, Jeremy Schmidt, Sandra Treccani – 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.

Review Draft 2018 accomplishments and discuss further refinements:

- Under Category 6.3 (Studies to Address Data Gaps - PMF analysis), change status to say Phase 1 analysis mostly complete and next steps are to complete Phase 2 analysis, share results and identify future follow up.
- Under category 6.3 (Studies to Address Data Gaps - How PCBs contribute to fish tissue contamination...) Change the next steps wording for the fall 2019 work group meeting to include discussion of scope study and approach for fish tissue “yardstick” process.

Review Draft 2019 work plan updates, discuss further refinements and approach and strategy for specific actions:

Action 1 (Track PCB fish tissue concentrations) - Funding for the Serdar modeling activity could come from the \$40K budget in the recently approved 2019 LimnoTech support to Task Force contract. In this contract, \$10K is set aside for special projects support.

- For Action 1, Lisa suggested lumping the fish work and Serdar modeling so when additional field studies are done collection information can be kept together and all the field sampling efforts combined when they are considered.

Action 2 (Water column, biofilm and sediment sampling) - Joel asked about and if a recommendation has been made for annual sampling for these items? *Ben said it was included as a place holder for future data collection and analysis, as discussed at the last Tech Track meeting, but has not specifically been scoped yet for 2019. We are waiting on the 2018 study results first to inform the 2019 and beyond plans for additional data collection and analysis. Brandee agreed there is a lot of useful information and it would be nice to do follow up sampling.*

- Ben noted for Action 2, that a \$3K supplemental analysis request of biofilm samples was included. Brandee said one biofilm sample was 2x higher than the rest and re-extracting and re-sampling would be ideal. Also, one was a duplicate or split sample and the results were very different so they would like to re-analyze those also. Ben asked if there was an urgency to getting this request before the Task Force. *Bud said the key timing issue is the viability of the samples. Brandee thought the sooner the better for information purposes but the samples are still good and should last a while longer*
- Joel asked if the supplemental analysis needs to be done before completing the report? *Ecology would like to do the re-sampling but can work on the report in parallel with the analysis to continue work towards meeting the schedule.*
- Ben asked if we want to flag Action 2, biofilm supplemental analysis as an early action for TF approval? Yes
- Lisa said early actions should be earmarked and things that are clear should be prioritized.

Action 3 (Education & Outreach support)- Vikki talked about Education & Outreach media options that are being considered by the work group. The different options will be brought before the full Task Force (TF) in February. Ben mentioned how the radio campaigns in the past have shown more traffic on the Waste Directory site so the work group wants to keep doing the radio ads along with other social media such as Facebook, Instagram and possibly Pandora. Education and Outreach is also considering utility billing inserts and looking at getting information into the schools. Multiple Tech Track members mentioned the importance of supporting these outreach efforts. The Spokane River Forum metrics are useful to have.

Action 5 (Atmospheric deposition study next steps) – Bud said this action is really a precursor/part of action 6 and he recommended looking at all of the data we have (including atmospheric deposition) and analyzing it to determine what we know and do not know. This will help us understand, for example, what additional fish data should be collected and where, along with other data needs. It will also help inform when and how do we do additional data collection and analyses. It is bringing information together to plot out next steps.

- Cadie suggested combining actions 5 and 6, making Action 5 a subset of 6. Karl agreed and said maybe Action 6 should be a high level category and other items can be subcategories under it?
- Ben asked for clarification about the description of Action 5 – specifically the statement added at the end about “no analysis of fingerprinting or homolog patterns in Ecology?” *Lisa said she added the statement so it was clear that this analysis had not occurred. One of the efforts leading up to the Action 6 workshop would be to evaluate the Atmospheric Deposition Study and see if anything further could be said regarding fingerprinting or homolog patterns. If not, then outline what the next steps would be to follow up with additional study in the future to hopefully be able to reach some conclusions. The study was a pilot effort; it was not done with fingerprinting so it may be hard to evaluate and may not be a robust enough data set to really say anything. Dave Dilks said what came out of the groundwater fingerprinting could be compared to the Atmospheric Deposition Fingerprinting to see if anything could be explained, along with findings from the water quality, sediment and biofilm analyses. Ben said Action 5 will be included under Action 6.*

- Lisa said the intent is to pull all prior information together into the analysis preparing for the Action 6 workshop, and that would provide next steps/inform detailed approaches for Actions 1 and 2 and other follow up actions. Action 6 would be an early action to complete sooner rather than later, and others agreed.
- Cadie said we have the challenge of not being able to do a methodical and comprehensive analysis effort due to funding and capacity issues. The synthesis workshop is important to get things moving forward, helping us confirm what we do and do not know, and ranking/prioritizing follow up actions will also be important.
- Mike said the scope of work for the PMF project is similar to some of the expected outcomes of the activities leading up to the synthesis workshop. He suggested we have the PMF Phase 2 fingerprint analysis completed in parallel with the LimnoTech data review and workshop preparation, so that both sets of findings are brought together into the synthesis workshop.
- Ben asked about timing and funding needs for the Phase 2 PMF work, noting the activity has been approved but funding has not yet been dedicated. *Mike will ask Lisa Rodenburg about the timing of when it can be done, but she indicated summers are better for her for completing her work, suggesting Phase 2 work may not be finished until fall 2019.* Ben asked about a total for the analysis and *Mike said it will be between \$15k-\$95k for the Phase 2 work, depending upon the number of data sets analyzed. The higher end accounts for analyzing 8 data sets.* Are there some things to have done earlier rather than later to get results for the workshop? *Yes, some could be done earlier.*

Action 6 (Analysis of SRRTTF data collected)– Ben said there is a budget of \$20k for hosting the workshop but that does not cover the pre-workshop preparation activities for LimnoTech.

- Bud said there is a need to figure out what LimnoTech needs to look at and how we want data conclusions presented.
- Ben said it would be good to have a placeholder amount in the 2019 work plan spreadsheet. Dave thought \$10-\$20k may be enough depending on how much detail is involved. Ben suggested a \$15-\$25k budget to be safe.

Action 7 (Annual database system management) – Mike suggested a \$5-\$15k range for the budget. Doug suggested this action be categorized as a basic need item along with LimnoTech support to the Task Force, which also does not require prioritization.

- Cadie agreed there is wisdom of separating into technical and non-technical due to timing of when things occur.
- Doug asked how much time are some of the preparation activities for the synthesis workshop going to take? *The workshop timing may need to be pushed out to account for both LimnoTech preparation work and Dr. Rodenberg's PMF Phase 2 analysis.*
- Doug gave an update on the 2019 – 2021 state legislature funding request. The TF request is in the Senate appropriations budget already and there is a need to keeping it moving forward.
- Karl said a lot of studies are winding down and funding pre-work is a priority.

Action 8 (PMF study next steps) – Mike said \$15-\$95k will be needed and he will provide more detailed information on timing and schedule after follow up with Dr. Rodenberg.

Action 9 (Green Chemistry next steps) – Lauren Heine has several tasks that will take her through June 2019. Do we keep GC future actions as a placeholder for the future?

- Doug said things will fall out of this but maybe more towards product testing, such as testing TiO₂, testing PCBs in silicone, etc. Lisa said most things have specific goals and outcomes but if it fits under product testing maybe we rank or prioritize it, but it is hard to prioritize a general topic. Cadie agreed and said maybe this should be pushed further out in time until there is a more specific need identified.
- Mike said the PMF data has never mentioned TiO₂ as being a potential source of PCBs.
- Rob said Green Chemistry is providing information that the Education and Outreach work group can use to help the public reduce its toxic footprint. EPA does not seem interested in going after the TSCA allowance. Ben mentioned at the last Education and Outreach meeting it was discussed that Green Chemistry may be able to help with informing messaging about what product categories consumers should avoid.
- Lisa said Ken Zarker at Ecology is also doing product testing and suggested there be more coordination with that group, along with continued coordination between Green Chemistry and TSCA work groups. Doug said EPA is also doing some product testing and maybe we could ask for product testing help from EPA also.
- With more information on consumer products, Education & Outreach could move forward with more specific messaging.
- Ben asked if ball park costs for tracking PCB levels in fish tissue can be figured out at this time? Lisa did not feel costs can be put down for Actions 1 and 2 without scoping first so it was decided to scratch the budget out of Action 2.

Prioritize Draft 2019 Work Plan Actions:

- It was agreed that the rest of the actions feed into action 6, so it is really more of a timing and sequencing of actions as opposed to a strict prioritization process.
- Doug mentioned that some things would need to happen before others; for example biofilm, Serdar modeling and PMF phase 2 need to happen first or asap. Dave Dilks' understanding is that the Serdar Modeling would not happen until after all the 2018 report findings are available.
- Brandee said they could have data findings available by March or early April.
- Lisa said her understanding is that Dave would take all the information and synthesize it. Would that include taking biofilm analyses and integrating in the Serdar modeling or not? *Dave could make an initial pass with Serdar but could not have the full analysis completed until later in the year. Someone needs to organize it all and that will be done by Dave but maybe Lisa Rodenburg could help?* The pre-work has budget of \$15-\$25k. Brandee mentioned EAP can also provide support.

Discussion of Schedule and Timing: The work group members discussed 2019 timing for the activities that would need to occur in preparation for the synthesis workshop

- Biofilm data reanalysis done – April/May
- Biofilm and sediment - April
- Synoptic sampling/water column – February/March
- Atmospheric Deposition study review – work could occur anytime
- PMF phase 2 – sometime in the fall
- Synthesis workshop – sometime in the fall?

- Ben asked if a workshop should be done earlier in the year before receiving all information or not? *Mike thought there may be a more productive outcome after receiving data from Dr. Rodenburg and Dave Dilks, so it may be worth waiting until next year to do a workshop? Karl said maybe the fall would be a good idea, to allow for more time to collect data.*
- Bud said it is important for the Tech Track work group to identify the questions to be answered, and to work with LimnoTech in determining the data to be considered, so that Dave can then develop a detailed scope and budget. The TF should have Limnotech and Lisa Rodenburg each do their work and bring it together at the end.
- Doug said we are required to spend half of the money we get for funding in the first year of the biennium, so consider that in the timing of work planning.
- For the next Tech Track meeting a more specific schedule will be shared after talking to Dave, Dr. Rodenburg and others.
- Brandee said the biofilm work has identified a few areas in the river where they may want to go back and further identify/verify areas of high concentrations. Doing it this summer would be ideal, especially if there are low flows. White Bluffs Consulting will coordinate with Brandee on a potential timeline to incorporate into the draft 2019 work plan for consideration at the next meeting.

Input on LimnoTech 2018 Technical Work Activities by Dave Dilks:

Dave provided an overview of the draft technical memorandum sent out ahead of the meeting. The purpose was to collect more data in 2018 and compare results with prior mass balance assessments. Concentrations were 25% lower than prior synoptic surveys, but higher river flows provide more dilution. They did not see groundwater loading in 2018 as it occurred in 2015. The reason Kaiser was not included initially in the plan was they thought it was already pretty well characterized. But Kaiser was included in the reach recently and a slide was added from Kaiser's data collection. The Kaiser Groundwater load is similar to previous years. They added a station just below Upriver dam this time and saw a loss of chlorinated homologs between Trent and Upriver.

- Was the data from Kaiser's effluent discharge? *The synoptic survey did sample that and Dave will update the report. Going forward information from previous years will need to be included so no one raises questions about missing data.*
- Are we going to get a revised report to review prior to going to the Task Force? *Dave would like to see if there are comments first before doing a new draft. Dave would like to set a deadline for commenting and needs comments by noon on Feb 11.*
- Lisa suggested seeing a visual that compares the groundwater loads in 2018 by reach. *Dave will add it to the report.*

Next Tech Track meeting date: March 5 at 10 am – Liberty Lake Sewer and Water District

ACTION: White Bluffs Consulting will put together changes on the 2019 work plan and proposed timing and sequencing for activities based upon communications with LimnoTech and others and send it out as an email to the work group ahead of the next meeting. The work group agreed to provide a status update to the Task Force on the 2019 work plan at the February 27 meeting.