

**Tech Track scoping call
July 24, 2019**

Attendees:

Joel Breems - Avista

Lisa Dally Wilson – Dally Environmental/SRSP

Bud Leber – Kaiser

Dave Dilks – LimnoTech

Jim Ross, Bill Fees, Jeremy Schmidt, Sandy Treccani, Brandee Era-Miller – WA Dept. of Ecology

Ben and Lara Floyd – White Bluffs Consulting

Ben gave an update on the purpose of the calls. The group will help scope the work plan for 2019-2021 as a recommendation to the larger Tech Track work group. The first call was to look at options and Bud made updates to the option descriptions after the call. Today's purpose is to finalize a recommendation to bring to the full Tech Track group

Bud shared the packet included three potential options for the use of the legislative funding based on previous discussion and he reviewed those options with the group. Ben asked if there were any questions regarding the scope.

Comments/Questions:

- Joel asked about timing and the development of the QAPP. Bud shared that it was labeled as Task 1 in each option and is being covered with existing TF funds but non-Ecology contract funds.
- Ben thought an earlier due date of July 31 or Aug 1 for the QAPP would be good.
- Jeremy said if the TF is not sure of how it all should be spent, part of it can be allocated now then the contract can be amended in the future. The work needs to be directly tied to the Comprehensive (Comp.) Plan. Specifically, task 5.14 in the plan is about groundwater and identifying contaminated areas and it has a specific process with steps. A lot of tasks are linked to 5.14. Ecology is having a hard time with some of the sampling ideas except for biofilm, sediment and seep sampling. The Comp. Plan needs to be the leading/guiding document for how this legislative money gets spent.
- What specifically is not linked to the Comp. Plan? Jeremy said the water column sampling at higher flow conditions was one that was highlighted. Task 3 is pretty specific to surface water and Task 4 seems premature (determining significance of groundwater). Lisa said they replaced task 4 with Education and Outreach in alternatives B and C.
- Brandee said they could put some instream monitors and determine continuity between site and river to determine loading at certain areas to help determine if it is worth pursuing. This could be an option for the TF in the future. The biofilm is helping determine hot spots but what is the loading or real impact?
- Ben asked Dave to comment. He said task 2 merged two sub tasks out of the workshop and one was looking at historical landmarks, drilling down deeper into this information, and then doing additional monitoring. Jeremy said we should not limit it to just biofilm and sediment. Dave said they could broaden the language. Jeremy said we can defer funding for additional work with a contract amendment until we know more.
- Dave said that Task 4 is moving upland to review results from task 2, including looking at the magnitude of potential sources and then identify candidate reaches. Jeremy said he does not see how identifying magnitude based on past data is consistent with the 5.14 work described in the

Comp. Plan. The only loading data that we can develop today is synoptic sampling because that is where we have concentration and we can't move upgradient with that kind of detail.

- Dave said it may not be a large enough load to raise concentrations, but it could still be a significant source to find and reduce, if possible. Jeremy said he understands using it to guide this but there may be other locations where the biofilm concentrations were only slightly elevated but could be contributing to a higher influx to the river. Dave thinks it is worth investigating because even a low mass source may have an impact on fish tissue. If only looking at mass then we should focus on water column sampling. Jeremy understood the desire to try and break the food chain pathway down into more understandable pieces, but the permits regulate water concentrations and focus on identifying sources and removing PCBs. Dave said that meeting water quality standards and accumulation of PCBs in fish tissue is also part of this.
- Jeremy said with the idea of including fish tissue sampling in long term monitoring (task 5), Water Quality is already doing this work and it comes up again in 2022 so it would be redundant for the TF to do this. He recommends the TF focus on water column sampling rather than the other three.
- Ben asked if the design part of the task (5) is still relevant to do?
- Bud commented that it looks like none of the options are up to par with Ecology standards regarding the Comp. Plan and being able to get a contract signed. The TF needs to figure out what level these discussions need to take place. Is it at the Tech Track level or the full Task Force?
- Which tasks are scheduled for August sampling that QAPPs are being developed now? Task 1 with biofilm, sediment and water column sampling.
- Jeremy said that their full intention is to move forward with Task 1 but before the Tech Track meeting on July 31 may want to tighten up the description and link it better with the Comp. Plan. Their concern is more with Tasks 2 and 4.
- Ben asked Jeremy to give Bud specific language that would help with the scope of Task 1. He said Karl could help with it potentially later in the week.
- Ben asked if task 2 is still fine to do the scoping of the sampling but not include the data collection? Jeremy thought that might be a more acceptable approach.
- Lisa said with task 2 all of the load is from groundwater but the intent was that the fish exposure could have been land practices from sediment or filling and historical land use in river or along bank. Did we get rid of that because we are focusing on groundwater? Jeremy said it seems to be a reasonable piece but doesn't fit under 5.14. It should be scoped and identified under an appropriate task in the Comp. Plan, but he did not see any issues with it.
- Joel says some of the upland information is informative, but it may not be specific enough to directly lead us to where we should be looking.
- What about task 3? Water column sampling at higher flow conditions. It is not linked to the Comp. Plan and intent was to see if there were any releases from seeps or sources from along the bank. It may need more work.
- Task 4 work for Option A is partially covered by the Task 2 work under options B and C. With making Task 2 more broad, it allows task 4 in options B and C to be in the education and outreach activities.
- With Task 5 Lisa said the fish work group has been talking about fish tissue monitoring for a while and we have never heard the TF is regulated with water and that the funding should not be used to assess concentrations in fish. This is specifically laid out in the Comp. Plan in section 6. Jeremy said in past TF meetings it was mentioned it may be a higher bioaccumulation factor which would drive down water column concentrations. Ecology's perspective is that they are already spending money with EAP doing fish tissue sampling. Ecology feels it is redundant with state money for the TF to do it and years of water column data would be better. Dave said it is problematic using water column

solely for trend analysis with fish. We need to have a discussion about what media are the best media for sampling trends.

- Ben mentioned repurposing task 5 similar to task 2. It could be a placeholder budget item. Lisa would like to see fish still in the mix. Ben said it could also include biofilm, sediment and water sampling, along with fish tissue as a broader long-term monitoring strategy.
- Ben wondered if the wording of tasks 2 and 5 could be changed soon so they could be included along with Task 1. Tasks 6 and 7 could be included as well since Ecology had no comments. He reviewed a draft recommendation and the group agreed to it in concept.

Budget for tasks (from a combination of the various options A – C):

Task 1 - \$55,000

Task 2 – \$20,000 for year two; and focus on developing sampling approach but not implementing

Task 3 - No budget right now - needs further discussion

Task 4 - leave as is, as described in options B and C – education and outreach; Task 4, Option A gets partially deferred and partially rolled into Task 2 as described in alternatives B and C

Task 5 - \$48,000, keeping design and focus on biofilm, sediment and defer initiation of program

Task 6 – leave as is

Task 7 – leave as is

He also said he would renumber the tasks from 1 – 6, since 3 was being deferred in the recommendation.

Next Steps/action items:

- Send out an updated scope of work and recommendation with Dave Dilk's help
- Change next week's Tech Track meeting to a conference call to discuss scope and recommendation.
- Schedule a TF conference call to approve recommended scope of work on August 7 or 9 and send out a doodle poll.