

Spokane River Regional Toxics Task Force Meeting

Meeting Notes

Facilitated by White Bluffs Consulting (Ben and Lara Floyd)

Tuesday, August 27, 2019 | 1:30 pm – 5:00 pm

Liberty Lake Sewer and Water District | 1004 North Freya Street, Liberty Lake, WA

Meeting Documents: <http://srrttf.org/?p=10652>

Attendees:

Voting Members and Alternates (*Denotes Voting Member)

Tom Agnew*, BiJay Adams – Liberty Lake Sewer and Water District

Doug Krapas* – Inland Empire Paper

Vikki Barthels*, Bruce Williams – Spokane Regional Health District

Bud Leber*, Brent Downey – Kaiser Aluminum

Rob Lindsay*, Mike Hermanson – Spokane County

Jeff Donovan* – City of Spokane

Amanda Parrish* – Lands Council

Mike Zagar* – Kootenai Environmental Alliance (phone)

Chris Donley* – Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

Mike Anderson* – City of Coeur d'Alene

Advisors

Karl Rains, Adriane Borgias, Bill Fees, Jeremy Schmidt, Sandy Treccani, Catherine Glick –

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)

Brian Nickel, Michelle Mullin (phone) and Xiaoyu Liu (phone) – Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Joel Breems – Avista

Dan Redline - Idaho Department of Environmental Quality

Interested Parties

Lisa Dally Wilson – Dally Environmental and Spokane River Stewardship Partners (SRSP)

Dave Dilks (phone) – LimnoTech

Ken Windram – Hayden Area Regional Sewer Board

Craig Borrenpohl – City of Post Falls

David Darling (phone) – American Coatings Association (ACA)

Jay West (phone) – American Chemistry Council

Kris Holm (phone)

Tonilee Hanson and Andy Dunau – Spokane River Forum

Amy Sumner – Spokane County

Paul Klatt – JUB Engineers, Inc.

Richard Shores

Introductions and Agenda Review: After introductions, Ben Floyd reviewed the agenda.

June 26 Meeting Summary Action: The Task Force (TF) had some edits to the paragraph describing the inadvertent PCB workshop and another edit on the top of page five clarifying the Ecology vs. TF pie chart locations for past evaluations and Lisa will provide the edits to Lara. The

TF approved the June 26 meeting summary with the suggested updates and Lara Floyd will post the final notes to the website.

Inadvertent PCBs in Consumer Products Presentation: Brian Nickel gave an introduction. The TF sent a letter to EPA on May 9, 2018 asking to lower the allowable level of PCBs and to provide assistance with testing certain products containing PCBs. Michelle Mullin and Xiaoyu Liu gave a presentation and update on the product testing results for 16 products. The goal was to test products that could have an impact on children's health and potential water quality impacts associated with those products.

Michelle Mullin said that what was presented was in the form of an update. What was shared are the results of step one - testing PCB concentrations of the source products. The next steps are doing migration analysis and gathering data that will be useful for a health assessment for future rulemaking. They will also test variability amongst a number of the sources such as the yellow glitter foam sheets. Also, they will be testing exposure into the water quality pathway.

Comments:

- PCB 11 is an obvious environmental impact for the Spokane River. Would there be any consideration of the study of PCB 11? *They have inquired and they are making progress, but they do not have a timeline on when results will be released. They did get a report on the hydroxylated form of PCB 11 and they found it does not seem to exhibit toxicity. EPA will provide the research findings to White Bluffs Consulting (WBC).*
- A question was asked about products Ecology has previously tested and how the values seem lower in this study. Did you do a comparison to data from the Ecology study? *The results are lower, and they do not have a clear reason why. Ecology was asked how they stored their samples and Ecology's samples were not stored the same way as EPA's. EPA plans to retest them. They are looking at one result from EPA and one from Ecology.*
- A question was asked about higher level congeners in the wafer box and why they would be there. *They have not discussed it yet.*
- Someone asked if they are looking at the pigment used in manufacturing those products? *The purpose of research is to gather data to assess whether there is an exposure risk from using the products as regulated under TSCA. Finding the actual pigment concentration is not their goal.*
- We have a known pathway for PCB 11 and diarylide yellow too. Why aren't we looking at some of the other products with different pigments also? *Funds are limited and EPA had to keep the scope fairly narrow.*

PCB Media Campaign Report Presentation: Tonilee Hanson and Andy Dunau from Spokane River Forum gave the presentation. Vikki Barthels shared that they worked with the Education and Outreach group on the spring media campaign. Radio is a great way to reach many people but if looking for click throughs, social media is the best. Pandora underperformed. They gave suggestions for future campaigns: Focus on Facebook, replace Pandora with digital display ads, and use more carousel ads to create link between PCB reduction and river stewardship. Another option is to consider a 15-30 second pre-roll video, similar to an example that was

shared about Hydro Appreciation. The Education and Outreach group will discuss what should be done in future campaigns going forward.

2019-2021 Ecology Contract Scope of Work: Bud shared that the TF had given direction to put some things in place of supporting EAP's August 2019 biofilm sampling, including getting a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) put together for additional sampling of seeps and sediment with Gravity's help and LimnoTech overseeing it, and using funding from the legislature to get it up and running. They are still trying to get a contract with Gravity in place and they were unable to get things in place in time for the sampling. They tried to put together scopes for the Ecology contract and legislative funding. The TF needs to prioritize and make use of the workshop findings to help in deciding what to do going forward. The funding has to be considered also.

Comments:

- We need to be a lot more thoughtful about how we plan our work and have a process plan put in place ahead of time with scope, budget, prioritization, and a timeline. Redefining what the process should be is important going forward.
- Long term monitoring was discussed at the Data Synthesis Workshop (DSW) and seemed to be a priority, but we have not had a chance yet to discuss this and other DSW findings in detail with the Task Force.
- It was suggested to get a group together (whether it is the Tech Track work group or another group) in person to discuss output from the workshop and goals of the TF. The group should develop a scope around the priorities and bring it back to the TF.
- Chris asked whether the goals being talked about are in the Comprehensive Plan (Comp. Plan)? Lisa said people may want to look more specifically at source locations in future work along with longer term monitoring. The TF needs to look at goals and outcomes.
- Craig said part of the scoping should include identifying what entities have a role or responsibility in that activity.
- Ben suggested going back to the Comp. Plan and talking about it as a TF. What are the highest priorities?
- Lisa suggested starting with the DSW outcomes and feedback. Ben suggested the October TF meeting being focused around long term implementation and what the TF wants to do or accomplish each year.
- Chris said long term monitoring is a long process and the TF does not know the cost. There should be a broader conversation about what to do with the leftover money. He suggested asking Dave Dilks about what a long- term monitoring process looks like annually and speak to the Education and Outreach work group also about their needs.
- Set up metrics and ask what the TF would like to do over a two-year period. Start with the Comp. Plan and what is missing in this analysis. Things can be amended along the way.
- Section 6.3.2 on page 72 talks about putting together a study plan. The study plan could go into the contract.
- Develop a scope of projects by a smaller group to bring back to the TF. Until this gets off the ground, we may need more regular TF meetings.

- The last measurable progress plan said a work plan would be developed. It needs to be balanced with the priorities of all the work groups and those conversations should happen at the TF level. The technical projects could be prioritized at a Tech Track level.
- The TF has prioritized in the past. We should take the workshop results and see how they validate the Comp. Plan and expand them based on new priorities.
- Have a meeting in September to get things organized and bring some structure to the October TF meeting.
- Can we use the leads for the work groups to help get this organized?
- It seems the TF was 80-90% there with the prior work scope planning and recommendations provided by Tech Track and had the bulk of this put together. Maybe it is more just identifying areas that need more discussion? Ben felt it is also about allocating funds. Adriane mentioned calendaring this out through the year.
- It was suggested to keep those involved with the initial scoping process in any follow up work, to maintain continuity.
- The group would focus on process for what the path forward looks like, how to address technical scoping and bring it back to the TF.
- Ben suggested reconvening the Tech Track work group in September to prepare for the October TF meeting. WBC will schedule a Tech Track meeting for the end of September.

MOA Revisions/Codification Discussion: Rob Lindsay shared that the MOA group has met twice, and the primary items addressed are provided in the MOA edits summary. He went over those general edits discussed. Ben went over the codification information provided and suggested TF members review it and we can further discuss findings at the October TF meeting.

Comments:

- Karl emphasized while no one in the group was involved in the original discussion of the MOA, the group decided to avoid editing unnecessarily. The group focused on suggested MOA updates to make it current with plan implementation activities primarily, with minimal other suggested changes.
- Craig B. shared that the Idaho dischargers met to discuss it and they have some additional comments. They want to make sure Idaho DEQ has an opportunity to look at the language also. The funding section talks about the first year of funding and it needs to be revised. Use this as a starting point and get comments back from the larger TF.
- Comments will be accepted by the end of September. WBC will compile the comments and the MOA group will meet before the next TF meeting in October or have it as a discussion in December.
- WBC will send out a word version of the MOA edits in an email for all to review and a reminder will be sent out on September 23, one week ahead of the due date.
- Adriane mentioned funding internally with member contributions as a recommended additional next step or 3rd option to the current funding process or codification.
- Many of the examples of the groups who have been codified had accountability to provide a formal report to the Governor or legislature regarding their assigned goals.

- Ben suggested having each entity let us know their thoughts on the codification idea at the October TF meeting.
- Brian asked if in the research there were other codified Task Forces not in the state of WA? Ben said he did not find any, but WBC could do some brief follow up research to see if some other examples can be found.

Stakeholder Workshop on Inadvertently Produced PCBs Update: Doug said the workshop will be held Oct 8 and 9 at the Spokane Convention center to help better understand inadvertently produced PCBs, with PCB 11 being the most common. A lot of people will be participating from various entities and there will be a lot of interesting speakers participating.

Lisa said the Lands Council is developing the webpage and registration, Northwest Green Chemistry (NWGC) is also helping with arranging speakers, and Ken Zarker from the Pollution Prevention program at the Department of Ecology is also helping. She walked through the agenda. There will be a WebEx option provided for those unable to attend in person.

Comments:

- Involving some of the packaging companies in Spokane would be a good idea and others agreed. Sonderan packaging was mentioned specifically.

Project Management Update and Work Group Reports:

ACE Commitment Report: Bud Leber gave an update. At the end of July, they had \$52,000 in available funds, with 24,000 allocated to CDM Smith and NWGC for the iPCB workshop. At the end of August, the balance looks to be about \$50,000. Adriane asked about a breakdown of expenses for the iPCB workshop.

Database Management: Spokane County is including additional data in the database to support PMF work that will be happening later this year. They are continuing to work on the web interface and are getting a contract together with CDM Smith for upgrades.

Education and Outreach: Toni Taylor has been working on google analytics with the <http://spokaneriverpcbfree.org/> website. Coeur d'Alene sent out 19,000 PCB flyer utility billing inserts, Liberty Lake sent out 3,813 and Spokane County sent out 47,300 inserts along with 15,000 e-bills.

Fish Sampling: There was discussion about the “yardstick” methodology being considered, which includes setting up a fish sampling plan in the river to measure progress in reducing PCB congeners in fish over time. A WDFW fish biologist will be working with Chris to pull together a scope of work, and they will be working with Ecology to make sure it complements their fish tissue sampling work scheduled in 2022. It is not about trying to track down contaminant sources but to determine PCB fish tissue concentrations in the river over time. A QAPP will be pulled together, and the plan is to have a scope of work and budget by January or February 2020 for the Task Force to review. They will look at fish that are ages 0-2 years. The work group is also closely coordinating with Dave Dilks from LimnoTech.

Funding (MOA committee): Covered already in the meeting

Green Chemistry: Someone from OECD, Inc. contacted Lauren Heine and was interested in talking about regulatory disconnects. There is a conference in October, and they want a presentation or paper on the topic. It may be a good TSCA topic to discuss who would do it. It would need to be given by EPA. This could be discussed at the next TSCA meeting.

PMF: Dr. Rodenburg put together a scope of work and they will have a PMF work group conference call to discuss it soon, and then plan to bring a recommendation to the TF by the October meeting.

TSCA: They are putting together a summary of the road paint white paper project. There was a freelance journalist who put it together and they have received a draft with multiple comments. They are planning a TiO₂ study to examine products associated with the Spokane River. They will have a draft QAPP by the next meeting. They are also working on an iPCB research project using the EPA library and they have come up with results and need to decide the relevance going forward.

Upcoming Task Force Meetings: October 23 and December 5

Future meeting topics: Have Heath Siders and Susan Braley come to talk to the TF about fish sampling and water quality standards? The group agreed it would be a good idea. Jeremy mentioned an amended agreed order with Kaiser and their cleanup and if there is interest as a future meeting topic and there was interest.

Other announcements: Ecology is going through the Variance applications they have received and is starting the rulemaking process to amend water quality standards for surface waters of the State of Washington. They have solidified November 14 as the date of an informational workshop at Spokane Valley Center Place. They are working on the agenda and details. There will be time at the end of that meeting for questions and answers. After the draft rulemaking comes out (fall/winter 2019), there will be a formal public hearing most likely in the fall of 2020 to adopt the rule. Thirty days after adoption the state rule would become effective.

Facilitation contract renewal discussion: The TF approved continuing with WBC for an additional year. They have some things regarding budgeting to work out at the October TF meeting.

The next SRRTTF meeting is October 23 at Spokane County Water Resource Center, 8:30 am – noon