

Basin Environmental Improvement Project Commission (BEIPC)
Quarterly Meeting Minutes

February 12, 2014, 9:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Wallace Inn (Gold Room)
100 Front St., Wallace, Idaho

Attendees:

Terry Harwood (BEIPC Executive Director)

Commissioners and Alternates present:

Rick Albright
Jim Best
Jack Buell, Chair
Phillip Cernera
Dan Green, Vice-Chair
Rob Hanson
Caj Matheson
Grant Pfeifer
Larry Yergler

Staff present:

Glory Carlile (BEIPC Assistant to Executive Director, note taker)
Ed Moreen (EPA)
Bruce Schuld (IDEQ)
Rebecca Stevens (CDA Tribe)
Sandra Treccani (State of WA)

(Please note that these minutes are a summary of reports and presentations. They are intended to capture key topics and issues, conclusions, and next steps and not every detail of the discussions.)

Call to order: Commissioner Jack Buell (Benewah County) called the meeting to order at 9:34 a.m. followed by the flag salute.

Review and Approval of November 20, 2013 Meeting Minutes:

Harwood reviewed some changes that had been submitted prior to the meeting by Bill Adams and by Ed Moreen. Motion was made by Commissioner Green to accept the minutes of the November 20, 2013 as read. However, Cernera added a correction on page 2 that it should read the “DEQ” not “Tribe” and that on page 8 he clarified that since Buell cannot make the motion as chair, that it be changed to “Buell adjusted the agenda”. Commissioner Albright then 2nd the motion to accept the November BEIPC meeting minutes as amended. **M/S/C**

Lake Management Plan (LMP) Update:

Jamie Brunner and Laura Laumatia presented an update on the LMP with a review of their 2014 monitoring plan, Bank Stabilization activities, and Education and Outreach.

2014 Monitoring:

They are continuing on with IDEQ monitoring of Tubbs Hill and University Point sites. The change this year will be that they are dropping Driftwood Point to get more information on mixing between the St. Joe and the CDA Rivers. They also will be continuing the monitoring at Cougar Bay 2, Blue Creek, Wolf Lodge, and Beauty Bay.

Bank Stabilization:

They are also planning to add stable isotope monitoring. Shadowy St. Joe project was completed in 2013. This year they are focusing more on planning.

Outreach:

- Branching out to reach out more for education.
- Working to develop a program called “Local Gems” to recognize other business.
- Identify opportunities for business involvement.
- Develop regional collaboration programs to provide training.
- Expand local gems to individual landowners.
- Regional collaboration.
- More focus through Spokane and extending to Spokane for more awareness of storm water issues

Education:

- Laumatia reported on the K-12 education.
- Continue their education outreach and to collaborate with University of Idaho STEM project
- Model grant for field training to work with students at schools.
- Summer camps will continue. Back to the earth provides value based science projects. Provides a value based science education for tribal students.

Outreach:

- Evaluating our outreach strategy.
- Changes to marketing. Robinson Research conducted survey work around the Basin and one of the things that came out of that was that the number one perceived threat to health of CDA Lake was Milfoil.
- Want to make sure people are aware and understand the issues.

Current Public Issues:

- Issues included a lack of understanding of LMP, lack of understanding of water quality situation and lack of public buy-in to LMP.
- Ineffective Resource Messaging is abstract, doom-laden, doesn't offer solutions, makes people feel powerless, and offers a false dichotomy; economy vs. environment.

Effective Resource Messaging connects with people's values so we realized the need to refocus how we do things. Took a look at the 2009 LMP goal to protect and improve Lake water quality by limiting basin-wide nutrient inputs that impair Lake water quality conditions, which in turn influence the solubility of mining-related metals contamination contained in Lake sediments. We realized how complicated it may be to understand. When reading that goal, it does not necessarily contain the values behind it and the reason why the LMP was developed, so that is where we are for refocusing the goal now.

Rebranding:

Brunner talked about the Rebranding. She reported that in the CDA Vision 2030 survey, number one positive was natural resources and number one concern was economy. The rebranding included developing a new logo showing “Our Gem” is the value and renaming it with “CDA Lake Collaborative” underneath on the logo.

Brunner also presented a draft of the new website: A lot of information is provided about the LMP. Scientists and citizens will have access to all the monitoring results. Action step is to be a steward and there will be opportunities to get involved and to volunteer.

The photo gallery shows appreciation of the water shed and there is a link to general information and contacts. Access links will be available. Landowners can find information. Downloads are available.

Questions/Comments:

Commissioner Green commented positively on the LMP website goals stating that finding people to be collaborative is tough. He also asked to be called if Kootenai County can help.

Commissioner Cernera applauded them on the LMP and shared some of the history of the plan. He commented that there are many components to the plan and noted that the Lake outreach and education component is very strong and an important component. He agreed that environmental protection and economic issues are connected. It is about the environment and the economy and getting the message out.

Commissioner Yergler commented that one of the strong considerations is protection of the businesses. It is a fine line to balance to profit from our natural resources. He shared that Governor Otter's number 5 point was that every ecological consideration must also strongly consider the economic stability.

Green added that finding the balance for promoting the resources is very important as it is one of the reasons people move to our area and the goal of developing the economy is also very important.

EPA Update:

Bill Adams made the EPA update on proposed 2014 work with a presentation about what is coming up in the year.

- Property Remediation - reaching the end of the program, working with IDEQ and planning additional outreach to complete community areas.
- Paved Roads Program - continuing this year. This work is implemented by the local jurisdiction, with oversight by EPA and DEQ. Also showed areas that will be worked on in 2014, which is more than double than last year.
- Remedy protection - A number of projects in the Box and in Basin; have a number of projects doing design and pre-design data collection.
- Repositories - Continue to operate a number of repositories. Construction of Lower Burke Canyon Repository (LBCR) and will need to have it open by the end of year; Proposed Big Creek Annex is an ideal location for expansion and they are evaluating additional data on the site. Will take input but will not have an official comment period. He showed a map of the potential Big Creek Expansion area. East Fork of Ninemile: This year start of Interstate Callahan construction at the site and hauling of waste to the WCA. Additional work in Ninemile will include continued monitoring of the drainage and looking at the source, evaluating sources at Tamarack. Continued road infrastructure work. Pre-design data collection and design at the Success site, lining Rex Creek thru Rex site.

Basin Environmental Monitoring Plan (BEMP) Update:

Adams reported that they are looking at a more effective monitoring progress and optimization of Operable Unit -2 (OU-2) data. EPA is working to update the BEMP to more effectively monitor progress toward ecological cleanup goals. EPA is working to make the monitoring more focused and will be conducting an optimization of all BEMP monitoring (not just OU2).

Central Treatment Plant (CTP) Update:

- Completed 30% Design Review in November, 2013.
- Value Engineering (VE) study conducted in January 2014.
- Current mine water treatment at the CTP removes approximately 1 million lbs. of metals per year from Bunker Mine discharges. Upgraded plant will improve on that removal quantity and treat

the water collected from CIA drain system. Expected removal efficiency is estimated to be greater than 99%

- Next Steps will take about 2 years to complete.

EPA Budget Update:

- Current SA account balance is \$50 million and still yet to receive from Hecla last payment due in August.
- Planned Trust Budget for 2014 is about \$23 million

Misc. Updates:

- Site Cleanup Implementation Plan update will be done on an annual basis. It will be put on the BEIPC website.
- Adams showed maps of where work is occurring and Harwood pointed them out. One of the Lower Basin pilot projects is at the Kahnderosa Campground. Little Pine Creek Remedy Protection Project in the Box has 23 private parcels that we will cross and need property owner approval for all of them.
- Adams also further explained the CTP plans included a change in routing discharge directly to the South Fork rather than Bunker Creek. Also discussed were the Unpaved Road Projects and Basin Remedy Protection Projects in the Basin including: Shields Gulch project that will divert the drainage water from in front of the Osburn Elementary School; Meyer Creek collection and drainage project through Osburn. Lower Burke Canyon repository construction and a small project at the Rex Mine Site to line the Creek across the previously remediated area.

Cernera asked Adams about the riparian work in Ninemile and asked if it focused on the corridor from the Interstate Mine down to the Success Mine? He suggested that they gather input from the Restoration Partnership and noted that it will be interesting what they do below the Success Mine with all that massive riprap.

Cernera also asked if the CTP upgrade is being built to treat potential upstream needs capacity and Adams replied that is being considered and additional components can be added for that capacity in the future.

Hanson asked about the Rex Mine site and the need for the lining. Adams answered that they created a channel to skirt around it to come down below but some of the surface water is infiltrating through the channel. He added that above the site they are seeing some impact so may eventually need some added water treatment to reduce some of the loading. Harwood asked if there was discharge above and the answer was yes.

Executive Director Update:

Terry Harwood reported on activities of the BEIPC. He reviewed some of the things he does in his role as Executive Director which are the basic part of his job of the Basin Commission such as the Work Plans, Accomplishments Reports, coordination and working with various governmental entities. He keeps track of everything including issues. He also monitors issues from Washington D.C., Congress, Senate and the House as well as the administration. He noted that we have levies along the River that need to be maintained and upgraded; worked with Senator Crapo's office on the Water Resources Development Act that recognizes the need to fund these type projects. First step in addressing levy problems is looking at condition of existing levies.

Infrastructure Inventory: Is completing for IDEQ an inventory of all of the drainage infrastructure that has been constructed in the Valley to ensure proper maintenance. The plan is to sit down with local

groups and work with the Silver Jackets work group on an approach. One of the things he has learned is that we have a lot of ways to get infrastructure built, but do a very poor job of maintaining it.

Working with EPA for review of Basin Remedy Protection project designs and legal documents; doing design and project management engineering for the State of Idaho on Box Remedy Protection projects; and leading the efforts on the unpaved roads program. One of the most important things about building projects is determining who will maintain them. All of the drainage projects will eventually somehow impact some private and adjoining properties. This is the reason for having agreements with landowners or otherwise the work cannot be done.

Last few months he has spent time with consultants regarding the upgrade of the paved roads; program strategy, life expectancy, etc.

Harwood concluded his update by stating that he is still very encouraged about the amount of work that is going on and the cooperation and coordination with the community.

Update and Discussion of Paved Roads Program:

Bruce Schuld stated that the Paved Roads Program is a big community involvement and implementation process. He presented the project roads lengths completed in 2013 showing the miles in the Box, and miles in the Basin completed for a total of 8.17 miles. He is really pleased that they were able to get all this done due to the EPA's willingness to move forward on funding and the cities and their engineers pulling together some very good projects.

The budget for 2014 almost doubled with the plan to repair and/or replace 17 to 18 miles of roadway in the Box and in the Basin. There will be about 4.7 million dollars of projects done in the Box and in the Basin about 3.4 million dollars in project costs that the CDA Trust will be paying for.

Schuld reported that he had a "Lessons Learned" meeting with Shoshone County Commissioners and various Mayors. He wanted input to find out how to improve administration of the program and how to remain on track. Part of the discussion included qualification of the roads, noting that some roads were approved to be included to the Paved Roads Program because they were impacted by the remedial action in the past work being done. There were some roads listed but did not really qualify under the program. He emphasized that in the Paved Roads Program the number one mission of the program is to cap over contaminated areas not to improve infrastructure.

He discussed the limits that we can fund paved roads program and the budget ceilings. He noted that the amount of work that can be done in the valley is also constrained by the amount of labor source. Talked about project proposals and budgeting for PRRACA (which is the agreement between the State of Idaho and EPA). He noted that Terra Graphics saw that we had a lot of projects proposed and when they went out for bids the bid numbers came in a lot lower than what were the proposed costs to the Paved Roads Program Roads Board. Number one priority in 2014 is that contingency costs can be added in without going through the process of submitting bids.

Lessons Learned:

- Implementation: How to get the construction season started as soon as possible? Hoping to get all the design work done earlier so they can start earlier and be done earlier in the season.
- Need to coordinate better with local utilities and remedy protection projects, other remediation action, and ICP coordination.
- Need to get coordination out in time for review, changes.
- Need to look at disposal of concrete and bituminous waste. Have a whole lot of logistics to do about this waste. Sheer volume has become an issue.

He also reported that work change orders went pretty well last year. When engineers found glitches we were fortunate that Jon Harwood had a cell phone and that he could give a verbal approval and then follow up with the proper paperwork. They make sure work matches up with funding. They were able to add about 40% more road work last year.

Discussion of Draft 2013 Annual Report:

Terry Harwood provided information about how by incorporating in 2013 the competitive public work contracting bidding process lowered the cost of remedy protection, unpaved and paved roads projects, noting that public works type contracting takes more inspection work and more engineering at the beginning of the process but is resulting in much lower costs for construction, in many case as much as 50% lower.

He then presented the draft of the 2013 Annual Report of accomplishments publication sharing that the photo on the cover is of East Fork Ninemile and contents include a “report card” on work that is being done. He commented that he is thinking about having another field trip in August.

An outline of his review of the draft of the Annual Report included the following in Part 1:

- Blood Lead Screening commenting that children playing in the Lower Basin now have more of a chance of contamination than those in the Silver Valley.
- Remedy Protection Projects: Explanation about the 2 types, urban and side drainages, with funding in the Box, and funding in the Basin; completed 2 projects in Mullan, Grouse Creek, Sierra Nevada, and Unnamed Creek.
- Showed before and after pictures of Unpaved Road Remediation and Paved Road Remediation.
- Repository Development and Management: Working on the waste consolidation in Ninemile.
- Big Creek Repository and Annex: Almost full and the annex that is planned to be constructed.
- East Mission Flats Repository
- Page “Box” ICP Repository
- New Repositories: Lower Burke Canyon where the Trust is doing the design work.
- Recreational Use Activities: Does not deal with disbursed recreation. Discovered that if you do not pave surfaces near the river side recreation site then it becomes re-contaminated.
- Upper Basin Remedies: Information from EPA with update of where they are at was provided by Bill Adams in his report.
- Lower Basin Remedies: Trying to understand how the River works down there. There are 2 pilot projects that Ed Moreen will talk about later. He noted that if you can keep the water level high enough in wetlands then the birds cannot get down to the contaminated mud.

Basin Environmental Monitoring:

Basin Environmental Monitoring Plan (BEMP) sampling program. He commented that Bill Adams had reported that they will take a look at the monitoring and see what has to be redone as far as monitoring is concerned.

Harwood summed up his review of Part 1 of the Annual Report with the comment that it gets us through all the work that was basically Superfund related work. Funded by appropriated monies from Congress, settlement monies from Hecla or the Trust which was funded from the ASARCO Bankruptcy, plus money appropriated through State of Washington and State of Idaho legislatures. Anything related to remediation action through the Superfund.

Review of Part 2 of the Annual Report included these activities and responsibilities:

- Lake Management Plan: CDA Lake and Spokane River are part of the Superfund site. Idaho and Tribe have their education and outreach program and scientific program and give updates at

every meeting reporting on their activities and their partnerships with other entities. They are changing to CDA Lake Collaborative.

- Flood Control and Infrastructure Revitalization: There is the issue that levies along the River in populated areas are not certified. Unless the levy is certified by a licensed professional engineer than cannot get FEMA approval. Cannot continue to disregard this issue of flooding. Need to have the existing levies evaluated but his personal opinion is that a concrete wall between the River and the existing inadequate levies should be considered the entire length of the River through populated areas. This approach would not disturb the existing levies or adjacent properties.
- Restoration Partnership: The Trustees are putting together an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). They started developing the draft Restoration Plan that will be a part of this document focusing on remediation and cleanup of the problem and then the natural resource restoration. The Restoration Partnership has implemented a number of restoration projects within the Basin.
- Challenges Ahead: We've got a lot done but have a long ways to go. Need to do a careful job and not rush through the process. Funding is a big issue and as long as we have settlement money than it will be difficult to get any appropriations from Congress for Superfund work.

Questions/Comments:

Rob Hanson had sent in a correction on page 5 of the Annual Report changing the date from 2012 to 2013. Harwood announced that once the Annual Report is approved it will be published and also posted to the Basin Commission website.

Denna Grangaard shared a suggestion brought up at the last CCC meeting to offer the contact information on all reports on the front page. The comment from the CCC was to include a website and contact information on the front page of each report made available to the public. This way, the person has an immediate visual reference. This is particularly helpful for people who are browsing and researching.

Harwood agreed that he will add the BEIPC contact information to this Annual Report publication and to the website and we will add it to all reports.

Commissioner Pfeifer moved and Commissioner Hanson 2nd the motion to approve the 2013 Annual Report for publishing. **M/S/C**

EPA Presentation on Lower Basin Pilot Projects and Lower Basin Sampling and Studies Results for 2013

Ed Moreen combined the 2 agenda items in his presentation of the EPA Lower Basin Updates:

Pilot Project Process and Status:

In March 2013 there were pilot project forums asking for input and they received 4 dozen suggestions from the public. The following 4 stage process was used to aggregate and evaluate ideas: Classification, Sorting/Grouping, Scoring and Assessment/Selection. These were used to go through the pilot project ideas and then they were sorted into 3 categories which were reducing risk to people, reducing risk to wildlife, and reducing continued mobilization of contaminants. 7 concepts were evaluated with at least 2 in each category. 11 criteria were applied to those and used to evaluate ideas such as partnering potential, timing, sequencing with ongoing work, and potential for replication. Transition to more pilot projects is planned as elements of data evaluation and modeling are completed.

Kahnderosa Campground Bank Isolation Pilot Project:

The Pilot Project combined 2 programs in tandem with the Basin Property Remediation Program. Moreen showed slides of the banks and wildlife that is there helping to break down the bank. The

campground was chosen because it is a high traffic site with easy access and therefore will be helping to more likely reduce exposure to more people. It is also higher in the basin with a steeper river gradient providing better test of the design. Overall, riverbank isolation project selection was based on a low risk of failure, low risk of recontamination and relatively low cost. They also wanted to have a visible example to encourage replication of a project that promotes habitat restoration with remediation.

- Objectives: Reduce risk of exposure to lead and avoid off-site disposal of waste. The slides showed Baseline Lead Levels documented with various lead levels on the banks and an aerial photo showed what it looked like in 2008 flood.
- Fabric Enclosed Soil Lift (FESL). Wrap soil with willows to anchor the bank. Showed an FESL Bank Stability example in Willow Creek, Alaska with vegetation that grew extremely well to stabilize the bank.
- Project Schedule: Plans are to construct this in fall 2014.

The other project is a water level control project to deter waterfowl from feeding in the contaminated wetlands. They are looking for water body that can be isolated relatively easily and working on landowner negotiations.

Lower Basin Data Collection:

Used Geophysical imaging. Tried sub bottom profiling (sonar) as a method to map the bottom of contaminated sediments in riverbed but unfortunately did not meet their expectations.

Coring: Moreen presented a picture of sediment being pushed out of a coring tube. Samples are sent to lab for confirmation. He explained that there are 2 types of cores; deep sediment cores collected using rotary drilling and Vibracoring that penetrated the upper layers of the riverbed.

The Vibracoring targeted various river bed forms throughout the lower basin. They want to know what is actually occurring at different river bed forms and locations.

Questions:

Cernera asked if scouring analysis has been done and the answer was no.

Green asked for clarification about the water flow effect and Moreen explained.

Cernera commented about the very nature of the mining process historically impacts this.

Current Status:

Moreen reported that the Sediment Transport Model is expected to be done in 2015.

What have we learned?

- 80% of lead mobilized in floods
- Large flood events
- EPA is refining estimates of floodplain deposition rates
- Based on current data a few areas account for estimated floodplain deposition

He showed sediment and lead budget graphic displaying the bed erosion in Lower Basin accounts for 79% of lead at Harrison and a graph showing relative deposition in floodplain areas. He stated that modeling tools will significantly enhance understanding of system and analysis of options. Highlights the ability to look at it.

What does it mean?

- Natural recovery time is centuries.
- Dredging very expensive and complex. (30 river miles) Lots of hurdles to overcome. Must address risk. Need to understand mobilization.
- Hot Spot Removal is worthy of evaluation as our tools and information becomes more complete.
- Splays areas unlikely to remove more than 10% Pb load.

- Looking at wetland projects. Treatment and thin layer capping potentially viable and expensive hydraulic controls not needed in many locations.

What's next?

- Lots of data to evaluate.
- Determine what remedies are suitable.
- Take a strategic remedial approach and cross-agency coordination.
- Determine if Decision Document is needed.

Certera commented on what's next information and noticed omission of pilot dredging project. He thinks there is a need to look into that technology. EPA had been looking into dredging at the St. Joe River cleanup project but it is off the table. Idea of amount of material in that riverbed concerning volume and noted that we have not done a scouring study. Moreen responded that the presentation did address the potential for focused remediation but not quite there yet.

Rebecca Stevens expressed appreciation on behalf of the Restoration Project. She added a comment about the possibility of holding off on the water level projects. Moreen answered that the 1D model is suitable for the purposes of evaluating water levels manipulations in isolated locations.

Risk Management Approach for Property Remediation

Bruce Schuld reported on the implementation of the Basin Property Remediation Program (BPRP) in the Lower Basin. They are moving further down the basin and are looking at decisions to define cleanup goals. He shared that they have encountered a number of challenges.

BPRP Implementation:

Brought up 3 Questions:

1. How do we manage health risk on public and private lands that are much larger than the typical sized properties found in the Upper Basin communities?
2. How do we balance costs of remediating private roadways with risk?
3. How do we remediate flood-prone areas that are subject to re-contamination?

Unpaved Roads:

Public unpaved roads are considered Type 2 Commercial Properties and they are also looking at how to deal with private unpaved roads which are evaluated on a case-by-case basis with the surrounding properties.

He described the process of remediation that is frequently designed to include removing 6 inches of gravel exceeding 1000 parts per million (ppm) lead or 100 ppm arsenic, capping contaminated surfaces with clean gravel, and providing positive drainage.

Caveats to the unpaved roads:

- All public road segments that qualify by meeting the soil action levels for lead or arsenic and serve residential properties within 500 feet of any residence or have extensive traffic likely to cause migration of dust migration to residences will be remediated.
- Some roads are being remediated through Remedy Protection Projects.
- Public unpaved roads under the jurisdiction of the federal agencies and the Idaho Transportation Department are not included in this program and are the responsibility of those agencies.

Recreation Areas:

There are 2 types of Recreation Sites in the Basin: 1. Developed sites that are on both public and private campgrounds, with trailer pads, boat ramps, parks, trails and trail heads, and 2. Dispersed sites that have no developed amenities such as power, water, restrooms etc.

The 2002 Basin ROD requires that developed recreation sites be remediated if at certain levels of contamination and remedial actions will be based on use and geography. There are dispersed recreation sites that will not be remediated under the BPRP, but may be considered under another cleanup program. Other recreational areas may be evaluated for cleanup based on a number of factors such as risk of exposure, location, and use.

Large Residential properties:

In the Basin, large residential properties are sometimes measured in acreage rather than in square footage resulting in the need to consider where the exposure exists. Based on risk analysis, remediation will include up to 1 acre around a primary residence and unpaved private roadways/driveways providing access to a primary residence if the potential for re-contamination is high. In addition they are providing property landowners with information on how to manage risk with educational information.

Schuld shared that one of the caveats is that we will not be considering properties where natural barriers prevent people from entering.

He concluded his report with the comments that we need to really rethink how to approach the remediation under both the residential and commercial sites and that we simply cannot do it all. He likes the “hot spot” removal concept and focus on the areas that have the highest risk.

Harwood asked what the costs are (per acre?) and Schuld answered that the average cost per property in the Upper Basin is \$60,500 and up to \$200,000 in the Lower Basin.

Citizens Coordinating Council (CCC) Comment and Presentation:

Jerry Boyd, Chair of CCC commented that the primary purpose of the CCC is for the public to provide the opportunity to learn what is going on and offer input. He expressed appreciation of the support of the Basin Commission and agencies.

He reported that at the meeting on January 16, they covered how we can better serve the people in the process. There were a wide variety of interested people at the meeting. From the meeting notes there were many questions that were brought up including: Is it really necessary to have quarterly meetings and what does low turn-out mean?

It was agreed that there is a big turnout for specific projects. The meetings serve as an opportunity for people to be involved. He then announced that the next CCC meeting is scheduled for April 16, but we do not know yet if will be in the afternoon or in the evening.

Albright asked what the focus of that meeting will be and commented that he thinks that the time for the meeting should be up to CCC. Buell added that a daytime meeting is better. Most people are too tired for evening so he suggested 4:00 p.m. meeting time. Boyd then announced that the next CCC meeting will be at the Medimont Grange at 4:00 p.m. on April 16, 2014.

A citizen asked if the Spokane River Water Quality issues are related to Basin Commission involvement and the answer was IDEQ in Idaho and Washington Ecology in Washington.

A further comment stated that a landowner was upset about receiving a letter from EPA and it ended up that actually it was a misunderstanding.

Boyd shared that there has been a lot of support by Ross & Associates (EPA) and that they send out an e-mailing to keep the community informed. There is a thought then that it could be a reason for a low turnout at a meeting because they are being kept informed.

Buell asked about the Spokane Tribe Water Quality issue. Boyd responded that they have set a water quality standard that is very low and difficult to achieve. Albright explained the fish consumption rate

and EPA approved the standard and is now being enforced. Cernera added that Idaho has rejected the standard and there is a study going on now. Survey needs to provide information about not what to eat today (fish), but in the future. Have an issue between Washington and Idaho.

Yergler asked how do we know if the levels were higher in the past?

Pfeifer commented on some contaminants in fish tissue. Washington Department of Ecology is working on this subject. Finding out what are the criteria and what the risk level is will help to establish the rate level. He also wanted to share that Washington is looking at how to live in the community and work on how to work within the regulatory structure if they adopt human health regulations. There is a balance between the individual and businesses. Looking at how can we implement this too and what is the approach?

Boyd commented on PCB standards noting that the level may not be detectible. Cernera asked about the Lower Basin yard remediation. Is EPA going in to remediate even though it is known it will be re-contaminated? Schuld answered that EPA still has a lot of questions. In the near future, focus on work in Upper Basin. Will continue cost effective work in Lower Basin and affirmed that we are going to do yards in the Lower Basin. Albright asked in terms of what might happen and if child testing is a high priority? Schuld answered that it will be the number 1 priority. They are trying to balance priority and where they should be directing the work.

Harwood commented that we can still take care of the risk and public health. Schuld added that the yard remediation program gets criticism. They are working really hard to provide services no matter where the property is. Cernera also added - and to be fiscally responsible, and sensitive to resource protection and further work.

Public Comment Open Session:

Boyd commented that the Basin and agencies may not be doing enough to share information concerning their good results.

Harwood ended the meeting with the comment that he is very pleased with the accomplishments reported in the Annual Report.

Commissioner Buell adjourned the meeting at 2:40 p.m.