

## **Basin Environmental Improvement Project Commission**

### **Meeting Summary: February 26, 2003**

Meeting Location: Kootenai County Administration Building, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho

Commissioners present: Steve Allred, DEQ  
Jack Buell, Benewah County  
Sherry Krulitz, Shoshone County  
Chuck Matheson, CDA Tribe  
Dick Panabaker, Kootenai County  
James McCurdy, Washington  
John Iani, Federal Government

Commissioners absent: None

Staff present: Luke Russell, IDEQ  
Phil Cerner, CDA Tribe  
John Roland, State of Washington  
Sheila Eckman, EPA

Note taker: Luke Russell

### **Summary:**

Chairman Krulitz opened the meeting at 10:07 AM.

### **Old Business**

Following introductions, including legislative staff in attendance, Commissioner Iani noted that as the federal representative there may be times during the days meeting that he would need to caucus with the other trustee agencies and appreciated the boards understanding should a break be requested.

The meeting summary from the December 4, 2002 meeting was reviewed. **The summary was then approved following a motion from Commissioner Allred, seconded by Commissioner Panabaker.**

Luke Russell provided an update on the \$2.0 M Clean Water Act grant by stating that the award letter was expected to be received by IDEQ perhaps by weeks end. This will allow the Commission directed entities to proceed with work in the field. Mr. Russell also indicated that the FY 2003 congressional budget included an additional \$1.8M for the Basin Commission, which may have the same Clean Water Act funding requirements on its use. Commissioner Allred asked if there were any planned earmarks for additional funding in the FY 2004 budget. Commissioner Iani replied, not at this point.

Sheila Eckman commented that EPA should know within a month or so what Superfund money would be available to the region for the Basin.

Chairman Krulitz, indicated then at this point in time there is \$2.0 M of Clean Water Act money available for Commission use, with an additional \$1.8M in Clean Water Act money available after submittal of a formal request.

Commissioner Matheson commented that based on this information there was no funding currently available to support commission staff. Commission Allred then presented the concept of the Commission using an indirect or cost-recovery rate on future funding sources to support commission staff. He suggested the DEQ and EPA would be meeting later this week to discuss the State Superfund Contract and perhaps this could be an item of discussion at that meeting.

Commissioners Krulitz and Panabaker commented that this is a very difficult budget year at both the state and county levels.

## **New Business**

### **Board Protocols:**

Luke Russell reviewed the proposed protocols for the operation of the Basin Commission. Chairman Krulitz lead a discussion which included: use of alternates: each appointing entity only could appoint an alternate, not a commission board member. An alternate would be able to vote. Commissioner Matheson indicated the tribe had appointed Richard Mullan as the tribes alternate. The use of proxies would not be allowed. To strike the duplicate “press” on the bottom of page 2 after Coeur d’Alene Press, a quorum would be at least 4 board members and an action by the commission would require at least 4 affirmative votes. She then questioned the need for discussion on press contacts in the protocol. Sheila Eckman indicated that the protocols were developed using information from other boards and this was a component of these reference protocols.

Commissioner Allred suggested the protocol be revised to include selection of a secretary-treasurer at the board level to track financial aspects of the commission affairs.

Commissioner Matheson questioned what the timeline was for retaining staff, as the board did not now have money. He suggested the current arrangement with the core staff from agencies was working well. Commissioner Allred indicated that the status quo with use of borrowed agency staff would not work over the long term. In fact, he questioned whether or not the state, under the current budget crisis, would have the resources to support Mr. Russell’s involvement with the commission after July of this year. Chairman Krulitz indicated staffing was somewhat confusing, e.g. Mr. Cernera is a tribe employee, a core staff to the commission and the chair of the Technical Leadership Group.

**It was moved by Commissioner Iani to adopt the board operating protocol, with the amendment that it includes provision for a secretary-treasurer at the board level. Commissioner Allred seconded the motion.** In discussion, Commissioner Matheson sought clarification that if only two county representatives were present they would not be able to veto a board action, which was confirmed by the board. Commissioner Buell questioned the use of alternates and felt this had been decided to not use alternates. Commissioner Iani explained that in his case, as regional administrator, at some point he would not be in this position. The use of alternates would keep the board operating with a full board until a new RA could be appointed. Commissioner Matheson indicated a similar issue existed with the tribe as he was up for reelection later this year. Chairman Krulitz confirmed that only the appointing entity, which was the Governor of Idaho and Washington, the Tribal council and the president of the United States who could appoint an alternate to the board as, proposed in the protocols. Commissioner Allred felt it made good sense to have an alternate ready to step it.

**A vote was taken and passed with Commissioner Buell voting against and Commissioner Iani abstaining.**

### **Funding, Budget and Staffing**

Luke Russell presented an overview of potential funding sources for the commission including settlements, superfund, grants, state and federal appropriations. He then overviewed potential staffing needs for the commission, which included an executive director, lake management coordinator, and management assistant to work with the CCC and TLG and a part-time administrative support. He presented a spectrum of operating scenarios for the commission from the current coordination role to a full stand-alone implementation role. A conceptual budget was presented that ranged between \$380K – \$430K for board staffing, operations and capital needs. Mr. Russell then discussed that while there was no direct funding from the current congressional appropriation to support the overhead of the commission, this could perhaps be obtained via an indirect or cost-recovery rate applied to grant money received by the commission. He presented an example that if the commission received \$2M from the Clean Water Act grant, and say \$8M from superfund, an indirect or cost-recovery rate of 4% would be needed to support the conceptual budget of approximately \$400,000. He then presented a path forward of developing commission “capacity” of fiscal, procurement and staffing plans to received direct funding under grants and Superfund.

Chairman Krulitz questioned EPA in regard to the superfund money for basin work. Sheila Eckman indicated that a request had been made to the national review panel for superfund funding. Funding would be based on the projects proposed. Money requested for box work would not be available to the commission. As the box is an on-going action it should compete well for superfund monies. In the Basin, this is considered a new start but EPA was confident they would get money for the basin. EPA should know in about a month how much money would be available for both the box and basin this year.

Commissioner Panabaker clarified that there is no money currently available to support commission staff or overhead, but this money may be obtained as an overhead on future grants. Ms Eckman clarified that staff work to implement projects could be part of grant requests, plus an overhead expense to help pay for rents, travel, computers etc.

Commissioner Matheson indicated that while it is a goal for the commission to be stand alone he was concerned about creating a new, potentially redundant bureaucracy. He expects the tribe to remain involved with basin clean up work and with the lake management. He did not want to see the commission hiring a redundant position in this regard.

Commissioner McCurdy commented that he saw the tribe as a potential source of funding for work in the basin or lake management plan implementation. He suggested there might be BIA natural resource funding available to the tribe to support basin work. He also suggested other tax exempt contributions could be sought to help fund commission activities.

Commissioner Buell questioned EPA as they are funding 90% of the remedial action and the state 10%, why would they not be willing to support the commission to implement the ROD? Commissioner Iani responded he understood Mr. Buell's frustration and the federal government does want work to get do. However, it was a chicken and egg situation in that the Commission needed to establish its capacity to receive grants and directly implement projects, but needed resources now to develop this capacity. He questioned if it made sense for the commission to establish this capacity as it could add to the administrative costs and reduces money for work on the ground. Mr. Iani indicated that he felt the commission was working as envisioned with high public input in the planning process and establishment of the CCC and TLG.

Commissioner Buell asked if there was no money available to hire staff what does the commission do? Commissioner Allred indicated that the authority of the commission under state statute envision it being both an action/implementation entity as well as a coordination entity. It would coordinate the work done by others with their funding (e.g. BLM/USFS). He felt the commission could develop the capacity documents for fiscal and procurement, etc by July. However, the commission needed to establish a conceptual budget for staff to begin conversation on the indirect rate required to support the administrative and overhead functions of the commission. In addition, an estimate of revenues would need to be made. He added that for revenues, the state annual appropriation would be available for commission lead activities.

Chairman Krulitz noted that the Commission is to implement the ROD and this may involve contracting with other entities to get this accomplished. Commissioner Allred suggested that federal and state funds could go through the commission but not all work necessarily needs to be done by the commission. However, he wants the commission to have its own staff. Commissioner Iani mentioned that wherever we wanted to be on the spectrum of commission roles, the commission needed a base level of staffing.

Commissioner Matheson noted the tribe wants to be involved in clean up and did not want to see control of the Basin Commission fall to a state agency. Chairman Krulitz said this would not happen.

**Commissioner Allred then moved that the Board accept the tentative budget presented by Mr. Russell for staff to use in developing a straw man cost recovery proposal for supporting the commission administrative and overhead costs. Commissioner Panabaker seconded the motion.** In discussion, Commissioner Iani repeated his concern of duplicating overhead with the DEQ and Tribe but recognized staffing as a real concern for the Board. Commissioner Matheson reiterated his opposition to moving forward with the budget process.

**The motion passed with Commissioner Matheson opposed, and Commissioner Iani abstaining.**

At 11:35 AM the Commission then took a lunch break and reconvened at 12:10 PM

### **Legislative/Land Transfer Update**

Commissioner Allred presented an update on the status of House Bill 149 in the Idaho Legislature. This bill addresses the voting by the county commissioners on annual work plans and budgets as well as the fiduciary responsibilities of the board members. The bill has passed the house and now is in committee on the senate side. He did not expect problems with having it be passed in this session.

Commissioner Allred then overviewed the current land transfers in the Box to Eagle Crest Corporation and the City of Kellogg. EPA is in the process of transferring lands in the box to the state. The state in turn is negotiating with Eagle Crest on a lease/option agreement for approximately 600 acres for possible use as a golf course residential development. The project would maintain the remedy and the state was negotiating a fee or other mechanism for the development to contribute to operation and maintenance costs in the box. A similar transfer is being pursued with the city of Kellogg for the current office building on McKinley Avenue. The DEQ would become a tenant and occupy a portion of this building but it would be the city's building.

### **Technical Leadership Group**

John Roland presented an overview of the operating protocols developed for the TLG. He provided to the board an updated version, dated February 25, 2003, to replace the version included in the board packets. He described the process for developing the first year's work plan was a good trial for identifying what needed to go into the protocol. However, it was not possible to anticipate every issue and that the TLG would need to develop additional policies or guidelines as issues arise. For example, how various project proposals work through the TLG and go before the Board for consideration. He indicated that Phil Cernera of the CDA Tribe had been appointed as TLG chair and that no vice-chair had yet been selected.

Chairman Krulitz questioned if the TLG was subject to the open meeting law. Mr. Roland replied that as the TLG is not a decision making body, but rather an advisory body it did not fall under the Idaho Open Meeting Law. However, he envisioned there would be public meetings of the TLG but not all TLG workshops would be public meetings. Chairman Krulitz then requested clarification on majority and/or minority proposals. She requested that in the future multiple proposals be identified as A or B.

Commissioner Allred commented the TLG is to provide technical input to the Board but that not all citizen comments need to go through the TLG. In discussion that followed it was suggested the TLG needs to be a technical filter so sound science is presented to the Board, that the TLG and CCC vent out proposals first if possible but the public can still come directly to the board if not satisfied with that process, and that the TLG be as free of political process as possible. Commissioner McCurdy commented that there was not enough people out there to do all the work envisioned by this clean up.

Chairman Krulitz commented that only the TLG representatives should sit at the table and other agency personnel or consultants should be advisory and speak when requested by a TLG member. She commended all that have been participating in the TLG process, especially citizens who are serving without compensation. Commissioner Panabaker then advised the Board that one of the Kootenai County representatives, Tom Mullan had resigned from the TLG and so he was appointing John Snider as the replacement representative to the TLG.

Mr. Roland identified two process issues still being worked out which included: 1) how work proposals would run through the TLG before they are presented to the Board – the need for timely proposals, and 2) integrating outside comments and input of both the TLG and CCC project focus team groups. Commissioner Allred asked how the work in Washington was being coordinated with the TLG and CCC. Mr. Roland indicated that there were Washington representatives on both the TLG and CCC who were providing this linkage so work could be coordinated in Washington with what was being planned in Idaho.

The board did not take a formal vote on the TLG protocol but indicated its concurrence with the process and procedures being developed.

### **Citizen Coordinating Council**

John Snider presented an update on the organizational process for the CCC. Mr. Snider is the current chairman of the Citizens Advisory Committee, and a new member of the TLG. He reviewed the organizational efforts of the CCC and discussed the process for selection of its chair, vice-chair, and establishment of a small integration group to represent geographic interests, as well as citizen project focus teams to mirror the TLG efforts. He presented the geographic areas for the small integration group members which will include the upper basin, box, lower basin/chain lakes, Coeur d'Alene Lake/Spokane

River, Benewah County and the Reservation, Post Falls and Coeur D'Alene cities, Washington State and an open position should the need arise.

Commissioner Allred questioned how the existing Bunker Hill Task Force inside the box was being integrated with the small integration group concept. There was discussion on how the experience gained by this group would be beneficial going forward in the basin. Additional contact with the Task Force was encouraged.

Chairman Krulitz suggested the terms of the CCC leadership be similar to the Board terms as well as that proposed in the TLG protocols that are a two-year term for the chairman. She also emphasized the need for the CCC to focus its commentary to the Board on the implementation of the ROD and not get distracted on other issues. She requested that citizens keep the board apprised on the nature of conversation and debate so they are aware of the groups focus. Ruth Spencer from the audience commented that the CCC chair does need to have the ability to run a meeting and tactfully keep the conversation on point. Kathy Zanetti commented that this is a volunteer group and all participants needed to be respectful of the other people's time.

John Roland then commented that there is a concern that the TLG and CCC maintain a level of separation in its membership. The TLG is providing technical advice and the CCC is providing community input on projects. Commissioner Buell replied that citizens do have technical qualifications and the agencies are not always correct. The board needs to have common sense applied to work plans and projects. Commissioner McCurdy commented that while both the TLG and CCC were doing well in getting formed there should be some level of tension within the groups. However, there could be a perception issue if there were dual roles in the membership of these groups (e.g. a CCC member also being at TLG member).

The Board decided not to take a formal action on the CCC protocol but did want to know how the group was organizing itself.

### **Annual Work Plan:**

Phil Cernera presented an overview of the TLG's proposed first year work plan. Using a matrix overhead he briefly summarized each proposed project and how the TLG felt about each. He also indicated where funding would come from to support each project proposed.

With regard to the stream bank stabilization project, he indicated there were two proposals before the Board: the majority proposal or Alternative A involved conducting additional study and analysis of stabilization methods conducted to date along with additional river information, with design to follow. Work may or may not be constructed in the field this year. The minority proposal, or Alternative B, involved a review of bank stabilization methods used to date, but with a commitment to construct up to 4 projects this year. Mr. Cernera indicated that these were essential two different philosophies, the first that we need better data before beginning actual field construction, the other we

know what to do, so let's do it. He indicated these two approaches had not been resolved and so, two proposals were before the Board.

In regard to the Lake Monitoring Plan, Mr. Cernera indicated that as the Lake Management Plan update was currently out for public comment the TLG was proposing to defer initiation of a monitoring plan until a review of these comments could be conducted. In addition, comments to date suggested the Lake Management Plan include a discussion on how the lake could be deleted from the Superfund designation, which would include discussion on lake monitoring. He added that the lake monitoring would seek to leverage the resources of the USGS, CDA Tribe, and US Fish and Wildlife Service.

At 2:00 PM the Board took a 10-minute break and reconvened at 2:10 PM.

Kathy Zanetti presented comments of the CCC on the proposed first year work plan. She provided a handout of comments (attached). Her comments included citizen concern on spending some much money to clean up residential yards, which children lead levels are down, and other communities show higher risk than Osburn. The Commission should focus its limited resources on location the greatest human needs and helping those people.

With regard to bank stabilization she presented the diverse citizen opinion on the two proposals before the Board. Some wanted the deliberative process, as there is confusion if metals loads come from the beds or banks, and others a more action oriented approach to get work done on the ground. The CCC favored the Board sending this works scope back to the TLG to discuss and find a middle ground.

With regard to water treatment, the CCC felt the Mullan I/I project was important and also that consideration be given to leaving the old pipes in place as a conduit for metal laden groundwater.

In regard to lake education and information, the CCC wondered what the other agencies would do to carry on this effort after the initial two year funding period ran out. They recommended that the word get out to the local granges and that signage be installed on the Coeur d'Alene River as well as along the UPRR trail south of Harrison.

The CCC also provided general comments that included: spend money where it will do the most good, focus on the Box, when will the Board address contamination in the Box from the CIA repository? They expressed concern that all projects could be trial and error rather than tested and true. Testing of innovative technologies is important, and when there are more than one proposal on the table consider labeling them option A and option B.

The board then discussed the work plan as presented. Commissioner Allred questioned Mr. Cernera on the Lake Monitoring and how was trend monitoring being conducted. Mr. Cernera responded that EPA was developing a basin wide trend-monitoring program but with the advancement of the Lake Management Plan update, the lake-monitoring

program was further advanced at this point in time. Paul Woods with the USGS added that the basin wide program would include monitoring of in flow and out flow from the lake. Anne Dailey with EPA added that a basin wide monitoring project focus team had been established and there was interest in participation from the CCC.

Commissioner Matheson asked Ms Zanetti why the CCC felt there might be a lack of testing of the beaches on tribal lands? Ms Zanetti replied that she could not provide additional information to the written CCC comments on this specific point.

Following a question from Ruth Spencer, Chairman Krulitz asked Mr. Russell if he could answer why the work plan proposed starting remediation of residential yards in Osburn. Mr. Russell replied observed blood lead levels do not drive the basin ROD actions. Rather, they are based on the predicted risk of elevated blood leads based on soil and dust lead levels. He referenced the Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) that predicted post remediation blood levels at various soil remediation action concentrations. This information indicated the predicted risk on contaminated yards in Osburn was very similar to the other communities. However, in Osburn, the State and EPA have more information on where the properties are that exceed these action levels. Thus, this is in part, why the PFT was proposing to begin yard work in Osburn. Commissioner Allred added that the box work plan includes about 200 residential properties to be remediated in addition to that proposed in this work plan.

Chairman Krulitz asked how close was the city of Kellogg to being deleted from the Superfund list. Rob Hanson with IDEQ replied that North Kellogg was very close to being certified complete which is the first step in an area being proposed for deletion. Chairman Krulitz added that it is important to start deletion in the box communities so the public can believe in the process – getting in and getting out of an area should be the goal.

Chairman Krulitz then opened the floor for public comments on the proposed work plan.

Doug Austin (remediation consultant) questioned how the TLG would address new technology. Phil Cerneria replied that the TLG had been discussing the establishment of a subset of the group to examine new and innovative technology to bring back to the larger TLG group. This could be similar to the old Coeur d'Alene Basin Interagency Group (CBIG). Chairman Krulitz supported this role and asked the TLG to consider such a role for the TLG.

Fred Traxler with the SNRC Science Committee questioned the proposed Mullan I/I project has having little impact on river metal levels and suggested the proposal be sent back to the TLG. Luke Russell replied the project would help Mullan come into compliance with their NPDES permit for nutrients and metals, but was also a demonstration project to look at trenchless construction techniques to minimize surface disturbance and potential recontamination of remediated properties. Mr. Traxler questioned why the Rex Mill site project was not being advanced in this plan. David Fortier with the BLM responded that technical issues identified would be addressed in the

final design but there needed to be funding to support final design. Mr. Traxler then question why the plan proposed to do any residential yard work in the basin and suggested that work focus on completing the box and address lower basin contamination concerns. He suggested that the inclusion of an arsenic cancer risk and a potential benefit in property transactions to be little more than a tactic to entice the public to having their yards remediated.

Randy Siemers with the Labor Council noted their written comments were included in the board package but not specifically addressed in the work plan.

Noel Logar, retired public health official, commented there were only a few elevated blood levels and so the plan to spend \$6M on human health seemed excessive. He mentioned that Osburn was a low priority in the Human Health Risk Assessment. He proposed that rather than start there with yard remediation, the Board, should take some of the proposed \$6M and use it to address source areas, the Bunker Hill box seeps and other projects to reduce zinc, lead and cadmium rather than doing yards.

Commissioner Allred suggested that for the future that projects include an estimate of the reduction in metal load that may be accomplished by a specific action. In this way the board may get the best bang for its dollar. Mr. Cernera offered that some projects, like bank stabilization, might be difficult to quantify in load reductions. Paul Woods with the USFS suggested that there might be capability to estimate such load reduction in the statistical power model being developed by Chuck Vita with URS.

Bret Bowers suggested through his presentation that the Board was creating a new bureaucracy and it was extremely difficult for the average citizen to keep up with all the acronyms and subgroups being established. He concluded that common sense was missing in action with this Board. Kristy Reed Johnson provided a handout to the board that clarifies the organizational structure of the Board, TLG and CCC and that the process is perhaps much simpler than presented by Mr. Bowers.

Fred Kirshner with the Spokane Tribe and TLG member commented that the full TLG had not had an opportunity to fully review the Alternative B bank stabilization proposal and suggested it be sent back to the TLG for further consideration. John Roland described the process of the PFT in developing its majority proposal and how an initial alternative proposal had been incorporated in Alternative A currently before the Board. However, another proposal had been made that did not have full TLG review and this is Alternative B currently before the Board. He added that time was of the essence if any work was going to get done on the ground this year.

Commissioner Iani commented that Alternative A appeared to be a true demonstration project and Alternative B was to get work done this year. The Board could support the Majority proposal (Alternative A) with the Alternative B project locations. The Board could approve these locations but ask the TLG to review the details. Commissioner Panabaker commented that there had been too much study and wanted to get on with

getting work done. He indicated there must be somewhere where we can go do something to see if it works.

Jim Hollingsworth, with the Lands Council replied that this was the question. How will bank stabilization affect bed metal movement? The TLG scientists support the majority proposal and political appointments to the TLG were primarily proposing the minority proposal. A quick fix is not the answer but rather a solid scientific start is needed so we can have a healthy watershed. Commissioner Buell commented that we are losing 5 –10 feet of bank a year, we know that bank stabilization works, and we should get on with it. Chairman Krulitz commented that the county board members had appointed citizens to the TLG who had scientific backgrounds.

Commissioner Allred expressed frustration with the lack of information presented to the Board to make decisions. He said the Basin Commission was established to implement the ROD. He questioned why we can't seem to find even a years worth of work to reduce metal loads, or decrease the human health risk? The Board needs design tools to make decisions and wants an emphasis on implementation of work.

Frank Frutchy commented on his experience on bank stabilization and past work with federal agencies. He stated the Board was to implement the ROD and the ROD identifies 33 miles of bank and riparian coordinator to be addressed. The Alternative B proposal would provide a real time, on the ground assessment of bank stabilization and allow further analysis of metal sources, be it the beds, banks or up river contributions.

Commissioner Matheson commented that riprapping was not a save all answer as it may affect fish habitat and that 90% of the metals were on the streambeds. Also, other actions outside of the Commission, for example the Avista dam management created a system that was the opposite of a natural system, and had an adverse affect on bank stability. He could not support riprap. John Roland commented that bank stabilization was more than rip rapping and would include bio-stabilization or the use of plant materials to help stabilize the banks. He again, mentioned the difference between the two proposals was timing of implementation.

Commissioner Panabaker questioned Commissioner Matheson as to why he would not support bank stabilization. Commissioner Matheson repeated that he did not feel riprap was the save all. If it affected bank energy it could affect the river sediment/metal movement and create a channel rather than a river system.

Roger Helm with the USFWS, speaking on this own, commented that more details were needed from the TLG. They should include with their recommendations information like the probability of success, the cost, what controversy existed over a proposed action, how one project related to other projects, human health benefits, etc.

Curt Fransen with the Idaho Attorney Generals office offered that the TLG had proposed about \$8M worth of work. The bank stabilization project was only about \$400,000 worth

of work. He suggested this project be sent back to the TLG for refinement as the work could probably still be done in the fall.

**It was moved by Commissioner Iani to adopt the one-year plan as proposed by the TLG with the following amendment: that in regard to stream bank stabilization, that it be sent back to the TLG with the recommendation that the TLG accept the projects proposed in Alternative B for consideration, and the TLG vent out concerns they may have, and get back to the board at its May meeting. Commissioner Matheson seconded the motion.**

In discussion, Chairman Krulitz indicated the Board could meet before May to consider this project if necessary to get work done on the ground this year. Commissioner Allred expressed a desire that additional information be developed to quantify the decision, and that the details and designs of the project(s) be flushed out between now and the May board meeting. He indicated support for the motion but expressed concerns that a) the project makes a difference and questioned the use of four separate projects versus one large well thought out project, b) in looking at project sites consider that addressing eroding banks is not the only issue. There are many other factors that need to be considered such as management controls like that considered by Kootenai County on boat wakes. c) that a river energy model is important for future decision making, d) in regard to the proposed Human Health work that it include high-risk yards (where young children and pregnant women reside) and continue to be a voluntary program, e) that alternative means be explored to reduce lead soil exposures, and f) that lake trend monitoring is critical and at a minimum this be initiated (or continue) while the Lake Management Plan was being finalized.

John Roland commented that by accepting the motion the Board was essentially approving Plan A and that the only difference would be the timing of project implementation. By sending it back to the TLG this may prohibit work being done in the field this year.

Chairman Krulitz asked if proponents of Plan B had specific projects lined up to implement this year. Frank Frutchy responded that if the Board acted today to press forward to get work on the ground this year, that between now and June 1 the TLG could come to agreement on specific project sites and designs so permitting and other work could be completed in time for a late fall construction (between October 1 and late November).

Commissioner McCurdy echoed Commissioner Allred's thoughts on conducting one large project but indicated there didn't seem to be enough information available at this point. He indicated the State of Washington desired to get the banks cleaned up but the TLG had not yet hashed out the Alternative B proposal. He indicated the Board was indicating a desire to get work accomplished not just more studies.

**A vote was taken and the motion passed with all in favor except Commissioner Iani who abstained in the vote.**

### **Five-Year Work Plan**

Sheila Eckman provided a brief update on the schedule for development of a proposed five-year work plan for the Board's consideration. She indicated that the TLG would be developing sideboards for the plan based on the planned actions in the ROD and where the biggest bang for the dollar may be achieved in the next five years. A plan for Board consideration is expected at the August meeting.

### **Final Board Comments**

Chairman Krulitz sought input from the board on selection of a vice chair and/or secretary treasurer. As there were no volunteers she suggested the board take this up at their next meeting.

The next meeting is tentatively schedule to be held in Kellogg on May 28 beginning at 10:00 AM.

### **Public Comment**

Noel Logar suggested the board take a hard look at in-situ yard stabilization to reduce lead bioavailability as well as to reduce costs.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at approximately 4:10 PM