

Minutes

Technical Leadership Group (TLG)

June 21, 2005 (Revised 7/21/05)

Spokesman Review Building, Main Floor Conference Room
608 Northwest Boulevard, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho

Call to Order and Introductions: The TLG Chair, Mr. Phillip Cernera called the meeting to order. He suggested moving the five-year plan discussion to the beginning of the agenda as one of the presenters for the CWA project updates would not be available until later in the morning. Then introductions were made by everyone.

Other Discussion: Mr. Cernera announced that he would like to tentatively schedule the next BIF (Basin Information Forum) for September 13 or 14. He has asked Mr. Paul Woods (USGS) to give a presentation at the BIF on the lake response model. The next Basin Commission meeting will be on Wednesday, August 10 in the Barbieri Moot Court Room at the Gonzaga University Law School, 721 N. Cincinnati St., Spokane, Washington.

Five Year Work Plan Schedule: The BEIPC Executive Director, Terry Harwood mentioned that the five-year work plan will be voted upon by the Commissioners at the August 10 meeting. The one-year work plan for 2006 will be approved at the Basin Commission meeting on November 9 which will bring the BEIPC current on work plan scheduling.

Mr. Cernera asked the TLG members to send their comments on the five-year work plan to him as soon as possible. The deadline for TLG comments is July 13.

Mr. John Snider would like to tentatively schedule the next CCC meeting on July 13 in order for Mr. Cernera to present the draft five-year work plan. Comments should be sent to Mr. Tom Beierle (Ross & Associates). The deadline for CCC comments is July 15.

On July 20, Mr. Cernera, Mr. Harwood, and Mr. Snider will meet to discuss and incorporate the CCC's comments into the five-year work plan. The TLG will have an opportunity for final comment during the TLG conference call on July 21. The final draft of the recommended plan is due to Harwood by July 22 for inclusion in the board packets.

CWA Project Updates: Mr. Cernera announced that discussion for the five-year work plan would be continued after lunch in order to proceed with the CWA project presentations.

Lake Response Model: Mr. Paul Woods, (USGS) presented an overview of the sampling being conducted on Coeur d'Alene Lake for the lake response study. The water quality data will be calibrated into the model and will also be posted to the web. Mr. Woods passed out a handout to show samples of the first year data. The 2004 water year parameters are October 1, 2003 to September 30, 2004. He mentioned that he will compile all of the information for the BIF presentation.

Lake Ecological Monitoring Project (LEMP): Mr. Brian Spears (USFWS) gave a presentation on the LEMP which consists of two components. The first component of the study involved waterfowl (mostly mallards). Sampling was conducted at 24 locations which measured the blood lead levels and sedimentation ingestion rates of the waterfowl. The results indicated that lead and sediment levels were high at Blackwell Island, Harrison, and Cottonwood Bay. The mallard blood levels were highest at the Harrison slough and Blackwell Island. Mr. Spears then reported on the second part of the LEMP involving fish studies for the evaluation of metal exposure.

Break

Mica Creek: Mr. Tom Bourque of Terragraphics gave an update on the feasibility study for the Mica Bay Nutrient Reduction project. The objectives of the project are: 1) sediment reduction; 2) wetland enhancement; and 3) water quality improvement. Because there may not be enough available land for the wetland treatment, adjacent property owners will be contacted about allowing easements or selling additional land. Several different options are being researched to determine if the project can achieve the desired results. However, Mr. Bourque reported that Terragraphics does not wish to spend all of the funding on the feasibility study if the project is not practical. Upon discussion, it was determined to proceed with the study to see if the project was viable or if an alternative could be developed to achieve the objectives.

Meyer Creek: Mr. Bourque made a presentation on the Meyer Creek project. The project seeks to protect public health and property values by preventing recontamination of residential yards in Osburn that have been previously remediated. He has been working with the city to assess the lessons learned from the flooding of Milo Creek in 1997. Mr. Harwood suggested that Mr. Bourque make a presentation at the next Basin Commission meeting. He also recommended that the City of Osburn needs to look into funding sources in order to implement the proposed remedies.

Pinehurst Flood Impact Study: Mr. Bourque mentioned that the work plans for this study are on the web, but it has not started yet. The project will: 1) provide riparian, stream, and wetland improvement; 2) help to control and mitigate water pollution; and 3) protect property from recontamination and flood impacts.

Mullan Inflow/Infiltration Project: Mr. Bill Adams reported that the deliverables report for the project is available. He would like to get comments back as soon as possible in order to issue the final report.

Lunch

Five-Year Work Plan Discussion: Mr. Harwood reviewed the changes he made to the BEIPC's draft five-year work plan. He also indicated that he incorporated the deadlines and targets of the various remediation projects from the EPA's Bunker Hill five-year review report into the BEIPC's five-year plan so that the dates would correspond. This includes property sampling which will be substantially complete by 2009. In addition, Mr. Harwood added a section for drinking water sources for 2009 and modified both the scope and objectives for the recreational areas to fit within the ROD. For the Phase II component of the overall OU2 remedy,

he added language that implementation of future work may require an amendment in the ROD between the State and the EPA.

Mr. Rusty Shepherd inquired about the proper time to present a minority report. Mr. Cernera replied that a minority report needs to be presented to the TLG first, then to the Executive Director at least two weeks before the Basin Commission meeting. Mr. Harwood replied that he will try to accommodate a minority position into the plan if presented, but that it will need to be presented at the BEIPC meeting as a minority report if it is after the board packets have been sent out.

Mr. Ron Roizen mentioned that in the Five-Year Bunker Hill Review report, there is a reference to a soil and blood lead study for OU3 that he was not aware of.

Other discussion focused on what issues may develop that will need to be included in the five-year work plan for the Basin Commission when the results of the NAS report and the final Bunker Hill Five-Year Review report are published. Mr. Adams suggested that those issues could be addressed in the next five-year work plan. Ms. Jeri DeLange indicated that in the minutes of the last BEIPC meeting on May 11, that Mr. Cernera pointed out the TLG could outline the recommendations generically in the sections that apply and update the sections later to provide the board with a plan for approval in August. Mr. Cernera responded that there would be a placeholder in the five-year work plan for forthcoming data.

Mr. Rusty Shepherd brought up the issue of active vs. passive treatment for Canyon Creek and how funding would be provided for active treatment options. He inquired what the State's position was on this issue. Mr. Adams answered that other options are being reviewed, but his understanding is that the State preferred a passive system. He reported that the current pilot study at the Success mine is a passive system using the Apatite process. The process is successful at removing the metals from the water, but the system has experienced problems in the past by becoming plugged. Mr. Neal Yancy of the INL is working on enhancing the system by installing plastic rings in the Apatite so that the water is able to flow through freely.

Another topic of discussion included the partial deletion of the Spokane River from the mouth of the lake to the state line. Mr. John Snider mentioned that he would like to see a write-up regarding the requirements for partial delisting. Mr. Adams replied that he will provide the information.

Water, Mine & Mill Sites: Mr. Adams presented project updates for the Golconda, Sisters, Rex, and Constitution sites. Then he gave a brief overview of the Arcadis proposal and other water treatment studies.

Biological Environmental Monitoring Plan (BEMP): Mr. Brian Spears mentioned that Ms. Anne Dailey (EPA) asked him to present the surface water monitoring information in her absence. Handouts were passed to the TLG for their review. Mr. Woods discussed the water quality data for Pinehurst, Enaville, Harrison, and Post Falls from 1991-2004 including the total discharge loads for lead and zinc (both total and dissolved). The data showed higher levels of lead passing through Pinehurst and Harrison. Most of the lead is associated with sedimentation, while most of the zinc is dissolved. Because of this, zinc levels will not influence the lake too

much except in a flooding event. Mr. Woods reported that all of the information will be summarized in a report which will be available on both the Basin Commission and EPA's (CDA) websites.

Avista Recreation Survey: Mr. Speed Fitzhugh (Avista) made a presentation on the Recreation Facility Inventory and User Surveys Report for the Spokane River project. The survey was prepared for use in Avista's dam relicensing process. It consists of three components: 1) on-site access interviews; 2) shoreline homeowners; and 3) visitors. Avista updates the visitor's section in the survey every six years to determine trends over time.

Recreational Management Roundtable: Mr. Cernera introduced Mr. David White (Idaho Parks & Recreation), Mr. Mike Stevenson (BLM), and Mr. Dean Chapman (CDA Tribe) to discuss issues dealing with recreational management.

Ms. Rebecca Stevens (Kootenai Shoshone Soil Conservation District) thanked Mr. White and Mr. Fitzhugh for their assistance with the lake map project.

Mr. Harwood mentioned that the recreational PFT will review what Avista has done in the recreation survey. He believes the information will be useful for future planning and development of recreational sites in the Lower Basin.

Mr. Hardy expressed his concerns about development of recreational areas and that some areas should be managed for fishing and hunting only. He agrees that contaminated recreational sites should be remediated, but not expanded. Mr. Roizen inquired if the recreational agenda was a legitimate concern. Mr. Cernera replied that it is not mandated. Ms. Toni Hardy commented that there is no disclosure along the river and that some recreational sites should not be allowed.

Mr. Harwood stated that he would like to develop a comprehensive approach to keep the public away from contaminated recreational sites and that the ROD directs cleanup of these areas. He would also be willing to work with different groups to try and find funding to develop substitute areas for recreational use.

Break

Bunker Hill Five-Year Review Report: Mr. Adams reported that the deadline for public comment on the report is June 30. He mentioned that there was low turnout at the open houses, but that it was important to get feedback and analysis now. The final report will determine the priorities for the next five years.

BEIPC Five-Year Work Plan: Mr. Cernera reiterated that it is important to continue to bring up issues and concerns in order to prepare the TLG's recommendations for the BEIPC's five-year work plan. Mr. Harwood added that comments should try to be specific in what the Basin Commission should be involved in and what direction to go.

Finally, Mr. Harwood asked to discuss one more issue; the role of the Executive Director in the TLG process. His main concern was how best to work with the TLG and yet represent the interests of the Basin Commissioners as a group. He indicated that when he was hired some

commissioners noted that the TLG process was not working very well and he was still unsure of BEIPC desires and the perception of his role and involvement. He then opened this discussion up for TLG input. Some comments presented included: 1) the Executive Director role is important, but should be more at a policy level rather than one of micro-managing TLG activities; 2) the Executive Director must realize that none of the TLG are his staff and although his input is desired it cannot be viewed as the final say; 3) the Executive Director could spend more time advancing the funding PFT and brokering policy level disagreements; and 4) the Chair of the TLG suggested that the TLG is not broken and the Executive Director should spend some time dispelling this perception.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.