

BEIPC/Citizen Coordinating Council (CCC) Meeting

Summary Notes

January 18, 2017, 3:30 – 6:00 p.m.

Best Western CDA Inn, 506 Appleway Ave., Coeur d'Alene, Idaho

Jerry Boyd, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Introductions of Attendees:

The following signed in attendee introduced themselves:

Jerry Boyd (**Citizen**/CCC Chair), Glory Carlile (BEIPC, note taker), Julie Dalsaso (**Citizen**), Bonnie Douglas (**Citizen**), David Fortier (**Citizen**), Forest Greenfield (Shoshone Co. Public Works), Andrea Lindsay (EPA), Caj Matheson (Restoration Partnership), Kim Matheson (Citizen/CDA Tribe), Ed Moreen (EPA), Matt Nykiel (Idaho Conservation League), Bruce Schuld (IDEQ), Marlene Sproul (**Citizen**/CDA Tribe), Rebecca Stevens (CDA Tribe), Ron Streeter (Mine Ventures), Sandy Trecanni (WA Ecology), Valerie Wade (PHD), Terry Harwood (BEIPC E.D.), Jim Roletto (Shoshone Co.) Cecil Urlich (AECOM), Kajsa Van de Riet (IDEQ).

Citizen Discussion of Issues and Concerns

Jerry Boyd gave some background of the CCC and the purpose of the CCC as part of the BEIPC is to facilitate the flow of information to and from the Basin Commissioners. He would like to hear from both agency reps and citizens noting that the CCC wants to hear what people are interested in.

David Fortier (Citizen) responded with ideas on how the organization can provide input and the direction that the CCC might go in. Boyd replied that some people do not believe that these meetings do not have any impact but they do.

He added that EPA responded in 2007 as there was a lot interest and concerns expressed regarding repositories. As a result, changes were made.

Julie Dalsaso (Citizen) shared that she had contacted Wendy Lowe (Participation Co.) and feels that we must get back to some of the core values. Feedback to Basin Commissioners is desired.

(On 11/23/16, The Participation Co. Final Situation Assessment was distributed by BEIPC to the public; CCC contact, agency representatives and other interested parties for their information, review and feedback. The document is a copy of observations and recommendations from a situation assessment prepared by Wendy Green Lowe under a contracted report to the EPA. The report focused on the BEIPC process as it pertains to citizen awareness of and involvement in CDA Basin cleanup decisions. With his e-mail of the documents, Terry Harwood requested that if you are interested, please review Wendy's observations and recommendations and contact Jerry Boyd, Chairman of the Citizen's Coordinating Council at jkbspokane@comcast.net or terry.harwood@deg.idaho.gov with your input. He also announced that Boyd planned to have a discussion at the next CCC meeting in January to develop some CCC recommendations on the subject of citizen's involvement in BEIPC issues.)

Review of the Situation Assessment Report by Wendy Lowe:

Facilitator: Andrea Lindsay, EPA Seattle, Community Involvement Coordinator.

Lindsay gave a brief background of the assessment process as follows: Lowe reviewed CCC meeting documents and interviewed about 35 people with people who had some connection to the BEIPC and CCC. Purpose of the assessment is to inform the Basin Commissioners. Lindsay will give a summary report of the results of this meeting to Terry Harwood (BEIPC E.D.) to present at the February BEIPC meeting. She added that the work that is done at this meeting will be used to inform the Basin Commissioners of observations and recommendations to consider.

She led an exercise that included meeting attendee participants using dots that will signify interest or not in the 4 items she has pulled out of the report. Blue dots = recommendations that you support and orange dots = recommendation you do not support or disagree with. After the exercise, Lindsay created a flip chart to show where the dots were applied.

Bruce Schuld (IDEQ, Project Manager) stated for the record that as an agency representative he was not interested in participating. He pointed out that he did not want any of the citizens to think that the agencies are trying to take over control. Lindsay responded that Harwood said that anyone can participate that is interested.

She reviewed the results to determine what points should be talked about. BEIPC should report back to folks regarding

(Lindsay's summary report is included after these meeting summary notes.)

Comments/Questions

Lindsay opened the discussion by asking what you want the Basin Commission to know about the item that the Basin Commission should report back to folks and the information to provide.

Fortier asked Harwood how he reports to the Basin Commission. Harwood responded, he hardly ever has personal contact with the Basin Commissioners but gets back to the agencies. Fortier wondered if the Basin Commissioners themselves and/or as a group are responding to issues.

Boyd explained that the Basin Commissioners receive the CCC summary notes of the meetings in their packets before the BEIPC meetings and are reported on at the meetings. Also when agencies make presentations the citizens are encouraged to ask questions and make comments and they do and then the presenters take the information back to their agencies. The Commissioners generally do not ask for anything.

Caj Matheson (Restoration Partnership) said that he hears several ways to make communication but he wonders what the appropriate channel is for getting a response from the Basin Commission. He wonders how to make sure the Commissioners have heard of the issue. Boyd responded that when someone contacts him he forwards the question to Harwood and then Harwood either answers or contacts someone who will give him the information.

Forest Greenfield (Shoshone Co. Public Works) said that he feels that the person should be reported in the notes as someone that provided certain input and the kind of input and how it was directed. It is not always a question, but important input. Harwood agreed and said he will begin reporting on that at meetings.

Items 3 and 4 could potentially go together if the loop was closed for reporting and providing input. Harwood noted that there are various levels of communication and Schuld agreed that there are ways of tracking.

Valerie Wade (PHD) is concerned that no one is reporting on what is being addressed so others do not know what has been done because it is not recorded.

Matt Nykiel (Idaho Conservation League) asked how the comments are brought up at CCC meeting.

In regards to how the Basin Commission asks for input, Boyd responded by stating that he always asks for comments or concerns at every meeting but suggested that if there is a general concern or a specific issue, it would be very helpful to know in advance and then it could be on the agenda for discussion.

Someone suggested more links be posted on various agency websites.

Dalsaso commented that she remembers that the East Mission Flats repository also brought up issues and Rebecca Stevens (CDA Tribe) also shared that the Tribe was very much involved and there was a lot of input on that project.

Nykiel also brought up if the CCC meetings still are needed every quarter or should be just as needed and spaced out stating that it is a matter of being effective. Harwood noted that it is in the MOA to have quarterly meetings and that they use the August tour of projects as one of the meetings CCC members are invited to.

Dalsaso commented about the idea of adaptive management in Lowe's report and she feels that the MOA asks for certain things and perhaps should be changed.

Bonnie Douglas (Citizen) asked about other groups and how they are involved. Harwood shared that the Accomplishments report of activities in the Annual Report provides a lot of information.

Schuld added that CIC's and Program Managers routinely meet with many of the local groups that also have their own values and issues. They generally categorize the issues and then it goes to TH and he documents it in reports and goes to Senior Management.

Douglas said there should be a way to get the input for decision making but wondered what the real representative input is. It seems that there is a gap with only having the reporting once a year in the accomplishment report. She wonders where there is real true public input for decision making.

Schuld added that he suggests that the CIC and agencies ask people to come to the CCC meetings to have discussions and express their values.

Other issues that were highlighted:

Harwood said the issue #1 was brought up at the last BEIPC meeting and it was confirmed that it was a coordination role.

Douglas commented that she liked that previous notes taken by Ross & Associates years ago had a table with bullet points at the end of the narrative and she would like to see that again because it is easier to go down the list of comments.

Matheson noted that the Basin Commission is not a decision making but a coordination type entity. However, we want to be able to provide input and know what happened to the input.

Boyd commented that at least the agencies respond to a lot of the questions and comments at the meetings.

Matheson suggested finding a way to let the other citizens know what has been done.

Marlene Sproul (CDA Tribe) commented that the Restoration Partnership has a comment period that has been extended. Besides the original framework she sees that they have other projects that have already been implemented but they are not on the website.

Fortier said that there is kind of a disconnect with how much the Commissioners themselves are hearing or reading. He does not see them sitting down and discussion things together and then give us some feedback. He suggests that they have a workshop to address this. He believes that the Commissioners are not talking with each other but Harwood said that there is some communication with some of them.

Nykiel brought up the interesting idea of holding a CCC meeting at a BEIPC meeting lunch time. Harwood explained that it is only an hour and staff and CCC Chair eat lunch together.

Harwood announced that anyone with any more comments and questions contact him and/or Boyd. Boyd gave his e-mail address: jkbspokane@comcast.net

Restoration Partnership

Caj Matheson (Restoration Partnership/CDA Tribe) announced that the drafts public comment period was extended to February 13, 2017.

He provided a brief background of Coeur d'Alene Basin Draft Restoration Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement - Jan 2017: 2 parts of CERCLA, Remediation (cleanup) EPA and Natural Trustees Restoration.

Restoration plan is required to spend the settlement funding and they have a 2007 Interim Restoration Plan with ongoing implementation of projects that were identified in that plan and using the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. Public Scoping was done in 2003.

Plan is programmatic and identifies priorities but is not specific in identifying projects. Focus is on what they could do and identifies geographic priorities and focuses on the approach and values and emphasizes cultural and human uses with natural resources as the priority.

(The Restoration Partnership (Natural Resource Trustees) e-mail message of a Notice of Availability of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was distributed to CCC contacts and other interested parties by BEIPC on 11/23/16.)

Kajsa Van de Riet (IDEQ) presented the Draft Restoration Plan and the EIS noting that there are two different approaches to restoration

Planning Area: 3 Alternatives: One is a no action alternate. Alternate #2 includes human use component. Alternate #3 does not include human use component.

Goals and major actions is also something to implement with other agencies as partners. Trustees make the decisions for selection.

Focus is on habitat. Wetlands use water fowl to help guide the type of restoration action such as contaminated areas that would be good restoration efforts. Streams have geographic priorities guided by needs of native trout such as bull trout and cutthroat.

Lakes: CDA Lake is top priority and some of the Chain Lakes guided by the needs of waterfowl and trout.

Human Uses are geographic priorities guided by public input but has limited funding amount because of the focus on habitat.

Matheson provided the information for the Public Comment period so people can submit comments on their website. To view the DEIS document or to download the plan and the online form go to www.restorationpartnership.org/RPDEIS Comments can also be e-mailed by the public comment period ending date of February 13, 2017 to comments@restorationpartnerships.org. He added that he will send the information to Glory Carlile to provide the link also to the CCC contact list. He also asked the agency folks to spread the word to solicit comments. Van d Riet confirmed that all the contact information is on the Restoration Partnership website.

Next Steps:

After receiving comments they will respond. Finalize plans and EIS, issue it and adopt a Record of Decision as each agency has to formalize an adoption of the EIS plan, and then begin restoration. The timeline will depend on comments and process.

Schuld said he was asked if there will be another round about public outreach for soliciting project proposals but Matheson said that has not been determined yet. Through the Strategic Planning process and at the point of project selection there may be specific public outreach.

Dalsaso asked if the aquifer was in the lakes, streams etc.; part, but Van de Riet said no because it is not considered an injured resource. She also wondered if human development would be considered. She relied that there may be a consideration for any aspect of the priority project if it was impacted and determined to be a factor.

Boyd asked if the focus is on injured resources and it was confirmed by Matheson that it is.

Moreen asked about the programmatic process. If you go select an action does it trigger another process and Matheson replied that it may case by case.

Rebecca Stevens (CDA Tribe) added to Schudls' question that there is a section in the back on project selection criteria. She shared that the reason why it is programmatic in nature is to try to streamline the projects and try to prevent bureaucratic processes.

Harwood announced that the 2016 accomplishments report will be presented at the BEIPC meeting on February 15, 2017.

Meeting adjourned at 8:05