



**Minutes**  
Water Quality Advisory Council  
January 10, 2017  
Missoula City-County Health Department  
301 West Alder 7:00 p.m.

**Present:**

- |                               |                         |                       |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Kelly Willett – WQAC          | Brett Rosenberg - WQAC  | Vicki Watson – UM     |
| Ron Russell - WQAC            | Travis Ross – WQD Staff | Ian Magruder – WQAC   |
| Michelle Hutchins – WQD Staff | Rachel Corley – WQAC    | Becca Paquette – WQAC |
| Bruce Sims - WQAC             | Andrea Stanley – WQAC   | Peter Nielsen – WQD   |
| Chris Brick – WQAC            | Patrick Doyle – UM      | Lucretia Olson - WQAC |
| Jen Harrington – WQAC         | Graduate Student        |                       |

**Introductions**

There are several new appointments to the council. It would be beneficial at an upcoming meeting to go over the council charge and history of issues that have been addressed by the Water Quality Advisory Council. Council members introduced themselves and discussed their professional background and history with the council.

**Missoula Water Quality Ordinance Revision – Travis Ross**

Missoula Municipal Code 13.26 addresses practices that pose risk to the Missoula Aquifer and measures to protect the aquifer. Provisions of this ordinance are enforced by the Missoula Valley Water Quality District. There are several aspects of the ordinance including: deicing materials and practices, fueling facility regulations, reporting of releases, soil and groundwater contamination. One aspect addresses requirements for Bulk Petroleum Storage Facilities. Those facilities are defined as those which store more than 50,000 gallons of petroleum products for marketing and wholesale distribution. The intent of that section is to establish safe management practices at these facilities. When this section of the ordinance was originally drafted in 1993 there had been a fairly recent history of releases at the bulk petroleum terminal at the end of the Yellowstone pipeline. Releases primarily centered around the manifold piping and the truck loading rack. The ordinance addressed these practices and additionally prescribed an inspection schedule for the bulk tanks. These were based on discussions with terminal management and industry standards in effect at the time (American Petroleum Institute (API) 653 is the primary guidance document). This guidance has evolved since then and tank inspections can be extended with certain protections in place (double-bottom and low corrosion rates). The 2<sup>nd</sup> edition of API 653 was in effect at the time and required a 10 year internal tank inspection if corrosion rates were unknown and a 20 year subsequent inspection interval maximum. The ordinance was written to require a 10 year inspection interval, subject to administrative waiver which could extend interval between testing. Since the time the ordinance was adopted, Phillips 66 has added a double-bottom to all of the tanks and has a complete corrosion record for the tanks. API 653 has also undergone 3 revisions and is in its 5<sup>th</sup> edition. This guidance is referenced by EPA in its Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures (SPCC) rules and inspection guidance documents.

40 CFR 112.8 (C)6 states:

*Test or inspect each aboveground container for integrity on a regular schedule and whenever you make material repairs. You must determine, in accordance with **industry standards**, the appropriate qualifications for personnel performing tests and inspections, the frequency and type of testing and inspections, which take into account container size, configuration, and design (such as containers that are: shop-built, field-erected, skid-mounted, elevated, equipped with a liner, double-*

walled, or partially buried). Examples of these integrity tests include, but are not limited to: visual inspection, hydrostatic testing, radiographic testing, ultrasonic testing, acoustic emissions testing, or other systems of non-destructive testing. You must keep comparison records and you must also inspect the container's supports and foundations. In addition, you must frequently inspect the outside of the container for signs of deterioration, discharges, or accumulation of oil inside diked areas. Records of inspections and tests kept under usual and customary business practices satisfy the recordkeeping requirements of this paragraph.

The District is considering a request to revise the ordinance to reference API 653 for internal inspection frequency with a maximum of 20 year. The District is also considering developing a subcategory of bulk petroleum storage facilities that are above 50K gallons but less than the storage volume of the two terminal facilities.

There are a number of smaller revisions the District may wish to propose at the same time as this. In the meantime, the District is able to administratively extend the internal inspection interval.

### **Montana Rail Link fuel spill – Michelle Hutchins**

Approximately 7,000 gallons of diesel fuel was released on December 12 around 5:30 am. Notification to local responders occurred several hours later. The release occurred due to a coupling failure in a pump house serving MRL's fuel dispensers. Initial actions were to remove product using a vacuum truck. Within a couple of day MRL began excavating contaminated soil. The deepest portion of the excavation was around 28 feet below ground surface. Most of the area was excavated to 10-12 feet deep. Contractors extended the width of excavation based on field screening. At the time of the meeting, Lab results were not back determining if contaminated soil remained (since the advisory council meeting, confirmation samples have shown that some contamination is still in place).

The release occurred on a state superfund site which was listed due to historic fuel spills while Burlington Northern operated the site (MRL purchased in 1987). Prior to the spill, monitoring wells in the vicinity had a petroleum sheen on top. Because of this, they had not recently been sampled in recent groundwater sampling events attributed to the superfund investigation. Contractors did conduct a vapor intrusion study based on the historic releases. They did not find anything that could be reliably tied to the site. There were detectable levels but it was not above background.

The risk assessment of the existing state superfund site was just completed. A revised draft of the feasibility study was submitted to the department today. As an interim measure, contractors are bioventing the contaminated soil and groundwater as well as removing product in groundwater by using petroleum absorbent socks placed in wells. There's also contamination of surface soils with polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) around the roundhouse that extend into the residential area surface soils.

MRL has replaced the couplings at the pump house and will replace others. MRL will receive a Notice of Violation from the District due to the delay in notifying local emergency response agencies. We requested that the monitoring wells around the spill be sampled. It probably makes sense to do this again. From the District's perspective it seemed that their response to removal was aggressive and that they recovered most of the contamination.

### **Smurfit Stone – Peter Nielsen**

After last meeting, council submitted comments about deep aquifer sampling. There was a teleconference today (1/10/17) with the EPA. These will be held quarterly. They are open to the public – Jan 10, April 11, July 11, Oct 10. EPA and DEQ will meet with PRPs tomorrow and discuss revisions to work plan (deep groundwater monitoring

and pcb investigation) with them. EPA will respond by the end of January to the comments from the advisory council. They will also have a revised work plan by the end of Feb. They talked about the PCBs found on operable unit 2 (Industrial Area). The agencies (EPA and DEQ) sent comments to the PRPs (significant comment) regarding the remedial investigation. Peter requested a copy of those comments as well as the work plan. Sarah felt they could soon determine the extent of the plume (pcb). It could possibly be removed in 2017 as part of a time-critical removal.

There will be a formal comment period when critical decisions are made. The superfund public process laws still apply even though there is not a formal listing.

They are discussion sampling macroinvertebrates, fish and river sediment (for pcb and dioxin). *There was not formal announcement.* There will be a stability analysis of gravel berms by the end of 2017.

Draft Human Health Risk Assessment will be out for review (in Operable Unit 1 – ag lands) in February.

A LIDAR survey was not conducted but they did fly an aerial survey. David Tooke stated that a report with aerial topography would be available in a month. FEMA is willing to discuss changing to the floodplain boundary.

Jon Harvala has reviewed some of the data tables. There is a monitoring well by the dumps that show pcbs in groundwater. They had a qualified detection in 2014 and again in 2016. Drilling logs had additional notes about oily sheen. PCB's tend to attach to soil so it is significant to find a detection of PCB's in groundwater.

Applicable Relevant or Appropriate Requirement (ARAR): In reference to closure of landfills and sludgeponds, EPA should collect the data needed to close appropriately close them.

Natural Resource Damage Program is engaged and considering pursuing the site under a Natural Resource Damage Claim

Still waiting on the judge to rule on the discharge permit.

## **Announcements:**

April 17-18 – Developing Watershed Restoration Plans @ UM

April 19-20 – Clark Fork Basin Council birth

May 21-26 – American Fisheries Society –

Clark Fork Restoration Symposium including contributed paper

August 22-26 International Symposium on Water Quality

No Public Comment

Next Meeting: Review charge, bi-laws, etc for new members