



Missoula City-County Health Department

WATER QUALITY ADVISORY COUNCIL

301 West Alder Street | Missoula MT 59802-4123

www.missoulacounty.us/wqac

Phone | 406.258.4890

Fax | 406.258.4781

**WATER QUALITY ADVISORY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 11, 2018 at 7:00 pm
Health Board Conference Room #210 (Second Floor)
Missoula City-County Health Department—301 West Alder**

Present: Andrea Stanley, **Todd Seib**, **Travis Ross**, Bruce Sims, Ian Magruder, Ken Crisp, Mary Price, Kali Becker, John DeArment, Kelley Willett, Jen Harrington, Cat Wiechmann

Notetaker: Todd Seib

Agenda Items

- 1. Review Action Items from last meeting**
- 2. Smurfit Stone Berm Stability Study**
- 3. Outstanding question discussion – Smurfit Stone**
- 4. Household Hazardous Waste Collection – Annual Event and Facility Plans**
- 5. Upcoming Agenda Items discussion**
- 6. Public comment on items not included on this agenda**
- 7. Adjourn**

Meeting Notes

- 1. Review Action Items from last meeting – Ian:** Ian will convey our support to Shannon in support of language change to Reg 1 on chemical toilets at parks, Ian met with the U of M Geography Dept and David Shively has a student named Adam Potts willing to take on the map.
- 2. Berm stability report discussion – Ian:** This was the main topic of the CAG meeting last week and Bruce summarized what was discussed (and he has a document that describes his main concerns): The report was not a good assessment since it used FEMA floodplain elevations that were generated from the 1970s. A more accurate assessment should be done by incorporating more current data. Also the report didn't update channel profiles, didn't model the channel, didn't assess river migration, didn't address internal berm stability, and focused on overtopping as primary analysis (as opposed to hydraulic erosion and other potential threats to berm stability). RDG hired by the WQD and listed things wrong with berm and expressed the fact that overtopping wasn't a high risk yet that's what the PRP consultant studied. Mary echoed this and commented on concern that they didn't use the most recent flood data, they used 1973

study and there exists 40 years of more data that wasn't considered. Travis brought up how the floodplain in relation to the dumps is important yet the LIDAR deviation was +/- 0.8 ft. Ian also thought overall the report was a weak attempt at answering the stability question but does think it was transparent in terms of problems with berms. He thinks we could be wasting our time recommending better studies since even with the flawed study results they're likely to spend money cleaning up the site instead of studying the berm more. Travis feels it's a good tactic to make them spend money and show them the deficiencies in their work. We should continue to point out that they're not identifying real risk of the sight with their studies. Group agrees that even with a sub-par study it is clear its best to clean up instead of continuing to study the berms. WQAC will write letter to this effect and incorporate Bruce's and RDG's highlighted deficiencies. Letter due Friday Sept 14th (**Action Item**)

Larry Deers (EPA's consultant) presented at the CAG and had shown inaccuracies on the map and said the mill site was healthy compared to Missoula. Brian Sanchez said there were some issues with fish sampling (not sure specifically what these were, FWP did the fish study). Bruce expressed concern that due to high water volume, fish movement, etc. that the fish study results will not be able to parse out the mill as a cause of any bioaccumulation and inevitably lead to a decision for no action. This generated some commenting by the group and Jen sought clarity on whether the feasibility study will be dependent on the contamination found? Group wonders if the HHRA and BERA don't show risk they won't do big feasibility study to then guide clean up. (Keith Large I thought did say the opposite, that the fs would address more of what is there once clean up is decided upon). Sara and Keith assured that real testing will occur during FS. Bigger worry is that they're not going to actually do it. Larry made it sounded like they won't.

More data should be coming soon in regards to dace fish, water testing, etc.

Ken, wondered about what's going to happen this next spring. Contingency plan should be complete by late fall (did temporary one this past spring). Mary not convinced there is a real plan since they've said there's no contamination so why protect the berm. We don't want a plan anyway if it just encourages more berming, we want it removed and site restored.

Conversation migrated to overall idea of how to clean up the site. PCBs, transformers, metals during flood, contamination from aquifer or soil, when will wells flush clean, high groundwater could continue to relocate contaminants, etc. Travis mentioned that the NRD might help us pay to do a channel migration study. The groundwater report should be out the first week of October.

- 3. Outstanding questions for EPA– Ian:** We basically covered this in our discussion of last agenda item. Group thought we could ask EPA to come talk about groundwater since they will be taking comments. Ian is compiling some ideas for questions (**Action Item**), including will RA results drive cleanup/FS? What are water quality trends in groundwater, some way to see all the contaminated samples onsite, did they take composite sampling in capped ponds below the cap depth?

4. **Household Haz Waste Days update - Travis:** We could still use volunteers, a facility is still in the works. Event is Sept 21, (9a-5:30p), and Sept 22, (9a-4p). Email Travis if interested. The facility update is that the city wanted us try asking Republic again. Republic said no again but is willing to broker a lease on Roseberg property where they're storing dumpsters off Coal Mine road. It's a great offer and location but one challenge is it will be 1100 ft to reach water main. Kali wonders how the North Reserve plan (on other side of Coal Mine Rd) might affect it?
5. **Upcoming Agenda Items:** Maybe do a landfill contamination review (Republic) on agenda. EPA/DEQ meeting. Jacobs Island sign (specifically how can rank them, and get content created for the right side in an efficient way. If geosci student will work on the left side where the map will be. The SKC tribe has content and size proportions for the other side (sign is a two panel design). Andrea and Ian will work with geosci student and Jen will get more info on the content from the Tribes. The WQD volunteered to come up with a template for the right side content if needed (**Action items**).
6. No public comments
7. Adjourned.

Action Items:

1. Ian will draft letter to EPA in response to the berm study and send it out to the group to submit by Friday.
2. Ian will start taking questions for our EPA meeting
3. Ian and Andrea will work with geosci student on map
4. Jen will find out more about Jacobs island content from Tribes.