May 17, 2005 – 3:00 P.M.

Summary of the Great Salt Lake Water Quality Steering Committee Meeting
DEQ Building #2, 168 N. 1950 W., Room 201, SLC, UT

Walt Baker, Chair opened the meeting.
Roll call was taken for steering committee members and alternates.
Stakeholder and visitor introductions were given.

Steering Committee Members and Alternates in Attendance:

Lynn deFreitas
Bruce Waddell
Henry Maddux
David Naftz
Edwin Blaney
Karl Kappe
Kent Sorenson (alternate for Clay Perschon)
Don Leonard
Kelly Payne
Leland Myers
Robert Adler
Richard Bay
Maunsel Pearce
Walter Baker

New Business

Bill Moellmer reported on the status of the laboratory analysis round robin for selenium (Se) in the highly saline water of the Great Salt Lake (GSL). Walt Baker asked about the usual time frame for analytical laboratories to respond. Bill replied that it is usually one week. Leland Meyers asked if there is a drop-dead date for completing the laboratory round robin. Bill was hopeful that a response would be received by July 1st with the exception of USGS, which will take longer.

Bill Moellmer talked about the Statement of Interest (SOI) for the Great Salt Lake qualitative conceptual model contract (see attached Microsoft word document "Statement of Interest for Conceptual Model.doc"), and presented a list of the potential contractors, including Dr. William Johnson at the University of Utah. This generated a discussion about advertising the SOI, and the timing for the contractor to respond. Bill commented that since this is an SOI and the amount of the contract is less than $50,000, it is not necessary to go through a full bidding process. Dr. Johnson commented that 10 days is a reasonable time to produce an SOI, and Jeff DenBleyker (CH2MHILL) said that 10 days is a sufficient time to respond. Walt Baker expressed some concern about the 10-day response time for the SOI, and recommended that the respondents be given 30 days.

Maunsel Pearce expressed the concern that doing an SOI and not an RFP (Request for Proposals) could potentially exclude some contractors. Walt commented that changing the process from an SOI to RFP might add time to the process and we might still not get a better product. Bruce Waddell was concerned that we may end up hiring an engineering firm that does not know much about selenium. Leland Myers observed that the Science Panel is only asking for a facilitator with the SOI, and if the Panel is not satisfied with the contractor, they will go to somebody else.

Robert Adler commented that it seems to be a disconnect between the SOI document and what the Science Panel is trying to accomplish with the facilitator. It seems from the discussion of the Steering Committee that the Science Panel would like a facilitator/contractor to get information from the Panel and compile it in a conceptual model. He suggested that the SOI should show it more clearly.

Dave Naftz asked if the entire Science Panel would receive a copy of the SOI packet with all of the contractor responses. Bill Moellmer replied that that was the plan. Leland Myers recommended having the Science Panel fill out scoring sheets for each contractor and using these scores as the basis for selection. Bruce Waddell agreed with Leland. Bruce also proposed adding some of the contractors that have performed selenium work for the Salton Sea.

Walt Baker reported on the financial status of the GSL Selenium Studies funds (see attached Microsoft Excel "GSL Selenium Financial Report.xls").

Follow up on Letter to Senator Bennett:

Jill Houston, Central Davis Sewer District, met with one of Senator Bennett's staff in Washington, D.C. regarding the GSL Selenium Studies. She passed along the letter signed by the Steering Committee members and the proposal requesting $1.2 million for the GSL selenium studies.

Walt Baker commented that this is not an easy time for STAG (state and tribal assistance grant) requests, because EPA has removed all previous recipients from the STAG request list, and those who are interested in these grants must now compete with each other for the $300 million STAG set-aside. Walt added that in order to qualify for these grants, the requestor had to show that it had received funds for at least the past 3 years. He indicated that Jeff Salt might have some ideas on that.

Ed Blaney suggested considering a broader approach to the GSL selenium work, such as raising the interest of Salt Lake and Davis counties, and the state legislature. Walt mentioned that the Jordan River TMDL (total maximum daily load) was funded by $200,000 from EPA and $200,000 through NRCS. Jeff Salt said that they were successful getting this $400,000 in funding for their watershed projects through a professional lobbyist. Karl Kappe added that $100,000 has been appropriated on an

annual basis by the Legislature to the Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands for water quality projects. He stated that these funds could potentially be used for the GSL Selenium Studies.

Jeff Salt commented that the Steering Committee needs to make the selenium issue important to political bodies. Maunsel Pearce asked if it was appropriate to have a subcommittee meeting to pursue funds for these studies. Leland Myers agreed that the more funds that are brought to the table, the better it is for the studies. Walt Baker liked Maunsel's idea, and asked if there were any volunteers.

It was decided that the following Steering Committee members would serve on a funding subcommittee:

1. **Walt Baker**
2. **Maunsel Pearce**
3. **Leland Myers**
4. **Jeff Salt**

A question was asked about the relationship between the Steering Committee and the Farmington Bay Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). It seemed that everybody agreed on the notion that it would be the same relationship established between the Steering Committee and the Science Panel. Somebody suggested having a financial report that would include the Farmington Bay.

A discussion came up on whether mercury (Hg) sampling should be performed concurrent with selenium sampling. Dave Naftz said that the procedures for water sampling for Hg and Se are different. Bill Moellmer commented that it is very difficult to combine Hg and Se sampling because of the clean sampling procedures required for Hg sampling. Walt Baker mentioned that there have been 280 fish tissue samples taken for Hg with only 4 exceedances. DWQ is collecting additional samples to find out if there is a problem with Hg bioaccumulation in fish. Walt described some of the actions taken by DWQ to look into this problem.

Jeff Salt said that in March he put in a request to the US Congress to do a comprehensive study for Hg. The study would include the fate and transport of Hg from fish tissue to humans. Robert Adler said it was clear to him that we do not have enough information on Hg and while we look at Se we can synergize. Ed Blaney mentioned that from a conversation he had had with Dr. Dianne Nielson, he was under the impression that Dianne would prefer to stay focused on Se and develop a process that can be used to examine other key pollutants.

Bruce Waddell commented that with Se, we are looking at concentrations in parts per billion (ppb), whereas with Hg, we are looking at concentrations in parts per trillion (ppt), which requires extremely clean sampling procedures. Also, Hg would mainly be measured in fish tissue samples, versus measuring Se in water samples.

Lynn deFreitas commented that there is an opportunity for us to do parallel studies on Se and Hg. Kelly Payne said that he is afraid that concerned citizens may ask questions about action taken by DEQ to monitor Hg, since it is currently in the newspapers. Walt suggested proceeding with the plan for Se studies and seeing what comes up in the next Science Panel.

Bill Johnson from the audience suggested that the Steering Committee ask the Science Panel what confidence they have to address the Se studies along with, or without, Hg. Robert Adler commented that it is not his intention to turn a Se panel into a Hg panel, but to ask the Science Panel to see if there are synergistic opportunities.

Walt asked USGS (Dave Naftz) and USFWS (Bruce Waddell/Nathan Darnall) to investigate any efficiencies that could be realized in sampling for Hg concurrent with taking Se samples.

Next Meeting Agenda Items:

- Results from the laboratory analysis round robin (Bill Moellmer)
- Conceptual model for Se pathways in the GSL (Bill Moellmer)
- Present Kennecott plan for the brine shrimp study (Theron Miller)
- Funding Plan Subcommittee and Finance/Accounting Report of GSL Se and Farmington Bay Studies (Walt Baker)
- Letter to Senator Bennett (Leland Myers)

Next Meeting: **Tuesday August 30, 2005 at 3:00 p.m., Room #201, DEQ Building #2, 168 N. 1950 W., SLC, UT.**