DRAFT

Great Lakes NRDA Roundtable

DePaul University, Naperville, IL July 18-19 2007
Meeting Notes

July 18, 2007 Morning Notes

DISCLAIMER: These notes reflect the best recollection of the note takers. The note takers assume no responsibility, but apologize in advance, for any inaccuracies. The minutes were composed so that statements of opinion or position were not attributed to any person or organization, and any implied or inferred attribution is purely coincidental.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting started with introductions and participants stating what they hoped to gain from the meeting. The most commonly articulated themes for desired outcomes of the meeting were:

- Foster cooperation among stakeholders
- Take advantage of the face-to-face meeting to develop relationships
- Explore avenues for getting to restoration most efficiently
- Explore avenues for integrating the NRDA and RCRA/Superfund response processes

In addition, several participants stated that they were new to NRDA and were looking forward to learning more about the process and the players.

Immediately following the introductions there was some discussion about EPA's potential sensitivity to the word "integration" when referring to close coordination between NRDA and RCRA/Superfund. Although the term "integration" has a particular meaning to industry practitioners, EPA may view a desire to "integrate" programs on the part of industry as an institutional challenge or impossibility. Practitioners were urged to use a less charged term when referring to close coordination between programs.

TRUSTEE AND INDUSTRY NRD PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

The notes presented in this section are meant to supplement presentation materials if any.

Indiana

Indiana's NRDA program is about 14 years old. Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) regarding NRDA with Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) and U.S. Department of Interior. Decisions regarding NRDA matters are decided upon by consensus among these parties. There is no state NRDA legislation, therefore Federal Consent Decrees are drafted (including Covenants not to Sue). The state has gotten Covenants not to Sue in settling NRDA matters from EPA as well as other Trustees. Indiana has had great success

working with U.S. EPA Region 5 to resolve NRDA matters in conjunction with response actions. State Trustees have good technical support on NRDA matters from IDEM and IDNR.

Many aspects of restoration take a long time. For example, establishment of conservation easements or property purchase is typically a 24 month process. These types of transactions should be started as early as possible in settlement negotiations.

The biggest hurdles for the state are at the project identification stage. Transaction costs can escalate when:

- Landowners pull out of agreements at the last moment
- Soil conservation service (or other local entity) objects to a project because it is not fully consistent with their goals
- Public objects because a project does not provide what they think is best

The State GAO reported on one Indiana case where 4 times the settlement amount was spent on transaction costs (primarily to identify and implement projects). In 1993 a MOU was entered between U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, IDEM, and IDNR to collaborate in identifying the best resource restoration projects.

The state establishes trust finds with court registry accounts on a case-by-case basis. Early in the life of the NRDA program, the vast majority of funds (the example of 99% was given) was spent on actual projects with administrative costs being absorbed by agency operating funds. Now a little more of the administrative costs are taken from site-specific court registry accounts, but it is still a relatively small amount (the example of <5% was given). Transactional/administrative costs tend to be a smaller percentage of the settlement amount on big cases than on smaller cases.

Indiana always attempts to engage parties in cooperative settlement discussions; however a process is always followed to preserve the rebuttable presumption should cooperative negotiations fail (i.e., Preassessment Screen, notification, and publication in the federal Register). The state usually does not enter into a tolling agreement unless a draft settlement has been reached and more time is needed to finalize.

<u>Comments from Participants</u>:

- One positive trend in NRDA settlements over the past decade or more is that parties are becoming more focused on spending recoveries on projects that provide the highest value in terms of restored services regardless of the relationship between injured and restored resources. For example, ecological restoration projects should focus on what is best for a system (creek, wetland complex, or watershed) and not on only reversing injury from a release (an example of such a project is restoring fish passage).
- By order of law, money is invested in government securities (treasury notes).

- If responsible parties are allowed to make payouts over time (as opposed to lump sum payments) this may be viewed more favorably.
- Trustees often prefer to have responsible parties implement restoration projects rather than pay Trustees to do the work because PRPs have more flexibility in completing transactions and can often complete the work more efficiently.

Illinois

There is a MOU between Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR), Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA), and the Illinois Attorney General's Office. Illinois is working with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) on Great Lakes NRDA cases. There are no dedicated NRDA staff in Illinois agencies. There is no state NRDA law, therefore cases are settled by Federal Consent Decree. There is informal interagency coordination on NRDA matters via bimonthly meetings between IDNR, IEPA, and the Attorney General's Office. Most sites are surface water sites involving spills. Settlements are typically in the $10K - $500K range. The state strives to turn settlements into restoration as expeditiously as possible and draft restoration plans are often prepared contemporaneously with settlement documents. Restoration typically entails several smaller projects rather than a single large project (e.g., wetland restoration, invasive species control, and in-stream work). Often need to work closely with soil and water districts (have lots of power) and other local entities such as drainage districts.

Groundwater is a big issue throughout the state. In the southern part of the state entire counties and communities rely on single aquifers. In the Chicago area, growth is so fast drinking water availability is a big problem and the City has banned groundwater use for drinking water (serves as an institutional control).

The state MOU does not currently include federal Trustees. MOUs with federal Trustees are developed on a case-by-case basis.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)

NOAA's NRDA program began to form in 1980 and was formalized after the Exxon Valdez oil spill. NOAA has dedicated program staff across the country. Scientists, economists, and attorneys form case teams and work on cases from start to finish. NOAA's program strives to emphasize integration of cleanup and restoration, and promoting cooperation, innovation, and a restoration-based approach.

NOAA has created mapping projects on a watershed basis (primarily for oil spills) and these are publicly accessible. The purpose is to create a single database that all parties can use. In the Great Lakes, watershed mapping projects exist for Kalamazoo River, St. Lawrence River (Massena, NY), and Sheboygan.

In addition to its NRDA program, NOAA has a Great Lakes Habitat restoration Program that focuses on Great Lakes Areas of Concern (AOCs). The focus is to reverse beneficial

use impairments, particularly sediment impacts to fish. Grant money is allocated on a competitive basis.

Ohio

Ohio currently has no formal state program and there are no state NRDA rules. The Director of Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA) is the State Trustee in cooperation with Ohio department of Natural Resources (ODNR). There is an informal process to identify NRD sites. OEPA has only gotten involved in NRDAs where other trustees have taken lead roles. A NRDA group was recently formed for specifically integrating with response programs but currently only for state lead sites. The group has developed some technical documents including those related to general input to Habitat Equivalency Analysis models (HEA) and scaling, and the team has evaluated approaches for groundwater NRDA. Additional dedicated staff are not likely.

OEPA has a boilerplate administrative consent order that is very similar to typical federal orders and they are evaluating adding in language to cover NRD.

BP

BP has no defined NRD group, rather NRDAs are addressed within the context of remediation. The idea of cooperative NRDA is consistent with corporate philosophy, but the company needs to understand what is meant by "cooperative". The goal of any NRDA should be to get to restoration more efficiently. Issues that have become problematic in NRDAs include:

- Attempts to quantify nonuse values
- Insufficient representation of local concerns by Trustees (local community acceptance is very important to companies)
- Spending more on assessment than recovered in damages

July 18, 2007 Afternoon Notes

USFWS Frank Horvath:
He agrees with everything that has been shared so far. USFW wants to cooperate with industry and they are of the option there's no way they could get stuff done without it.
The Executive Director of Interior is the actual trustee delegate. The bureaus are delegated to be the trustee reps that carry out the trustee delegate's responsibility.
Mi, WI, IL, ID OH, WS, MO and IO
Ecological Services Field Offices-each of the 8 states has a field office and part of the program that is administrated is the environmental contaminant specialist. Coordinate a lot of the cases through the process.
The EC specialists are the actual NRDS problem implementation. They look at the impacts of COCs on resources.
NRDA is the tool to achieve restoration of injured resources.

DRAFT

NRDARF is a special fund to receive settlement monies to be used for settlement and to achieve environmental restoration.
They do not consider NRDA to be a punitive program. ALL the money has to be used for restoration.

Relationships-it is tough for a duck to know which ½ of the duck belongs to whom. USFWS does not like to divide up natural resources so they like to develop trustee councils and sign MOUs. They also work with the tribes. There are numerous tribes in this part of the country.
They follow 43 CFR Part 11 to the extent they can. The big part of that is the pre-assessment criteria. They evaluate the case facts against the Pre-Assessment criteria to see if they have a case. Their goal is to settle cases. They have settled all but they always conduct those cases as if they're going to litigate. They consider this process an adversarial and litigative process.

How does the USFWS select NRDA cases? If the service sees that a restoration is possible, that is a case on which they should do an NRDA. They don't do it because they can, they do it because NRDA is helpful in obtaining restoration.
They like to work with other trustees because they don't like to split trust resources.
Their focus is on restoration-based claims where the PRP's are focused on doing the restoration themselves rather than pursue a cash-out settlement.
How do they organize a case? Around case teams: a solicitor, contaminant specialist, the executive director, and state, federal and tribal personnel.

Andrew Davis raised a question relative to performance standards when the PRPs elect to conduct the restoration themselves. If there was a performance standard, it would be hard for Andrew not to encourage his clients to cash out rather than carry out the restoration themselves.
How does a trustee get enough money to "pull off" what they agreed to do in terms of compensating the public? Those issues are huge in terms of the quality of settlement. These areas are wide open for discussion and fruitful for negotiation. 52 or 53 cases settled and 25 of those in ID. None of those cases have been litigated but several came close. Case load at any one time can be 30 cases, for the majority of the states. Most of the states have similar programs and have about 30 cases at any one time.
When they do claims, one of the biggest items is reimbursement of assessment costs. In order to settle a case, they will need to include indirect costs as well as assessment costs in the future.
Frank distributed a handout that is specific to Region 3 that includes his phone number and their web address.
BP: From a PRP's point of view, they might have better PM skills but restoration is NOT their business and so their expertise is NOT in the restoration business and they do not necessarily want to get involved in restoration. Their business is the commercial business they're in, not cleanup, etc.
Frank appreciates industry's perspective. Because of the manner in which states and government have to conduct business, some portions of the cases and transactions are more productive if the PRPs conduct those portions. (ex: land purchase)

BP stated that that could be a much more attractive portion of a settlement that industry could accept because there is an end point to that part.
Robin Burr stated that some of these functions of the trustees require additional funding.
BP (Chuck): one opportunity is to obtain a local qualified resource to help out and support in identifying what restoration projects are out there. Use resources in the local community,
USFW-involve local NGOs.

Illinois/Lawrenceville Site
Cooperative NRDA
Illinois supports cooperative rather than integration. They feel like if they integrate it too far, some of the boundary lines might get crossed.
Management has to support cooperation in order for a cooperative NRDA process to work.
Recognize the CERCLA: priorities-human health comes first. Trustee should recognize this.
Cooperation vs Integration: not crossing lines of authority and allowing regulatory personnel to be the remedial project on the site first. Within the state, they are committed to not having an interagency squabble between jurisdictional boundaries, etc. Trustees cannot dictate remedy.
Tom:
As long as there is a vision and at the end of the day there is a goal to compensate the public,
Todd R/IL gave a presentation relative to this project.
Frank asked why Chevron determined to pursue a cooperative process? Chevron recognized it was probably the best process to pursue because they wanted to get complete closure and not have any hidden liabilities left over.
IDNR publishes once a month “Outdoor Illinois” and published this last month “responsible neighbors” to demonstrate the cooperative nature of the process to resolve environmental issues relative to the refinery operations.
Observations:

1) you need the right people in the room
2) The regulatory process and the NRDA process were not laid down side by side and required to flow. There was flexibility in the processes and cooperation between both processes. The goal was always restoration
3) Where are they in the process? They are pre-rod and settlement discussions have been going on for NRDA for the last 6 months. When does it make sense to settle, has been a part of the discussion. Federal trustees decided that they could not settle for NRDA prior to the ROD. State trustees are talking settlement at this point and a consent decree is under construction.

Todd communicated that Chevron appears to be “ok with the fact that they are not getting a complete release or settlement because the feds are not signing at this time. Todd also noted that a portion of the success was because there was the EPA project manager.

DRAFT

Kevin Faus: Minnesota Program

Two trustees (Pollution Control Agency and DNR). They do not have a formal program and those that fulfill the trustee role fill about half of their time in NRDA. The mind set of the PCA is being aggressive and getting results. Going through a formal process is a workable process and they have started working with federal trustees.

Cohassett, MN oil spill. Kevin provided a presentation
Key to a cooperative approach is for the PRP to want to get the processed finished.

ConocoPhillips spill presentation

Presentation by Robin and Nancy
Great Lakes NRDAR Roundtable DOI NRDAR Federal Advisory Committee (FACA/DOI website). Final publication will be provided to the committee members soon.
NRAR Federal Advisory Committee Charter-member selection and charter had to be approved by Congress
Looking for advice and recommendations for achieving sound, timely and cost effective recommendations for reaching restoration. All reports or recommendations present to committee for consideration before submitted to Designated Federal Official
Committee was NOT to resolve ongoing contentious case issues
Committee was not for handing off issues to other entities but would take on legislative or responsible-side issues of a clear obstacle to implementation of consensus advice
Parts of NRDAR process considered:
Natural resource injury determination and quantification
Scoping of restoration
Interim loss damages
Restoration implementation

Drafting Team:
John Carlucci, William Brighton, Richard Seiler, Dale Young, Shannon Work, Pat Casano, Barry Hartman, and John Mueller.

Next Steps after Committee Report
May 2007-Unanimous consensus on committee recommendations'
Summer 2007- Brief DAS and AS-PMB on implementation plan
Fall 2007- Start implementing plan
2008- Roll out Guidance, Policies, workshops and draft regulations

DOI typically allocates between 6-7MM a year for restoration
DOI Restoration Fund managed by Bruce R. This money is strictly for restoration use and monitored and invested accordingly.

If changes cannot be made the DOI rule, how can folks practically and more effectively go about the NRDA business to make it more effective?

We have to get the Native American Tribes more integrated especially from the "quantification" perspective of cultural resources.

Discussion points for tomorrow

1) Getting to restoration quickly
    a. Not leaving injury on the table (trustees)
    b. Coming up with discussion points

2) Injury determination/modeling
3) MOAs/guiding principles in lieu of a formal MOA
4) Baseline-getting better methods for establishing baseline (GIPRA goals for DOI-right now they're based on restoration miles and acres-how to get beyond like develop IBIs)
5) Involvement of Native American Tribes and/or EPA
6) Question relative to contractors being hired to implement restoration to take the burden off of the PRP and the trustees.

www.grants.gov website for federal monies available
CDFA-catalogue for federal assistance
Restorations can be difficult because of the change of land use (local buy in) and the measure of success
Insurance cost caps might be one solution
Being able to think about things to the extent that thoroughly considering restoration challenges and needs for success in order to "throw" enough money at a project-this is an area for immediate evolution within the NRDA arena.
Trustees are not driven by money but rather by their responsibility to compensate the public. The PRPs, however, as highlighted by trustees, are business men and so they may have an opportunity to make business arrangements relative to implementing a restoration project more effectively than the trustees.
Since EPA has become comfortable with the insurance companies (AIG, ZURICH, XL, etc) holding the monies allotted for a clean up, perhaps there's an opportunity to extend the same situation for NRDA process.
Margarite provided input that that could be a good idea but that just some education would be useful in expanding the knowledge of insurance holdings, process, etc. in order to become comfortable with that process.

One of the challenges is that sometimes restoration changes land use.

Remediation vs Restoration-what is the difference? They both can be done because they are both engineering projects but can one project accomplish the same objective? Frank gave the example of remediating an area so samples were collected to determine nature and extent and identify an appropriate remedial action. The action

was to dredge the wetland. However, now you've demolished the wetland so what events have to be implemented

Day Two July 19, 2007

State of Ohio NRDA Program
Simplified Groundwater Evaluation Method for Natural Resource Damage Assessment
Brian gave the presentation
Goal is to estimate groundwater damage value to begin negotiations for settlement.
Issues:
Changes in background conditions
Excess of drinking water/risk-based standards
Failure of water quality standards
Loss of use/Plume Halo (well siting requirements)
Volume of Impacted Water
Two common methods/models
Flow/flux
Static volume
See: groundwater discussion paper, national Association of Attorneys General (NAAG) Natural Resource Damage Work Group
Ohio selected the Static aka Bathtub method
Cubic feet*effective porosity=volume
Plume size is estimate using MCLs or risk-based cleanup values instead of background or halo

Injury Assessment:
Total volume (yearly volume multiplied by time)
generally 30 years (may use time from interim action)
Keep time value of money and groundwater consistent (no discounting or compounding)
Damage Determination
Volume multiplied by reasonable dollar value ($/gal)
Critical resource (public water supply, 100 gal/minute, growing location) average 2 highest current water providers (public or private)
Others average of all available within the area
Result is a dollar value used for settlement purpose

Settlement on dollar amount

Restoration Plans

EXAMPLE
Acre plume
Reach cleanup goals in 20 years
Porosity (20' at .0 and 5' at .3)
Water rate .0014 $/gal

There is opportunity to negotiate the use of this formula based on proposed groundwater remediation for the site and plume size over time.

Restoration: they are currently researching potential restoration opportunities for the acquired monies though NRDA settlement. They do not have an Ohio State NRDA rule that specifies how they must spend their monies. It is not a high priority for the state trustees to pursue shallow, perched aquifers.
They are open to all kinds of "restoration" options for the groundwater.

Question: has there been a GEA ever generated that provides the same kinds of results for GW that HEA produces for ecological resources. Indiana recommended that folks look at the Bob Unsworth' IEC paper presented to ATSWMO NRDA group relative to a GEA approach to determine injury.

In Indiana, for the settlements they've negotiated, how did they incorporate groundwater? They looked at discharge to surface to surface water, injury to wetlands, etc., but they did not specifically look at groundwater injury. A release was granted on currently known injury including groundwater. They let the superfund program address the groundwater.

Minnesota is struggling with how to address groundwater and have considered the public's willingness to pay. He believes the CERCLA addresses damages. They are considering generating a formula. They've also considered the service to service approach and they've hired Bob Unsworth to assist them on some cases. On other cases, they've just negotiated groundwater as part of the settlement ad primarily the AG's office negotiated something with the PRP for release of NRD for a site. It is primarily "horse trading" because there is no specific formula for use to settle these claims.

Indiana is very conservative on these values now. The settlements they agree to are as close as what they can possibly let IN determining groundwater injury.

Has there ever been resolution in assigning allocation for multiple plumes? Indiana has not. Some of the sites have dropped out of the superfund program into the voluntary program where groundwater was addressed in those situations. Every case is site specific. Based on the law in Indiana, one can use the water under their property any way they want; however, the quality of the groundwater entering and leaving the property has to remain the same quality. If nothing is leaving the site, there can be restrictions placed on the use of groundwater for that site but they wouldn't necessarily pursue an NRD claim for that groundwater.
In Illinois, there is a lot of groundwater being remediated and just because it is to being used for drinking water does not preclude them from pursuing NRD for injury to that groundwater.

Urban Setting designation: a populated area is all taken care of by a water system and not necessarily through groundwater.

In Illinois, there is the use of groundwater institutional controls so that the groundwater is not being used but that may be important later in an NRDA. There are more uses for groundwater than just…

The PRP group in Jasper, Mo came up with a theory relative to the groundwater that comes down from the mining area. They know the amount of mining that has occurred and how much could be coming down from acidified areas and so naturally attenuated before it reached an area of use.

Illinois and Ohio would consider when a PRP has cleaned up groundwater and as a result, used that effluent to support their process thereby reducing draw from pubic resources. These states would consider giving release in such an instance but it is site specific. Indiana has a consent decree in review that includes release of a CAMU on the facility, where a wetland was created through remedial actions. The remedial program wanted the wetland removed because it was built through some contaminated material. The trustees worked with the PRP to maintain the wetland and do some additional work an contaminated material removal in order to keep the wetlands and enhance the area, and to provide a conservation easement for the property to protect all the enhancement that had been done to protect those created resources into the future. This met any compensation needs under NRD.

Minnesota said for small plumes the calculation approach would work or using a service to service approach would work but for large plumes, one might have to take a different approach like a willingness to pay and focus groups.

There have been some projects, for instance one in Georgia as well as some other sites, the PRPs were not willing to talk dollars but rather look at REA so that resource service losses are identified and then replaced through restoration. This allows restoration to be considered and potentially incorporated into the remedy.

Discussion Items:
What are the concrete things we can develop in the Great Lakes Group that we will use in practicality?
One of the advantages of this group is the sharing of case studies which are especially beneficial to new people to NRDA. Would there be an opportunity to generate some work products that can be distributed like ATSWMO did or the JAT for the West Coast?
There's a need for tools that people can agree on perhaps
The company perspective is that "they all do it differently". If the Great Lakes region could agree on some product or maybe the process of doing that is valuable, a regimented approach with some agreement
Brian offered to provide a summary of state NRDA programs which would be appreciated by industry.
Dave Rumph mentioned the Adhoc Industry Group website that is a mechanism where tools and processes approaches, etc., could be posted for knowledge and access.
DOI NRDA program doing with Barbara's group and has their website to provide information for information exchange.

DRAFT

Value is staying in touch and with a simple distribution list, if there are questions, etc., schedule a conference call for instance if someone needs feedback from industry relative to a Great Lakes issue.
Hold another meeting that is more focused, not on general NRDA stuff but rather state specific projects or other issues that would allow for that exchange of information.
Receive an update from the states on their specific programs and cases.
Receive some information relative to Insurance
Put together a meeting or webinar to present the opportunities for insurance relative to NRDA settlements
Doing a webcast or webinar meeting for the future Great Lakes meeting in the future to have more time and better participation
The trustees in the Great Lakes need to get together to discuss NRD issues among the state and federal trustees.
The open forum is an appreciated format.
There are some unique situations in the Great Lakes among the states and in some situations where the trustees can agree on an approach, and this meeting forum does provide an opportunity for discussion among members.
Great Lake Legacy Act-great impact in the area
The discussions for closure are case specific. The networking accomplished in these meetings is extremely valuable. USFWS point of view is that they have 8 states in the Great Lakes region and meeting the parties involved in these situations goes along way when it comes time to work on cases. The FACA recommendations could be further opportunity to work together.
The vote seems to be for this meeting to continue in another year and ½. It would be good to have more PRPs present for these type discussions.
Categorize issues: oil spills are no big deal in the Great lakes region compared to the Coast. CERCLA and contaminated sediments are the big deals in the Great Lakes region, For NRDA cases in the regions, CERCLA either upland or on the Great lakes and if it is the Great lakes, it will involve sediment contamination.
Try to get some funding for participation for trustees.
Are there any grants for this type participation (education) of meeting? WK Kelloggs Foundation provides education funding.
Provide an email on where to find the results from the NOAA CAAP meeting in Chicago that includes the states' report on their own NRDA program.

Distribution items
State Items
Lawyer website
Sign in sheet for this meeting
Slides for this meeting
List of websites that are important (NOAA, Barbara G, USFWS Region 3, etc)

Location of next meeting
Steering Committee (in moving forward, who keeps the ball rolling?) Should the steering committee keep pushing to move this forward? How motivated are we to continue to work through the actions identified during this meeting.

DRAFT

Andrew Davis offered to provide their Chicago office for the next meeting and also to participate as a industry member of the meeting.

Places for next meeting:
EPA meeting in Chicago
Federal Building in Twin Cities next to airport
Columbus has rooms to use for meeting
Indianapolis has a conference center that we could use for the meeting or the Dunes National State Park for our meeting location in Indiana
Dave Rumph volunteered to be on the Steering committee to host the next meeting in Michigan.
Fort Snelling week of April 22-23, 2008.

Ginny will have someone from WSP send receipts to all participants that paid their registration fees ($25)
Jim Brossman will tentatively replace Rees and Chuck wants to remain involved.
Jim Smith will stay on for Indiana
Brian will replace Heidi
Dave Rumph added to steering committee
Andrew Davis (Lebouef Lamb) will also be added to the steering committee

Jeff will distribute the presentations along with meeting minutes and attendees list.
Date for follow up conference call October 22 @ 10 am central, to plan for next meeting and follow up. Someone should sponsor the call so that there's a 1 800 number for call in.