

Notes from EcoRA Work Group Workshop Held 9/27-28/00 in Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.

The following is a summarization of the input and recommendations for changes to the Draft Coeur d'Alene Basin Ecological Risk Assessment received during the workshop held in CdA on September 27-28, 2000. This is not a comprehensive record of all conversation but is intended to capture changes that were suggested during the meeting.

- Clarify lines of evidence used
- In the tables which identify sources of soil, sediment and surface water chemical data, clarify the Quality Assurance/Documentation "unknowns" because we know that some of the data sets identified as unknown QA definitely do have QA documentation (e.g., USGS data sets)
- Explain the context of including the Ute's ladies tresses even though it is not confirmed to present in the project area (e.g., it is an endangered species and we have to include it under ESA)
- Address questions concerning background concentrations and sieved data
- Provide a more thorough explanation of the confidence in the weights of evidence; explain how determined which type of evidence ranks highest so if conflicting information, how did we decide which is more appropriate
- In the weight of evidence tables, include a qualitative (as opposed to a quantitative) weight of evidence determination using assumptions and upstream concentrations for areas with no data
- Add a discussion addressing the overall summary of risks in CSM 3 in addition to the breakdown for each of the six segments
- Add conclusions regarding the bull trout separate from other aquatic species to Section 5
- Add internal fish data to water risk evaluation
- Segment names on Fig. 4-61 are not right
- It was suggested that there may be some references that are not included in the EcoRA that should be included (no specifics were provided, however)
- Reference and address BLM and USFS special status species lists; note that species may already be addressed via USFWS ESA list or already be covered by other surrogate species (**on 9/28/00 Dailey obtained the BLM list from Scott Robertson and the USFS list from Rick Patten)
- There was substantial discussion about DQOs/DQAs. EPA will discuss it further with their contractors but there was discussion about using nested DQOs. There was discussion about updating/revising the DQOs/DQAs present in the draft Technical Workplan. The EcoRA DQOs could be nested within the overall RI/FS DQOs.
- Add DQO write-up => process, etc.
 - the DQOs should be clear and transparent
 - the EcoRA DQO discussion will be a nested subset of the DQO discussion for the overall RI/FS
 - may include DQO discussion in an appendix plus a chronology of workgroup discussions
 - the DQOs could be linked to the ecological management goals to help provide a focus
- Add DQA write-up => are data of sufficient quantity/quality for EcoRA?
 - do data support decisions
 - data usability -> confidence in the data/ do the data support the decisions? (use HHRA guidance where appropriate)