Assessment of Cold-Climate Environmental Research Priorities

J. B. States

April 1983

**Prepared for the U.S. Environmental Protection
Agency and the U.S. Department of Energy
under Contract DE-AC06-76RLO 1830**

**Pacific Northwest Laboratory
Operated for the U.S. Department of Energy
by Battelle Memorial Institute**

DISCLAIMER

This report summarizes the process by which the EPA's Cold-Climate Environmental Research Program has been reviewed and revised and is now being implemented. It is intended to convey technical information only and not to constitute agency policy. The report does not supersede specific procedures and documentation for quality assurance, chain-of-custody, and other requirements addressed by Environmental Protection Agency regulations and policy guidance documents currently in effect. The research described in this report has been funded by the United States Environmental Protection Agency through interagency agreement no. AD-89-F-1-845-0 to the United States Department of Energy. As an internal working document, this report has not been subjected to the Agency's required peer and policy review.

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST LABORATORY
operated by
BATTELLE
for the
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
under Contract DE-AC06-76RLO 1830

Printed in the United States of America
Available from
National Technical Information Service
United States Department of Commerce
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, Virginia 22161

NTIS Price Codes
Microfiche A01

Printed Copy

Pages	Price Codes
001-025	A02
026-050	A03
051-075	A04
076-100	A05
101-125	A06
126-150	A07
151-175	A08
176-200	A09
201-225	A010
226-250	A011
251-275	A012
276-300	A013

ASSESSMENT OF COLD-CLIMATE ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PRIORITIES

J. B. States

April 1983

Prepared for the Environmental Protection Agency
and the U.S. Department of Energy
under Contract DE-AC06-76RLO 1830
and Interagency Agreement AD-89-F-1-845-0

in cooperation with

Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
Tetra Tech, Inc.
University of Alaska

Pacific Northwest Laboratory
Richland, Washington 99352

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has consistently recognized that cold regions pose unique environmental problems. For years, EPA operated a research laboratory in Fairbanks, Alaska. More recently, the agency has funded cold-climate research through the Environmental Research Laboratory in Corvallis, Oregon. However, the pace of natural resource development in Alaska has accelerated and the associated range of potential environmental problems has broadened. Funds available for environmental research have not kept pace.

One result of the increased range of needed research and the relatively limited funding has been an ongoing debate about which research needs are most pressing and who should take the lead in addressing them. The EPA program has been repeatedly criticized by special interest groups, each having its own perspective on what EPA's research priorities should be. Although many of the criticisms were correspondingly biased, the Agency felt that the following were valid: 1) research priorities have been largely determined by a select group and have not been broadly representative of existing needs, 2) research projects have often failed to provide the information needed for solving specific environmental problems under EPA jurisdiction, 3) considerable past research has reflected principal investigator interests rather than EPA need to know, and 4) program planning on a year-to-year basis with little interagency coordination has resulted in the neglect of major environmental problems, particularly those requiring more than one year of research and more financial resources than the EPA alone could afford.

PROGRAM PLANNING

Consequently, in September 1981, the EPA asked Pacific Northwest Laboratory (PNL) to develop a work plan for a three- to five-year program that would redress these deficiencies. Planning proceeded in three phases. In the first phase we interviewed a large number of environmental scientists, environmental managers and natural resource developers who were conversant on a broad range of possible problems. We thus identified a group of informed and articulate individuals who represented an equally broad range of viewpoints. In the second phase, as many of these individuals as possible were involved in identifying and prioritizing research needs. During the third phase, detailed research plans were developed and prioritized by representatives of most of the agencies having environmental responsibilities in Alaska.

Three workshops were conducted using an innovative decision process to incorporate as much informed opinion as possible in achieving consensus yet minimizing divisive debate. This approach provided the broad conceptual framework and interagency cooperation necessary to avoid repeated yearly disruptions of research due to political pressures from special interest groups.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

This report sets forth the conceptual framework and research plans for the high priority research areas detailed in Appendix A. It therefore

provides the fundamental basis for implementation of the EPA Cold-Climate Environmental Research Program. This three- to five-year program encompasses both short- and long-term research of high relevance to the EPA and to the cold regions that it serves. The program plan is being implemented by PNL, as an on-site management contractor through its Alaska Operations Office, under supervision of an EPA project officer. The research will be performed by organizations experienced in cold-climate research and best qualified to do the work. Coordination and collaboration with other agencies is being developed as described below.

CURRENT PROGRAM STATUS

After detailed research plans were developed, an Agency Oversight Committee of representatives from 20 federal, state and local agencies was formed as a permanent advisory body to the Cold-Climate Research Program. The purpose of the committee is to provide a mechanism for integrating research with the parallel efforts and interests of other agencies. This committee will meet at least once a year, before RFPs are generated, to review and comment on EPA research plans for the subsequent year. This will enable program managers to consider new perspectives and accommodate needs and interests of other agencies in research designs. In addition, where agency responsibilities overlap, particularly on problems too large to be addressed using single-agency resources, the committee will serve as a focal point for joint or cooperative research efforts.

At its first meeting the Agency Oversight Committee utilized a computer -aided process to prioritize the research plans developed earlier. Research on Vehicle Emissions and Alternate Fuels had already been implemented by the time of the meeting. Although all 17 of the remaining research plans are considered important, the priorities established by this committee are being used as the primary guidance in determining order of implementation. The plans expected to be implemented during fiscal years 1982 and 1983, and the report pages on which each is summarized, are listed in order of priority as follows:

<u>Research Topic</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Impact of Oil Development Upon Coastal Tundra Wetlands	43
2. Ecosystem Impacts of Placer Mining	40
3. Urban Pollution - Pollutants and Health Effects	31
4. Biodegradation and Toxicity of Hydrocarbons in Oiled Waters	39
5. Asbestos Levels in Rural Alaskan Drinking Water	37
6. Cost-Effective Bio-Indicators of Marine Pollution	38
7. Urban Pollution - Develop Basis for Predicting Pollutant Dispersion in Highly Stable Atmospheres	31
8. Impact of Logging on Interior Alaskan Stream Ecosystems	45
9. Gravel Removal From Riparian Habitats	46
10. Summary and Synthesis of Cold-Climate Air Pollution	36

To ensure that resulting research meets all agency concerns, committee members have volunteered staff time and meeting facilities to assist in refining work statements before the work begins. A second advisory group, the Technical Review Committee, will help select winning bidders responding to requests for proposals.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report represents the cooperative effort of a great many people in the Alaskan environmental science community. In particular, it was through the vision of Dr. Norman Glass, EPA Project Officer and Director of the Terrestrial Division, Environmental Research Laboratory, Corvallis, Oregon, that this project was undertaken. Once priority research needs had been identified, the research plans to fulfill those needs had to be developed by technical experts in the relevant scientific disciplines. This planning was done by a team from the University of Alaska, Fairbanks, Alaska, and Tetra Tech., Inc., Anchorage, Alaska. The University component of the team was coordinated by Dr. David Norton and Dr. Glenn Juday. Task leaders were Dr. Gunter Weller, air pollution; Dr. Don Button, water contamination/consumption; and Dr. Terry Chapin, habitat modification/ manipulation. Dr. Robin Sener of Tetra Tech., Inc., coordinated research planning in the waste disposal area. Major contributors in the various fields were:

Air Pollution - Dr. Thomas Gosink
Dr. Glenn Shaw
Mr. Leonard Verrelli

Water Contamination/Consumption - Dr. Helen Myers
Dr. Don Schell
Dr. David Shaw
Mr. Douglas Redburn

Habitat Modification/Manipulation - Dr. Glenn Juday
Ms. Rosa Meehan
Dr. Mark Oswood
Dr. Charles Slaughter

Waste Management - Dr. Robin Sener

The project was managed by Dr. Jim States and coordinated by Sandra Henry from the Alaska Operations Office of Pacific Northwest Laboratory operated for the U.S. Department of Energy by Battelle Memorial Institute.

	<u>CONTENTS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY		iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS		v
INTRODUCTION		1
METHODS		4
INTERVIEWS AND SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS		4
WORKSHOP PROCESS FOR PRIORITIZING DECISION ALTERNATIVES		4
RESEARCH PLANNING		9
RESULTS		11
INTERVIEWS		11
GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES		11
Workshop Participants		11
Broad Range of Issues		11
Issue Priorities		17
SPECIFIC RESEARCH PROBLEMS		19
Workshop Participants		19
Broad Range of Problems		19
Problem Priorities		24
Synthesis		24
COLD-CLIMATE RESEARCH PROGRAM		27
AIR POLLUTION RESEARCH		27
Urban Pollution - Pollutants and Health Effects		28
Urban Pollution - Develop Basis for Predicting Pollutant Dispersion in Highly Stable Atmospheres		28
Urban Pollution - Transportation System Characterization Study		30
Urban Pollution - Vehicle Emissions and Alternate Fuels		30
Photochemistry at High Latitudes		31
Industrial Pollution - Pollution Downwash and Deposition Modeling		31
Background Studies - "Arctic Haze"		32
Background Studies - Natural Concentrations of Organic and Inorganic Compounds		33
Summary and Synthesis of Cold-Climate Air Pollution		33

WATER CONTAMINATION/CONSUMPTION RESEARCH	34
Asbestos Levels in Alaskan Drinking Water	34
Cost-Effective Bio-Indicators of Marine Pollution	35
Biodegradation and Toxicity of Hydrocarbons in Oiled Waters	36
Ecosystem Impacts of Placer Mining	37
WASTE DISPOSAL RESEARCH	38
Review Cold-Climate Waste Research Needs	38
Effect of the Arctic Climate on Risk of Fecal Contamination	38
HABITAT MODIFICATION/MANIPULATION RESEARCH	40
Impact of Oil Upon Coastal Tundra Wetlands	40
Impact of Logging on Interior Alaska Stream Ecosystems	42
Gravel Removal from Riparian Habitats	43
PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	45
PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	45
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	45
CURRENT PROGRAM STATUS	46
LITERATURE CITED	50
APPENDIX A - Detailed Research Plans for EPA Cold-Climate Environmental Research Program	A.1
APPENDIX B - Preliminary Research Sketches for EPA Cold-Climate Environmental Research Program	A.1

FIGURES

1.	Steps in the Development of a Cold-Climate Research Program .	2
2.	Spectrum of Air Pollution Settings	29
3.	Integration of Tasks to Produce a Usable Methodology in Solid Waste Management	41

TABLES

1.	Contacts Made as a Basis for Initial List of Cold-Climate Research Issues and Potential Workshop Participants . .	12
2.	Participants in Workshop to Prioritize Generic, Cold- Climate Environmental Research Issues	15
3.	Environmental "Route" Categories Encompassing the Top 15 Issues	18
4.	Participants in Workshop to Prioritize Specific Cold- Climate Research Topics That Were Identified Under High-Priority Generic Issues	20
5.	Waste Disposal Topics Recommended for Inclusion in Research Prioritization Workshop	21
6.	Waste Disposal Topics Not Recommended for Inclusion in Research Prioritization Workshop	22
7.	Results of Environmental Research Prioritization Workshop at Chena Hot Springs, Fairbanks, Alaska, March 30 - April 2, 1982	25
8.	Agency Oversight Committee for the EPA Cold-Climate Environmental Research Program	48
9.	Results of Research Prioritization by Agency Oversight Committee	49

ASSESSMENT OF COLD-CLIMATE ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PRIORITIES

INTRODUCTION

Since its inception, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has maintained a research program in Alaska to address unique environmental problems in cold climates. The wide range of natural resource developments now being considered poses an equally wide range of possible environmental and related human health problems. Given the many potential problems, severe limitations on fiscal resources, and diversity of opinion on which problems are most important, considerable controversy has been generated within and outside the EPA over the relevance and effectiveness of the EPA program. Major criticisms include the following: 1) research priorities have been established largely by a select "in-group" and have not been broadly representative of existing needs, 2) component projects have often failed to provide the information needed to solve specific environmental problems under EPA jurisdiction, 3) Alaska-based supervision and coordination is needed to assure that research remains focused on an EPA need to know rather than principal investigator interests, 4) long-term planning and continuity of effort should be encouraged in place of year-to-year crisis management, and 5) better advantage should be taken of inter-agency cooperative research efforts to get more effective use of the limited resources available to agencies having environmental responsibilities.

In response to these criticisms, in September 1981, the EPA asked the Pacific Northwest Laboratory (PNL) of Battelle Memorial Institute, to establish a sound conceptual framework and work plan for a three- to five-year cold-climate environmental research program. The approach was to:

- identify, through personal contacts and literature reviews, experts and parties having a vested interest in natural resource-related environmental problems
- involve as many of these individuals as possible in a collaborative planning process that minimizes polarization and divisive debate while achieving a representative consensus as to research priorities, and
- develop detailed recommendations on the highest priority research topics and incorporate these into a well-focused, integrated, three- to five-year cold-climate environmental research program.

The steps involved in this planning approach are illustrated in Figure 1. Forty-three experts representing many disciplines from federal and state agencies, industry, private consulting firms and universities provided input during two workshops using a computer-assisted method for achieving consensus. In the first workshop, participants identified 120 generic, environmental issues pertinent to development of natural resources in cold climates. This list was eventually reduced to the 15 highest priority issues.

Subsequently, a team of environmental scientists from the University of Alaska and Tetra Tech, Inc. collaborated with PNL in developing a

FIGURE 1. Steps in the Development of Cold-Climate Research Program

series of 43 preliminary research sketches for specific environmental problems identified under the 15 generic issues. These were reviewed, expanded to a list of 49, and prioritized in a second workshop.

Finally, the project team was charged with developing detailed research plans for as many of the highest priority research sketches as time would allow. Where possible, elements (such as logistics or site use) from several sketches were combined to achieve greater integration and efficiency. Each research project was to be defined in terms of a series of milestones recommended by the planning team, beginning with an indication of when the research should begin and why. As much as possible, milestones were defined in terms of identifiable outputs or products to which time and dollar estimates might be tied. The final milestone was to be an estimated time to completion (including final reports). Where the milestone was an output, the nature of that output was to be indicated.

The ways in which findings of the research were expected to be applied in identifying and resolving environmental problems were to be clearly specified. Attempts were to be made to anticipate who might use the information, how it might be used, and the approach (formatting, presentation, politics) by which results of the research might be applied in protecting the environment. Authors were asked to indicate whether or not the answers to the questions posed could be obtained before the development activity commenced so that the results might be applied beforehand in order to circumvent potential problems.

The overall objective of the detailed planning process was to provide the pertinent information that an EPA contractor would need in order to begin work. Where the state of knowledge was so poorly developed that the specificity called for in the outline could not be provided, ways were to be suggested in which the uncertainties might be addressed and resolved creatively. The resulting 18 plans are detailed in Appendix A and summarized in this report under four research categories (air pollution, water contamination/consumption, habitat modification/manipulation and waste disposal).

METHODS

The highest priority research issues were selected on the basis of current knowledge about natural resource developments and their possible effects on cold-climate environments. Such knowledge is available primarily from the people involved in such matters on a daily basis. Consequently, these people were the principal sources of information, beginning with their involvement in an extensive series of interviews, continuing through their assistance in three research prioritization workshops, and culminating with their review and comment on this report.

INTERVIEWS AND SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

All interviews were conducted in person by the project manager. The initial list of interviewees was compiled from PNL and EPA resources and augmented by suggestions from the interviewees. The objective was to canvass experts from state and federal agencies, universities and private business, representing the widest possible range of environmental disciplines, resource developers and regulatory agencies. Each interviewee was asked the following questions:

- In your area(s) of knowledge, which natural resource developments, existing or contemplated, are most problematic (either the likelihood of adverse environmental and health effects is high or the uncertainty about this likelihood is high)?
- Among the problem areas identified, what kinds of research are most needed to enable us to circumvent or minimize the problems?
- In your opinion, which of these research problems should be EPA responsibilities?
- Are you aware of ongoing research or published reports which address these problem areas in detail?
- Are there other experts in your or related fields with whom we should talk?

Once the interviews had been completed, those interviewed or others they recommended became the pool from which we selected participants for the workshops in which research priorities would be decided. Criteria for selection included: standing among professional peers; cooperation and interest during discussions; availability; and ability to present, in an articulate manner, one or more of the points of view encountered.

WORKSHOP PROCESS FOR PRIORITIZING DECISION ALTERNATIVES

A portable, computer-aided decision process was developed by PNL specifically for this project. Its purpose was to enable a group of experts to simultaneously bring their subjective and objective knowledge to bear in identifying and ranking research options. The decision to use a computer-assisted approach resulted from our disillusionment with standard workshop methods in making good use of available expertise and in achieving

a collaborative decision representative of the overall group. The computer-assisted approach was applied three times on this project, first to identify and rank generic environmental research issues, second to identify and rank specific researchable problems under the higher priority generic issues, and third to prioritize detailed research plans. The approach followed in the workshops involves the steps described below:

Develop Provisional Lists of Decision Options and Judgement Criteria

Based on information developed in the interview phase, the project staff develops a comprehensive provisional list of decision options along with a list of criteria by which the importance of these options should be judged. These two lists are discussed and amended by workshop participants to their collective satisfaction. Considerable information is exchanged, leading to a common information base for group decisions. During this initial phase, all suggested items are added to the provisional list without criticism or debate.

Shorten the Lists

Workshop participants next reach a collective decision as to whether or not the lists of decision options and criteria are too long. Lists judged too long are shortened using agreed-upon "screens" for elimination. For example, generic research issues viewed as being under the jurisdiction of and adequately addressed by other agencies were eliminated from further consideration. In coming up with the final list of criteria it was necessary to keep in mind the following objectives: 1) keep the list as short as possible, 2) avoid overlap between criteria, and 3) cover the range of subjects that must be considered in prioritizing the decision alternatives.

Weight the Final List of Judgement Criteria

The selected criteria provide a common basis for judging the importance of decision options, in this case, environmental research options. Once we have a group of agreed-upon ranking criteria, the micro-computer is used to generate a list of the criteria in random pairs. Each participant "scores" the importance of the first member of each pair relative to the second member of the pair on a five-point scale. Pairing scores are entered into the computer where the "weight" of each criterion is calculated. The weights are a measure of the importance of a given judgement criterion relative to all the others and are used later in calculations which determine priority of decision options.

The paired comparison approach overcomes the inherent difficulties involved in making simultaneous comparisons among several criteria. Participants are required to indicate comparative importance between only two alternatives at any one time. All possible pairings are offered to ensure that each criterion is evaluated against every other criterion on the list. Randomization minimizes the possibility that weightings of the criteria would be influenced by the order of their treatment rather than intrinsic importance.

Prioritize Decision Alternatives

With a final list of decision alternatives and weighted judgement criteria in hand, the group is prepared for the definitive step in the workshop process, that of prioritizing the remaining decision options under consideration. It has been our experience that by this stage we have a very involved, very positive group of participants. However, having arrived at the point of actually making a decision, they are also biased in defense of their own preferred alternatives. Left unchecked, this tendency can have negative consequences.

For this and a variety of other practical reasons, we use an Apple II micro-computer to generate score sheets on which each participant makes his own ranking judgements independently of the rest of the group. A separate score sheet is generated for each decision alternative. The decision alternative is printed across the top of the page with the judgement criteria listed below. Beside each criterion are printed the numerals 0-9 representing the degree to which the participant believes that criterion applies to the given decision alternative. Each participant receives a complete set of score sheets on which he ranks the importance of each decision alternative based on each of the criteria listed below it. Participants are asked to indicate "no response" for any item on which they feel unqualified to make a judgement (in order to avoid offsetting the valid judgements of those who are qualified). Resulting scores from all participants are then entered into the micro-computer which stores and processes the data.

Details of criteria pair randomization, data input, validation and editing will not be discussed here. In the discussion of computer functions to follow, assume a workshop of "A" participants using "B" criteria to rank "I" decision alternatives or issues.

Storage of Data for Weighting Judgement Criteria

Consider the three dimensional array $X(a,b,c)$ where:

a = participant # (min = 1, max = A)

b = criterion # (min = 1, max = B)

c = criterion # (min = 1, max = B)

At each position of this array the computer stores a numeric value derived from each participant's evaluation of a pair of criteria, criterion-b vs. criterion-c. For the diagonal, where $b=c$, store a zero. Values stored in the array are shown in the following table.

<u>Evaluation</u>	<u>$X(a,b,c)$</u>	<u>$X(a,b,c)$</u>
criterion-b << criterion-c	0.0	1.0
criterion-b < criterion-c	0.25	0.75
criterion-b = criterion-c	0.5	0.5
criterion-b > criterion-c	0.75	0.25
criterion-b >> criterion-c	1.0	0.0
remembering the diagonals where $b=c$	0.0	0.0

Weighting Judgement Criteria

A weight for each judgement criterion may be computed for any specified group of participants ranging from the whole group down to one individual. The weight for criterion b is computed using all values stored in the three-dimensional array, x, which correspond to participants included in the specified group.

$$W_b = \frac{\sum_{a=1}^A \sum_{c=1}^B A(a,b,c)}{\sum_{a=1}^A \sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{c=1}^B A(a,b,c)}$$

Where participant a must be coded as included in the current subset.

This weight for criterion b is then converted to a percent of all responses made by the specified group:

$$\%b = W_b \times 100$$

Storage of Data for Issue Ranking

Each participant will score each issue on a 0 to 9 scale for each criterion. Consider the three dimensional array $X(i,a,b)$ where:

i = issue (min = 1, max = 1)

a = participant (min = 1, max = A)

b = criterion (min = 1, max = B)

The computer places the participant's scores in this array without modification; simply putting a value 0,1,2,3...., 8,9 in the proper location i,a,b .

Scoring the Issues

When calculating the issue score, the computer works only with the specified subset of participants and issues. That is, in computing the required sums, it omits those values in arrays x and y which correspond to excluded participants or issues.

The score for an issue is simply the sum of all included 0 to 9 responses for that issue multiplied by the group-determined weight for each criterion.

Thus the score S_i is:

$$S_i = \sum_{a=1}^A \sum_{b=1}^B Y(i,a,b) * W_b$$

The score is a measure of the importance of that decision alternative in the judgement of the specified group of participants.

Ranking the Issues

Once the scores, S_i , are computed, they are sorted in descending order, indicating relative importance.

Feedback Session

Results of the computer analysis are presented to participants in the final session of the workshop. Each participant is given an opportunity to comment on the results. It is in this session that important dissenting views, which might otherwise be lost in the consensus process, are captured. Frequently, this is also the time when innovative ideas develop from the new perspective afforded by an overview of the results.

Advantages of the Decision Process

The advantages offered by this process over standard workshop procedures may be summarized as follows:

- Maximizes Capture of Information: The process allows incorporation of the best subjective and objective knowledge and experience of every participant. It offers an opportunity for all participants to contribute both to the list of options and to the criteria by which their importance is judged, to clarify the options offered, and to express opinions both pro and con. Discussions leading up to final lists of weighted judgement criteria and options prove to be a valuable process of mutual education whereby a common information base is developed for sound group judgements.
- Minimizes Conflict: By providing each participant with an equal opportunity to express his or her views prior to preparing their individual scoresheets for the final ranking exercise, nonproductive and divisive debate is minimized.
- Achieves Consensus: The final, computerized result is a clear summary of the group judgement. Although an individual participant may not agree with that judgement, he recognizes that he has had an equal opportunity to influence it.
- Provides for In-Depth Analysis of Results: Computer tabulation of results provides for a better record and more thorough analysis of results than is possible under other presently accepted workshop procedures. In addition to analysis of group consensus, the process offers the option of analyzing the results by subgroupings such as disciplines, affiliations, or even individuals. The final computer printout offers in-depth information such as standard deviation (which provides a measure of the diversity of opinion on any given issue and allows insight into how agreement or disagreement is distributed among criteria).
- Provides Good Closure: Feedback and results are available during the process and final results are available to participants at the close of the workshop, thus enabling them to leave with a clear understanding of the outcome. The opportunity for each participant to comment

on the result offers a satisfying sense of accomplishment and closure to the workshop and enables workshop leaders to capture important dissenting views that might otherwise be lost in a typical consensus report.

The workshop prioritization process had to be applied in two workshops because ranking criteria were different for generic issues than for specific researchable problems within issues. For example, elegance of experimental design can be applied as a criterion only when considering specific problems.

RESEARCH PLANNING

Once the highest priority generic issues had been identified, a competitive RFP was issued soliciting bids in one or more of four research areas representing the four major routes of environmental effect: air pollution, water contamination/consumption, habitat modification/manipulation and waste disposal. The University of Alaska was selected in the first three categories and Tetra Tech., Inc was selected in the fourth.

These two organizations assisted with the development of specific research plans in two stages. First, following the initial workshop, they screened a large number of possible research problems under the highest priority generic issues. They then developed preliminary sketches for research on problems they deemed to be most important or research approaches that appeared most promising. These preliminary sketches were presented at the second workshop, added to by suggestions from reviewers and prioritized by the computer-aided decision process.

In the second phase of research planning, the subcontractors were asked to develop detailed research plans for as many of the highest priority preliminary sketches (or meaningful combinations thereof) as was possible within existing limits of time and resources. These plans were to be done according to the following format and general guidance:

INTRODUCTION

- Clear statement of the problem(s) and/or question(s) to be addressed by the research
- Current state of knowledge and available literature
- Rationale and background information on need for the research, its relevance to environmental decision making and why it is of interest to the EPA
- Relationship to the rest of the research package and to the guidance provided by the two workshops.

RESEARCH APPROACH

- Strategy for the proposed research, including identification of alternatives and arguments for selecting the proposed option

- Special characteristics of the approach that make it appealing from scientific and decision-making points of view
- Important aspects of experimental design to be addressed, include details of experimental design if sufficient information exists (or how this information should be obtained if not)
- Identification of study site alternatives, recommended sites and rationale

RESEARCH MILESTONES

Each research project was to be defined in terms of a series of milestones recommended by the planning team, beginning with an indication of when the research should begin and why. As much as possible, milestones were defined in terms of identifiable outputs to which time and dollar estimates might be tied. The final milestone was to be an estimated time to completion (including final reports). Where the milestone was an output, the nature of that output was to be indicated.

REQUIRED RESOURCES

- Manpower, time (in months) and dollars estimated for reaching each milestone
- Type of expertise and organizational qualifications required for successful completion of the work
- Identification of specific organization and individuals having the qualifications to perform the work

APPLICATION OF RESULTS

The ways in which findings of the research were expected to be applied in identifying and resolving environmental problems were to be clearly specified. Attempts were to be made to anticipate who might use the information, how it might be used, and the approach (formatting, presentation, politics) by which results of the research might be applied in protecting the environment. Statements were to indicate that if the answers to the questions posed could be obtained before the development activity commenced, the results might be applied beforehand to circumvent potential problems. The overall objective of the detailed planning process was to provide the pertinent information that an EPA contractor would need in order to start work immediately. Where the state of knowledge was so poorly developed that the specificity called for in the outline could not be provided, ways were to be suggested in which the uncertainties might be addressed and resolved creatively.

RESULTS

This section presents the major results of each of the three project phases discussed above -- interviews, prioritization of generic issues and specific research problems and detailed research planning.

INTERVIEWS

Interviews produced the preliminary lists of generic research issues from which all else followed. The agencies, organizations, expertise and/or interests represented at the interviews are given in Table 1. To further ensure as broad a base as possible, an effort was made to include additional agencies, organizations and individuals in later phases of the work.

GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

The task of determining what the EPA should include in its Cold-Climate Environmental Research Program was not a simple one. At the beginning it was necessary to treat the subject broadly enough to include the entire range of environmental issues potentially associated with natural resource development in Alaska. Then, by a logical process that incorporated existing knowledge on cold-climate environmental research needs, we needed to focus on the relatively few problems most appropriate for concentrated EPA attention. Finally, we had to select a very few "straws" out of the "haystack" of potential environmental problems from which to develop detailed research plans and experimental designs for EPA cold-climate research.

Workshop Participants

Participants in the initial workshop were selected to collectively represent a broad range of opinions on cold-climate research needs (Table 2). EPA representation ranged through all levels of administration from the Alaskan Field Office to the Washington Office of Research and Development. There were also representatives from other federal and state agencies, major resource developers, environmental consultants, and university experts representing major environmental disciplines.

Broad Range of Issues

Early in the planning effort, it was perceived that the level at which environmental issues were defined must somehow be standardized. When an expert was asked for his list of high-priority issues, the response almost invariably ranged through a continuum from very generic (effects of oil and gas development on marine ecosystems) to very specific (effects of aromatic hydrocarbons on species A in Valdez Harbor). Any attempt to prioritize a list of issues ranging through this continuum is a feat of mental gymnastics which favors those issues we know most about. In addition, the very generic issues encompass too many potential research problems while at the very specific level there are too many research problems to list, much less prioritize.

Table 1. Contacts Made as a Basis for Initial List of Cold-Climate Environmental Research Issues and Potential Workshop Participants.

NAME	ORGANIZATION	POSITION OR EXPERTISE	LOCATION
<u>Business and Other</u>			
Wayne Hanson	ERTEC	Terrestrial Ecologist	Anchorage
Jim Hemming	Dames & Moore	Manager, Alaska Operations	Anchorage
Dick Firth	Woodward-Clyde Consultants	Vice President	Anchorage
Larry Rundquist	Woodward-Clyde Consultants	River Engineer	Anchorage
Mike Joyce	Woodward-Clyde Consultants	Staff Biologist	Anchorage
Ihor Lysyj	Rockwell International, Inc.	Marine Biologist	Newbury Park, CA
Russell Babcock	Bear Creek Mining Company	Vice President	Anchorage
Rick Shafer	Sohio	Manager, Environmental Affairs	Anchorage
Scott Robertson	Atlantic Richfield Company	Senior Environmental Coordinator	Anchorage
G. Scott Ronzio	Atlantic Richfield Company	Senior Environmental Coordinator	Anchorage
Walt Parker	Parker and Associates	President and Transportation/ Telecommunications Consultant	Anchorage
Chris Noah	Alaska Council on Science & Technology	Executive Director	Juneau
Dick Mikkelsen	Alyeska Pipeline Company	Environmental Coordinator	Anchorage
Dennis Predville	Alyeska Pipeline Company	Government Affairs Supervisor	Anchorage
Marc Lorenzen	Tetra Tech., Inc.	Vice President	Seattle
Melissa Strom	Alaska Conservation Foundation	Executive Secretary	Anchorage
<u>State Agencies and Municipalities</u>			
Jim Anderson	Alaska Department of Natural Resources	Director, Technology Transfer	Anchorage
Ken Hudson	Alaska Department of Natural Resources	Div. of Minerals and Energy Management	Anchorage
Greg Daggett	Alaska Department of Natural Resources	Div. of Land and Water Management	Anchorage
Meg Hayes	Alaska Department of Natural Resources	Div. of Land and Water Management	Anchorage
Pete Authier	Alaska Department of Natural Resources	Div. of Forestry	Anchorage
Marco Pignalberi	Doyon Limited, Native Corporation	President	Fairbanks
Phil Derrien	Doyon Limited, Native Corporation	Biologist	Fairbanks
Dick Eakins	Division of Industrial Development	Director	Juneau
James Souby	Division of Policy Development and Planning	Director	Juneau
Gretchen Keiser	Division of Policy Development and Planning	Coordinator, Oil and Gas Leasing	Juneau
Ernst Mueller	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation	Director	Juneau

Table 1 (Page 2)

NAME	ORGANIZATION	POSITION OR EXPERTISE	LOCATION
Glenn Akins	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation	Assistant Director	Juneau
Bill Lamoreaux	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation	Coordinator, Anchorage District Office	Anchorage
John Halterman	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation	Director, Program Division	Juneau
Leonard Verrelli	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation	Air Quality Program, Supervisor	Juneau
Douglas Redburn	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation	Oceanographer, Environmental Assessment	Juneau
Dave Sturdevant	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation	Terrestrial Habitat Protection	Juneau
Tony Burns	Municipality of Anchorage	Municipal Planner, Remote Sensing	Anchorage
<u>Universities</u>			
David Hickok	Alaska Environmental Information and Data Center,	Director	Anchorage
	Alaska Council on Science and Technology	Director	Anchorage
Larry Underwood	Alaska Environmental Information and Data Center	Physiological Ecologist	Anchorage
Don Button	University of Alaska, Institute of Marine Sciences	Environmental Chemist	Fairbanks
John Bligh	University of Alaska, Institute of Arctic Biology	Chairman	Fairbanks
Glenn Juday	University of Alaska, Institute of Northern Forestry	Ecological Reserves Coordinator	Fairbanks
Dave Norton	University of Alaska, Geophysical Institute	Ecologist	Fairbanks
Neil Davis	University of Alaska, Geophysical Institute	Meteorology/Seismology	Fairbanks
Robert Weeden	University of Alaska, Resource Management	Natural Resources Management	Fairbanks
Robert Carlson	University of Alaska, Institute of Water Resources	Engineer, Hydrologist	Fairbanks
Vim Wright	University of Washington, School of Environmental Studies	Acting Director	Seattle
Ostello Leopold	University of Washington, Quaternary Research Center	Director	Seattle
A. Lincoln Washburn	University of Washington, Quaternary Research Center	Chairman, Polar Research Board NAS	Seattle
N. Untersteiner	University of Washington, Quaternary Research Center	Director, Polar Research Center	Seattle
Larry Bliss	University of Washington, Botany Department	Chairman	Seattle
<u>Federal Agencies</u>			
Calvin Lensink	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Project Leader, Marine Birds	Anchorage
Bill Palmisano	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Director of Research	Anchorage
John Morrison	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Special Studies Group Leader	Anchorage
Keith Bayha	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Director, Habitat Preservation	Anchorage
Ray Corning	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Analyst, Habitat Preservation	Anchorage
Earl Kari	U.S. EPA - Pipeline Inspectors Office	Director, Environmental Studies	Anchorage
Robert Courson	U.S. EPA - Region X Headquarters	Director, Technical Services	Seattle

Table 1 (Page 3)

NAME	ORGANIZATION	POSITION OR EXPERTISE	LOCATION
Jim Sweeney	J.S. EPA, Alaska Operations Office	Director	Anchorage
Ray Morris	U.S. EPA, Alaska Operations Office	Chief, Oil and Special Materials	Anchorage
Norman Glass	U.S. EPA - Corvallis Environmental Research Lab	Director, Terrestrial Division	Corvallis
Dick Tindall	U.S. Bureau of Land Management	District Office Director	Anchorage
Dick Vernimen	U.S. Bureau of Land Management	District Office Associate Director	Anchorage
Art Hosterman	U.S. Bureau of Land Management	Chief, Biological Resources	Anchorage
Jim Johnson	U.S. Bureau of Land Management	Chief, Division of Resources	Anchorage
Bill Gabriel	U.S. Bureau of Land Management	Special Studies Group Leader, State Office	Anchorage
Terry McFadden	Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory	Chief, Alaska Projects Office	Ft. Wainwright
Max Brewer	U.S. Geological Survey	Operations Chief, AK Petroleum Reserves	Anchorage
John Haugh	U.S. Geological Survey	Biologist	Reston, VA
Leslie Vierick	U.S. Forest Service	Ecologist	Fairbanks

TABLE 2. Participants in Workshop to Prioritize Generic, Cold-Climate Environmental Research Issues.

NAME	ORGANIZATION	POSITION OR EXPERTISE	LOCATION
Larry Bliss	University of Washington, Botany Dept.	Chairman	Seattle
Charles Boddy	Usibelli Mining Company	Director of Reclamation	Usibelli
Raymond Corning	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Habitat Protection	Anchorage
Ray Dronenburg	North Slope Borough	Science Coordinator	Barrow
Al Galli	U.S. EPA - Environmental Processes and Effects Research	EPA Mission and Mandate	Wash. D.C.
Norman Glass	U.S. EPA - Corvallis Research Lab	Director, Terrestrial Division	Corvallis
Ray Hadley	University of Alaska - Institute of Marine Science	Assistant Director	Fairbanks
Jim Hemming	Dames & Moore	Manager, Alaska Operations	Anchorage
Larry Johnson	University of Alaska & Cold-Regions Research & Engineering Lab	Plant Ecologist	Fairbanks
Ronald Johnson	University of Alaska - Mechanical Engineering	Water Pollution Control Technology	Fairbanks
Ron Kreizenbeck	EPA - Region 10 Office	Appointed to Direct Alaska Operations	Seattle
Dick Mikkelsen	Alyeska Pipeline Company	Environment	Anchorage
Ray Morris	Marine Consultants	Marine Biologist	Anchorage
David Norton	University of Alaska - Geophysical Institute	OCS Project Biologist	Fairbanks
Douglas Redburn	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation	Oceanographer, Environmental Assessment	Juneau
Scott Robertson	ARCO Alaska, Inc.	Senior Environmental Coordinator	Anchorage
Mary Ann Simmons	Pacific Northwest Laboratory	Statistics and Computer Programming	Richland
Jim States	Pacific Northwest Laboratory	Project Leader	Richland
Kimbal Sundberg	Alaska Department of Fish and Game	Habitat Protection	Anchorage
Leonard Verrelli	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation	Air Quality Program Supervisor	Juneau

To minimize these difficulties, we first defined environmental issues at an intermediate level of specificity. The resulting level remained well above the level at which one would normally attempt to develop experimental designs. We therefore designated them "generic environmental issues." They were characterized in terms of five principal aspects:

- the natural resource development under consideration
- the stages or phases of development involved
- principal routes through which environmental effects may be transmitted
- major environmental effects for which concern has been expressed
- important geographic, climatic or other physical/environmental variables to be considered.

The first three components describe the development activity aspects of an issue (development type, development phase and route for environmental effect), thus providing a common level of issue definition. The last two components describe the "problem" aspect of the issue. For the purposes of this project, then, an environmental issue was any natural resource development activity for which we might anticipate significant environmental problems.

Workshop participants considered 120 natural resource development activities that could potentially affect the environment (States 1982, Appendix E). The activities were grouped under seven major types of natural resource development and a cumulative effects category:

1. Nonfuel Minerals
2. Oil and Gas
3. Coal
4. Electrical Power Generation
5. Renewable Resource Utilization - Fisheries
6. Renewable Resource Utilization - Timber
7. Renewable Resource Utilization - Agriculture
8. Cumulative and/or Regional Effects

Each of the seven major types of natural resource development were subdivided into four or five stages or phases of development (such as extraction, processing, product transport and storage, accidents and associated population/infrastructure development). These, in turn, were subdivided into four principal routes through which effects might be transmitted: air emissions, water contamination/consumption, habitat modification/removal and waste disposal. This exercise ultimately yielded 120 natural resource development activities.

These 120 activities were either ranked or were screened out during the three-day workshop. Elimination was by one or more of the following screening criteria:

- failure to identify significant environmental problems potentially associated with the development activity
- potential problems were identified but considered relatively unimportant

- identified problems were not germane to EPA mission or mandates
- the issue is being adequately addressed by other organizations

Issue Priorities

Eighty-two of the 120 items were eliminated. Seventeen experts participated in ranking the remaining 38 issues, using the computer-aided process described in the Methods section of this report. In addition to listing the 38 issues in order of priority there are two other ways to look at the workshop results (States, 1982). First, the issues can be ranked as to how the expressions of environmental concern were distributed among major development types. By this approach, oil and gas development accounted for over half of all concerns expressed by workshop participants. A second way to analyze the results is in terms of the major "route" of environmental effect. The greatest concerns, expressed in descending order, were for water contamination/consumption, air emissions, waste disposal, and habitat modification/removal. A large, natural break in weighted scores below issue 15 was conveniently used to further shorten the 38 issue list. Elimination was necessary because funds for environmental research are limited. These are the top 15 issues on which research should be focused:

1. Effects of oil and gas processing (including petrochemicals) through air emissions
2. Cumulative and/or regional effects through air emissions
3. Cumulative and/or regional effects through water contamination/consumption
4. Effect of oil and gas accidents through habitat modification
5. Cumulative and/or regional effects through habitat modification/removal
6. Effects of oil and gas product transport and storage through habitat modification/removal
7. Cumulative and/or regional effects through waste disposal
8. Effects of nonfuel mineral extraction through habitat modification/removal
9. Effects of oil and gas processing (include petrochemicals) through waste disposal
10. Effects of oil and gas processing (include petrochemicals) through water contamination/consumption
11. Effects of nonfuel mineral extraction through water contamination/consumption
12. Effects of electrical generation operations (all types) through air emissions

13. Effects of oil and gas support-population/infrastructure through air emissions
14. Effect of oil and gas accidents through water contamination/consumption
15. Effects of oil and gas extraction through water contamination/consumption.

Although the list is organized by priority, research is usually organized under disciplines. Therefore, the list was reorganized and categorized based on routes of environmental effect (Table 3), which more adequately reflects usual disciplines or areas of scientific research. Detailed research plans were developed for selected problems in the four routes of effect and under the 15 issues within those routes. Attention was given to each issue to the degree suggested by its priority ranking. Cumulative and/or regional effects are special problems requiring greater resources than are available to the EPA alone. The approaches or strategies for dealing with these problems will be addressed during the course of the program through joint funding and cooperative agreements with other agencies and organizations.

TABLE 3. Environmental "Route" Categories Encompassing the Top 15 Issues

<u>Route</u>	<u>Issue Development Type</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Rank</u>
Water Contamination/ Consumption	Cumulative/Regional Effects - Oil & Gas	All	3
		Processing	10
		Accidents	14
		Extraction	15
	Non-fuel Minerals	Extraction	11
Air Emissions	Cumulative/Regional Effects - Oil & Gas	All	2
		Processing	1
	Electrical Power	Support Population/ Infrastructures Operations	13 12
Waste Disposal	Cumulative/Regional Effects - Oil & Gas	All	7
		Processing	9
Habitat Modification/ Removal	Cumulative/Regional Effects - Oil & Gas	All	5
		Accidents	4
		Product Transport/ Storage	6
	Non-fuel Minerals	Extractive	8

SPECIFIC RESEARCH PROBLEMS

The above-described process of reducing the number of generic environmental issues from 200 to 15 provided a relatively narrow range of topics within which the project team could identify researchable questions or problems and select a few of these for sketching out possible research. This was accomplished in the following steps:

- A comprehensive list of candidate problems was developed under the four major routes for effects (air pollution, water contamination/consumption, habitat modification/removal and waste disposal).
- Experts prepared preliminary research sketches for as many of the candidate problems as possible.
- Sketches were reviewed and modified by the project team in cooperation with the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, the state agency whose local perspective was most like that of the EPA.
- The modified list of preliminary sketches was presented at a second workshop. Invited reviewers had received the list of candidates prior to the workshop and were asked to come prepared to add their own suggestions. The combined list of sketches was then prioritized using the computer-aided decision process.

Workshop Participants

A second workshop was convened to select the highest priority research problems for detailed research planning. Participants were of two types. One group consisted of a combined team from the four task groups (air pollution, water contamination/consumption, habitat manipulation/modification and waste disposal) and the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation. This first group had developed the preliminary sketches. The other group consisted of invited reviewers. Participants in this group were selected on the basis of their 1) having participated in the earlier workshop, thereby providing both expertise and continuity to the second workshop, 2) having been recommended by project task leaders as able to bring particularly pertinent technical knowledge into the review process, and 3) being representatives of other agencies or organizations having environmental responsibilities but not having been previously involved in the project. A list of participants is given in Table 4.

Broad Range of Problems

Distribution of the 15 high-priority generic issues into four task areas provided the focus for identifying specific problems in each area. The task leader and a team of experts discussed each set of problems extensively before selecting the top candidates for recommendation to the project team as a whole. For example, the waste disposal team evaluated 25 potential problems of which only five were retained for discussions with the rest of the planning group. Although it is not possible to discuss all of the candidate problems considered, a list of the 25 waste disposal topics and reasons for their acceptance or rejection are given in Tables 5 and 6, respectively.

TABLE 4. Participants in Workshop to Prioritize Specific Cold-Climate Research Topics That Were Identified Under High-Priority Generic Issues.

NAME	ORGANIZATION	POSITION, EXPERTISE OR GROUP	LOCATION
Don Button	University of Alaska, Institute of Marine Sciences	Environmental Chemist	Fairbanks
Terry Chapin	University of Alaska	Habitat	Fairbanks
Norman Glass	U.S. EPA - Corvallis Environmental Research Lab	Director, Terrestrial Division	Corvallis
Tom Gosink	University of Alaska	Air Pollution	Fairbanks
Larry Johnson	University of Alaska & Cold-Regions Research & Engineering Lab	Plant Ecologist	Fairbanks
Ronald Johnson	University of Alaska - Mechanical Engineering	Water Pollution Control Technology	Fairbanks
Glenn Juday	University of Alaska, Institute of Northern Forestry	Habitat	Fairbanks
Glenn Shaw	University of Alaska, Geophysical Institute	Air Pollution	Fairbanks
Deborah Kirk	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation	Air Pollution	Juneau
Rosa Meehan	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Habitat	Fairbanks
Ted Merrell	National Marine Fisheries Laboratory	Marine Pollution	Auke Bay
Helen Myers	University of Alaska, WAMI Medical Education Program	Human Health	Fairbanks
David Norton	University of Alaska, Geophysical Institute	Coordinator	Fairbanks
Walt Pearson	Battelle Marine Research Laboratory	Marine Pollution	Sequim, WA
Ken Rahn	University of Rhode Island, Graduate School of Oceanography	Air Pollution	Narragansett, RI
Douglas Redburn	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation	Oceanographer, Environmental Assessment	Juneau
Scott Robertson	ARCO Alaska, Inc.	Senior Environmental Coordinator	Anchorage
Don Schell	University of Alaska, Institute of Water Resources	Water Pollution	Fairbanks
Robert Sener	Tetra Tech., Inc.	Waste Disposal	Anchorage
David Shaw	University of Alaska, Institute of Marine Science	Marine Pollution	Fairbanks
Charles Slaughter	U.S. Forest Service	Habitat	Fairbanks
Kimbal Sundberg	Alaska Department of Fish & Game	Habitat Protection	Anchorage
Steve Sparrow	University of Alaska, Agricultural Experiment Station	Habitat/Agriculture	Fairbanks
James Sweeney	Environmental Protection Agency, Alaska Operations	Air Pollution	Anchorage
Leonard Verrelli	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation	Air Pollution	Juneau
Patrick Webber	University of Colorado, Institute of Arctic Alpine Research	Plant Ecology	Boulder, CO
Jim States	Battelle Alaska Operations	Project Leader	Anchorage
Gunter Weller	University of Alaska, Geophysical Institute	Air Pollution	Fairbanks
Dick Williams	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation	Waste Disposal	Fairbanks
Carol Lewis	University of Alaska, Agricultural Experiment Station	Habitat/Agriculture	Fairbanks
Carl Amstrup	Alaska Agricultural Action Council	Executive Director, Habitat/Agriculture	Fairbanks

TABLE 5. Waste Disposal Topics Recommended for Inclusion in Research Prioritization Workshop.

<u>WASTE DISPOSAL TOPIC</u>	<u>REASON FOR INCLUSION</u>
1. Cost-Effective Waste Treatment and Disposal Alternatives for Rural Alaskan Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Inappropriate, outmoded procedures in effect at most communities. o Wastes persist and accumulate yearly in cold climates. o No integrated program exists to provide practical solutions.
2. Small-Scale Treatment Technologies for On-Site Greywater Disposal in Permafrost Soils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Septic tanks and leach fields inefficient in permafrost areas. o Alternative cold-climate sewage treatment systems exclude greywater from treatment. o Greywater often dumped untreated around residences or facilities. o Yet greywater treatment is required by State of Alaska regulations, creating a regulatory dilemma. o No cost-effective solution has been identified for single-residence or single-family use.
3. Solid Waste Generation Rates and Predictive Model for Rural Alaska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No available information exists on waste generation rates for rural Alaskan communities. o This lack of knowledge limits agency ability to develop effective waste management and resource recovery procedures. o Results will allow projection of disposal site life expectancies and enable realistic planning and design of new sites.
4. Effect of Arctic Climate on Solid and Liquid Waste Decomposition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No data available for arctic conditions. o Wastes persist and accumulate year after year at disposal sites. o We need to know if certain wastes should be disposed of differently in cold climates, and how to do so efficiently.
5. Freeze-Thaw Cycle Effects on Concentration and Migration of Contaminants at Disposal Sites and Settling Ponds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o At disposal sites and settling ponds, the yearly freeze-thaw cycle may produce zone concentration of contaminants in far greater concentration than the waste stream. o Innovative design features can avoid build-up of heavy metals or other contaminants in bottom sludge at these sites.

TABLE 6. Waste Disposal Topics Not Recommended for Inclusion in Research Prioritization Workshop.

<u>WASTE DISPOSAL TOPICS</u>	<u>REASONS FOR PROVISIONAL EXCLUSION</u>
1. Control of Arsenic Contamination from Mine Tailings	o Site-specific, case-by-case monitoring and mitigation will be conducted by industry and agencies.
2. PCB Waste Management in Alaska: Associated Problems and State-of-the-Art Procedures	o Agency consensus that this is not a current problem.
3. Restoration of Hazardous Waste Sites and Spill-Damaged Areas	o Funding should be provided by private sector.
4. A Community (Small and Rural) Model for Handling Hazardous Material Transportation Emergencies	o Not sufficiently research oriented.
5. Innovative Technologies to Detect Waste Plume Movements in Multimedia Environments	o Agency need not demonstrated for Alaska.
6. Landfill Design for Permafrost Soils	o Integrated into "Cost-Effective Waste Treatment and Disposal Alternatives for Rural Alaskan Communities."
7. Acid Mine Drainage	o Site-specific, case-by-case monitoring and mitigation will be conducted.
8. Effects of Acidity from Snowmelt	o Review comments indicate low priority.
9. Spray Atomization of Wastewater at Remote or Mobile Camp Facilities	o ADEC may investigate this possibility in-house.
10. Oceanic Disposal of Non-Hazardous Solid Wastes	o Application probably not practical for small communities.
11. Alternative Technologies for Disposal of Seafood Processing Wastes	o Brown and Caldwell study now in progress.
12. Control of Suspended Fines from Off-shore Dredging and Artificial Island Construction	o Energy and mining industries giving attention to this problem through privately funded studies.

(Table 6 continued)

<u>WASTE DISPOSAL TOPICS</u>	<u>REASONS FOR PROVISIONAL EXCLUSION</u>
13. Processing of Metalliferous Gravels and Muds at Offshore or Coastal Facilities	o Activities are subject to agency monitoring.
14. Effects of Suspended Drilling Mud Components and Dissolved Additives on Marine Plakton	o Energy industry giving attention to this problem through privately funded studies.
15. Optimum Offshore Disposal Techniques for Drilling Mud, Cuttings, and Conditioners	o Energy industry giving attention to this problem through privately funded studies.
16. Control of Leachate Runnoff from Highly Mineralized Mine Tailings	o Private industry and agency monitoring programs will be available.
17. Putrescible Waste Management at Remote Camps	o Technology available; increased compliance enforcement required.
18. Gas Turbine Stack Injection of Liquid Waste	o Now under study by Northwest Alaskan Pipeline Company and ADEC.
19. Effects of Waste Disposal on Pathogen Distribution in Lakes and Lagoons	o Transferred to Water Quality Group for review.
20. Restoration of Settling Ponds and Reserve Pits Following Mining or Drilling	o More appropriate for industry-funded programs.

In a meeting of project coordinators, task leaders, several representatives from the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation and a representative from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the overall list of candidates for research planning was reduced to 42. Although much shorter than the initial list, it was still much too long for all to be included in the EPA program. Hence, the need for convening a second prioritization workshop. Prior to the workshop, preliminary sketches for the required research were written to provide sufficient information on objectives, scope, timing and costs for well-reasoned comparisons.

Problem Priorities

At the workshop, seven more candidate problems were added to the list, bringing the total number to 49. These 49 were presented, discussed and prioritized, using the computer-aided decision process. Results are shown for candidate problems in each of the four research areas plus the group of topics added in the workshop (Table 7). The rank of each candidate is given for the workshop as a whole and then for subgroups defined by scientific discipline or affiliation. The numbers in parentheses at the end of each topic title refer to a numbered preliminary sketch in Appendix B.

Synthesis

The research prioritization exercise was necessarily a reductionist approach, beginning with the wide range of generic environmental issues associated with natural resource development and ending with only a few discrete research tasks of the highest priority. Research planning team members were strongly convinced, however, that the research planning process (as opposed to the prioritization process) should produce an integrated, implementable research package directed towards answering relevant, high-priority questions. To that end the planning team was asked to pay particular attention to the following advice offered by participants in the final workshop feedback session:

- Consider combining several research problems by identifying regions and specific sites where research which integrates a number of the high-priority research tasks might be undertaken.
- Develop, if possible, detailed research plans on one or more of the higher priority research topics in each of the four categories, thereby offering a program that is comprehensive as well as focused on the most important problems.
- Provide a mix of basic and applied, long- and short-term studies.
- Seek opportunities for cooperation and collaboration with other agencies so as to cover as many of the priority research topics as possible within given funding limitations.

The research plans developed by the planning team are presented in the following section.

Table 7. Results of Environmental Research Prioritization Workshop at Chena Hot Springs, Fairbanks, Alaska, March 30 - April 2, 1982. Shown are the relative rankings for 49 research topics considered by all workshop participants and by subgroupings of those participants according to scientific discipline or agency affiliation.

	Topic Number and Title (Rank)	All Participants (n = 28)	Discipline					Affiliation					
			Air (6)	Habitat (8)	Water (6)	Waste (2)	Other (6)	Agency (9)	University (14)	Consultant (3)	DEC (4)	EPA (2)	FWS & FG (2)
Air Pollution	1. Air Pollution -- Define Problem -- Literature Survey (1)	29	43	11	31	30	8	40	17	34	46	17	34
	2. Air Pollution -- Sources and Transport -- Dispersion from Local Pollution -- Added Tracers (2A)	3	7	7	6	8	19	8	7	4	??	40	11
	3. Air Pollution -- Sources and Transport -- Dispersion from Local Pollution -- Natural Tracers (2B)	33	23	38	14	12	40	34	29	22	33	34	24
	4. Air Pollution -- Sources and Transport -- Dispersion from Local Pollution -- Downwash of Stack Effluents (2C)	7	6	26	11	31	1	2	23	35	3	2	30
	5. Air Pollution -- Sources and Transport -- Dispersion from Local Pollution -- Meteorological Prediction of High CO Days (2D)	2	3	13	15	9	6	1	21	23	2	4	6
	6. Air Pollution -- Sources and Transport -- Intermediate and Long Range Transport -- Industrial Pollutants (3A)	13	9	28	17	26	12	14	12	24	16	20	36
	7. Air Pollution -- Sources and Transport -- Intermediate and Long Range Transport -- Imported Pollutants (3B)	4	13	15	1	27	5	20	1	12	21	8	28
	8. Air Pollution -- Chemistry -- Urban and Industrial -- Priority Pollutants (4A)	1	1	4	12	5	9	3	3	5	1	28	8
	9. Air Pollution -- Chemistry -- Urban and Industrial -- Pollutant Photochemistry (4B)	17	4	23	28	16	30	9	26	25	4	42	18
	10. Air Pollution -- Chemistry -- Urban and Industrial -- Pollutant Deposition (4C)	9	2	18	32	23	18	7	22	31	5	19	29
	11. Air Pollution -- Chemistry -- Background Levels -- Natural (4D)	21	8	24	34	35	27	24	20	33	20	45	23
	12. Air Pollution -- Chemistry -- Secondary Pollutants (4E)	32	12	34	38	28	36	32	30	14	19	48	31
	13. Air Pollution -- Effects -- Ames Mutagenicity Tests (5A)	38	22	42	40	15	39	39	39	15	31	39	38
	14. Air Pollution -- Effects -- Health Effects -- Respirable Particles (5B)	8	10	30	7	2	17	12	16	9	9	36	32
	15. Air Pollution -- Effects -- pH -- Acid, Alkaline Precipitation (6)	19	5	36	10	43	24	21	41	41	15	33	41
	16. Air Pollution -- Mitigative Measures -- CO Reduction by Alternate Fuels (7A)	16	14	29	21	11	3	5	32	21	12	3	2
	17. Air Pollution -- Mitigative Measures -- Vehicle Use Studies (7B)	5	11	12	5	21	4	4	19	16	10	9	1
	18. Air Pollution -- Synthesis of Cold Climate Air Pollution (8)	10	41	2	19	33	7	26	5	19	41	12	4
Habitat Modification	19. Habitat Modification -- Forest Management and Aquatic Habitats (1)	23	28	10	13	29	33	33	11	10	27	27	35
	20. Habitat Modification -- Gravel Removal from Riparian Habitats (2)	26	34	6	30	18	29	31	15	11	35	16	17
	21. Habitat Modification -- Oil Development in Coastal Tundra Wetlands (3)	15	32	1	24	36	23	16	6	32	29	5	3
	22. Habitat Modification -- Environmental Optimization of Transportation Corridors (4)	35	36	20	37	20	32	37	24	13	37	13	30
	23. Habitat Modification -- Damage Assessment and Mitigation of Oil Spills (5)	34	24	22	45	42	16	30	31	26	24	22	37
	24. Habitat Modification -- Agricultural Land Clearing and Migratory Birds (8)	49	49	49	48	49	48	49	48	48	49	49	48

(continued)

Table 7 (continued)

	Topic Number and Title (Rank)	All Participants (n = 28)	Discipline					Affiliation					
			Air (6)	Habitat (8)	Water (6)	Waste (2)	Other (6)	Agency (9)	University (14)	Consultant (3)	DEC (4)	EPA (2)	FWS & FG (2)
Water Contamination	25. Water Contamination -- Ecosystem Impacts of Placer Mining (1)	14	25	3	23	32	13	13	13	20	23	6	5
	26. Water Contamination -- Control of Sediment Discharge (2)	37	45	32	27	44	26	36	38	29	39	15	21
	27. Water Contamination -- Peat Mining Effect on Aquatic Ecosystems (3)	27	35	9	9	22	43	35	10	42	40	21	19
	28. Water Contamination -- Dissolved Hydrocarbons -- Concentrations (4A)	24	30	21	16	17	22	27	13	40	26	23	27
	29. Water Contamination -- Dissolved Hydrocarbons -- Biodegradation (4B)	22	40	16	8	14	20	28	9	37	38	24	15
	30. Water Contamination -- Dissolved Hydrocarbons -- Excreted Products (4C)	30	42	15	18	25	37	44	2	38	47	35	42
	31. Water Contamination -- Dissolved Hydrocarbons -- Chronic Effects on Algae (4D)	41	27	39	39	37	44	43	25	45	30	36	47
	32. Water Contamination -- Petroleum Pollution in Oil Brine and Waters off North Slope (5)	31	44	37	2	3	21	17	27	43	25	7	10
	33. Water Contamination -- Innovative Biomonitoring -- Literature Review and Field Evaluation (6)	11	19	5	29	24	10	15	8	17	17	25	9
	34. Water Contamination -- Sublethal Toxicity of Produced Waters (7)	18	17	40	3	4	14	10	28	27	11	11	12
	35. Water Contamination -- Literature Survey, Environmental Effects of Chronic Industrial Discharges (8A)	39	36	31	46	34	31	25	44	30	22	26	7
	36. Water Contamination -- Herbicide Effects and Stream Eutrophication from Farming (10, 11)	43	37	33	47	41	42	46	37	36	42	44	44
	37. Water Contamination -- Development of Northern Lakes Water Quality Model (12)	44	29	45	42	38	45	41	43	44	36	30	22
Waste	38. Waste -- Cost-Effective Waste Treatment and Disposal Alternatives for Rural Alaskan Communities (1)	12	16	19	20	3	11	6	35	3	6	14	16
	39. Waste -- Small Scale Treatment Technologies for On-Site Graywater Disposal in Permafrost Soils (2)	20	21	25	22	7	15	11	33	8	14	10	26
	40. Waste -- Solid Waste Generation Rates and Predictive Model for Rural Alaska (3)	36	18	43	43	1	35	22	45	6	8	29	43
	41. Waste -- Effect of Arctic Climate on Waste Decomposition (4)	28	20	27	33	6	25	19	41	1	13	18	39
	42. Waste -- Freeze-Thaw Cycle Effects on Contaminant Behavior at Disposal Sites (5)	25	15	17	36	10	38	23	36	2	18	32	25
Other	43. Other -- Asbestos Levels in Rural Alaskan Drinking Water (1)	6	26	8	4	19	2	18	4	7	28	1	14
	44. Other -- sediment Contamination in Cold Climate Aquatic and Marine Systems (2)	40	39	41	25	47	34	29	40	39	43	31	33
	45. Other -- Litter/Detritus Degradation as a Measure of Ecosystem Function (3)	46	31	46	35	48	41	42	47	28	45	37	46
	46. Salmon Carcasses as Source of Nutrients in Arctic Freshwater Systems (4)	48	48	48	49	39	49	45	49	49	32	47	40
	47. Semi-Mobile Research Support Facility (5)	45	46	44	41	40	28	47	42	18	48	41	45
	48. Research Reserves (6)	47	47	47	44	46	47	48	46	46	44	46	49
	49. Water Contamination -- Oil Development Impact on Seagrass Ecosystems (6)	42	33	35	26	45	46	38	34	47	34	43	13

COLD-CLIMATE RESEARCH PROGRAM

The project team selected several from among the 49 research problems to be developed as detailed research plans. In making their selections, task leaders were asked to consider the advice from the workshop feedback session; consider the prioritization results, particularly emphasizing those research topics which had been highly rated by 1) the overall group, 2) the experts in that particular research area, and 3) the EPA and/or the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (Table 7); and to use their best professional judgement in modifying and synthesizing topics where it seemed advisable. Consequently, there is no one-to-one relationship between research topics offered at the workshop and research plans developed by the planning team. The research plans (Appendix A) were submitted to Battelle by Tetra Tech., Inc. and the University of Alaska. Appendix A was prepared as a comprehensive five-year research program; all research plans included are considered to be of high priority for initiating or continuing research in the near term. The resulting 17 plans are numbered and summarized below in four research categories (Air Pollution, Water Contamination/Consumption, Habitat Modification/ Manipulation and Waste Disposal). An additional plan on vehicle emissions was included later as a completion of ongoing research on carbon monoxide problems. Numbered research plans were prioritized by a multi-agency oversight committee (see Current Program Status section).

AIR POLLUTION RESEARCH

As a group, air pollution topics were given the highest priority for environmental research. This is attributed to the facts that many of the air pollution topics are immediate problems, they can become geographically widespread and there is a potential for direct and indirect effects on human health.

The nature and severity of cold-climate air pollution problems may best be investigated in Alaska. The high Alaskan latitude produces extremes in temperature, solar radiation and inversion strengths not typical of the 48 contiguous states. Alaska's geography and topography present at least three distinct air pollution regions: the north slope, the interior and south-central Alaska. Each of these presents unique problems.

The current state of knowledge about air pollution in Alaska is incomplete and available information is widely scattered in the scientific literature. There is some information for a limited number of priority pollutants in urban areas, but such information is missing or is proprietary for the Prudhoe Bay area, and for pristine areas. Weather and climate information is generally available but health-related information is essentially nonexistent. Only general health criteria can be applied to what is known about the concentrations of a limited number of urban pollutants such as carbon monoxide and lead. Standard dispersion terms for modeling studies are not applicable to the extremely stable inversion conditions of the Interior. Some research has been done recently in this area but has not been completed. Data on respirable particles is generally restricted to the mass of the particles, and virtually nothing is known about their size, numeric distribution or toxic components anywhere in Alaska. Although photochemical pollution has been theoretically predicted

and has been observed at similar latitudes in Europe, it has not been experimentally demonstrated in Alaska. Acid precipitation may be a threat to tundra regions of the north, particularly in light of increased industrial effluents in that area. Nothing is known about the current air pollution inputs, let alone projected future inputs. The phenomenon of "arctic haze" has recently received attention, but its sources, transport pathways and chemistry are far from well-known, and the potential effects on Alaska are likewise unknown. In short, there is relatively little information on air pollution in Alaska.

The State is an ideal air pollution research laboratory because the anthropogenic pollution sources are quite isolated and can be readily studied. It also offers a unique range of environmental conditions. In some respects the winter pollution problem in interior cities, such as Fairbanks, represents one extreme of the air pollution spectrum in the United States (Figure 2). In spite of Alaska's uniqueness, applications of the knowledge to be gained from air pollution projects recommended here will not be limited to Alaska. Well over half of the population of the United States is located in areas where the average monthly temperature is 0°C or colder for at least one month out of the year.

Air pollution research plans were developed in the form of nine basic projects or tasks:

Urban Pollution -- Pollutants and Health Effects

The area of second highest concern in urban areas was the potential for deleterious health effects from airborne particles, especially from woodsmoke and vehicular emissions in the respirable size range. Research objectives are to observe the time and space distribution of pollutants in Alaskan urban centers and assess their possible health effects. Investigators will use standard techniques for the collection and analysis of samples. Calibrated monitoring devices will be used to determine carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, oxides of sulfur, nitrogen (including ammonia) and ozone at selected locations within Anchorage and Fairbanks. High volume samplers with a 10 μ cutoff will be used to collect particle samples for mass loading, trace element and PAH analyses and toxicity screening studies. Size and number of particles will be determined by means of diffusion batteries, aerosol spectrometers and other devices. Health implications will be determined in two ways. One is to compare observed concentrations with recommended levels. The other is to perform Ames mutagenicity and phagocyte tests to ascertain synergistic effects.

Urban Pollution -- Develop Basis for Predicting Pollutant Dispersion in Highly Stable Atmospheres

This study is in two phases. Phase I is the final step in a project already underway which examines actual meteorological conditions during high CO days in urban centers in Alaska. The objective is to determine from actual case studies the type of meteorological conditions that cause CO concentrations in urban areas to increase. These data are being used to develop and calibrate a statistical model for predicting periods of high CO concentration. This is required for developing counter-measures and contingency plans for use during periods of high pollution.

FIGURE 2. Spectrum of Air Pollution Settings

Phase II involves the use of an artificial tracer, sulfur hexafluoride (SF6) to determine empirically the dispersion equations that apply to the stable atmospheric conditions in the arctic and subarctic atmospheres. The result will be a modified Gaussian gas/particle dispersion equation which, unlike the presently used equation, is applicable to the highly stable atmospheric conditions in Alaska.

Urban Pollution -- Transportation System Characterization Study

This study is designed to test, by actual observation, the validity of several assumptions made in the Fairbanks North Star Borough Air Quality Attainment Plan regarding:

1. current average vehicle occupancy rates at
 - a) downtown vs. area-wide traffic
 - b) commuter vs. non-commuter vehicles
 - c) various temperatures
2. vehicle idling for unattended vehicles and for attended vehicles prior to being driven
3. emissions during idling vs. each segment of the driving cycle
4. projections of conversion to diesel vehicles in the future.

Urban Pollution -- Vehicle Emissions and Alternate Fuels (Currently Underway)

The deepest concern expressed in the research prioritization workshop was about the potential effects of air pollutants on human health. The most immediate problem in this category is presented by two non-attainment areas (Anchorage and Fairbanks) where the EPA carbon monoxide (CO) standard has been repeatedly exceeded. These areas must be brought into compliance by 1987. Consequently, the Mobile Environmental Test Facility (METFac), now on loan to the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) from the EPA, is being used to conduct vehicle emission tests under low temperature conditions. This will enable the DEC and EPA to quantify the effectiveness of alternative transportation control strategies in achieving ambient air quality standards by the statutory deadline. Resulting information is expected to be useful to other cold-weather CO non-attainment areas in determining the most cost-effective ways to achieve emission reductions.

The work will consist of the following tasks:

- 1 - Complete an alternative fuels test program to determine the emission reduction benefits when using gasohol, compressed and liquified natural gas, etc., at low temperatures.
- 2 - Evaluate new state-of-the-art retrofit devices in terms of their effectiveness in reducing low temperature emissions.
- 3 - Collect test data to augment existing data base for emissions factor "splitting factors." This splitting technique is an analytical device that

allows isolation of low temperature emissions generated during the initial startup and ensuing 2-6 minute warmup known as the cold start period. Additionally, it allows emissions from the mobile phase of the operation to be separated from stationary-phase emissions. This allows both stationary and mobile emissions to be more accurately assigned to off-highway and on-highway use. This task also includes development of emission factor splitting programs which will address the effects of the cold-start, long-idle period to be used on the present EPA mobile 2.5 air quality model.

4 - Test selected vehicles before and after tune-ups to determine the effectiveness of tune-ups in reducing cold-start emissions. These tests will be limited to vehicles selected to augment data collected in the winter of 1981-82.

5 - Compare emissions from the standard driving cycle used in the Federal Test Procedure and an Alaska specific driving cycle.

6 - Retest vehicles participating in the 1981-82 METFac program to determine their emissions and fuel economy characteristics after twelve months of usage.

7 - Develop a final report analyzing the results of the above tests and describing the most promising alternatives for meeting carbon monoxide air quality standards by 1987.

Photochemistry at High Latitudes

Ozone and photochemical irritant production are of primary concern to the EPA mission. There is evidence that assumptions regarding the lack of photochemical reactions at high latitudes may not be correct, particularly during long summer days. The urban and industrial centers of Alaska are growing, yet virtually nothing is known experimentally about photochemical activity at high latitudes (above 60° N) anywhere in the world.

Observations of ultraviolet radiation intensity, and organic and ozone concentrations at high latitudes (65-72° N) in urban (Fairbanks) and industrial (Prudhoe) areas will be used to ascertain the probable duration and intensity of photochemical reactions at high latitudes.

Industrial Pollution - Pollution Downwash and Deposition Modeling

Recent air quality dispersion modeling of gaseous pollutants emitted from gas turbines has indicated that typical climatic conditions exhibited on the North Slope of Alaska may result in downwash of these pollutants to the ground at a relatively short distance from the point of emission. Several site-specific parameters, some of which cannot be adequately simulated by the current model, control the occurrence, relative frequency and magnitude of the downwash events. As a result of the downwash activity, pollutants contained in the turbine exhaust plume may reach the surface at a higher concentration than would normally be expected because of the limited plume transport time. The frequency of this downwash phenomenon may result in a much greater impact than previously projected on the health of resident workers and terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems on the North Slope.

Regulations for the emission of oxides of sulfur and of nitrogen are concerned only with concentrations in the air at any given time or averaged for a set period of time. The wind velocities of the North Slope are generally high, thus regulations are unlikely to be violated, yet substantial acid-producing material may be emitted. It is anticipated that the best manner in which to assess the occurrence, frequency and magnitude of downwash is to simulate climatic conditions, turbine exhaust plumes, and facility parameters in a series of wind tunnel experiments. These experiments are to assess the plume downwash phenomena for two discrete facility scaler models subjected to a variety of wind speeds, facility orientation and barometric pressures as a basis for a predictive model.

Field sampling to verify and improve the model, particularly for the North Slope areas, will require extensive use of aircraft throughout the year. Some analyses, e.g., NO_x , SO_x , hydrocarbons, particulate counts, ozone, etc., will be made from the aircraft while flying downwind of facilities such as the Prudhoe Bay complex. Aircraft will also be required to pick up samples of snow, and wet and dry precipitation across the tundra. Battery-driven samplers which open only during snow or rain are commercially available, and will operate at low temperatures. Trace element data from background studies will also be employed along with pH and major anion/cation (ion chromatography) and trace gas data collected as a part of this project.

The primary output of this study will be a predictive computer model and associated software for the stack downwash under wet and dry conditions for distances up to 100 miles in the Prudhoe area. Such a model is critically necessary to provide source term input for aquatic and terrestrial models of potential effects from acid precipitation.

Background Studies - "Arctic Haze"

Industrial aerosols and emitted gases enter dry Eurasian air masses north of the polar front and travel over continental pathways into the high arctic regions. During transport, the aerosol removal rate is small due to the inherent stability of arctic air masses and the low amount of cloud volume available for scavenging. Such polluted arctic air masses reach the American Arctic and travel southward into Alaska, bringing with them residues that are characteristic of mesoscale air pollution of the kind that reaches and affects geographical areas far from emission sources (eg., the Canadian or Scandinavian acid rain problem). They are liable to prove more important in causing ecological damage than specific pollutant mixtures near source areas because they affect large areas and because they contain acid aerosol which has converted from sulfur-bearing trace gases.

The purpose of these studies is to assess the concentration, composition and transport pathways of trace gases and particles imported into Alaska from Eurasia and Northeastern U.S.A. The arctic and interior Alaskan air environment with superimposed arctic haze traveling in from specific source regions in eastern Europe and the central USSR provides a pristine laboratory system to study long-range transport of pollutant material. Trace aerosol chemical analyses will permit analysis of chemical signatures from distant source regions such as North America, Eastern Europe and the central Soviet Union.

The determination of chemical tracers should be performed with a minimum time resolution of 2-3 days to differentiate air mass alterations. In addition, the size distribution of particles in the range of particle radii $r > 0.001$ is needed to assess the rate of conversion of gases to particles. Measurements should be carried out at an uncontaminated sampling site in interior Alaska.

Background Studies - Natural Concentrations of Organic and Inorganic Compounds

Organic constituents in clean air over the tundra have been determined in the past, before any Prudhoe Bay activity, to be over 0.20 ppm during the summer. This is a significant fraction of the recommended limits of hydrocarbons. It is nearly equal to the once-a-year, three-hour concentration guideline of 0.24 ppm of hydrocarbons in urban air. Some of the questions are, how extensive is the phenomenon in the Arctic and Subarctic, in area and in time? Are these organic compounds of the type that will induce photochemical activity?

Nature produces organic materials from marshy areas (eg., tundra). Past reports indicate organic sulfur compounds in the air can become quite concentrated in these areas, especially during summer when the potential for photochemical oxidation is also highest. These compounds, in turn, may be oxidized to produce oxides of sulfur and eventually sulfuric acid downwind of its point of origin. These natural components may be partly responsible for arctic haze phenomena due to oxidation and photochemical activity.

The objectives of this study are to determine what natural concentrations of organic and inorganic compounds arrive at industrial and urban sites in the Arctic and Subarctic. In some cases, this is an important fraction of the pollutant load that would normally be associated with human activity. Samples will be collected at two clean-air sites, upwind from an industrial site near Point Barrow and upwind from the Fairbanks urban center, to be compared to samples taken from within and downwind of these locations. Samples will be analyzed by gas chromatography, mass spectrography and special analyses for natural sulfur compounds.

Summary and Synthesis of Cold-Climate Air Pollution

At the beginning of the project there is a need to compile a synthesis of all available information on air pollution in Alaska. This is to include sources of pollutants, chemical characteristics, transport, effects of the pollutants and mitigative measures taken to date. Towards the end of the project a companion synthesis should be performed. This should be an assessment of the air pollution potential and problems for the entire State. The literature search should include available literature and reports from EPA, DEC, the University of Alaska and other institutions. The purpose is not so much to produce a systematic, computerized list of references as to offer a synthesis of the available information including foreign sources. The product will be two reports with comprehensive bibliographies. These up-to-date summaries should allow EPA (and DEC, municipalities, etc.) to:

- a. plan future studies, since data gaps will be pointed out in the reports (particularly the first one)
- b. update literature and research progress reports
- c. plan mitigative measures to reduce pollution problems (control standards, siting of industry, routing of traffic, etc.).

WATER CONTAMINATION/CONSUMPTION RESEARCH

Water-borne pollution is second only to airborne pollution in its potential for wide geographic dispersal and effects upon man, both direct and indirect. Hence, water-borne problems received considerable attention in the workshops.

Asbestos Levels in Alaskan Drinking Water

Asbestos is a carcinogen. Exposure can occur from inhalation and/or ingestion (Becklake, 1976; Selikoff, 1980). The amount of asbestos in the Yukon River, 40 - 1,000x10⁶ fibers/liter, reaches a level higher than that associated with an increased risk of developing cancer from ingestion (Millette, 1981; Kaparek, 1980). Exposure in the region of the Yukon could occur not only from drinking the river water, but also from eating asbestos-laden fish from the river as well as inhalation of wind-blown dust from river banks and alluvial deposits in the region around the river.

The level at which asbestos can be considered hazardous has not been well established, particularly for ingested asbestos. In establishing standards of hazardous chemicals, the EPA has considered that development of pathological conditions can arise from multiple factors acting together synergistically. If so, certain segments of the population may be at greater risk than others. Such a situation may exist in a region in rural Alaska where hepatitis B viral infection is endemic; this region includes villages on the lower Yukon and Kuskokwim Rivers. The lower Yukon contains high levels of asbestos; the Kuskokwim, judging from the geology of the watershed and initial measurements, probably does not. A liver cancer, primary hepatocellular carcinoma (PHC), is a common sequella of hepatitis B infection, but it is thought that another carcinogenic agent such as asbestos must be present for the cancer to develop. Although the population along the Kuskokwim River is greater, no cases of PHC have been diagnosed in people born in this region, whereas eight cases have been diagnosed in the lower Yukon population. (Four of these cases showed positive signs of previous viral infection, one case was negative and three were untested.)

It is not possible, within the scope of this research project, to definitively address the question of whether ingested asbestos could be acting as a cocarcinogen with hepatitis B virus in the development of PHC. Nevertheless, the assumption on which such a hypothesis might be based, i.e. that the asbestos content of drinking water in villages along the Yukon is higher than in the drinking water of villages along the Kuskokwim, can be tested. For this purpose, samples should be taken within the area of endemic hepatitis B viral infection. Villages to be chosen should

be selected on the basis of size (Bethel on the Kuskokwim is a major population center), percentage of the population showing signs of hepatitis B viral infection, and the number of cases of PHC that appeared in the village (for villages on the Yukon). In addition, there have been cases of PHC in people born in villages outside the area of endemic hepatitis B infection. The villages of Noatak, Selawik, and Fort Yukon occur in areas where waterborne asbestos is predicted to be high. Conversely, there are cases of PHC on and near the Seward Peninsula where there is little evidence of asbestos formation. Any water sampling done in these regions should specifically test those villages where the PHC patients were born.

This research is directed towards determining the concentration of asbestos in selected Alaskan rivers and in the other drinking water sources to estimate the extent of exposure of the village populations to asbestos. The data on the levels of asbestos in the rivers and other drinking water sources will indicate to what extent hazardous amounts of asbestos are present. Should hazardous amounts of asbestos in fact be found, the data could be taken to appropriate state agencies to indicate the need for 1) testing of water supplies in villages not examined by this survey, 2) an educational campaign to alert rural residents to the danger of drinking water containing asbestos, and 3) the development of filters for asbestos which can be used in an innovative way where a public, piped water supply may not be the main source of water.

A preliminary survey of Alaskan geology and asbestos mining claims indicates that other rivers probably also contain asbestos. This asbestos appears to come from erosion of natural deposits. It is likely to increase if mining operations resume in the Fortymile and Kobuk regions (as is being discussed by Native Corporations). If mining activities resume, EPA will need the data as a measure of "background" levels of asbestos to determine whether mining activities are polluting the rivers with additional amounts of asbestos. The data on the amounts of asbestos in the drinking water in relationship to the development of PHC will be examined for consistency with the hypothesis that asbestos can act as a cocarcinogen with hepatitis B virus. Definitive proof will have to be sought through the use of animal models or examination of a larger population exposed to both asbestos and hepatitis B virus.

Cost-Effective Bio-Indicators of Marine Pollution

What biological manifestations of oil pollution stress are most suitable for use as indicators of ecosystem health in cold marine environments subjected to chronic pollution? This is a question of considerable importance to state and federal agencies responsible for the regulation of discharge of waste to the environment. This research is intended to identify those bio-indicator systems that offer both scientific validity and cost-effectiveness so that permits can be written that provide the environmental monitoring information society wants without putting unnecessary financial burdens on the discharger.

In order to meet these two objectives, a two-phased approach is necessary. Phase one includes a critical review of the scientific literature to determine which available bio-indicator systems are most likely to be useful in cold climates and a workshop at which environmental decision

makers, industry representatives and research scientists can discuss the pros and cons of various bio-indicators. It is important that the literature search not simply be a computer-controlled retrieval of all work in the field, but a careful evaluation by scientists with the experience and ability to judge the applicability of the work to cold climates. Phase two consists of scientific research both in controlled laboratory experiments and in actual field discharge conditions to determine the statistical relationship between selected bio-indicator responses and petroleum exposure.

Laboratory results would be validated in the field by examining the indicator response along known petroleum pollution gradients resulting from chronic discharge in the marine environment. In Alaska such field gradients could include Port Valdez, where tanker ballast with residual petroleum is discharged; Cook Inlet, where co-produced water is discharged by offshore oil production platforms; and Prudhoe Bay, where co-produced water may be discharged in the future. Laboratory experiments should include oil-in-seawater preparations simulating direct releases, ballast water and co-produced water.

Biodegradation and Toxicity of Hydrocarbons in Oiled Waters

Current policy regulates the dumping of low molecular weight aromatic hydrocarbons into the Alaskan environment without knowing either how long they remain or what they form. Current research shows that these chemicals will accumulate in much the same way as DDT and PCBs do in the world ocean. In addition, it shows that entirely unsuspected partial oxidation products accumulate from aromatic hydrocarbon biodegradation similar to the conversion of DDT to DDE. Dissolved aromatic hydrocarbons are biodegraded at rates which give lifetimes of from weeks to many decades in Southcentral Alaska. By way of comparison, the lifetimes under similar conditions in the Gulf of Mexico are only a few days (unpublished observations). So, very long lifetimes for dissolved hydrocarbons in seawater are a cold-climate phenomenon.

Substantial quantities of dissolved aromatic hydrocarbons, 2.4 metric tons per month, are now discharged into Port Valdez on a continuous basis. Additional amounts are likely to be included with the "produced" water that is separated from oil and discharged into the Beaufort Sea, and major accidental releases remain a possibility. Need for the research is based on observations showing that about half of the large amounts of aromatic hydrocarbons dumped into Alaskan waters are converted to peculiar organic products of unknown identity. Although these products disappear as invisible components of seawater, given the potentially very long lifetimes, the suggestive toxicity data, and the very large amount of material involved, it is entirely appropriate to identify what we are adding (present and potential) to the ocean. Since toxicity is associated with both the aromatic hydrocarbons and their oxidation products (clearly demonstrated for certain oxygenated derivatives), it is important to understand the lifetimes (biodegradation rates) of both the hydrocarbons and their products so that accumulation processes over decades and centuries can be considered. These data are critical to informed decisions on the adequacy of current processing of oily waste water, transportation accidents, and the consequences of increased dumping.

Current key questions are 1) how long do these aromatic hydrocarbons remain in the water column, 2) what concentrations are attained, 3) what significant organic products are formed during biodegradation, 4) what are the lifetimes of these biodegradation products in the environment, and 5) what is the toxicology of the resulting mixture?

The research approach is to 1) identify the organic products of dilute dissolved aromatic hydrocarbon biodegradation by indigenous Alaskan microflora, 2) quantify the portion of each component produced during attack by the organisms, 3) produce these components in quantity with radiolabels attached, 4) measure the decomposition rates of both these radiolabeled products and their parent hydrocarbons in potential receiving waters of Alaska, and 5) produce a model that forecasts concentrations of both the aromatic hydrocarbons and their products on an estuarine and global scale. Only with this kind of information can a reasonable regulatory policy be formulated.

Ecosystem Impacts of Placer Mining

The renewal of placer mining activity in Alaska has placed a developmental burden upon several of Alaska's streams and estuaries. Although the introduction of large amounts of suspended particulate matter is the most obvious of the resulting impacts, other potentially more serious perturbations may arise through less visible insults such as the introduction of heavy metals and large quantities of dissolved and particulate organic matter. These impacts could have either deleterious or positive impacts on stream biota depending upon whether additions were toxic (e.g., mobilized arsenic) or a potential food source to invertebrates (suspended peat particles). Very little information is available on stream ecosystem alteration by developmental impacts in Alaska and most permitting and regulatory action is based upon visible changes in water quality or criteria adopted from temperate latitudes bearing small relevance to the extreme seasonal hydrologic regimes of interior and arctic Alaska.

This research project would approach the problem from an ecological perspective. Selected indicator species of apical or near-apical position in the foodwebs of the impacted streams would be assessed as to potential impact in a "downward-looking matrix" to predict the likely points of stress on the life cycle or food supply or reproductive requirements of the organisms. These sensitive points would then be studied to see if, indeed, the perturbations were stressing the organisms. Thus, in an "adaptive environmental assessment," the focus of the study may shift rather than being committed to studying predetermined perturbations which may have little real impact on the biota while more serious problems arising from indirect or less visible effects go unattended. A small group of interdisciplinary scientists would be assembled to address the consequence of mining activities. Biological and physical disciplines would be represented by the scientists most knowledgeable of the processes and environment of the area. Participation by mining industry personnel and agency personnel would aid in evaluating likely mining activity and possible control measures. For this project, either the Alaska Gold Company's working dredge in the Nome district or the Goodnews Bay platinum dredging in southwestern Alaska are likely candidates for study.

Activities of the interdisciplinary team of experts would be coordinated by a project manager and synthesized through a series of workshops. The environmental and biological data obtained would assist state and federal agencies in evaluating the magnitude of impacts and to realistically regulate human activity with an awareness of the ecological costs involved.

WASTE DISPOSAL RESEARCH

A review of waste disposal research was not definitive because the major information needs identified during the review phase were at least partially being covered by other environmental research programs. Consequently, the planning team at Tetra Tech made two major recommendations, one for a more intensive review of research needs and one for a research project that would complement an existing EPA project (Tilsworth, 1982).

Review Cold-Climate Waste Research Needs

The planning team strongly recommended a more focused review and planning effort before funds were expended on field research. Within the first three months, experts and specialists in cold regions waste disposal would be notified and invited to participate in the planning effort. A comprehensive, labor-intensive information review would be conducted and documented in an Information Report. The Information Report would be distributed in draft form to the confirmed program participants for review and comment. Following the incorporation of review comments and the examination of additional information sources identified by the reviewers, a final Information Report would be prepared and distributed to program participants.

Within the next three months, participants identified and brought into the program earlier would meet in an intensive workshop to discuss the Information Report and provide a consensus on research priorities. It is expected that workshop participants would include agency representatives, academic specialists, consultant experts, and managers and technicians actually engaged in waste management procedures at cold regions communities in the United States and Canada. Following the workshop, preliminary research plans would be developed in accordance with workshop recommendations and distributed to the workshop participants for review and improvement. After revision, final research plans would be developed to the level of detail necessary to allow responsive research proposals to be prepared.

Effect of the Arctic Climate on Risk of Fecal Contamination

The specific research topic offered here, "Research Plan to Determine the Effect of the Arctic on Risk of Fecal Contamination," is a refinement of the research plan abstract which Tetra Tech, Inc. recommended for highest priority during the Chena Hot Springs waste disposal presentation: "Effect of Arctic Climate on Solid and Liquid Waste Decomposition." They selected the present topic because they believed it was one area in which field and laboratory research can make a new and significant contribution to the existing body of knowledge. The contribution would be significant because it would provide information on the severity of a potentially

serious health hazard, and because this research will provide decay coefficients which can be used to alter the design of waste treatment and disposal systems on a fairly site-specific basis for individual cold-regions communities. Such coefficients are used routinely in developing design criteria for waste treatment systems in temperate latitudes, however, they have not been developed for cold regions.

Arctic climates may alter the life cycles of waterborne pathogens to the extent that predictions based on information from the "Lower 48" states are inaccurate. Consequently, a research plan has been devised to evaluate the effects of climatic factors on survival and growth of pathogens and their indicators.

The problem is that arctic climates differ from temperate climates in terms of temperature, light, humidity, and transport. These factors vary in range and in pattern. The effects of the arctic climate on survival and disinfection of fecal bacteria and other organisms have not been quantified and cannot be accurately predicted. Bacteriocidal effects, growth conditions, transport and mixing have significant effects on pathogenic microorganisms, and affect the exposure of human populations. With the burgeoning Alaskan population, the probability of exposure will increase due to increased sources of pathogens as well as increased use of water resources. Human exposure will depend on the interaction of sources, vectors and control measures.

Fecal pathogens include bacteria, viruses, protozoa, and multicellular parasites. Special techniques can be used to isolate and measure specific organisms but standards and criteria are often set using composite bacteriological and physical indicators. Total coliforms, fecal coliforms, and fecal streptococci are often used as indicators of fecal microorganisms. Turbidity or suspended solids are often used to assess the presence of potential risk of exposure to protozoan cysts and to parasites. These indicators may be totally inaccurate in arctic climates because of differential rates of survival, encystment, and growth of pathogens. It will be necessary to characterize conventional indicators and specific pathogens in cold climates to adequately determine risk. Sources of fecal pathogens include all human waste disposed to the environment. The major sources will be liquid wastes from waste treatment plants and solid waste disposal sites or dumps in the bush. Survival of pathogens from these sources and potential exposure pathways should be elucidated to evaluate risk of exposure.

Several important objectives need to be satisfied for protecting the public health in Alaska. These include:

- evaluating survival of common indicator and selected specific pathogenic organisms in waste disposal sites and in ground and surface waters (fresh and marine)
- evaluating effectiveness of disinfection methods for the common indicators and selected pathogens in wastes and aquatic ecosystems
- developing and confirming methods for evaluating treatment and disposal alternatives so that the public health risks are minimized.

The tasks necessary to accomplish these objectives are integrated as shown in Figure 3. The relationships between the tasks and the inputs and outputs of the research are also delineated. The major output of this research program will be a report describing the methodology and how it can be applied by state and local government personnel.

HABITAT MODIFICATION/MANIPULATION RESEARCH

Although a wide range of potential effects on habitat were considered and most of these will need to be addressed in coming years, only three of the specific problems discussed were ranked highly enough by workshop participants to warrant their inclusion in the initial program plan.

Impact of Oil Development Upon Coastal Tundra Wetlands

Expanding oil and gas development in tundra wetlands of northern Alaska is a source of increasing environmental impact. In order to develop an environmentally sound management plan, the following research objectives should be met:

- Define the major habitat types in North Slope wetlands in terms of vegetation composition, primary production and soil properties. Develop a guide for managers including descriptions of vegetation types with representative air and ground photos of these types.
- Compare impacted and control areas in each major wetland type with respect to the following disturbances: altered drainage, dust and production waters (i.e. those contaminated with oil).
- Determine which disturbances are most detrimental to sensitive habitats, and why.
- Rank habitats with respect to sensitivity to each type of disturbance.
- Recommend guidelines for habitat use and for permissible levels of each disturbance type.

Three major research approaches are recommended for study of North Slope wetlands. These approaches are complementary and should all be undertaken to achieve research objectives.

1. Carry out an extensive literature search and evaluation on the impact of oil development on coastal tundra. A great many studies have already been done in this area and the greatest initial contribution that this project could make would be a summary and evaluation of this work and a set of preliminary conclusions as to which habitats are most likely to be sensitive to environmental damage and which habitats are of particular biological importance. This literature survey would involve contact with industry and agencies as well as survey of the published literature.

2. Develop or adopt a simplified habitat classification scheme of major types that are (a) biologically important and (b) readily recognizable from infrared aerial photography. Produce a guide for managers that

FIGURE 3. Integration of Tasks to Produce a Usable Methodology in Solid Waste Management

would enable them to identify these habitats from aerial or ground photography or vegetation data and that would provide a ranking of habitat types in terms of biological importance and sensitivity to disturbance. These rankings would be developed in research approaches 1 and 3.

3. Determine the time course of impact of various environmental disturbances by comparing control areas with disturbed areas of different ages. Community response would be measured in terms of altered soil properties (temperature, thaw depth, pH, salt content, and nutrient availability), vegetation characteristics (species composition, primary production and biomass by species, plant nutrient content and pattern of phenological development), and use by mammals and waterfowl. Permanent plots would be established in each dated disturbance which would be followed by non-destructive sampling over a period of years to confirm that comparison of different-aged disturbances at one time is a valid measure of the time course of community recovery or degradation. Disturbance types to be studied include several which would receive major effort (dust, impoundment, and oil production waters) and others which would be studied with lesser intensity as time and funding permit (SO_2 pollution, salt, drilling mud, and brine).

Experimental design will depend upon accurate aging and determination of the nature and severity of the initial disturbance, as determined by reconstruction from aerial photography of different ages. Where possible, it is crucial to find replicate disturbances of the same age and type in each habitat type and to compare these areas with controls of the same habitat type which were present before disturbance. This would be determined from pre-disturbance aerial photography and examination of peat structure in disturbed sites. Prudhoe Bay is the only reasonable study site because of the long history of oil-related development on the site.

The results of this research program should have direct application to EPA's needs in Alaska. It is designed to provide a preliminary (2 year) and a final (5 year) managers' guide that will enable EPA or any other management agency concerned with tundra wetlands to define important wetland types and define sensitivity to various disturbances in each of the major wetland types. The manager can then make environmentally sound decisions on permit applications using the managers' environmental guide and either aerial or ground photography or minimal vegetation data. In future years, if extensive large-scale vegetation mapping or photography were available for North Slope wetlands, long-range management plans could be developed using the manager's guide in such a way as to concentrate development in less sensitive or critical habitats and avoid environmentally important or sensitive areas.

Impact of Logging on Interior Alaskan Stream Ecosystems

The subarctic taiga environment of interior Alaska (between the Alaska Range to the south and the Brooks Range to the north) is among the least studied forest regions of the United States. Interior Alaska is a region of discontinuous permafrost and extensive forest interspersed with low-lying wetlands and above-treeline alpine tundra. This region has the potential for vastly accelerated development and exploitation, with conflicting management pressures already brought about by increased populations and volatile land ownership issues.

Quantitative, documented information of either undisturbed or managed subarctic upland landscapes and associated stream systems is extremely scarce. Agency response to state and federal land management and regulation directives, notably Section 208 of Public Law 92-500 (non-point source pollution), is hampered by the current lack of knowledge of both the permafrost-dominated taiga upland environments, and the response of that environment to resource management practices.

The study recommended here is designed to investigate specific impacts of timber harvest in interior Alaska's forests on headwater stream systems. This research would be best done at Caribou-Poker Creeks Research Watershed in central Alaska where the air quality group is recommending a major research focus. The two groups could use many of the same logistic facilities and environmental information.

Effects of vegetation removal would be examined by both "before and after" studies and "upstream-downstream" studies following timber harvest. The guiding hypothesis is that vegetation removal will shift the energetic basis of the stream community from dependence upon leaf input from riparian vegetation to increased primary production within the stream itself. This shift should produce a predictable change in community structure of stream invertebrates and changes in utilization of invertebrates by stream fishes. Primary production by stream autotrophs, secondary production of stream invertebrates and community structure of primary producers and invertebrates would be used as integrative measures of changes in stream energetics following vegetation removal. Changes in streambed sediment loads would be investigated as well.

The primary "customers" for the knowledge to be gained in this research are natural resource managers operating in Alaska's subarctic, and the agencies/personnel having oversight and regulatory authority over both natural resources management and environmental protection. In Alaska, state regulatory agencies are currently attempting to exercise oversight on forest management operations, in accord with the 1978 Alaska Forest Practices Act. The agencies are handicapped in developing guidelines and "Best Management Practices," because of lack of quantitative documentation of the impacts of forest harvest on streams in the subarctic. The results of this research will provide sorely needed factual data on such effects. The results may substantiate current policy or indicate need for revision; in either case, the documentation is needed to help ensure that an appropriate level of environmental protection accompanies forest harvest in the taiga uplands.

Gravel Removal from Riparian Habitats

Consideration of the need for habitat protection should begin with habitats that support an unusually diverse, abundant, or valuable biological resource and with habitats that are directly threatened by development activities. When these are found in a single habitat type, special attention is called for. This is the case for riparian habitats of the arctic slope of Alaska.

The major river systems of the arctic slope flow north from the Brooks Range to the Arctic Ocean, bringing nutrient-rich basic sediments to the acid tundra of the Arctic Coastal Plain. The plant and animal communities of arctic riparian systems are richer in species and higher in productivity than surrounding tundra. The willows and herbaceous perennial plants of riparian communities are highly preferred by a number of herbivorous animals. Moose extend all the way to the arctic coast and are increasing in abundance in riparian communities; they are rarely found away from riparian willow stands. The rapid increase in the musk ox population introduced to the Sadlerochit River draining is related to their use of extensive riparian communities. Populations in the Canning and Hulahula River drainages, with less extensive riparian communities, have not increased as rapidly. Riparian areas are also the most important winter and spring habitat for ptarmigan, which feed upon willow buds and catkins.

The recommended research approach would be to:

- utilize aerial photography and ground truthing to provide a classification and survey of riparian habitats of the arctic slope of Alaska, identifying those that are particularly productive, critical to animal populations or vulnerable to development
- establish an intensive study site along the Saganavirktok River, easily accessible from the Dalton Highway to:
 - 1) document the plant diversity, community structure, and productivity of representative riparian stands with respect to seasonal flooding and stage of riparian succession
 - 2) document the use of riparian communities by grazing vertebrates, and nesting birds, and assess the importance of riparian communities to populations of these animals on the arctic slope of Alaska.

Riparian habitats are particularly vulnerable to development for at least two reasons. First, they provide an easily accessible and abundant source of gravel for the roads and work pads that are needed for development in the arctic. The huge quantity of gravel used at Prudhoe Bay has been removed from the Sagavanirktok, Putuligayuk and Kuparuk Rivers. Gravel removal produces a severe but local loss of habitat. In addition, river valleys are the most economical and feasible routes for roads and pipelines, as is clearly indicated by the routing of the oil pipeline and Dalton Highway. The likely construction of a gas pipeline, which could require a work pad entirely separate from that of the oil pipeline, and the development of new oil and gas fields with feeder lines to the major oil and gas pipelines, will contribute to a cumulative and regional alteration or loss of riparian habitat. Evaluation of these losses must enter the early phases of development planning to prevent unacceptable losses of valuable habitat.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

The Pacific Northwest Laboratory is implementing and administering the Environmental Protection Agency's Cold-Climate Environmental Research Program in accordance with Interagency Agreement No. AD-89-F2A189. Program management is divided into two categories, program administration and technical assistance.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

The primary research to be conducted under this contract will be performed under subcontract. PNL will conduct all necessary administrative activities pursuant to the issuance and monitoring of subcontracts for research as follows:

- Issue subcontractor RFPs, scopes of work, or other solicitations for work as required by the EPA project officer.
- After peer review and approval by the project officer, provide funding of projects through subcontracts or other appropriate funding instruments.
- Monitor technical progress and fiscal expenditures on subcontracts.
- Provide overall management of a quality assurance (QA) program to assure that environmental measurement data generated by subcontractors comply with an approved QA program plan. PNL will include in each statement of work for each subcontractor specific guidance on QA requirements. Each subcontractor will be required to complete an approved QA project plan immediately after contract award. PNL will monitor subcontractor compliance with project QA plans.
- Coordinate with other federal and state agencies and private businesses and institutions to prevent duplication of effort and, where possible, explore the possibility of cooperative agreements where mutual research interests are identified.
- PNL will be responsible for timely reporting of results to the EPA project officer. At a minimum, an annual report will be prepared. As each subcontract is completed, PNL will prepare a final report on the subcontract element and forward it to the project officer within 30 days. In addition, within three months of the beginning of each budget year, PNL will submit a brief report on RFP's issued and responses to those RFP's by potential subcontractors for conduct of various portions of the Cold-Climate Research Program.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

In addition to the managerial and administrative activities defined above, PNL will perform additional work upon request by, and as agreed to with, the EPA project officer. These will be primarily synthesis and integration tasks such as the following:

- PNL's management of the program will be under the purview of an EPA project officer who will be advised by two committees. PNL will coordinate meetings and the EPA project officer will chair both committees. The first committee will consist of a scientific peer review committee which will provide technical and scientific advice and guidance to PNL in order to assure that all awarded subcontracts are of the highest scientific quality. The second committee will 1) provide advice on the program priorities, 2) review for relevance the proposed subcontracted research, 3) assure that program components meet, as closely as possible, all federal and state agency needs, and 4) serve as the Agency Oversight Committee for all EPA-sponsored cold-climate research.
- Synthesis and integration of research results may be required from time to time in the form of reports, brief background papers, position papers and draft reports on various aspects of the effects of pollutants in the cold-climate environment. PNL will prepare such reports as mutually agreed to with the EPA project officer.
- PNL may hold periodic symposia or other scientific and technical meetings and workshops. These workshops will bring together state and federal officials and scientific and technical experts in appropriate disciplines, at a time and place which is approved by the EPA project officer in order to conduct state-of-the-art analyses. Additional workshops may be required in order to bring together appropriate experts and environmental managers from state and federal agencies as well as the scientific community in order to disseminate information and current results from the Cold-Climate Research Program to the user community.
- PNL may also fund assessments or problem analyses in various resource areas as the basis for making priority research decisions.
- Finally, periodic reports of the proceedings of workshops, symposiums, other meetings, and meetings of the two oversight committees will be submitted at irregular intervals. PNL will also provide summarized state-of-the-art documents and syntheses of research results from various subcontract tasks assembled in a timely fashion in appropriate format for EPA use. The exact timing of these reports is not known at this time, but it is anticipated that two or three reports which assess or synthesize data from two or more subcontract areas will be required each year. The required format and timing will be prescribed by the EPA project officer with concurrence by PNL.

It is expected that, as a result of the environmental research conducted under this program, the EPA will be better able to reach informed decisions on environmental problems under EPA jurisdiction. During the course of the work the results will be disseminated to other concerned agencies and individuals.

CURRENT PROGRAM STATUS

Following development of the research plans summarized above, the Agency Oversight Committee involving representatives from about 20 federal,

state and local agencies was formed as an advisory body to the Cold-Climate Research Program (Table 8). This committee provides a mechanism for integrating EPA research with parallel efforts and interests of other agencies. This committee will meet at least once a year, prior to the generation of RFP's, to review and comment on the EPA's research plans for the coming year. This enables program managers to consider new perspectives and accommodate needs and interests of other agencies in the actual conduct of research. In addition, where agency responsibilities overlap, particularly on problems too large to be addressed using single-agency resources, this committee serves as a focal point for joint or cooperative research efforts.

At its first meeting, the Agency Oversight Committee used the computer-aided process to prioritize the research plans described above (Table 9). Column 1, representing one vote for each of the participating agencies, is being taken as the ruling judgment for future planning. Columns 2 through 7 represent priorities established by all participants as well as selected subgroups of participants. The research on Vehicle Emissions and Alternate Fuels had already been implemented at the time of the meeting. Although all 17 of the remaining research plans are considered important, the priorities established by this committee are being used as the primary guide in determining the order of their implementation. It is expected that approximately ten of the higher priority plans will be implemented during FY 1982 and 83 at a combined funding level of 600 to 1100K.

To ensure that resulting research would best meet the concerns of all agencies, committee members volunteered staff time and meeting facilities to assist in refining work statements before the work begins.

A second advisory group, the Technical Review Committee, helps select winning bidders from among those responding to requests for proposals. Members of both advisory groups will be involved in annually reviewing results of the research.

TABLE 8. Agency Oversight Committee for EPA
Cold Climate Environmental Research Program Presentation

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Position</u>
Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation	Leonard Verrelli	Supervisor, Air Quality Program
Alaska Department of Fish and Game	Kimbal Sundberg	Habitat Division Representative
Alaska Department of Natural Resources	Allan Carson	Deputy Director, R&D Division
Alaska Council on Science and Technology	David Hickock	Director
Municipality of Anchorage	James Sweeney	Manager, Environmental Resources
North Slope Borough	Ray Dronenburg	Chief Biologist
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: Environmental Research Lab. at Research Triangle Corvallis Environmental Research Lab. Washington Office of R&D	Ron Bradow Norman Glass Alfred Galli	Air Quality Division Senior Science Advisor Director, Air & Energy Division, Office of Environmental Processes and Effects Manager
Juneau Alaska Operations Office	Ronald Kreizenbeck	
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	John Morrison	Chief, Division of Technical Services
U.S. Forest Service	Charles Slaughter	Principal Watershed Scientist
U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service	Theodore Merrill	Deputy Director
U.S. Bureau of Land Management	H. William Gabriel	Research Coordinator
U.S. Minerals Management Service	Jerry Imm Jon Nauman	Chief, Environmental Studies Office of Leasing & Environment
U.S. Army Cold Regions Engineering & Research Lab	Larry Johnson	CRREL Representative
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Kirk Shadrick	Assistant Chief of Construction
U.S. Department of Energy	Bill Osborn	Ecological Research Division

TABLE 9. Results of Research Prioritization by Agency Oversight Committee.

	All Agencies (1 rep./group-13)	All Participants (17)	EPA (2)	EPA, ADEC, Anchorage (4)	FWS, ADF&G, BLM (3)	Federal Agencies (8)	State & Local Agencies (5)
1 A Study of Pollutants, Especially Particulates, In Alaskan Urban Centers and Their Human Health Effects	3	5	1	1	13	6	1
2 Using Observed Co and Artificial Tracer Concentrations to Predict Dispersion of Air Pollutants under Stable Atmospheric Conditions	7	8	4	2	11	13	3
3 Fairbanks Transportation System Characterization	15	16	9	6	10	15	15
4 Investigation of Photochemistry at 65° N Latitude	13	13	6	5	14	12	11
5 Industrial Air Pollutant Downwash and Deposition and Their Potential Effects (Acid Precipitation)	12	14	16	9	16	14	8
6 Concentrations, Composition and Transport of Pollutants Contributing to Arctic Haze	11	11	13	13	8	9	12
7 Background Concentrations of Organic and Inorganic Compounds	17	17	14	15	17	17	16
8 Summary and Comparison of the Existing State of Knowledge on Cold-Climate Air Pollution - Before and After Completion of 5-Year Program	14	12	3	10	9	16	9
9 Asbestos Levels in Rural Alaskan Drinking Water	5	6	8	4	7	1	14
10 Cost-Effective Bio-Indicators of Marine Pollution	6	4	12	14	4	5	10
11 Biodegradation and Toxicity of Hydrocarbons in Oiled Waters	4	3	5	12	2	3	7
12 Ecosystem Impacts of Placer Mining	2	2	10	7	1	2	4
13 Review Cold-Climate Waste Research Needs	16	15	17	17	15	8	17
14 Effect of Arctic Climate on Risk of Fecal Contamination	9	10	11	8	12	11	6
15 Impact of Oil Development upon Coastal Tundra Wetlands	1	1	2	3	3	4	2
16 Impact of Logging on Interior Alaskan Stream Ecosystems	8	9	7	11	6	10	5
17 Gravel Removal from Riparian Habitats	10	7	15	16	5	7	13

*KEY

ADECAlaska Department of Environmental Conservation
ADF&G.Alaska Department of Fish & Game
AnchorageMunicipality of Anchorage
BLMBureau of Land Management
EPAEnvironmental Protection Agency
FWSU.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

LITERATURE CITED

- Becklake, M. R. Asbestos-Related Diseases of the Lung and Other Organs; Their Epidemiology and Implications for Clinical Practice. Amer. Rev. Resp. Dis. 114:187-227 (1976).
- Kaparek, M. S. et al. Asbestos in Drinking Water and Cancer Incidence in the San Francisco Bay Area. Am J. Epidemiol. 112:54-71 (1980).
- Millette, J. R. et al. The Need to Control Asbestos Fibers in Potable Water Supply Systems. Science of the Total Environment 18; 91-102 (1981).
- Selikoff, I. J. Asbestos-Associated Disease. In Public Health and Preventive Medicine. 11th ed, John M. Last, ed; pp. 568-644, (1980).
- States, J.B., 1982. Prioritization of Cold-Climate Environmental Issues. Summary of a Workshop by the Cold-Climate Research Assessment Project. December 15-17, 1981. PNL-SA-10272. Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, Washington.
- Tilsworth, T., 1982. An Assessment of Solid Waste Disposal Practices in Rural Communities in Alaska. University of Alaska, Fairbanks, Alaska. Report to the Corvallis Environmental Research Laboratory, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Corvallis, Oregon. 26 p.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIXES

Appendix A presents detailed research plans for 18 of the highest priority research sketches.

Appendix B presents preliminary research sketches considered as candidates for detailed research planning.

This information is summarized briefly in the text of the report. The appendixes are offered under separate cover for those few readers who may wish to deal with this information in greater detail.

Appendixes are available in hard copy from:

Battelle Alaska Operations
101 Benson, Suite 320
Anchorage, Alaska 99503

Or on microfiche from:

National Technical Information Service
United States Department of Commerce
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, Virginia 22161

When ordering please refer to:

"Assessment of Cold-Climate Environmental Research Priorities, Appendixes A,B. April 1983. PNL-4581 APP. A,B, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, Washington.

DISTRIBUTION

No. of
Copies

OFFSITE

10 Dr. Norman R. Glass
U.S. EPA
Environmental Research Laboratory
200 S.W. 35th Street
Corvallis, OR 07333

2 DOE Technical Information Center
P.O. Box 62
Oak Ridge, TN 37830

Carl Amstrup
Executive Director
Alaska Agricultural Action Council
Sportsman's Mall
14th & Cushman
Fairbanks, AK 99701

Jim Anderson
Director of Technical Services
Department of Natural Resources
Pouch 7-005
Anchorage, AK 99506

Dr. R. O. Baker
Director, Alaskan Operations
ERTEC Northwest, Inc.
600 W. 41st Street
Suite 203
Anchorage, AK 99503

John Bligh
University of Alaska
Institute of Arctic Biology
Fairbanks, AK 99701

Dr. Larry Bliss
Dept. of Botany
AJ 10
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98156

Charles Boddy
Director of Reclamation
Pouch 13
Usibelli, AK 99787

Ron Bradow
Environmental Sciences Research Lab
Mail Drop 46
Research Triangle Park
Raleigh, NC 27711

Dr. Jerry Brown
USACRREL
72 Lyme Rd.
Hanover, NH 03756

Tony Burns
Municipality of Anchorage
Pouch 6-650
Anchorage, AK 99502

Dr. Don Button
University of Alaska
Institute of Marine Science
Arctic Health Research Center
Fairbanks, AK 99701

Allan L. Carson
Deputy Director
Alaska Dept. of Natural Resources
Division of Research & Development
555 Cordova St., Pouch 7-005
Anchorage, AK 99510

Dr. Terry Chapin
University of Alaska
Irving Building, Room 408
Fairbanks, AK 99701

Raymond Corning
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
1011 E. Tudor Rd.
Anchorage, AK 99503

Robert Courson
U.S. EPA
Region X Headquarters
1200 6th Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101

Phil Derrien
Doyon Limited
201-1st Avenue
Fairbanks, AK 99701

Ray Dronenburg
North Slope Borough
Box 69
Barrow, AK 99723

Dick Dworsky
Chief Of Planning
c/o Bureau of Land Management
Federal Building
701 C Street
Anchorage, AK 99513

Dr. H. W. Gabriel
Bureau of Land Management
701 C Street, Box 13
Anchorage, AK 99503

Alfred A. Galli
U.S. EPA
Office of Research & Development
Mail Code RD 682
401 M. St. SW
Washington, DC 20460

Dr. Tom Gosink
University of Alaska
Geophysical Institute
903 Koyukuk Avenue
Fairbanks, AK 99701

Ray Hadley
University of Alaska
Institute of Marine Sciences
Fairbanks, AK 99701

Wayne Hanson
Dames & Moore
800 Cordova
Suite 101
Anchorage, AK 99501

Jim Hemming
Manager
Alaska Operations
Dames & Moore
800 Cordova, Suite 101
Anchorage, AK 99501

Jerry Imm
U.S. Minerals Management Service
P.O. Box 101159
Anchorage, AK 99510

Dr. Larry Johnson
University of Alaska
83A Arctic Health Building
901 Koyukuk Avenue
Fairbanks, AK 99701

Dr. Ronald Johnson
University of Alaska
129 Duckering Building
Mechanical Engineering Department
Fairbanks, AK 99701

Dr. Glenn Juday
University of Alaska
Institute of Northern Forestry
308 Tanana Drive
Fairbanks, AK 99701

Earl Kari
U.S. EPA
Pipeline Inspectors Office
Pouch 6619
Anchorage, AK 99502

Gretchen Keiser
Division of Policy Devel. & Planning
Court Bldg. #450
Pouch AD
Juneau, AK 99811

Ted Merrell
NMFS Lab
P.O. Box 155
Auke Bay, AK 99821

Deborah Kirk
Alaska Dept. of Environmental Cons.
Pouch O
Juneau, AK 99811

Howard Metsker
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
1011 E. Tudor Road
Anchorage, AK 99503

Ron Kreizenbeck
EPA Alaska Operations
3200 Hospital Drive
Suite 101
Juneau, AK 99801

Dick Mikkelsen
Alyeska Pipe Line Company
1835 South Bragaw Street
Anchorage, AK 99512

Carol Lewis
Agricultrual Experiment Station
O'Neil Resources Building
University of Alaska
Fairbanks, AK 99701

Ray Morris
Marine Consultants
255 E. Fireweed Lane
Wuite 201
Anchorage, AK 99503

Marc Lorenzen
Tetra Tech, Inc.
2550 Denali
Anchorage, AK 99503

John Morrison
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
1011 E. Tudor Rd.
Anchorage, AK 99503

Dr. Helen M. McCammon
Ecological Research Division
Office of Health & Environ. Research
Office of Energy Research
Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20545

Tom Murrell
U.S. Minerals Management Service
P.O. Box 101159
Anchorage, AK 99510

Rosa Meehan
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Box 20, Federal Building
101 12th Avenue
Fairbanks, AK 99701

Dr. Helen Myers
WAMI Medical Education Program
University of Alaska
Arctic Health Building, Room 103
901 Koyukuk Avenue South
Fairbanks, AK 99071

Jon Nauman
U.S. Minerals Management Service
800 A. Street
Anchorage, AK 99501

Larry Reeder
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Box 7002
Anchorage, AK 99506

Chris Noah
AK Council on Science & Technology
Pouch CV
Juneau, AK 99811

Scott Robertson
Senior Environmental Coordinator
ARCO Alaska, Inc.
P.O. Box 360
Anchorage, AK 99510

Dr. David Norton
University of Alaska
Arctic Project Office
Geophysical Institute
903 Koyukuk Avenue North
Fairbanks, AK 99701

Don Schell
University of Alaska
Institute of Water Resources
Duckering Building
Fairbanks, AK 99701

Bill Osborn
Division of Ecological Research
U.S. Dept. of Energy
Washington, DC 20545

Dr. Eric O. Schneider
Office of the Administrator
National Oceanographic & Atmospheric
Administration
Department of Commerce
Washington, DC 20030

Irv Palmer
Deputy Manager
U.S. Minerals Management Service
Alaska OCS Region
800 A Street
Anchorage, AK 99501

Fred Seiber
U.S. Minerals Management Service
P.O. Box 101159
Anchorage, AK 99510

Dr. Ken Rahn
Graduate School of Oceanography
University of Rhode Island
Narragansett, RI 02882-1197

Dr. Robert Sener
LGL Alaska Research Asso., Inc.
1577 C Street
Anchorage, AK 99503

Douglas Redburn
Alaska Department of Environmental
Conservation
Pouch O
Juneau, AK 99811

Kirk Shadrick
Asst. Chief of Construction
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Box 7002
Anchorage, AK 99506

Dr. Glenn Shaw
University of Alaska
Geophysical Institute
903 Koyukuk Avenue
Fairbanks, AK 99701

Leonard Verrelli
Alaska Dept. of Environmental
Conservation
Pouch 0
Juneau, AK 99811

Dr. Charles Slaughter
c/o Institute of Northern Forestry
U.S. Forest Service
308 Tanana
Fairbanks, AK 99701

Dr. Patrick J. Webber
University of Colorado, Boulder
Institute of Arctic Alpine Research
Campus Box 450
Boulder, CO 80309

Steve Sparrow
Agricultural Experiment Station
O'Neil Resources Building
University of Alaska
Fairbanks, AK 99701

Dr. Gunter Weller
University of Alaska
Geophysical Institute
903 Koyukuk Avenue
Fairbanks, AK 99701

Bob Stottlemeyer
Department of Business
Department of Biological Sciences
Michigan Technological University
Houghton, MI 49931

Dick Williams
Alaska Dept. of Environmental
Conservation
Pouch 0
Juneau, AK 99811

Kimbal Sundberg
Alaska Department of Fish & Game
333 Raspberry Road
Anchorage, AK 99502

ONSITE

DOE Richland Operations Office
H. E. Ransom/P. K. Clark

James Sweeney
Environmental Resources
Municipality of Anchorage
Public Utilities
600 E. 37th Avenue
Anchorage, AK 99503

Pacific Northwest Laboratory

J. W. Anderson
W. E. Fallon
D. H. Fickeisen
C. M. Novich
T. L. Page
W. H. Pearson
W. H. Rickard
R. G. Riley
M. J. Scott
M. A. Simmons
J. A. Strand
C. R. Watson
D. G. Watson
Publishing Coordination (2)
Technical Information (1)

Lance Trasky
Alaska Dept. of Fish & Game
333 Raspberry Rd.
Anchorage, AK 99501

Dr. Larry Underwood
Arctic Environmental Information and
Data Center
707 A Street
Anchorage, AK 99501

Columbus Laboratories
G. C. Stotler