

## Deschutes River, Capitol Lake, and Budd Inlet TMDL Advisory Group Meeting

Thursday, March 22, 2012 -- 9:10 a.m. to 11:55 a.m.  
Tumwater Fire Department, 300 Israel Rd. SW, Tumwater

### Attendees

---

#### Black Hills Audubon Society

- Sue Danver

#### Citizen

- John DeMeyer

#### Deschutes Estuary Restoration Team (DERT)

- Cliff Mitchell
- Dave Peeler

#### Ecology, WA State Dept. of

- Kim McKee
- Diana Smith
- Lydia Wagner

#### Enterprise Services (DES), WA Dept. of

- Carrie Martin

#### Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), U.S.

- Dave Ragsdale

#### Little Hollywood Blog, SPEECH

- Janine Unsoeld

#### LOTT Clean Water Alliance

- Karla Fowler
- Laurie Pierce

#### Olympia, City of

- Laura Keehan

#### Thurston County Environmental Health

- Sue Davis

#### Thurston County Water & Waste Management

- Barb Wood

#### Thurston Public Utility District

- Chris Stearns

#### Tumwater, City of

- Dan Smith

### General Updates

---

**Past meeting materials:** The November 17, 2011 and January 26, 2012 meeting materials are complete and waiting for posting online. An email notice is expected to go out today. The February 23, 2012 meeting materials should be completed and posted before the end of the month. **Update:** *Ecology posted the November and January materials online later this same day.*

**Eyes Over Puget Sound:** Ecology's Environmental Assessment Program (EAP), the Marine Monitoring Unit, conducts a variety of marine observations of Puget Sound conditions. A unique product of their efforts is "Eyes Over Puget Sound" (EOPS). It combines high-resolution photo observations with satellite images, en route ferry data between Seattle and Victoria, B.C., and measurements from moored instruments. Capitol Lake is highlighted on photo 11, (slide 21), of the March 19 publication. The caption reads, "Sediment laden Deschutes water meets clear water freshwater".

#### Website Links:

- Photo 11, (Slide 21): [32212-DeschutesAdvMtg-EOPS-19Mar2012-Capitol-Lake.pdf](#)
- March 19 EOPS publication:  
[http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/eap/mar\\_wat/eops/EOPS\\_2012\\_03\\_19.pdf](http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/eap/mar_wat/eops/EOPS_2012_03_19.pdf).
- Sign up for future publications at [Ecology-Eyes-Over-Puget-Sound@Listserv.wa.gov](mailto:Ecology-Eyes-Over-Puget-Sound@Listserv.wa.gov).

## Hardel Mutual Plywood Cleanup Site

---

Diana Smith, Public Involvement Coordinator, Ecology, Toxics Cleanup Program, Southwest Region

Ecology's Toxics Cleanup Program (TCP) conducted an investigation on the Hardel Mutual Plywood site located on West Bay Drive. During the investigation, Hardel found that some contaminants, including heavy oil, diesel petroleum hydrocarbons, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) were moving toward Budd Inlet. This posed an immediate threat to the environment and Hardel proposed an interim action (partial cleanup). The company has since completed the interim action and after sampling groundwater for one year did not find any contaminants above cleanup levels. The final cleanup plan is now out for public review and comment from March 22 – April 20, 2012.

Website links:

- Hardel Mutual Plywood Draft Cleanup Plan Public Review Announcement: <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/1209106.html>
- Hardel Mutual Plywood investigation home page: <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/gsp/Sitepage.aspx?csid=3704>
- For more information contact Guy Barrett, Site Manager, at (360) 407-7115 or [Guy.Barrett@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:Guy.Barrett@ecy.wa.gov).

**Matrix Scenarios Discussion:** It concentrated primarily on the Deschutes River-oriented ranked analysis.

### **Reduce nonpoint phosphorus sources (Page 1, Analysis Order 1) and Increase nonpoint sources (Page 2, Analysis Order 3)**

- EPA: Setting a reduction of 50% is not realistic.
- Suggestions: Combine 1&4 from pages 1-2. Add/subtract NPS loading. Bracket the conditions. For example, where appropriate, decrease 10-20%, and increase 10-20%. Take out the 50% target. Modify the number of septic system removals.
- Consider population densities.

### **Shift from septic systems to centralized wastewater (Page 1, Analysis Order 2)**

- This is for watershed wide modeling. Thurston County has done work in the Urban Growth Area (UGA). We need to address nonpoint sources (NPS) such as contributions from septic systems.

### **Increase nonpoint sources (Page 2, Analysis Order 4)**

- The TMDL needs to look at future growth and uses. Answers from the models may help local organization policy makers to change local regulations and policies. For example, requirements or limitations regarding exempt wells.

### **Exempt Wells (Page 2, listed in Analysis Order as "keep")**

- The Deschutes River watershed is heavily impacted by exempt wells.
- Thurston County has a high use of exempt wells. This will probably increase and not decrease in future.

### Extend LOTT Outfall (page 3, Analysis Order 3)

- **LOTT:** In the 1990s extending the outfall was considered and determined to be more expensive than putting in the nitrogen removal system.
- **AdvGrp:** If the outfall was moved, does it make a difference? **LOTT:** Extending the outfall is almost cost-prohibitive to reduce nitrogen any further.
- **AdvGrp** Priest Point Park is permanently posted for “no contact”. Consider that moving the outfall to address nutrients could create a different problem.

**Decision:** In the model, move the outfall to two locations, 1) North of Priest Point Park and 2) Boston Harbor.

### Advanced wastewater treatment for all plants all the time (Page 3, Analysis Order 2)

- **LOTT:** They currently operate the nitrogen removal system from April – October. This is condition of their discharge permit. The shoulder months are April, May, and October. The most sensitive months are June – September.
- **Q** *Is there any benefit for nitrogen removal in winter months?* **LOTT:** Limiting factors for these months are sunlight and temperature. Previous evaluations did not indicate any benefit.
- **Q:** *What are the other wastewater treatment plants (WWTP) within the watershed doing?* **A:** Secondary treatment.
- **Q:** *Can the other WWTPs achieve the same level of nitrogen removal as LOTT?* **A:** It is unrealistic. The model should answer this question.
- **Q:** *What is the projected growth factor for the watershed?* Nitrogen is a key issue and a big potential problem we should focus on early.
- Possible options include setting the parameters for LOTT and/or all the WWTPs to provide advanced treatment from 1) June – September, 2) June – October, or 3) September only. We have to exclude the winter months for reasons already explained by LOTT.

**Decision:** In the model, have the other WWTPs provide advanced treatment for nitrogen removal from April – October to mirror LOTT’s current permit condition. Set the level at 3 mg/L.

### Flows

- **EPA:** Low flow conditions are a critical issue. The TMDL needs to address it to ensure it is protective of current standards and conditions. It also needs to consider future conditions.
- **AdvGrp:** There is a relationship with flow and water quality.
- **Q** *In previous meetings Ecology clearly stated the TMDL would not look at flow and water resources. Has this changed?* **Ecy:** No, the TMDL will not establish any water rights. **EPA:** While TMDLs do not establish water rights, they must presume critical (low flow) conditions. The TMDL can advise regulatory policy makers on what needs to happen and where to preserve and improve water resources.
- **AdvGrp:** Ecology should look at low flow data for the 2000-2001 water years to establish baseline data. **Ecy:** We used the 7Q10 model to determine the baseline. **AdvGrp** The TMDL should document how Ecology determined the base assumptions on low flow and future use.
- **Thurston County:** They do extensive groundwater monitoring and the data is updated monthly.
- **Suggestion:** Add a column to the matrix to list the projected benefits from the model runs or calculations.

### **General comments:**

- We should focus on the Deschutes River-wide scenarios where we will get more benefit from Ecology resources.
- We need to remember all the models are linked and will provide information on the overall benefits to the watershed.
- **Q:** *Does Ecology have to run a model on each of these 3 scenarios to complete the TMDL?* **A:** Ecology has to develop load and wasteload allocations so the EPA has reasonable assurance the water quality problems are going to get addressed. We are using modeling to show the value to the answers produced and how we used them to make those allocations.
- EPA wants to see the TMDL include a plan to reduce pollutants and achieve water quality standards.
- Ecology advocates sustainable solutions.
- We should concentrate on the mission for this TMDL and the benefits to the watershed.
- This watershed is in the shallow part of the Puget Sound and Capitol Lake is shallow. We should consider bioremediation.
- Land use affects water quality. We don't have a land use model as it relates to water quality. We need to address existing degradation but also look forward to growth.
- The Implementation Strategy needs to address future growth and land use.

**Public Outreach and Media:** This is a follow-up to the discussion which began at the February 23 meeting. We want advisory group members to start thinking about the best way to inform the public about this water cleanup effort. Items to consider include:

- How many public meetings should Ecology hold?
- When should the public meetings occur? *(For example, during the regular business day; early evening; both?)*
- Where in the watershed should the meetings occur? *(For example, one key location in the upper, middle, and lower watersheds.)*
- Are there any special groups Ecology should contact directly? *(For example, the Thurston County Commissioners.)*

**Q:** *Has Ecology considered public outreach when the Technical Report is final and released in June?* **A:** Lydia will bring this up to Environmental Assessment Program staff. The Technical Report is their publication and they may have an outreach strategy in place.

**Q:** *Can Thurston County request a meeting by Ecology to come and talk about the Technical Report?* It is important to contact the Thurston County Commissioners as early as possible to schedule any briefings. **A:** Lydia will bring this up to Environmental Assessment Program staff.

**Open Comment:** None

### **Next meeting**

Date: Thursday, April 26, 2012  
Time: 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon  
Place: Tumwater Fire Department, 300 Israel Rd. SW, Tumwater