South Fork Palouse River TMDL
Water Quality Advisory Group Meeting
December 10, 2008
10:00 am to 12:00 pm
Notes

Attendees:

Rob Buchert – City of Pullman
Jim Carroll – Ecology
Matt Hammer – City of Colfax
Drew Hawley – Palouse CD
Roland Line – Pullman resident
Les MacDonald – City of Moscow
Cheryl Morgan – Landowner (SFPR & Hatley Ck)
Marty O'Malley – WSU
John Reed - WSU
Janet Schmidt – WSU Extension
Elaine Snouwaert – Ecology
Scott Tarbutton - Ecology
Michael Yount – Commissioner-Elect Office

The meeting began at 10:08 am with round table introductions. The group reviewed and approved the October meeting notes as written.

The meeting was opened for announcements. Drew announced that the Palouse Conservation District applied for an Ecology grant for implementation of the South Fork Palouse River TMDL. Rob announced that the City of Pullman discussed the stormwater utility fee ordinance at the council meeting the night before. The ordinance failed and will be brought back to the city council on January 6th with some revisions.

The group discussed the location for future meetings. Originally the timing and location was selected to coordinate with the Watershed Planning Unit's meetings. In 2009, the Planning Unit will likely reduce their meetings to quarterly meetings. Since the majority of participates attend from Pullman or Moscow it was proposed that we move TMDL meeting to Pullman. The group agreed that future meetings should be held in Pullman. Suggested locations include Cougar Depot, Neill Library, City Hall and the hotels. It was also decided that a different day and time should be selected to avoid logistical difficulties for those participants who do want to attend both meetings when both occur. Elaine will send an email to the group asking for preferred days and times and select one that works for most. It was recognized that it will be difficult to select a day and time that works for all.

Jim reviewed EPA's requirements to include stormwater in TMDLs. TMDLs need to include wasteload allocations (WLAs) for all stormwater sources covered under a NPDES permit which for this TMDL includes Pullman and WSU. These WLAs can be given as a categorical WLA to multiple outfalls rather than assigned them to individual outfalls.

As part of the TMDL sampling Ecology caught a storm on May 2, 2007. The 2006-2007 water year had approximately average precipitation. The May 2nd storm was a smaller storm compared to some earlier in the year but met the definitions of the storm for the purposes of the study. Approximately ¼ inch of rain fell during the storm. Ecology dispatched 4 teams from Spokane. These teams sampled 25 locations (including stormwater outfalls) twice during the day. Jim presented a chart that showed the measured loads at the various locations and the percent of the load coming from tributaries or storm drains into

the South Fork Palouse River. During the May 2, 2007 event less than 5% of the FC bacteria load originated from outside of the Pullman city limits. Within the city, almost 90% came from 3 different sources:

- More than 40% came from the stormwater outfall to Missouri Flat Creek at Stadium Way (34MissSD120).*** *This was later revised due to an overestimate of flow at SD 120. The measured load at SD 120 accounted for almost half of the load in Missouri Flat Creek. The other half was from unmeasured sources. This could include SD 120 (we may have missed a slug of FC bacteria), but there were also 17 other unmeasured stormwater outfalls. However, the flow balance suggests that we measured most of the water flow.*
- Almost 12% came from the stormwater outfall to the SF Palouse River at Benewah St. (34SFPRWSU1).
- Almost 40% came from Dry Fork Creek between the mouth and RM 2.2.

Jim then showed comparisons between the results of the May 2nd storm and the 3 storms sampled during the Pullman Stormwater Pilot Study in 2005-2006. This comparison showed that the May 2nd storm had similar representativeness of stormwater characteristics compared to other storms in Pullman. The results of all stormwater sampling demonstrate that the runoff greatly increased bacteria pollution, degrading water quality beyond the levels of the dry or wet season pollution.

Rob Buchert described the drainage that flows into the stormwater outfall at MissSD120 (Jack in the Box). There is a small lake and wetland believed to be historic Lake Depuddle off Merman Rd behind some apartments. He has been sampling two locations where this waterbody flows into storm drains. The West location drains out of the NW corner of the lake into a storm drain. The East location drains out of the wetland into a storm drain that enters the same storm sewer upstream of the West location. On average the West location bacteria results (range 25-7636 cfu/100mL) have been much higher than the East location results (range 13 -80 cfu/100mL).

Elaine explained the elements the TMDL report must include. These include:

- Scope of the TMDL (study area/watershed description)
- Water Quality Standards
- Loading Capacity
- Wasteload Allocations
- Load Allocations
- Margin of Safety
- Season Variation
- Reasonable Assurance
- Public Participation

Jim's technical language will include most of these sections. We will ask the advisory group for help on the reasonable assurance section. This section should include activities currently underway or planned that assure progress toward addressing the pollution sources. The public participation section will be completed after the public comment period.

Typically an implementation strategy is included in the report which is then followed up with the development of an implementation plan which expands on the strategy. There is the possibility of skipping the strategy and go immediately into developing the plan.

The implementation strategy must include:

- Timeframe for meeting standards
- Approaches that will be used to meet load and wasteload allocations
- Interim targets
- Monitoring strategy
- Schedule for monitoring and evaluation of the TMDL

The implementation plan that needs to be development within a year of TMDL approval expands on the implementation strategy by including more detail about who will do what, by when and how it may be funded.

The group discussed the option of skipping the implementation strategy and going straight into developing the implementation plan. While both options had merit the group decided to develop the implementation strategy to help focus the development of the implementation plan.

The group also discussed options for developing the implementation strategy:

- Should the group as a whole brainstorm the activities and approaches for implementation?
- Should Ecology draft language for the group to review?

The group leaned towards the latter option but felt reviewing the technical language and its recommendations would better direct which option makes the most sense. Jim and Elaine stated that they would try to get the report out to the group by the end of December.

Considering the group would need time to review the report, Elaine suggested that we may want to delay meeting again until February to ensure there was adequate time for review. The group decided we should cancel the January meeting and meet again in February.

Cheryl raised the concern about children playing in the river with the high bacteria levels. She asked if a warning regarding human contact with the water should be given to riparian property owners. She also raised the concern about water right holders using this water for watering lawns and gardens.

Meeting adjourned at 11:45 am.