

Spokane River TMDL Collaboration

Full Group Meeting

August 24, 2005, 9:00a.m.-2:00 p.m.

City of Spokane Fire Training Center, N. 1618 Rebecca Street

Full Group Attendees

Brian Crossley, Spokane Tribe of Indians (for Chris Butler)

Tim Connor, Sierra Club (for Rick Eichstaedt)

Dick Denenny, City of Spokane Valley

Tom Eaton, US EPA-Region 10

Wayne Frost, Inland Empire Paper

Gwen Fransen, ID Dept. of Environmental Quality

Hank Nelson, Avista (for Bruce Howard)

Jim Kimball, Hayden Area Regional Sewer Board

Jack Lynch, City of Spokane

Rene Marc-Mangin, WA Dept. of Ecology-ERO

Todd Mielke, Spokane County Commissioner

Dave Peeler, WA Dept. of Ecology-Olympia

Bill Ross, Facilitator, Ross & Associates

Ryan Orth, Ross & Associates

Mike Sharar, Mike Sharar Consulting

John Spencer, CH2M Hill

Collaboration Update and Meeting Agenda Review

Bill Ross opened the session shortly after 9:00 AM to review the day's agenda. Each of the Workgroups will present to the Full Group an update on their status in gathering information and data to answer their assigned Fundamental Questions. The Full Group will then discuss how to roll-up the various Workgroups' results into a matrix and summary format that will be useful for the deliberations of a TMDL Implementation Plan. Mr. Ross described a possible preliminary deadline of September 14 to have information from the Workgroups. The Full Group will also briefly discuss media inquiries.

Co-Chairs Todd Mielke and Dave Peeler acknowledged the Workgroups' efforts and coordination since the July 22 Full Group meeting to meet the common goals of the Collaboration. Mr. Peeler also thanked Inland Empire Paper Company for allowing the Technology Workgroup to utilize the results of their pilot.

Status Reports and Discussion of the Workgroups' Progress, to Date, in Answering Fundamental Questions

Flows & Loadings Workgroup

Co-Chair Bruce Rawls reported on the status of Flows & Loadings Workgroup. Since the July 22 Full Group meeting, the Workgroup has received projected flows from the Hayden Area Regional Sewer Board (HARSB). HARSB had planned to land apply their treated wastewater, however due to storage

costs and low plant uptake, land application may not be possible during the months of April, May, and October. During these months, HARSB assumes they may need to continue to discharge into the Spokane River. The Flows & Loadings Workgroup is now prepared to complete their flows and loadings matrix and will include this latest information in the document.

Co-Chair Richard Koch presented the progress of the Flows & Loadings Workgroup in understanding the loadings of phosphorus to influent. The Workgroup referenced studies from the Minneapolis Metropolitan Council that found dishwashing detergent contributed 7-12% of total phosphorous influent loading. The Workgroup believes that smaller local jurisdictions in Washington and Idaho may be contributing more than 12% from dishwashing detergent, due to comparatively fewer commercial and industrial sources than Minneapolis.

The Flows & Loadings Workgroup has also observed a seasonal pattern of high total phosphorous amongst several of the municipal dischargers in summer months. Tim Connor asked what the Workgroup knows about the causes of these peaks. Mr. Koch replied that the Workgroup could only speculate on causes at the moment, but that the peaks could be due to recent growth, greater use of garbage disposals, and higher flows in sewers.

The Full Group discussed the relationship of influent concentration of total phosphorous to the effluent concentration of total phosphorous. There is little direct correlation between these two figures, as treatment technologies will generally produce a range of effluent nutrient concentration independent of the influent concentration. However, the Workgroup did report of benefits to reduced phosphorous loadings to treatment plants in terms of operating and maintenance costs of electricity and chemical coagulants.

The Flows & Loadings Workgroup has not convened since the July 22 Full Group meeting. The Workgroup will meet on Monday, August 29 to discuss their latest flow projections. The Flows & Loadings Workgroup will also identify a range of the possible goals and resulting benefits and pathway to implementing aeration in Lake Spokane. The Full Group asked that Flows & Loadings and Re-Use & Conservation Workgroups coordinate to ensure that conservation and growth estimates are neither omitted nor double-counted.

Todd Mielke asked if in their study of the phosphorous contribution of detergents, the Flows & Loadings Workgroup had made any distinction between hand dishwashing soap and machine dishwashing soap. Bruce Rawls replied that their survey found that hand dishwashing soaps do not contain phosphates. Mr. Mielke also asked the Flows & Loadings Workgroup whether they had determined from the total number of households in the region, what percentage are sewered versus septic. Mr. Rawls replied that the Workgroup knows the number of septic tanks on the Washington side of the border, many of which will be removed through the septic elimination program. For Idaho, however, the Workgroup will have an estimate, but the information on septic connections is not as well tracked. The Flows & Loadings Workgroup will build an element of growth into their septic tank estimates. The areas of Spokane County that are over the aquifer and within an urban growth boundary will be sewered. Other areas over the aquifer that are not within an urban growth boundary will need to have at least five acres for drainage. The Workgroup is still gathering information on septic tank requirements over the aquifer in Idaho.

Stevens County Commissioner Tony Delgado asked how a municipality could enforce a ban on dishwashing detergents and what concentration of phosphorous would be allowable. Bill Ross commented that while this mechanism has not yet been developed, an approach similar to Spokane

County's ban of laundry detergents could be used, one that relies on an ordinance that sets acceptable levels for dishwashing detergent. To be successful, such a ban would require a regional effort. Dave Peeler added that one of the effective ways to enforce a ban on dishwashing detergents is to work closely with the wholesalers that supply local retailers. There are "nil phosphorous" detergents available that contain very close to zero percent phosphorous. Local elected officials would determine the acceptable limit of phosphorous within any ordinance enacting such a ban.

The Flows & Loadings Workgroup Co-Chairs will work to meet a deadline of September 14th to deliver their information for roll-up. The Flows & Loadings Workgroup presentation is available on the Collaboration website: <http://client-ross.com/spokane-river>.

Technology Workgroup

Co-Chairs Lars Hendron and Len Bramble gave an update on the Technology Workgroup. The Technology Workgroup's data collection effort has been extensive, gathering information on over 113 treatment facilities from around the country. The Workgroup is $\frac{3}{4}$ completed with their survey and tracking the responses in a table. Wherever possible, this information includes regulatory required monitoring data. The Technology Workgroup has discovered that the surveyed facilities cover a variety of applications and not all are "clean fits" with the dischargers in the Collaboration. The results of the facility survey are organized into the general categories of $<50 \mu\text{g/L}$, $50\text{-}100 \mu\text{g/L}$, and $100+ \mu\text{g/L}$. Of primary interest to the Technology Workgroup are those facilities producing concentrations of phosphorous at $50 \mu\text{g/L}$ or less. The Technology Workgroup plans to develop visual charts of the data they have collected to aid in the Full Group's understanding of their results.

Tim Connor asked if the Technology Workgroup has made any effort to determine which facilities are subject to phosphorous restrictions by regulatory agencies. Len Bramble replied that the bulk of the facilities are reporting some sort of phosphorous discharge labels. Dave Peeler added that in general, facilities only report data on benchmarks that they are required to by their issued NPEDS permit. While these facilities may not necessarily be subject to a TMDL, the Technology Workgroup assumes these data are significant because of this relationship between permit requirements and reporting.

The Technology Workgroup's presentation displayed data from three of the technologies they are researching, organizing the data within line graphs showing effluent phosphorous, average phosphorous effluent, and 95th percentile phosphorous effluent. To help see the spread of this data, it is also organized into box plots. John Spencer asked that the Technology Workgroup show the flow capacity of each of the facilities. The Technology Workgroup will also consider adding labels to display the permit limits associated with a particular facility. Jack Lynch questioned if the permit level is an important piece of information. Dave Peeler commented that permit level is significant for the purposes of the survey because a facility will operate to ensure that it meets the permitted discharge. Mr. Lynch commented that it would be helpful to the City of Spokane to see the results from plants that are larger in size and close to the range of concentrations to be considered for the Spokane River TMDL Collaboration. Mr. Lynch added that the effectiveness of technologies in examples given by the Technology Workgroup may relate to the size of the plant and some of these plants, independent of scale of operation, may not be achieving the highest level of treatment possible. Perhaps some of these plants would be willing to test the performance limits of their operation to eliminate some of this variability.

The Technology Workgroup attended a presentation by Kruger's Actiflow technology and hopes to see results of their methods from a pilot at the City of Spokane's treatment facility. The City plant will also pilot the US Filter and Parkson's technologies to determine the performance variables between Spokane River TMDL Collaboration

industrial and municipal applications. The Zenon technology will not be demonstrated at the moment, but is hoped to be included in the City's pilot at a later date. Each of the technologies will require a couple of weeks of setup to become optimized to the City's particular flows. The Full Group will receive a report from Inland Empire Paper Company's pilots if the data is compiled by the September 28 Full Group Meeting.

The Technology Workgroup will meet on September 7, and were considering an additional meeting before the September 28 Full Group meeting. By September 28, the Technology Workgroup anticipates significant progress in their data collection and further analysis. By September 14, the Workgroup will deliver data for the roll-up effort. Bill Ross asked that the Technology Workgroup prioritize around the twenty or so facilities that are performing at 50 µg/L or less and learn more about what is driving their operations in terms of flow volume, capacity, and permit limit. Dave Peeler added that there may be some other outstanding facilities that could be included in this short list of interest. Scalability is a critical factor that will be considered once dischargers have honed-in on specific promising technologies.

The Technology Workgroup presentation is available on the Collaboration website: <http://client-ross.com/spokane-river>.

Re-Use & Conservation Workgroup

Co-Chair Lloyd Brewer reported on the status of the Re-Use & Conservation Workgroup's progress. The Workgroup has developed estimates for net urban irrigation requirements and potential re-use opportunities in tabular form, including the distance from the nearest treatment facility. Opportunities are displayed geographically, with concentric rings to indicate those that fall within a 5, 10, 15, and 20-mile radius. Most of the hard data for re-use opportunities, to date, are for those in Washington State. The Workgroup is coordinating with Jim Kimball of HARSB to better understand the re-use opportunities in Idaho. The Re-Use & Conservation Workgroup is considering the difference in the amount of water that could be added through irrigation over the season, as well as the costs associated with the storage of water.

The Workgroup reported on several additional factors that affect their re-use data. Liberty Lake has indicated that they look at re-use opportunities within 4 miles of their treatment plant. Spokane County has indicated that they will consider opportunities within 15 miles. The City of Spokane is not prepared to land-apply treated wastewater to parks or schools at the moment, and these opportunities have not been counted in their urban irrigation needs/re-use opportunities profile. The Re-Use & Conservation Workgroup continues to add some data to their table for additional identified re-use opportunities and estimated flow reduction attributed to re-use of municipal wastewater. The Workgroup is capturing information about re-use sites in a broad manner and is now considering what may be reasonable and feasible to implement.

The largest and most immediate re-use opportunities appear to be freeway open spaces, golf courses, and in-plant applications. The Re-Use & Conservation Workgroup continues to assess longer term opportunities and review the experiences of other communities. The Workgroup feels that more thorough study is needed around the question of seasonal sensitivity of the Spokane River system to phosphorous. In addition, a re-use demonstration, feasibility study, and cost effectiveness determination may figure into the implementation of re-use.

Jim Kimball reported that 1500 acres of land has been identified for re-use in Hayden Lake, Post Falls, and Coeur d'Alene. A study was completed for these 10 square miles of land and found that

less than 3.3 square miles can be used for wastewater re-use through land application. Idaho dischargers continue to study available land and the costs and feasibility associated with wastewater re-use, estimating that it will take 6-12 months to complete their investigation. In Idaho, dischargers can apply directly above the sole source aquifer. The State of Idaho has adopted new groundwater quality guidelines that require Class A water standards for re-use in these areas. The Idaho dischargers are working with the Department of Environmental Quality to determine what this means for their particular applications. Gwen Fransen of Idaho DEQ added that the Rathdrum Prairie aquifer is designated as a sensitive resource aquifer where water quality cannot be lowered through re-use activities. Specific land application guidelines also apply to re-use over the aquifer with hydraulic loading and nutrient uptake of plants as limiting factors. Idaho DEQ will work with the Idaho dischargers to help clarify the connection between these land application regulations and aquifer water quality guidelines.

Dave Peeler commented that Inland Empire Paper Company is re-using 1+ MGD of wastewater internally. Mr. Peeler asked if the Re-Use & Conservation Workgroup has factored this type of re-use into its figures or coordinated with the Flows & Loadings Workgroup to account for such industrial activities. Lloyd Brewer replied that this specific number for Inland Empire Paper has not been added to re-use opportunities table, but that this facility has been identified for re-use activities.

Tom Eaton asked whether the Re-Use & Conservation Workgroup has contacted golf course associations or other industry representatives to determine the economics of re-use opportunities. Lloyd Brewer agreed that cost will be the driving factor for the implementation of these opportunities and reported that the Re-Use & Conservation Workgroup has spoken with local cemeteries, but not with local golf courses. Jack Lynch commented that the City of Spokane is interested in piloting re-use with the planned use of golf courses. Jack Lynch, Dale Arnold, and the City of Spokane Parks Department have been coordinating on the potential for such a re-use pilot.

The Re-Use & Conservation Workgroup has not identified a specific estimate of conservation opportunities, but has discussed a range of 5 to 20 percent reductions. The Workgroup determined that in many cases, deferred capital costs for plant construction will drive conservation programs. Water conservation may result in increased river flows, and would result in operational savings that could then be used to help offset the cost of phosphorous controls. While a Conservation Workshop will be a good activity in the future, most Workgroup participants believe savings in phosphorous loading due to conservation would not be measurable, and therefore a Workshop would not contribute vital information for the TMDL negotiation.

The Workgroup has identified key questions about aquifer recharge, but has not determined estimates for specific aquifer recharge opportunities.

Tim Connor asked for clarification on the point of whether conservation would affect the pounds of phosphorous going to the Spokane River system. Bruce Rawls explained that consistent with the discussion during the Flows & Loadings Workgroup update, a given treatment technology will generally produce a range of effluent nutrient concentration independent of the influent concentration. For this reason, any reduced loadings to the treatment plants will produce proportionate reductions in phosphorous discharges. John Spencer and Mike Sharar agreed to produce a description for the Full Group of the relationship between influent total phosphorous concentration, effluent total phosphorous concentration, and flows to be posted on the Collaboration website. The Re-Use & Conservation Workgroup presentation is also available on the Collaboration website: <http://client-ross.com/spokane-river>.

Non-Point Source Workgroup

Co-Chairs Neil Kersten and Dave Knight provided an update on the status of the Non-Point Source Workgroup. The Workgroup has now looked at all sources categorized in the draft Spokane River TMDL as either non-point or background and started with the presumption that all sources under consideration may be potentially controllable. The Workgroup is also considering controllable non-point source contributions directly to Lake Spokane. Using the Non-Point Source matrix discussed at the July 22 Full Group meeting as a guide, the Non-Point Source Workgroup has assigned "champions" to particular geographies or categories of sources who have summarized what is currently known from local data and literature or studies from elsewhere. From this information, the Non-Point Source Workgroup has developed preliminary estimates and understandings about potential controls and the range of effectiveness of those controls for the Valley Aquifer, Little Spokane River, Hangman Creek, Lake Spokane, Lake Coeur d'Alene, and Stormwater/CSO.

The Non-Point Source Workgroup has used information directly from the draft Spokane River TMDL unless more detailed information was available from other sources. The current estimate of reductions from controllable non-point sources is 20-50%, based on control options that have often been successfully implemented elsewhere. The load reduction will have a range of effectiveness dependent upon site conditions and the extent of implementation. Spatial variability is another factor in the estimate of load reduction effectiveness. Further study would be required to gain knowledge of specific load contributions. The low end of the estimated range of reductions is close to the draft TMDL target. The Non-Point Source Workgroup's accounting of non-point source contributions is currently different than that within the draft TMDL. If this trend continues, the Workgroup will document these differences in their final report to the Full Group. Dave Peeler commented that if the Workgroup's numbers are significantly different than the TMDL, then the Collaboration will need to better understand this information.

The Non-Point Source Workgroup's next steps are to refine the range of potential reductions and explain any assumptions behind the estimates. The Workgroup will also evaluate potential periodic phosphorous loadings, such as significant runoff events in Hangman Creek. The product the Workgroup will submit to the Full Group will include a report on each source with assumptions explained and information sources cited.

Jim Kimball suggested that the Non-Point Source Workgroup compare reductions month-by-month to correlate with the Re-Use & Conservation's estimate of land application opportunities.

Tim Connor asked whether the Workgroup could produce significant findings by the September 14 data deadline, given the complexity of the questions and the potential need for further study. Dave Knight responded that with every citation there will be a caveat as to the source and the reliability of the information. The Non-Point Source Workgroup's discussion of further study will be developed and in their final product. Neil Kersten added that the Workgroup will have two meetings before the September 28 Full Group Meeting, by which they will have a draft matrix with detailed back-ground information and data. The Workgroup will take their current information a step further by the September 14 submittal of data for the Workgroup roll-up effort. Brewster Boyd added that there is information behind the summary for each of the controllable non-point sources, with detail on septic tanks, lawn and garden fertilizers, agricultural runoff, etc. The Non-Point Source Workgroup is comfortable with these initial estimates and will tighten this information, as needed. In addition to detail on sources, the Non-Point Source Workgroup will report on the available control measures and assign a range of confidence for each. In some cases the Workgroup may not have ultimate

confidence in the control method, which will be noted. Walt Edelen commented that the Workgroup is using established studies that report the effectiveness of various best management practices.

Tim Connor asked how the Workgroup has scrutinized natural background from non-point sources. Neil Kersten replied that some information will not be known; for example, all entry points into the Rathdrum Prairie aquifer. Tom Eaton commented that "non-point source" and "natural background" is an artificial distinction and that the Collaboration should be thinking about these as "controllable" versus "non-controllable" sources of phosphorous. Todd Mielke suggested that the Workgroup continue to distinguish all non-point sources as either controllable or non-controllable. A monitoring program and an adaptive management structure will assist with understanding of the need for and how to move forward on some non-point source controls. Mr. Mielke added that it is important to ask these types of questions to help bring together the TMDL Implementation Plan.

The Non-Point Source Workgroup presentation is available on the Collaboration website: <http://client-ross.com/spokane-river>.

Monitoring Workgroup

Mike Sharar presented background information on the traditional scope of monitoring programs, which are comprised of three primary elements: monitoring, studies, and modeling. Monitoring allows for River health to be consistently measured, including the impacts of implementing phosphorous reduction activities. Monitoring can also inform when goals have been achieved and/or measure any unexpected responses of the River system. Further study allows for better understanding of how some factors may affect the River, how factors inter-relate, and what measures may be most effective for River health. Modeling describes using additional data to improve a model's ability to assess potential future states of the River system.

The proposed scope of a Workgroup that would consider the design of a Monitoring program would include each of the three primary elements. Mr. Sharar's presentation included specific questions this preliminary Monitoring group would be charged with addressing:

- How should we use existing monitoring?
- What additional monitoring is needed?
- What are suggested studies and ways to prioritize them.
- How do we assure good coordination among monitoring, studying and modeling?
- Who pays and how do we run the program?

For membership of the preliminary monitoring group, the following individuals have been nominated or are expected to participate: Sid Fredrickson of Cour d'Alene, Stan Miller for Spokane County, Bob Cusimano of Ecology, Joel Mossman for the Sierra Club, an individual from the City of Spokane, an individual from the Ecology Eastern Regional Office.

The Full Group was asked to provide comment on Mike Sharar's scope, charge, and membership of a group that would design a monitoring program. Lloyd Brewer asked if the scope of the monitoring program would recognize river-aquifer interchange. Mr. Sharar clarified that the scope of a monitoring program would include the entire geophysical system contributing to River health. Todd Mielke asked for clarification on the modeling element of the scope. Mr. Sharar explained that the existing model can be used, but the Workgroup should comment on what data or information can be used to make the model more effective. Part of the charge of the final Workgroup is to identify and monitor the variables that are not well understood. Lars Hendron commented that a group has met

previously to discuss what areas of the model could use more study. Bob Cusimono participated in this earlier discussion.

Tom Eaton commented that it is not appropriate to ask this preliminary monitoring group who should pay for a monitoring program, but rather what such a program would cost. The decision about commitment of resources for the Program should come back to the Full Group. Bruce Rawls commented that a phosphorous technical advisory committee was established early-on in the TMDL process and had discussed a long-term monitoring structure. This may be a place for the preliminary monitoring group to start for more information. Jim Bellatty commented that a process for conducting modeling runs is being developed by Ecology and that their current proposal describes a relationship between Ecology and the Spokane River TMDL Collaboration. Ecology is looking for feedback on this proposal. Dave Peeler asked whether the long-term monitoring group would simply be reporting or actually managing the monitoring program. Bill Ross commented that the preliminary monitoring group should consider this detail and provide a recommendation.

Walt Edelen volunteered the Conservation District to participate in this preliminary monitoring exercise and was added to the group.

The Monitoring Group will require a facilitator to help get organized. Ross & Associates will provide this support. Bill Ross commented that the monitoring element is necessary, but need not delay the efforts of putting together the rest of a TMDL Implementation Plan. The preliminary monitoring group will need a couple of months to address their charge and hopefully can provide a substantive report by October.

The Monitoring presentation is available on the Collaboration website: <http://client-ross.com/spokane-river>.

Discussion of Deadline for Workgroup Analysis and Roll-Up of Workgroup Information, both in Matrix Form and Narrative Summary

Bill Ross presented a draft Full Matrix as a logical framework for the roll-up of Workgroup information. Some Workgroup information will not fit into the Full Matrix and will be attached as narrative. The purpose of the roll-up exercise is to get a more comprehensive look at the data and more clearly see the larger picture of each of the Workgroups' contributions. A deadline of September 14 will be set for each of the Workgroups to submit what is currently known in their particular area. It is not expected that all information will be definitive or absolute. This evolving Full Matrix will allow the Full Group to begin a discussion of scenarios. Ryan Orth and Brewster Boyd will be working with each of the Workgroups to gather this information to populate the Full Matrix and develop narrative, as necessary.

Dave Peeler commented that some of the Workgroup data will not be available by September 14 but should eventually be included in the Full Matrix. Mr. Peeler asked whether the Full Group should assume that this information will become available by the October Full Group meeting. Bill Ross replied that Workgroups should continue work until they are instructed to stop and expect to update the Full Matrix as this additional information becomes available.

Tim Connor asked if there was any plan to include levels of confidence of phosphorous contribution and phosphorous removal methods. Bill Ross replied that the Workgroups may need some time to determine confidence levels. The more information can be clarified by Workgroups, the better. Mr. Connor asked that if the Workgroup Co-Chairs populate the matrix, whether Ecology would stand

behind the information in the matrix. Mr. Ross replied that the Full Matrix is an intermediate step to assemble information in a way that will be helpful to the Full Group.

Discussion of How to Tee-Up Full Group Deliberation of TMDL Implementation Plan

Bill Ross explained that individuals or groups are going to review the information from the Workgroup roll-up and make judgments in light of the confidence levels described by the Workgroups to develop scenarios. There are several choices for how to proceed with these deliberations. The Full Group could perform this process collectively or within caucuses to allow a suite of scenarios to come forward and begin a dialogue about their similarities and differences. The consideration of scenarios will lead the Collaboration to an understanding of whether the overall process is headed towards a collaborative agreement or if Ecology will need to make decisions on its own. The overall Collaboration process is not designed to sustain Full Group discussion of many alternative scenarios or to engage in a lot of back and forth negotiations over scenarios. Small groups will naturally coalesce and make recommendations about the scenarios, but those putting forth scenarios should do so with best faith efforts. The general timeline is for the Full Group to decide how to proceed with the development of scenarios at the September 28 meeting and to begin the consideration of the scenarios that are developed at the October Full Group meeting.

Bruce Rawls added that he sees the Matrix as a summary of possibilities, ranked by feasibility and cost. Some elements of a solution will be cut and dried. Other elements will require additional discussion. Gwen Fransen commented that the Steering Workgroup could attempt to assemble scenarios for Full Group deliberation. Bill Ross replied that the Steering Workgroup was assigned policy making responsibility and is not fully representative of the Full Group. However, perhaps there is a representative small group that could be tasked to develop scenarios. Dave Peeler commented that the development of scenarios would be difficult to do as a Full Group. Dick Denny suggested that John Spencer and Mike Sharar bring forward three to four scenarios to the Full Group for review.

Todd Mielke commented that the Collaboration process was originally a negotiation between Ecology and the Petitioners and expressed concern about opening the process to one "drafted by committee" when some members are not affiliated with either party. A representative small group could develop a draft for others to critique, section by section. The Collaboration process has been open with regards to the information being considered within the negotiation, but now comes down to who is party to negotiation. Richard Koch suggested that the Workgroup Co-Chairs develop both the Full Matrix and the scenarios as a logical next step. Bill Ross replied that the scenarios are a policy-related product and the Collaboration does not want to have multiple scenarios just for the sake of having them. Todd Mielke agreed with the basic concept of developing scenarios as a way to begin Full Group deliberations of a TMDL Implementation Plan. Of the options described, Mr. Mielke suggested a draft scenario developed by John Spencer Mike Sharar with consultation with the Workgroup Co-Chairs. This format will allow input from both parties, who may then solicit more information from the Workgroup Co-Chairs. Dave Peeler added that it is not fully known at this point how the Collaboration will monitor and adapt for long-term management of the Spokane River. Whichever scenario is put forth, the Collaboration will need to effectively manage the uncertainty that exists.

Bill Ross explained that the Full Group is not yet making a decision about what how to deliberate on a potential TMDL Implementation Plan. This decision of how to move forward with the process will be made at the September 28 Full Group meeting. Mr. Ross suggested that Full Group members continue to have this dialogue about how to move forward between now and the September Full Group meeting. Mr. Ross replied to Mr. Mielke's earlier comment and suggested that he was correct about the original path of the Collaboration starting as a negotiation between Ecology and the Spokane River TMDL Collaboration

Petitioners. However, Ecology and the Petitioners are not the only stakeholders in this process and other parties will inevitably have ideas on what a TMDL Implementation plan should contain. Any scenario needs be each stakeholder's "best shot", no matter how the deliberation process occurs. The conservation community has an idea of their best faith proposal and the petitioners should, as well. Mr. Mielke added that there is some difference in the breadth of the parties; while Ecology has a responsibility to the state, the Petitioners have a responsibility to their constituents and municipalities need to balance these specific interests. Tom Eaton suggested that the Full Group review the principles that were agreed to at the beginning of the process and ensure that each scenario touches on all of these principles.

Todd Mielke suggested that the frequency of Full Group meetings increase to bi-weekly after the October Full Group meeting. Bill Ross commented that it is fine for the Full Group to consider and calendar more frequent meetings, in that the first cut at the scenarios at the October meeting may not be completely comprehensive. However, these meetings after October assume that Ecology is still interested in developing a TMDL Implementation Plan with the Full Group.

Status of Media Inquiries and Outreach

Bill Ross announced that Ecology has developed an internal protocol for media inquiries that is consistent with the general protocol laid out in the Collaboration principals. The Collaboration process is starting to attract more media attention and this will be a good agenda item for future Full Group meetings.