MEETING SUMMARY

Spokane River TMDL Collaboration

Reuse and Conservation Workgroup

June 22, 2005

Member Attendance: (x)-present; (p)-by phone; (a)- alternate attended in place of

Here	Name	Sponsor	e-mail	Phone
x	Anderson, Jerry	Ecology	gand461@ecy.wa.gov	(509) 329-3400
	Blau, Pat	Petitioners	Pat.Blau@kaisertwd.com	(509) 927-6350
ph	Brewer, Lloyd*	Petitioners	lbrewer@spokanecity.org	(509) 625-6968
x	Cupps, Kathy*	Ecology	kcup461@ecy.wa.gov	(360) 407-6452
	Fox, Tom	Ecology		(206) 296-5279
	Hyatt, John	Petitioners	pwdir@city-of-airway-heights.org	(509) 244-5429
ph	Kimball, Jim	Petitioners	JKimball@JUB.com	(208) 762-8787
x	Koch, Richard	Ecology	rkoc461@ecy.wa.gov	(509) 329-3400
ph	Krapas, Doug	Petitioners	Doug_Krapas@iepco.com	(509) 924-1911
x	Mellish, Lee	Petitioners	Sewerdoc@aol.com	(509) 922-9016
x	Rawls, Bruce	Petitioners	Brawls@spokanecounty.org	(509) 477-3604
x	Riley, Craig	Ecology	craig.riley@doh.wa.gov	
	Smith, Doug	Petitioners	dsmith@libertylakewa.gov	
alt	Triplett, Frank	Petitioners		
ph	Werner, Terry	Petitioners	Twerner@postfallsidaho.org	(208) 777-9857

Attach Audience Attendance Roster

Jeff Lilly (Triplett alternate), jlilly@spokanecity.org
Jordana Griff (Sierra Club), jgriff@lawschool.gonzaga.edu
Dave Ragsdale (EPA), ragsdale.dave@epa.wa.gov
Bill Rickard (Brewer alternate), brickyard@spokanecity.org

Meeting Summary:

1. Reviewed responses from the steering committee on the fundamental questions. Agreed the intent was to clearly identify existing and future potential opportunities (and constraints) for water reclamation and reuse and conservation.

2. Discussed potential constraints on reclaimed water use.

   a. Spokane Water utility voiced concerns about their customer base and stranded utility costs if the potable customers changed to reclaimed water. The City currently has plenty of water rights to serve customers.

   b. Reclaimed water may not be the cost-effective alternative when viewed from the perspective of a single utility. The economic viability must consider the broader picture of

wastewater, potable water supply, the new reclaimed water utility and other benefits to the area. Financing will require coordination among all parties to appropriately establish costs and benefits (who pays for what and how).

c. Irrigation (land application at agronomic rates) is crop dependent (whether urban or agricultural) and needed only during the crop growing season (generally mid-June through September). Peak irrigation uses occurs in July and August. There may be little demand for irrigation use in April, May, early June or October.

d. Storage of reclaimed water when demand for the water is not available is an additional expense. Constructing and maintaining large volumes of storage may not be cost-effective.

e. Groundwater has hydraulic continuity with the river and the area geology is porous so that phosphorus discharged to the aquifer may still impact the Spokane River. Some level of phosphorus reduction is still needed.

f. Spokane County noted that public may resist some reuse applications based on perceptions about the reclaimed water's origin (sewage) and quality. It may take considerable time and outreach to convince the public to:

   - Use reclaimed water at elementary schools or other areas frequented by small children. (The county will not include these uses in the first tier efforts for use.)

   - Recharge groundwater (protected sole source aquifer) with reclaimed water.

3. <u>Reviewed data collected to date</u>.

   - Utilities are still working at compiling the data to answer question #1 for irrigation, commercial and industrial uses. Data needs to be completed by the next meeting – July 13.

   - Dave Ragsdale agreed to contact the conservation district for information on lands that are or could be irrigated with reclaimed water.

   - Spokane County noted that the county could not easily get information from water purveyors. Information may be available at DOH but would require someone to pull the water supply plans and review the information. This would be hit and miss and time consuming. No one volunteered.

   - Lloyd noted that the City had already received preliminary water use information from the City water utility and noted that the Spokane Aquifer Joint Board (a purveyor group) was polling its members regarding customer water use at or above 100,000 gallons a day and would be reporting back to this TMDL work group.

4. <u>Assigned all members to review watershed management plan</u>. Group needs to review the watershed management plan for consistency with recommendations in that plan.

5. Inland Empire Paper reported that they could reduce up to 20% of their discharge (1 MGD) through conservation measures. However, this is at considerable expense – no dollar figure given.

6. Idaho data - Jim Kimball reported that Idaho could land apply on existing irrigated lands with Idaho DEQ's Class A reclaimed water. They stated that discharge could be at higher than agronomic rates early and late in the season if that was helpful to recharge the aquifer.

Notes on Status of Revised Fundamental Questions:

1. Define concentric rings from each existing and proposed treatment plant to establish a range of distances for re-use of treated municipal wastewater? Answer the question, "What is the total quantity of re-use opportunities within those concentric rings for re-use in agricultural, commercial, industrial, landscaping, aquifer recharge and golf-course applications? Use the period April 1 to October 31as a first tier consideration. Identify other opportunities that are not seasonal.

Dischargers continue to compile data. Should be completed by July 13 meeting.

2. Estimate the flow reduction that can be attributed to re-use of municipal wastewater assuming reasonable opportunities are captured over the next 20 year period.

Compiled with data in #1.

3. Identify the range of potential opportunities that exist in the Spokane River basin. Focus on the following elements (a) identify the largest and most immediate re-use opportunities in the area, (b) identify the longer term and perhaps more comprehensive opportunities (c) as time allows, identify the experiences of other communities to determine the possible long term range of opportunities, degree of difficulty in implementation and other dimensions. (d) Identify if a more thorough study would be useful to help guide actions over the long haul.

Using information from #1 attempt to complete at July 13 meeting.

4. What is a reasonable expectation for reduction in municipal wastewater influent flows from water conservation measures in the Spokane region?

Reviewing information provided by Tom Fox and in the watershed plan.
Preliminary estimate is that a 50% reduction may be possible with a very aggressive program; 20% appears to be a more achievable goal.

5. Focus on identifying opportunities for aquifer recharge – see question #1. Provide 'key questions' back to the Steering Workgroup about aquifer recharge in the Spokane area.

Group will discuss through e-mail forum prior to the July 13 meeting.

Topics for Next Meeting:

- Check status of potential reuse data collection (#1)
- Review data format for potential reuse opportunities (#3)
- Consistency with watershed management plan efforts
- Identification of barriers to water reuse and ways to resolve including information from other communities.
- Key questions to the steering committee on aquifer recharge. (#5 revised)
- Identify if a more thorough study would be useful (#3 revised).
- Report to full committee on July 22.

Next Meeting Time and Place:

Note: Meeting moved back 1 week to provide time for data collection to be finished.

13 July 9:45 am - 12 Spokane City Water Dept. Conference Rm. 914 E. North Foothills Drive