MEETING SUMMARY

Spokane River TMDL Collaboration

Steering Workgroup Meeting

June 9, 2005

ATTENDEES:
Dick Denenny
Sid Frerickson
Wayne Frost
Jack Lynch
Todd Mielke
Dave Peeler

Bill Ross
Ryan Orth
Mike Sharar
John Spencer
Dale Arnold
Bruce Rawls

The Steering Workgroup (WG) held a meeting on June 9 to discuss the following agenda:

1. Workgroup Status Reports
2. Water Quality Trading—Announcement and Schedule
3. June 23 Full Group Meeting—Development of Draft Agenda and Supporting Materials

1. Workgroup Status Reports

Participants discussed general Workgroup progress. The following topics were discussed specifically:

Re-Use & Conservation Workgroup Response to Fundamental Questions

The Steering Workgroup received a request for clarification on several of the Fundamental Questions from the Re-Use & Conservation Workgroup. The Steering Workgroup discussed the points of clarification and provided a reply to each, which may be found attached at the end of this summary.

Flows & Loadings Workgroup— Status of Aeration Workshop

Bruce Rawls updated the Steering Workgroup on the Flows & Loadings Workgroup's June 17 Workshop on Lake Aeration Evaluation. Mr. Rawls will re-distribute the Workshop announcement and logistics to the full list of contacts gathered from previous Full Group meetings. Rachel Paschal Osborn and Richard Koch, both members of the Flows & Loadings Workgroup, have offered to record the meeting proceedings. Bruce Rawls will summarize the main points and findings of the workshop in a memorandum to be distributed to the full list of participants and posted on the Spokane River TMDL

Collaboration website. The Workgroup is collecting the data necessary to answer the fundamental questions for this Workgroup.

Technology Workgroup
The technology Workgroup is actively engaged in identifying possible technologies for phosphorus treatment. Some dischargers are conducting pilot tests on selected technologies this summer. Mike Sharar and John Spencer will check in the co-chairs to ascertain progress being made on answering the fundamental questions for this Workgroup.

Nonpoint Source Workgroup
Mike Sharar and John Spencer will check in the co-chairs to ascertain progress being made on answering the fundamental questions for this Workgroup.

2. Water Quality Trading—Announcement and Schedule
The Steering Workgroup discussed the announcement and schedule of an analysis of the opportunities for water quality trading within the Spokane River watershed. Rob Greenwood and Brewster Boyd of Ross & Associates Environmental Consulting, Ltd. are now on contract with EPA Region 10 to conduct this water quality trading analysis. In the coming weeks, Mr. Greenwood and Mr. Boyd will conduct a series of interviews and coordinate with the Spokane River TMDL Collaboration's Non-Point Source Workgroup to collect relevant data for their study. Mr. Greenwood and Mr. Boyd will give an educational overview of the water quality trading approach at the Spokane River TMDL Collaboration's June 23 Full Group Meeting. Draft findings on the suitability of water quality trading in the Spokane River watershed will be presented at the Collaboration's July 22 Full Group meeting, where they will obtain input before completing their report in August. The Steering Workgroup will make an announcement of the water quality trading analysis that will be distributed to the full list of participants and posted on the Spokane River TMDL Collaboration website.

3. June 23 Full Group Meeting—Development of Draft Agenda and Supporting Materials
The Steering Workgroup tentatively identified the draft agenda for the June 23rd full group meeting, consisting of:

- Updates and path forward from the co-chairs of each Workgroup
- A verbal summary of the Aeration Workgroup
- Initial presentation on the water quality trading analysis

The meeting will focus on progress each Workgroup is making in answering its fundamental questions and identifying pounds of phosphorus that may be able to be removed from the river.

Water Reuse and Conservation Workgroup
Steering Workgroup Reply to Responses on 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, during the period April 15 to Sept. 30?"

Response: We believe this should be April 1 to October 31. Please confirm. In addition, it would be helpful to know which months have greater benefit to the river from reuse.

Reply from Steering Workgroup: Yes, the Re-Use & Conservation Workgroup should consider the April 1-October 31 timeframe in their analysis of re-use opportunities. This timeframe for the growing season is a first-tier consideration. The Workgroup should bear in mind that there are other potential opportunities for re-use such as aquifer recharge and industrial re-use which are not as seasonal.

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

Response: We believe this should be an estimate of flow reduction rather than phosphorus reduction. We are not sure how to estimate phosphorus reduction until we know what the concentrations will be discharged from the treatment facilities (technology workgroup). We can provide information on the flows diverted to water reuse so that phosphorus reduction could be calculated once treatment levels are defined. Please confirm.

Reply from Steering Workgroup: The Re-Use & Conservation Workgroup should focus on an estimate of flow reductions rather than phosphorus reductions. The Workgroup should await a request from the Technology Workgroup before applying a calculation to these estimates to develop a set of phosphorus reduction ranges or a month-by-month tabulation of averages, as deemed appropriate.

3. What lessons from experience of other communities in arid climates are there in regard to timing and scale of implementing water re-use measures?

Response: We have had some difficulty understanding the purpose of this question. Is it simply meant to document successes and barriers that other communities have had? If so, why does it specify arid climates (or in the other version – climates similar to Spokane)? Is there something more specific that we are trying to accomplish? Please clarify the goal.

Reply from Steering Workgroup: In looking at this question, the Steering Workgroup would like to clarify the goal of the Re-Use & Conservation Workgroup: to identify the range of potential opportunities for re-use that exist in the Spokane River basin. With this in mind, the Workgroup should 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 re-use opportunities in the area and (c) as time allows, identify the experiences of other communities (similar in climate and scale) to determine the possible long term range of opportunities, degree of difficulty of implementation, and other dimensions of their re-use activities. As the Workgroup addresses these three elements, they may also see fit to identify if a more thorough study of re-use potential would be useful to help guide actions over the long haul.

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

Response: No questions at this time.

5. Is the cost estimate, prepared by the City of Spokane and Spokane County for land application of municipal wastewater accurate to within an engineering order of magnitude standard.

Response: This question was deleted at the last full committee meeting but appeared in our starter packages. Is it deleted?

Reply from Steering Workgroup: Yes, this question has been deleted and the Re-Use & Conservation Workgroup does not need to provide an answer.

6. What is the order of magnitude cost for aquifer recharge alternatives given the analysis done in #1 above?

Response: Question 6 is a new question that appeared in our starter packages and was added after the full committee meeting. Why are we specifically looking at cost for aquifer recharge alternatives vs. cost for any water reuse or conservation alternatives?

Reply from Steering Workgroup: The Re-Use & Conservation Workgroup does not need to focus on the order of magnitude of costs for aquifer recharge at the moment. Costs will be considered at a later point. The Workgroup should focus on looking within the concentric rings described in question #1 and identify opportunities for aquifer recharge. The group should then describe the likely applicability for priority of these various aquifer recharge opportunities. The Steering Workgroup would appreciate receiving the Reuse and Conservation Workgroup's "key questions" that need to be answered about aquifer recharge for the Spokane area.