MEETING SUMMARY

Spokane River TMDL Collaboration

Steering Workgroup

September 23, 2005

Dale Arnold
Jim Bellatty
Tim Connor (as observer)
Dick Denenny
Sid Fredrickson
Wayne Frost
Dave Peeler
Bruce Rawls

Bill Ross
Ryan Orth
Mike Sharar
John Spencer

The Steering Workgroup held a meeting on August 22 to discuss the following agenda:

1. Workgroups—Status Reports on Pending Work Products
    a. Flows & Loadings
    b. Re-Use & Conservation
    c. Technology
    d. Non-Point Source
    e. Monitoring Workgroup

2. Discussion of Options for Scenario Development
    a. Consideration of Draft Framework for Scenario Development

3. September 28 Full Group Meeting— Confirm agenda and supporting materials

1. Workgroups—Status Reports on Pending Work Products

The Steering Workgroup considered whether it is productive for the Workgroups to continue analysis to answer their assigned Fundamental Questions, or if the Workgroups' efforts in answering their assigned Fundamental Questions are sufficiently robust and what remains to be addressed are more policy-type questions. Bill Ross commented that the Workgroups have gathered a lot of information up to this point, however, their submissions for the Roll-Up leave some holes within the Full Matrix, especially in the areas of re-use and conservation opportunities. At this point, information on costs and avoidance costs are not necessarily available, but do not necessarily prevent the Collaboration process from moving towards the development of scenarios for what a TMDL Implementation Plan could look like.

Mr. Ross provided a general status update on the various Workgroup information roll-up submittals, and their contributions to a more comprehensive Full Matrix. The Flows & Loadings Workgroup submittal describes approximately 96 MGD flowing from all of the dischargers by 2028. Ross & Associates is currently gathering the assumed growth rates for these flow calculations. The Technology Workgroup focused the results of their facility survey in the last month, highlighting a number of facilities with average phosphorus effluent performance in the range of 10-50 μg/L. However, there is some disagreement over the average performance recommendation of 50 μg/L made within the Technology Workgroup's submittal. The Re-Use & Conservation Workgroup identified approximately 100 MGD of re-use opportunities within the concentric rings surrounding the treatment plants, however, significant unknown elements related to costs and quality of effluent remain. Of these 100 MGD, about 5 MGD were identified by dischargers to include within the Full Matrix. The Re-Use & Conservation Workgroup identified conservation opportunities in the 5-20% range for the City of Spokane and a 5% commitment for Liberty Lake. Spokane County did not identify a specific range of conservation, but rather spoke to a future conservation program. The Non-Point Source Workgroup estimated a larger number of pounds contributed from Hangman Creek due to the TMDL's use of a dry year. The Conservation District's analysis indicates the draft TMDL estimate for Hangman Creek could be low by up to 35 pounds. There is still some disagreement within the Workgroup around estimates for potential reductions from these non-point sources.

Dave Peeler commented that if the Non-Point Source Workgroup and the Conservation District have larger estimates for contributions from Hangman Creek, then there are larger numbers of pounds that need to be removed from the Spokane River system. Ecology wants to ensure that the dischargers do not interpret this situation as bringing flexibility to other phosphorous reduction elements. If the Workgroup does believe different information should be considered for this source, this information should be fed back to Bob Cusimano at Ecology. Bruce Rawls added that the Non-Point Source Workgroup did discuss that any increases in contributions from non-point sources would require proportionate reductions.

John Spencer commented that the Full Matrix to be presented at the September 28 Full Group meeting itself is not a scenario, but rather a summary of the information the Workgroups have gathered, to date. Todd Mielke added that he anticipated some gaps in information at this point, some of which can be defended better than others. The Full Group will have a discussion about these specific gaps and decide whether there is enough information on which to base proposals for a TMDL Implementation Plan. Bill Ross suggested that the Co-Chairs of each Workgroup could describe what they've done in great detail or in summary form at the Full Group meeting. In either case, additional research could be performed to gather gaps in information if so directed by the Full Group. However, the more time spent discussing the details of the Workgroup information, the less time will be available for the discussion of scenarios.

The Steering Workgroup agreed that the Co-Chairs of each Workgroup should provide a 10-15 minute summary of their submission for the Workgroup Information Roll-Up and Full Matrix. Each of the Co-Chairs should be available at the front of the room for this period in the event of cross-cutting questions from the Full Group.

All nominees for the Monitoring Workgroup have now been submitted and a draft Charter is developed. The first Monitoring Workgroup meeting will be scheduled in October. Ecology nominated Bob Cusimano as an Ecology co-chair. The dischargers will choose a co-chair amongst themselves and communicate this nominee at the Monitoring Workgroup meeting. Bruce Rawls

mentioned that Stan Miller is willing to serve as a co-chair, but this decision will need to be formalized amongst the discharger group. There is no target date for the completion of the Monitoring Workgroup's tasks at this point. It is anticipated that several meetings may be required for the Workgroup to complete their responsibilities.

2. Discussion of Options for Scenario Development

The Full Group members did discuss several approaches to the development of scenarios at the August 24 Full Group meeting. The Full Group considered the options to develop scenarios as a large group, within small groups, or delegating this task to the Petitioner and Ecology contractors. Of these options, the Full Group had expressed concerns about developing a scenario as a large group. The Steering Workgroup believes a continued discussion about scenarios will be appropriate for the September 28 Full Group meeting. Mr. Ross suggested that Ecology should not develop their own scenario or participate in a joint scenario, as the Collaboration process fundamentally changes once Ecology begins to describe the specifics of a TMDL Implementation Plan. Instead, Ecology should consider the various scenarios to determine whether they could become the basis of a TMDL Implementation Plan.

The Steering Workgroup does not anticipate the development of many scenarios, but agreed that all Full Group members who wish to develop a scenario should be allowed to. Those who plan to develop a scenario should declare their intentions to do so and Ecology should then be available to each Full Group member (or group of members) that will submit a scenario before the October Full Group meeting to discuss the draft submissions and provide general feedback. Mr. Ross encourages an open dialogue and sharing of information amongst Full Group members as it is useful over the next month. Mr. Rawls commented that it would be helpful if Ecology would present an overview of its expectations for scenarios at the September 28 Full Group meeting. Dave Peeler replied that Ecology will not have specific numbers to share, but will have an idea about what is workable, information about reasonable timeframes, etc. Mr. Peeler agreed to develop a presentation to outline Ecology's fundamental expectations for scenarios.

Mr. Ross proposed a draft Framework for the Development of Scenarios. Scenario submittals would be due to the facilitator by close of business October 24. Within the proposed Framework, Full Group members are asked to address the following in their submittals:

- What combination of phosphorous reductions through influent source control and conservation, treatment plant technology for river discharge and/or land application, effluent re-use opportunities instead of river discharge, and non-point source controls would comprise a TMDL Implementation Plan?
- How should a TMDL Implementation Plan describe timeframes under which specific phosphorous reductions, the evaluation of monitoring data, and interim goal-setting take place?
- What form of agreement among what parties in the Collaboration is best to ensure that a TMDL Implementation Plan is approved and implemented?

The Steering Workgroup indicated that it would be helpful for Full Group members to refer to the Fundamental Questions and Guiding Principles documents as they are developing scenarios. The draft Framework will be revised to include this guidance as well as mention of Ecology's role in providing feedback on scenario concepts throughout the development period. The draft Framework for Scenarios will be distributed to the Full Group prior to the September 28 meeting.

3. September 28 Full Group Meeting Agenda

The Steering Workgroup discussed agenda items for the September 28 Full Group Meeting. As previously discussed, the Full Group will receive a report from each of the Workgroup co-chairs on the information they have gathered, to date. Inland Empire Paper Company and the City of Spokane indicated that they will be available to provide an update on their technology pilot projects, as well. The Full Group will also discuss the options for scenario development, the revised draft Framework for Scenario Development, and any guidance from Ecology. The Monitoring Workgroup's status and draft Charter will also be discussed this meeting. The final agenda item, before a meeting wrap-up will be the status of model runs.

The Steering Workgroup discussed the questions that could be asked in a future model run. John Spencer suggested that the shoulder months and seasonality questions should be addressed most immediately. Dave Peeler indicated that Ecology has drafted a question for the model concerning shoulder months and seasonality and that an additional model question could address flows. Mr. Peeler commented that Ecology would like to bring these questions to the Full Group meeting for closure on September 28. Mr. Spencer asked how much a model run would cost and suggested that dependent upon this cost, it may make sense to wait to see what comes through within the submitted scenarios before running the model. Mr. Peeler responded that the Collaboration can afford to run more than one model if there are competing ideas about flows.

The Steering Workgroup meeting adjourned at approximately 9:00 a.m.