MEETING SUMMARY

Spokane River TMDL Collaboration

Technology Workgroup Meeting

May 13, 2005—10:00 AM - Noon

Meeting Attendees:

Here	Name	Sponsor	e-mail	Phone
No	Blau, Pat	Petitioners	Pat.Blau@kaisertwd.com	(509) 927-6350
Yes	Bramble, Len*	Ecology	lbra461@ecy.wa.gov	(509)-329-3504
Tele	Cupps, Kathy	Ecology	kcup461@ecy.wa.gov	(360) 407-6452
Yes	Fredrickson, Sid	Petitioners	SidF@cdaid.org	(208) 769-2277
Yes	Hendron, Lars/Arnold, Dale*	Petitioners	Lhendron@spokanecity.org	(509) 625-7929
Yes	Krapas, Doug/Fink, Rick	Petitioners	Doug_Krapas@iepco.com	(509) 924-1911
No/ No	Massman, Joel/Beavers, Bonne	Ecology	bbeavers@cforjustice.org	(509) 835-5211
Yes	Peterson, Mike	Ecology	mpetersen@landscouncil.org	(509) 838-4912
Tele	Ragsdale, Dave (EPA Advisor)	Ecology	rags461@ecy.wa.gov	
Yes	Rawls, Bruce	Petitioners	Brawls@spokanecounty.org	(509) 477-3604
Yes	Werner, Terry	Petitioners	Twerner@postfallsidaho.org	(208) 777-9857

Meeting Summary:

1. The Technology Workgroup (TWG) should tackle Fundamental Questions 1 and 2 immediately.
2. TWG should be prepared to tackle Fundamental Questions 3 and 4 as soon as pertinent information becomes available to TWG from the Flows & Loading Workgroup (FLWG) and/or other workgroups.
3. Consistent with the discussions of the Full Group (FG), TWG made "question 3" for TWG into Fundamental Question 5 for TWG.
4. TWG feels it needs input/guidance from Ecology pertaining potential compliance criteria including, but not limited to, utilizing data averages versus mean versus median; the frequency of environmental sampling; the possibility of using rolling averages for compliance; a major consideration for this is due to the sensitivity of reservoir to react to fluctuations in pollutant loading and it's corresponding changes in DO throughout the lake.
5. We must clearly define "non-compliance" if allowing something innovative (Dave Ragsdale).
6. There is interest on behalf of the dischargers on identifying and reviewing any model changes made by Ecology.
7. TWG expressed an interest in pilot studies, but also expressed concerns over timing and costs to set up, conduct, and interpret pilot results.
8. Arrange conference calls for future TWG meeting to discuss and Q&A with entities operating these newer systems, their regulators, and ask for key data for these plants in advance.
9. Heard description of Inland Empire Paper's (IEP) planned June pilot tests of Parkson D2, US Filter Trident, and Zenon's Ultrafiltration MBR processes.

10. E-mail the technical memorandum/report for the August 23, 2004 "Advanced Wastewater Treatment Technology Evaluation Workshop" to TWG for discussion and to confirm or adjust the selection criteria utilized within that report.
11. IEP to inquire with Parkson, US Filter, and Zenon as to the possibility of any of them being able to conduct a month-long municipal pilot in the Spokane are following the June pilot at IEP. Len Bramble to inquire with Liberty Lake Sewer & Water District (LLSWD) to gauge their willingness to host pilots of these treatment technologies. There still remains the need to better understand pilot testing costs and cost sharing.
12. A key issue is the applicability of new and emerging technologies to current and future wastewater treatment (public and private) situations. We must be sensitive to influent parameters, temperatures, etc.
13. We should also consider individual treatment technologies effectiveness at treating ammonia, BOD, PCB's, and metals in addition to phosphorous. These parameters are of concern either in the DO TMDL or other Spokane River TMDL's.
14. We should consider the proportions/amounts of non-reactive phosphorus versus reactive phosphorus at each treatment location.
15. Lars Hendron to follow up on Jim Correll's data request of BlueWater, Inc.
16. Re-use was discussed, specifically as it might apply to IEP versus the proposed Spokane County POTW. It was noted that there are different standards for industrial reuse.
17. Ken Merrill added that a permit could specify a technology rather than an effluent limit, which could be determined as performance becomes better understood.
18. There was discussion about possible presentations by vendors, but questions were raised as to does this really help at this time (see #'s 7,8,9).
19. Dale Arnold proposed that EPA & Ecology should determine which identified treatment technologies appear to be valid.
20. Bruce Rawls indicated that he would likely choose to bring his consultant(s) to future TWG meetings.

Notes on Status of Fundamental Questions:

1. What are the criteria to be used to qualify treatment technologies as ready for implementation for industrial and publicly owned wastewater treatment plants, using current industry knowledge?

The criteria previously utilized at the August 23, 2004 "Advanced Wastewater Treatment Technology Evaluation Workshop" is currently being distributed to TWG members and will likely be utilized either as-is or in some modified form as determined by TWG to qualify treatment technologies accordingly. Plans are for TWG to undertake this at it's next meeting.

2. What is the lowest, average and median final effluent concentration of phosphorus that can be achieved by municipal and industrial treatment plant technologies that are ready for implementation for industrial and publicly owned wastewater treatment plants? What final effluent concentration for phosphorus is achieved at the 95th percentile among qualified technologies?

To be determined through future meetings of TWG.

3. What is the total number of pounds of phosphorus to be released to the Spokane River from municipal and industrial point sources including the proposed Spokane County Treatment Plant during the period April to October 30? To answer this question, use the results of #2. What is this poundage at the end of each 5 year increment over the next 20 years, from 2008 to 2028?

To be determined through future meetings of TWG following input from the Flows & Loading Workgroup.

4. Taking into account; (1) the flows and loadings developed by the Flows and Loadings Workgroup and (2) conservation and re-use recommendations of the Conservation and Re-use Workgroup and (3) the effluent loading reductions resulting from source control, what is the range of point source loading of phosphorus to the river over the next 20 years, 2008 to 2028?

To be determined through future meetings of TWG.

5. What are the measures to be used for determining the phosphorus loading limits to the river; daily, weekly, monthly, seasonally?

To be determined through future meetings of TWG.

Topics for Next Meeting:

- Make substantive progress on responding to Fundamental Questions 1, 2, and 5 (those not requiring input from other workgroups at this time)
- Discuss pilot testing, including the appropriateness of pursuing such within the next 2-3 months

Next Meeting Time and Place:

- May 26, 2005 from 1:30 P.M. to 4:00 P.M. at Spokane Wastewater Management Department, 909 E. Sprague, Spokane
- June 9, 2005 from 3:00 P.M. to 5:00 P.M. at Spokane Wastewater Management Department, 909 E. Sprague, Spokane
- June 22, 2005 from 1:30 P.M. to 4:00 P.M. at Spokane Wastewater Management Department, 909 E. Sprague, Spokane