

**Knight, David T. (ERO) (ECY)**

---

**From:** Jerry and Julie Jose [jjj@oo.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 04, 2007 2:46 PM  
**To:** Knight, David T. (ERO) (ECY)  
**Subject:** Spokane River TMDL Comments

**Attachments:** Spokane River TMDL Comments.doc



Spokane River  
MDL Comments.do.

Thank you for the informative open house at SFCC. Attached are my comments.

Julia Jose

October 3, 2007

Dear Department of Ecology,

Please consider my following comments regarding the Spokane River TMDL permitting process.

I love living near a river with many parks and natural areas where I can hike, watch birds and enjoy the scenery. I want the pollutants to be cleaned up as much as possible to protect aquatic life and so that people can eat the fish they catch.

My first concern is for the outflow of raw sewage into the river during dry months. I only recently became aware that this is still happening, and I hope Ecology will insist that the City of Spokane repair and maintain its system to prevent further spills.

Since the Clean Water Act says that upstream users should not increase pollutants for downstream users, I can see how this draft plan could be challenged in court because it allows the Idaho permit holders to add an amount of phosphate and then the Spokane County holders to add an equal amount before the river enters the Spokane Indian Reservation. In order to prevent DO content degradation, I urge you to study and implement reuse of treated sewage effluent rather than pumping it all back into the river. That along with improved treatment technology would decrease phosphorus pollutants, especially when the new regional treatment plant comes online. I also urge that the Avista Corp. be included as one of the permit holders and held accountable for the low dissolved oxygen content behind its dams in warm months. Beginning an aeration program now could restore the proper DO level while other technical fixes are in process.

Finally, I was disappointed to read that there is no legal requirement in the draft plan that a certain level of improvement will be achieved by the ten year mark and that the state will consider weakening the DO water quality standard then if permit holders have not met guidelines. I believe there should be marked improvement in ten years and that the plan would not comply with the Clean Water Act if it does not require compliance.

The heritage of this community was a river full of salmon, trout and other aquatic life. We have lost the salmon, but I see no good reason to allow further degradation. Please seriously consider the ideas from the Sierra Club, Center for Justice and others who believe as I do that we can write, support and comply with a plan which maintains a cleaner river in a shorter time frame than 20 years.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Julia A. Jose  
2632 W. Everett  
Spokane, WA 99205