Meeting Summary for the July 23, 2014 Model-Techno-Policy Workgroup:

Discussion Items

DEQ received requested memo from the municipalities group identifying projected effluent concentrations under various technologies for TP reductions.

- Jack (HyQual) – Greenleaf and Middleton are no longer on lagoon systems
- Matt (Brown and Caldwell) – the memo is based on general recommendations and industry standards
- Kate (Boise) – will provide the actual reference documents to the group when Robbin returns
- Ben (EPA) – as this is representative of the industry in general, there shouldn't be an issue using the values to model

Jack – wants to see a scenario with 0.07 mg/L TP for all sources. There is too much uncertainty in ground water and tributaries achieving 0.07, hence, the municipalities should be required to ~~meet~~ have the same ~~target~~ allocation (correction per phone message from Jack on 7/29/2014).

- Troy (DEQ) – the current scenario of WWTFs = 0.1 May-Sept and 0.3 Oct-Apr are used as a starting point for analyses based on earlier preliminary analyses. DEQ will adjust the scenarios as appropriate to meet the target.

Darcy (DEQ) – presented preliminary analyses and methodologies to the group.

- Using observed TP instead of OP data for every segment, tributary, and facility where available, instead of relying on model stoichiometry.
    - Jack – need to have appropriate detritus, bioavailable, etc. There is really no sediment transport in the model. What were the new OP boundary conditions vs. the new OP boundary conditions?
    - Tom (HDR) and Ben (EPA) – what about running the model under current conditions, but substituting the OP for TP to compare?
- Ben – Wants to model the facility's design flows. Modeling only current flows would limit the facility loading.
    - Darcy – changing the facility flows would require a change in water balance and model calibration.
    - Tom – other questions about changing flows would have to be addressed (e.g. do we add flows, maintain neutral balance, etc?).
    - Kate (Boise) – all WWTF facility flows represent a small proportion of the overall LBR flows, especially during irrigation season.
    - Matt – wants to stress the importance of including design flows in order for facilities to have proper loading.
- Jack and Lee (Caldwell) – beginning in 2013, Riverside began regulating Indian Creek flows and spilling very little to Indian Creek.
    - Ben – this activity continuing may be dependent on a number of factors…perhaps run two scenarios, one with 2012 conditions and one for no flows in Indian Creek?

Tom – What to present at the next TAC?

- Troy – will depend on the subsequent model analyses

To do's

All

- Review and provide written comments on Darcy's spreadsheets and draft analyses

Troy and Darcy

- Post WWTF memo, DEQ spreadsheets, and other information on the ftp site and/or LBR WAG webpage
- Continue spearheading the modeling process…

Next Meeting - TBD