

**Pend Oreille River TMDL Watershed Advisory Group  
Meeting Summary**

**Thursday, May 10, 2007**

**1:00- 4:00 p.m.**

**Pend Oreille Historical Society Museum, Newport Washington**

**Attendees:**

Christine Pratt, Seattle City Light; Paul Caton, interested citizen; Patty Perry, Kootenai Tribe; Ted Runberg, Preist river Chamber of Commerce; Lori Blau, Ponderay Newsprint; Kent Easthouse, Army Corps of Engineers; Gary Wescott, Southside Water and Sewer District; Don Martin, EPA Region 10; Ed Tulloch and Jenna Borovansky, Idaho Dept. of Environmental Quality; Paul Pickett, Marcie Mangold and Jon Jones, Washington Dept. of Ecology; Ruth Watkins, Tri-State Water Quality Council; Jessica Koenig and Steve Carter, Tetra Tech (phone); Rob Annear and Chris Berger, Portland State University (phone).

**Welcome:**

Ruth Watkins welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the agenda.

**Role of Idaho tributary work group in decision-making process:**

Jenna Borovansky asked the WAG to consider an addition to its operating procedures that would delegate authority to the Idaho tributary work group to directly recommend tributary TMDLs (and proceeding with public comment on those TMDLs) to the Panhandle Basin Advisory Group. Everyone in attendance agreed that the procedures should be changed to formalize delegating this authority to the work group, however it was also agreed to have this on the agenda for the next meeting to get approval from other members not present today.

Jenna invited WAG members to attend the next tributary work group meeting to be held in Sandpoint on May 23<sup>rd</sup>. Paul Pickett noted that the three tributaries in Washington that were not included in the Colville National Forest TMDL are being covered in the river mainstem TMDL.

**Update, Sediment listing for the Pend Oreille River in Idaho and TDG tributary listings:**

Jenna reminded everyone that Idaho's 2002 Integrated Report showed the Pend Oreille River listed for Total Dissolved Gas, temperature (focus of our current work) and sediment. She explained that the TDG TMDL will be brought forward to the group in the future, and that the state will be recommending that the river be removed from the impaired list for sediment. DEQ will be preparing a justification for removal of the river for sediment and will bring this to the WAG for consideration.

Jenna also reported that Idaho tributaries currently listed as impaired by TDG will also be removed from the list. These tributary TDG listings were the result of a mapping error

when the river GIS was established, so the error will be corrected and the tributaries de-listed.

**River temperature TMDL schedule:**

A schedule for developing and finalizing the river temperature TMDL was developed by the two states, tribe, EPA and Tetra Tech (project contractor) and is as follows:

May 25	All info (modeling results and states' analyses) to Tetra Tech
June 1	Conference call with coordination group/Tetra Tech
June 25	Draft TMDL from Tetra Tech to group
Week of June 25th	WAG meeting to preview draft TMDL with WAG members
June 25-July 13	Coordination group reviews draft
July 20th	Conference call with coordination group/Tetra Tech to review and finalize draft for presenting to WAG
Week of August 6th	Draft TMDL (including implementation section) to WAG
Week of August 13th	WAG meeting to present TMDL, Tetra Tech attends
August 31	Comments due from WAG
September 14	Revisions made to draft from WAG comments
Week of Sept 17th	WAG meeting to vote on recommendation to BAG to begin public review process
October 15th	Public comment period starts
November 16	Public comment period ends
November 30	Responses to public comments prepared
December	Final TMDL submitted to EPA

The group reviewed the key milestones and noted important dates for WAG meetings: the weeks of June 25<sup>th</sup>, August 13<sup>th</sup> and September 17<sup>th</sup>. Ruth will email this schedule out to all WAG members along with proposed dates for June and August (see below).

**Overview of temperature modeling results in Idaho:** [Presentation is posted on Idaho website.]

Jenna gave an overview of the information that was presented at the March meeting regarding the river temperature modeling results for the Idaho portion of the river. She noted that comparisons of existing and natural conditions (scenarios 1 and 8) showed periods (in time and space) of increased and decreased temperatures. She described the potential sources of temperature that were modeled—point sources, tributaries, bank shading and Albeni Falls Dam—and explained that Albeni Falls Dam was the only source shown to be influencing river temperature. Jenna noted that most of the time existing conditions are cooler than natural conditions. She distributed a hand-out that describes DEQ's initial assessment of the modeling results and comparisons of the results to Idaho Water Quality Standards. Idaho temperature standards are not being met at 2 of the 13 compliance points on the river in Idaho.

Jenna described the next steps which will be to (1) evaluate the impact of the two non-compliance areas on cold water aquatic life/beneficial uses in Idaho and (2) look at the relationship of Idaho river conditions to downstream impairments.

Paul noted that Washington standards approach is different than Idaho's and that we will also have the Kalispel Tribe's standards to factor in as well. The group asked to have the standards comparison chart finalized in time for the next meeting and Patty asked that it be sent out to the WAG before we meet again.

### **Results of temperature modeling scenarios, Box Canyon segment:**

Paul provided preliminary results on the temperature modeling scenarios for the Box Canyon reach in Washington, which includes 357 segments that begin at Albeni Falls Dam and end at Box Canyon dam. He explained that Portland State University started with the model used in the Pend Oreille PUD re-licensing process (for Box Canyon Dam) and then recalibrated it with additional data to develop a newer version of the model. The draft report from PSU has recently been completed and WAG members will be notified when a copy has been posted on the web.

Eight scenarios, paralleling the scenarios in Idaho, were run through the model for this reach. The graphs of preliminary model results showed:

- No noticeable effect on river temperature from point sources.
- A small effect on river temperature from tributaries. (Tributaries are less than 1% of the river flow.)
- No noticeable effect on river temperature from shade (using potential natural vegetation—PNV—on the river shore.)
- Using natural conditions from the upstream Idaho model:
  - at the state line below Albeni Falls, existing conditions are warmer than natural in the spring; existing conditions are cooler in the summer (There is a lot of variability in the results.)
  - farther downstream, existing conditions are warmer in the spring.
  - still farther downstream, temperature differences from upstream influences are about gone. (Paul noted he will be analyzing this information further.)
  - He also noted that a one-day profile showed upstream coming in cooler (less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  degree.)
- Regarding Box Canyon Dam, at times existing conditions are cooler than natural, but there are times when conditions with the dam are much warmer than natural. Chris Berger pointed out that a one-day snapshot could be just a snapshot and may not account for travel time, weather from past few days, etc. Paul noted that Box is a run-of-river dam and does not have much storage and that Albeni Falls regulates flow downstream under most conditions.
- Using natural conditions for all potential sources except that only Box Canyon is "on," natural conditions are cooler at times.

-Comparing existing vs. natural conditions, temperatures were quite variable, with existing sometimes being cooler and natural sometimes cooler. Periods of impairment occur, and the next phase of analysis will better quantify those periods and the contribution of human sources.

The next steps will be to:

- Quality-check and finalize the model scenario runs
- Evaluate compliance with standards
- Compare results to upstream
- Provide results of analysis to Tetra Tech for the TMDL

### **Results of temperature modeling scenarios, Boundary segment:**

Paul provided graphs with preliminary results on the temperature modeling scenarios for the Boundary reach in Washington, which includes 109 segments. He explained that Seattle City Light is conducting studies now for re-licensing of Boundary (in 2011) and that the timing has worked well for incorporating SCL's efforts into the current TMDL process. At today's meeting he provided results from 6 scenario runs; 2 additional scenarios are still being finalized. There are still some questions regarding backwater from the next dam on the river in Canada, so results on that site are not completed yet. Results of the 6 scenarios show:

- No noticeable effect on river temperature from point sources.
- A small effect on river temperature from tributaries.
- No noticeable effect on river temperature from mainstem shade.
- Influence from the dam is greater at segments closer to the dam. When the river scenario is "un-impounded," existing conditions are warmer at a few spots above the dam.
- Comparing existing vs. natural conditions, temperatures were quite variable, with natural sometimes warmer and sometimes cooler than existing. Periods of impairment occur in the Boundary reservoir, and the next phase of analysis will better quantify those periods and the contribution of human sources.

Paul said that for the Boundary segment an outstanding question is how much of the problem is coming from upstream and that this still needs to be identified.

As with the Box Canyon segment, the next steps will be to:

- Quality-check and finalize the model scenario runs
- Evaluate compliance with standards
- Compare results to upstream
- Provide results of analysis to Tetra Tech for the TMDL

Paul said that additional information will be sent to the WAG as it becomes available before the next meeting.

### **Next meeting and agenda:**

The following items were suggested for the next WAG meeting agenda:

- Preview draft TMDL
- Discuss compliance points
- Decide how to address upstream/downstream differences with 3 sets of water quality standards
- Finalize WAG operating procedures regarding tributary work group in Idaho

Potential dates for the next meeting were identified as Monday June 25<sup>th</sup> in the afternoon (first preference) or Friday June 29<sup>th</sup> in the morning. Ruth will email the full group to confirm which of these dates would work best for everyone. It was agreed to meet in Sandpoint.

The group also agreed on a Thursday, August 16<sup>th</sup> meeting date for Tetra Tech to attend and present the TMDL draft.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.