ADEQ 5/21/07

~~Lost~~

Queen Creek Cu and Lake Mary
- June 30 '08 - requested extension (not yet approved)

→ Lake Mary (natural background issue)
by this summer - Queen Creek 2 Cu segments (may also get 2 new breaks out of Pb) - may not be until '08 for the Pb

Pinto - public meeting (early June) - public comment this summer

Lake Mary - several months of comments (not sure if it will be done by this FY)
- no mining interests in that area
- looking at Minesota and other data for pre-industrialization (P.K. - Calif. - we could look then up w/ people there b/c they've wrestled with some of the same issues to arrive at a natural background number) - set up a call between CA + AZ
- gave Diane Fleck to handle the call for technical side on methyl mercury
- Idaho (re: limited data and how to maximize it and air dep + source analysis re: watershed (mining a larger source vs. air)

maybe to have them talk to Idaho

- guidance for TMDLs? Asked P.K. - nothing yet

→ Tonto - one among many topics
- more straightforward compared to some done in '00-'01 timeframe
- had adverse comments re: assigning most of load reductions to lower reaches (they've assigned load #s to upper ness - if they change the #s -

Landowner on lower Bear Creek (math standpoint)

would it be another approval process?
- improving clarity
P.K. → State usually takes lead + we support
and re-approve (but usually not popular
for LAs to be changed)
- they would need to public
notice again (just the LAs
w/o background info)
→ particularly (EPA) if WLAs are
changed
Tonto has a fish hatchery

P.K. - future growth? or LA undefined WLA
- Palo Verde - Wastewater treatment
plants could expand
- Gila - potential growth issues
- maybe LCR
(not too many right away that would
have growth issues)

e.g.) - Pinto - they are starting a mine
(had to clean up Gibson)
- have gone to zero discharge
- and w/ Queen Creek
1) future undefined growth
2) " " growth from an existing
facility
- could make allocation to be the
greater of ... (two things)

PD → we likely have a boiler plants
Comments response to bullet #2
Hlmo → draft to be released in 1 month
- Public notice - late July

8/21/07

ADEQ call

Lawa → amending once only
- monitoring strategy
- if they need money, then will give them the '07 and '08 together

1) monitoring strategy comments
PK → not a high priority item
will talk to Janet + let them know the next expectation
- not waiting on us

2) QA - Dave Taylor
revisions → ADEQ waiting for feedback
but may be a long delay
- ADEQ revised it, don't anticipate anything immediate

3) TMDL effectiveness monitoring
→ currently project by project
→ ADEQ → a basic approach
- sampling under critical conditions in the TMDL
- post monitoring data sets the clock
- 200 samples

general customer monitoring → different monitoring design
- could be some overlap when remediation done
→ specific monitoring sites → once you determine source
- Dave also effectiveness ← even more specific
BMP specific? Dog Scout Ranch
Yes, to quantify improvement
- but not a lucrated effort
> 3 ice mats not a TMDL

more specific to sources identified/critical conditions

Ques. for R9 lab

4) - Wet weight vs. dry weight
- adopting a wet weight methyl mercury fish tissue std.

5) ephemeral waters → Jason 8/27 - a trib to mule
- Brenny Gulch
- a portion of mule + a portion of Queen Creek
- have not to date done a TMDL for an ephemeral (currently working in mule + Queen)

Mule Gulch
Queen Creek (upper)
Brenny Gulch (Mule) (mentioned in cmts - Rappanos related)
- ends (isolated tributary) - a step beyond the ephemeral question
→ ADEQ's position - considered waters of the U.S. assess whether stds. attained (list) ~~[illegible]~~ these have stds. that apply + Rappanos doesn't change that)
→ adopting stds under their authority - everything included - specifically included ephemeral as waters of the U.S. in their law
→ under stds. - can be more stringent
→ MPDES - can't be more stringent than U.S.
→ management levels to support ADEQ's position

6) Pinto - SSO - Triennial Review

Mule Gulch - got a number of natural background samples (1-1/2 month will have results)
~~[illegible]~~
ph - up near 7, keeping NZO out of gulch

7) Alamo Lake - ~~[illegible]~~ Gary for PD letter response
→ 100 ~~[illegible]~~ water subshed - more of complicated = trying to tease out #'s
→ clarify their answer to PD in this?

8) Lake Mary
→ natural background samples more straightforward

9) Queen Creek
- hundreds of samples
- hitting natural background sites too

BEACHES data

1. FIPS - County codes
(AS, Gu) - ~~AS~~ - note: only a few codes apply (5-6) for the territories - should be easy to match? (we could do)

2. Access - Type
(AS, Gu) - listed as required 4 pub/priv combos
Q. how essential?
Q. if not inputted, does the BEACH database reject the entire dataset? or is it that HQ wants it before completing inputs?

Pinto (2)
Alamo Lake (1)
Lake Mary (5) lakes
Queen Creek (2)
(rain - issue nat. bkgd. - may use Pinto
Mule Gulch ? Maybe
(up to 12 TMDLs)
- 3 segments, 4 pollutants
- PD - expecting a challenge
Parker Canyon (1) - schedule
Oak CK (e-coli) (1) -
Sedona
(depends, new stds - std. has changed & more data to re-analyze, new allocations - ~~[illegible]~~ re-doing [illegible] recreated - on schedule

3. Activity Code - Input,
Amer. Samoa - HQ says it was provided but the column is blank. No advisories or closures in '06?
Guam - HQ says incorrect codes provided, then?
CONTAM = ADV used.

4. None
Guam - HQ says OK if correct (looking for confirmation!)
~~Am. Samoa~~

J. Sutter 5/6/08

- TMDLs
  - Submitted + approved for completion by 9/08?
- Tekran Hg data analysis?
  - draft ones for review? when coming
- RARE - who to contact? Steve P.
  - Hg fish tissue? Boulder Ck

1) Hillside mine - Boulder Ck.
- waste folks - want to give a waiver - not one - called waste
- waste folks waiting for R9
- what PDs willing to do
- all 3 will go to PD w/ the waiver language

2) Turkey Ck. - '06 TMDL Pb
- no exceedances
effectiveness - but tracking down Pb source in upper watershed
total Pb exceedances under storm conditions - bound to sediment
- natural or old mine?
- really remote

3) Measure W possibility - dec list
- Pena Blanca lake - small, rural lake
- Hg in fish tissue
HDEQ (→ Forest Service - BI recommending
supporting draining, dredging - killing fish & re-stocking - next species
- sample species as re-stocked
- 3 sampling events
- high Hg in the sediment

9) Parker Canyon Lake (Hg)
— contract begins — draft TMDL by Feb

10) Queen Ck. Cu (Z)
~~need~~ — are modeling internally — winter
will be ~~storm~~ sample data now
tight — end of month — start running
model — should be on track
a little certain but possible

PK — in order for our TMDL
been cont for FY 08, EPA needs
to have approved the TMDL by
end of Sept. So I asked Jason
for first week of Sept. submittal
and draft copies in advance.

Steve P.
TDS — Colorado only
on the R.
— Salinity — important wa parameter
but haven't moved beyond the
Colorado stds. —
controversial — tend to have higher salinity —
— haven't gotten there
Salt River
TDS criteria — stds. they couldn't
meet a possibility
— wg irrigation / domestic water source
fish + wildlife protection

TDS → Colorado Std. 700 mg/l
range

— products — problematic w/
TDS in the thousands — would be
toxic to aquatic life

Jason S. 6/3/08

- Lake Mary - workshop in a couple weeks
  - Read up TR - Hg fish tissue

- Gila R. and Slide Rock - put it on the list
  - neither write out the door
  - finishing up
  - natural background #s for sediment

storm condition sources - E. Coli under storm flows - sediment
  - FDC number for recreation - ~~[illegible]~~
  - talking a 2nd look at assessment
  - but how to address in TMDL - implementation
  - would be next to possible - when its only during stormwater - not to improve WQ - do we still want to see the TMDL?
    - rural land

Check

→ rethinking for the Gila - at base flow its not a problem.
  - can also look at data from other areas

higher sediment flows
→ related but stable over 4-day period
→ timespan at higher flow

1) assessment process? alternative is
2) impaired w/ TMDL but control of sources not feasible

→ concern about discounting stormwater - in general

→ and suspended sediment std. - only applies during baseflow
  - stormwater permits - no enforcement tool

→ ~~what to be~~ Consistent w/ E. Coli TMDLs

E. Coli — base flood issue
Oak Cr. (3) total
Sediment Gila Cr. (2) Sediment
same segments

public process for TMDLs (by end of June) — would be telling
(Slide Rock incl. in Oak Cr.)
(getting tight w/ Sept.
- 30-days public cmt. period)
- 3 months - Sept. 30 - pushing the envelope

Cu Queen Cr. (2) Cu - all lab results
draft cont on it a bit behind } in model waiting for data + lots of natural background

write in July
late Full

Oak Cr. → 2004 - NOT listed for E. Coli
but check (4 new segments
Draft '06

→ ADEQ could say the state can't write a TMDL until it's on the list - may not but could cause a problem for Oak Cr.

→ 1 sediment listing for Gila '04
(they added E. Coli)
- SSC and E. Coli added in '06 for upper reach (1 segment)

TSS values in WQS database
- corresponding dates for the same date
- highest TSS is 107,000 ug/L was 231 cfs (Little Colorado River)
not L on the same line - so
→ will ask for help from their data management group
- as soon as possible

→ July 9th - next call @ 1:00

Jason S. 7/9/08

→ E. Coli Gila River (Stormwater TMDL)
- TMDL — crunch the #s and % reduction for flow regimes
- median value, load duration curves
- ~~[illegible]~~ public process
→ later Fall - wouldn't make the FY deadline
= IWIR - may - binomial approach for single sample max rather than 2 exceedances (at this point)
- Beach Hct - meant more for an action level

→ EPA TMDL Workshop
- he attended
- nobody from Nevada
42 States
- Washington has nonpoint source authority (no pollutants can be added to surface water)
@ national conservation training center

Oak Cr. E Coli (S) - writing on data analysis
- Friends of the Forest data - late 90s - 2001 - paper data in electronic format - and using it for load duration curves
+ how to segment the stream -
- Sept. 108 - not happening

draft early Aug.

1) Gila River sediment (2) - close but not likely - Sept. '08 will probably be too hard

- stable high flow flows

3) the first followed by Gila River F. Coli (2)

~~[illegible]~~ Dale Ck. (5)

public and in [illegible] 30-UC [illegible]

2) then F. Coli would follow close

4) Qu. Ck. - waiting to get model running ~~but~~ data there
- models built + now working on GIS interface
- then chemistry data
- model running by end of month
- providing no natural background issues (in the spring)

5) Hg Trends in spring

ADEQ has only → total mercury concentrations only
→ Tekran - particulates, reactive gaseous
- Jason's checking - dry deep rates for Tekran

- have a couple of facilities near
- core - definite indication of smoke stack impact
+ Hg isotope signatures
~~[illegible]~~
- coal source + composition
- record of where they buy the coal from

Lyman Lake area
- have snow/precipitation data

Pinto Ck Cu - FY '04
~~[illegible]~~ Site-specific std.

Hillside mines tailings piles - discussions
[illegible] ADEQ ~~[illegible]~~ EPA H/Q - liability issue to take material

DOP – Arizona
- identify top priorities – Goal 2, 5
- Sheet will talk to me this week
- how much FTP in oversight for AZ (everything we do) ~~in this ...~~ includes the # of TMDLs and basins covered for rotating basins
- bullet form – 2 sentences max
- what we expect them to do (not commitments were held to HB for TMDLs
- internal investments and disinvestments

1) TMDLs expected in FY09

09

Oak Cr. Fact. revisions (4)
Gila River Sediment (2)

Fall

more Certain

Queen Cr. Copper (2)

Spring

8

Less Certain

Lake Mary Hg (5)
Parker Canyon Hg (1)
Alamo Lake Hg (1) trib to W. Fork 3) West Fork West Fork to Roosevelt Lake
1) needing trib to an trib 2) trib to 3 + potentially (4)
Pinto Ck. Cu (2) – Gibson Mine Trib
very uncertain Mule Gulch metals (3)
– mean site specific remarking, verchude, from FY 08
inc. Bramery 8

Gila River E. Coli (2) 5 10
– writing TMDLs

2) 303(d) Assessment – to EPA in Oct. (likely)

3) WQ standards – Triennial Review – NOT 1 target

4) 106 grant supervision, including national river + streams survey – sites to be sampled in FY 09

Lake → pike or other (first time) – Load reduction necessary
Mary → direct dep to lake (outside of grant $)
→ may have it to me in next couple of months
Queen Cr. → running model – modeling report by next couple months – Oct.