From: "Croxton, David" <Croxton.David@epa.gov>
To: "Opalski, Dan" <Opalski.Dan@epa.gov>
Date: 6/4/2018 3:30:11 PM
Subject: FW: Deschutes -- Quick update on briefing with RA
Attachments: 05.21.2018 Deschutes R10 ORA Briefing.docx
Enclosure_ORA 5-21 briefing.docx

Dan,
Goodin's message below indicates that Hladick is calling Ross about Deschutes TMDL, and Havard is asking if this has occurred. Is Hladick on the hook to do so, has that contact occurred?
thanks

From: Havard, James
Sent: Monday, June 4, 2018 6:21 AM
To: Croxton, David
Cc: Hodgkiss, Miranda ; Hunter, Christopher ; Lewicki, Chris
Subject: FW: Deschutes -- Quick update on briefing with RA

Hi Dave –

Welcome back! Please see below. Do you know if the RA has connected with Dave Ross yet?

Thanks!

Jim

From: Goodin, John
Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2018 2:19 PM
To: Ross, David P <ross.davidp@epa.gov>; Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ann <Campbell.Ann@epa.gov>; Connors, Sandra <Connors.Sandra@epa.gov>; Wall, Tom <Wall.Tom@epa.gov>; Havard, James <Havard.James@epa.gov>
Subject: Deschutes -- Quick update on briefing with RA

Afternoon, Dave—as referenced last week, what follows is a quick download on the Deschutes briefing for the R10 RA yesterday, via Branch Chief Jim Havard, who was invited to listen. FOIA exemption (b)(5) [redacted] A few additional points:

- The RA plans to call you (likely sometime later this week) to discuss the matter
- The RA asked the Regional program to provide a status update to the State of WA (Dept of Ecology and also potentially the Governor's office) before acting
- The Region, OWOW, and OGC are preparing materials in anticipation of acting by the June 29th deadline.

I've attached the briefing document used to brief the RA, including a separate attachment in chart form that describes the status of each TMDL, as well as our background summary email below.

Happy to follow-up before or after your call with Chris.
Thanks,
John

- - - - - - -

From: Goodin, John

Sent: Thursday, May 17, 2018 6:42 PM
To: Ross, David P <ross.davidp@epa.gov>; Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ann <Campbell.Ann@epa.gov>; Wall, Tom <Wall.Tom@epa.gov>; Havard, James <Havard.James@epa.gov>; Connors, Sandra <Connors.Sandra@epa.gov>
Subject: Deschutes Update

DELIBERATIVE DRAFT

Dave et al.— the following is some updated info on the Deschutes TMDLs and a recommendation on how to engage you for input prior to Region 10 action on the TMDLs by our June 29 deadline.

The court denied our recent motion to stay the case until June 29. OGC is considering options while the Region continues to work on the TMDLs. You previously indicated that you supported our general direction in the case, however, you were interested in the RA's position on potential TMDL disapprovals well before the actual decision is made. Chris H. will be briefed Monday and we'll get this feedback to you immediately thereafter. I also spoke to the R10 Water Division Director and indicated that you'd likely also be interested in the rationale of what TMDLs were candidates for approval, for approval with minor rework, and for disapproval. We'll work with the Region to provide this information in an efficient format. With the RA's views and background info in hand next week, we would be available to brief you or provide the info to you for your review. Recommend that you could then have a call with Chris before the end of May.

FOIA exemption (b)(5)
[redacted]

Let me know if we can do anything further.
Thanks,
John

- - - - - - - -

Background
The Deschutes River, Percival Creek, and Budd Inlet Tributaries (Phase 1) TMDL study area is located in south Puget in Thurston and Lewis Counties, Washington. The Washington Department of Ecology submitted the final Phase 1 Deschutes TMDL to EPA for approval on December 17, 2015. That document addresses a total of 73 waterbody-pollutant combinations, involving temperature, dissolved oxygen [DO], pH, fecal coliform, and fine sediment impairments.

Litigation
On September 6, 2017, Northwest Environmental Advocates (NWEA) filed a complaint against EPA alleging violation of section 303(d)(2) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) for failure to act on the Deschutes River TMDL submission. Section 303(d)(2) requires EPA to either approve or disapprove a state's TMDL submission within 30 days of submittal.

As part of the ongoing litigation, EPA has stated in briefs that we will act on the Deschutes TMDL by June 29, 2018. The judge has denied EPA's motion to stay the case until June 29, but has not yet ruled on the plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, and recommended a consent decree or stipulated entry of judgment to ensure EPA action on the TMDL. OGC is reviewing options while the Region continues work on the TMDL decision.

Current Status
The CWA requires EPA to either approve or disapprove state-submitted TMDLs, and if we disapprove, we are required to develop a replacement TMDL within 30 days. FOIA exemption (b)(5)
[redacted]

FOIA exemption (b)(5)

Region 10 Briefing Paper for the Office of the Regional Administrator

MEETING/EVENT TITLE: Deschutes Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Action
MEETING DATE: May 21, 2018
LOCATION: ET Conference Room
PREPARED BY: Miranda Hodgkiss
DATE: May 17, 2018
ATTENDEES: Region 10: Dan Opalski, Angela Chung, Laurie Mann, Miranda Hodgkiss, Leah Brown, Cara Steiner-Riley, Allyn Stern, Chris Zell
Headquarters: Jim Havard, Jim Curtin
EXTERNAL PARTICIPANTS: N/A

I. REQUESTING OFFICE

R10 OWW – Watershed Unit

II. TIMING

EPA has informed the Court that it intends to approve and/or disapprove the Deschutes Watershed TMDL by June 29, 2018. We anticipate the Court will enter an Order that we do so.

III. PURPOSE

We are holding this briefing to inform the RA of our proposed action on the Deschutes Watershed TMDL. The draft decision document includes disapprovals of TMDLs for waters impaired by multiple pollutants submitted by Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology). The draft decision document also includes approvals of some of the state-submitted TMDLs. The purpose of this briefing is to provide the RA with sufficient information about the Deschutes TMDL and resulting litigation to make an approval/disapproval decision and coordinate with counterparts at Headquarters.

IV. BACKGROUND/HISTORY

Timeline

December 17, 2015	Ecology submitted the final Deschutes TMDL to EPA for approval.
July 17, 2017	Ecology submitted supplemental TMDL information, including new bacteria loads and a temperature equation.
September 6, 2017	Northwest Environmental Advocates (NWEA) filed a complaint against EPA alleging violation of section 303(d)(2) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) for failure to act on the TMDL submission within the statutorily required 30-day timeframe.
June 29, 2018	Date by which EPA has said it will take action on the Deschutes TMDLs.

Background

The Washington Department of Ecology submitted the final Deschutes TMDL to EPA for approval on December 17, 2015. The TMDL addresses 73 waterbody-pollutant pairs for five pollutants – fecal coliform, temperature, dissolved oxygen (DO), pH, and fine sediment. EPA must approve or disapprove each waterbody-pollutant pair – essentially requiring 73 individual decisions to either approve or disapprove loadings developed for a waterbody-pollutant pair. Region 10 OWW and ORC have been consulting with counterparts at Headquarters in the Watershed Branch and Office of General Counsel (OGC) regarding the Agency's planned action on this TMDL.

This TMDL is the first phase of a multi-phase process to address water quality impairments for waters flowing into south Puget Sound. The watershed addressed in this phase includes the Deschutes River and its tributaries, Percival Creek, and the tributaries to Budd Inlet. The Deschutes River originates in heavily forested regions of the Bald Hills, then flows northward into Capitol Lake (in Olympia), then into Budd Inlet (south Puget Sound). Capitol Lake was formed in 1951 as an impoundment of the Deschutes estuary to create a reflecting pool for the State Capitol Building. The TMDL watershed is situated within the boundaries of Thurston and Lewis Counties, Washington, and includes the cities or towns of Olympia, Lacey, Tumwater, and Rainier. Ecology has stated that a second phase of the TMDL to address the marine segments of Budd Inlet, impaired for DO and bacteria, is planned for completion in 2021. No plans have been made by Ecology to develop a TMDL for Capitol Lake, which is impaired for total phosphorus and bacteria.

Litigation

On September 6, 2017, NWEA filed a complaint against EPA alleging violation of section 303(d)(2) of the CWA for failure to act on the Deschutes River TMDL submission. Section 303(d)(2) requires EPA to either approve or disapprove a state's TMDL submission within 30 days of submittal. EPA has represented in recent court filings that it will complete its action no later than June 29, 2018, and it is likely that the court will soon order EPA to complete its action by this date.

V. KEY ISSUES

FOIA exemption (b)(5) [redacted]

Once EPA disapproves a TMDL, CWA section 303(d)(2) requires the Agency to develop a new TMDL within 30 days. Thus, for the waterbody-pollutant pairs we disapprove, we will need to develop revised TMDLs that remedy our concerns.

FOIA exemption (b)(5) [redacted]. The primary deficiencies we have found with the TMDL submittal are summarized below:

- Incomplete TMDL submittals: The State did not provide critical TMDL components (e.g., loading capacity, wasteload allocations, and load allocations) for some waterbody-pollutant pairs, as required by 40 CFR § 130.2 and 40 CFR § 130.7.
- Public notice requirements not met: The supplemental 2017 submittal did not undergo public review. Since it contains new loading calculations for bacteria, we are concerned these waterbody-pollutant

pairs do not meet public review requirements at 40 CFR § 130.7(c)(1)(ii). We find these TMDLs otherwise approvable.

- Downstream uses not protected: Washington's water quality standards at WAC 173-201A-260(3)(b-d) require that downstream uses be protected. Some waterbody-pollutant pair TMDL calculations allow pollutant loadings that are not protective of downstream waters. Thus, they are not consistent with requirements at 40 CFR § 130.7(c)(1) that TMDLs be established at levels necessary to attain and maintain the applicable water quality standards.
- TMDL target not protective of water quality standards: Some waterbody-pollutant pair TMDL calculations do not provide a clear linkage analysis to demonstrate that the water quality target chosen to develop the loading capacity is protective of State water quality standards. Thus, they are not consistent with requirements at 40 CFR § 130.7(c)(1) that TMDLs be established at levels necessary to attain and maintain the applicable water quality standards.

F
OI
A
ex
e
m
pti
on
(b)
(5)

VII. ROLL-OUT / COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

Other than notifying the State, NWEA, and the court of our final action, a communication plan has not been developed, nor is one anticipated to be necessary.

VIII. NEXT STEPS / UPCOMING DEADLINES

The Region has developed an anticipated schedule for meeting the June 29th deadline. This was put forth to the court in a declaration filed on April 4, 2018, by David Croxton, the Watershed Unit manager. The following steps represent our planned course for developing decision documents and briefing management:

- *April 23 – May 18*: R10 OWW, ORC, OGC and Office of Water (Headquarters) review draft decision document.
- *May 28 – June 15*: R10 Watershed Unit shares draft decision document with RA, Office of Water AA, and OGC for senior management review.
- *June 18 – June 28*: R10 Watershed Unit finalizes review.
- *June 29*: Agency finalizes Deschutes TMDL decision document and takes final action on TMDL.

FOIA exemption (b)(5)

[redacted]

FOIA exemption (b)(5) [redacted]

[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]