Date: 06/16/2010 03:52 PM

Subject: SIM mixing zone: 300 ft regulatory mixing zone and marine criteria applied

Hi Lisa:
WAC 173-201A-400(7)(a) indicates that the 300 ft may be applied to an estuary having flow characteristics that resembles a river. Ed Abbasi also tells me that the marine water quality criteria was applied based on discussions between Ecology, King County and SIM consultant that the salinity of the water was higher and closer to the marine environment.

Thanks

Anise Ahmed, P.E.
Environmental Assessment Program
Department of Ecology
(360) 407-6767

-----Original Message-----
From: Olson.Lisa@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Olson.Lisa@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, June 16, 2010 1:01 PM
To: Ahmed, Anise (ECY)
Cc: Cope.Ben@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: RE: Phone call re Seattle Iron and Metals mixing zone report

Hi Anise,

I had one question that I forgot about. Would you please explain how the consultants decided that it was appropriate to use the fresh water 300 hundred foot regulatory mixing zone rather than the estuarine 200 foot length? They used marine criteria for the toxics. Ed told me, but I don't remember what he said.

Thanks. Talk to you tomorrow -

Lisa

Lisa Olson
NPDES Permits
US EPA Region 10, Office of Water and Watersheds
1200 Sixth Avenue, M/S OWW-130
Seattle, WA 98101
Phone: 206-553-0176
Toll-free: 1-800-424-4372, Ext. 0176
Fax: 206-553-0165

From: "Ahmed, Anise (ECY)" <AAHM461@ECY.WA.GOV>

To: Lisa Olson/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 06/15/2010 10:48 AM

Subject: RE: Phone call re Seattle Iron and Metals mixing zone report

Hi Lisa:
I just want to make sure that we are working on the same document. The latest mixing zone report we have from Seattle Iron and Metals is dated April 9, 2010.
Thanks

Anise Ahmed, P.E.
Environmental Assessment Program
Department of Ecology
(360) 407-6767

-----Original Message-----
From: Ahmed, Anise (ECY)
Sent: Tuesday, June 15, 2010 10:39 AM
To: 'Olson.Lisa@epamail.epa.gov'
Subject: RE: Phone call re Seattle Iron and Metals mixing zone report

Sounds good

Anise Ahmed, P.E.
Environmental Assessment Program
Department of Ecology
(360) 407-6767

-----Original Message-----
From: Olson.Lisa@epamail.epa.gov [
mailto:Olson.Lisa@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, June 15, 2010 10:38 AM
To: Cope.Ben@epamail.epa.gov; Ahmed, Anise (ECY)
Cc: Abbasi, Ed (ECY)
Subject: RE: Phone call re Seattle Iron and Metals
mixing zone report

Thanks for the questions, Ben. How about Thursday at
9:30 am? Anise,
we can call you at your desk if you'd like. Ben, I
will set up one of
the conference rooms on this floor.

Thanks again -

Lisa

Lisa Olson
NPDES Permits
US EPA Region 10, Office of Water and Watersheds
1200 Sixth Avenue, M/S OWW-130
Seattle, WA 98101
Phone: 206-553-0176
Toll-free: 1-800-424-4372, Ext. 0176
Fax: 206-553-0165

From: Ben Cope/R10/USEPA/US

To: "Ahmed, Anise (ECY)"
<AAHM461@ECY.WA.GOV>

Cc: "Abbasi, Ed (ECY)"
<EABB461@ECY.WA.GOV>, Lisa
Olson/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 06/15/2010 09:53 AM

Subject: RE: Phone call re Seattle Iron and
Metals mixing zone
report

I'm free anytime today, tomorrow after 2 PM, and Thursday from 9:30 to 11 AM.

Here's some questions based on a quick review (not including appendices):

Does Ecology agree with consultant that the most stringent scenario for tidal conditions is unrealistic? They simulated a scenario and then said it was not to be considered further because that condition does not happen for very long (or something like that).

Does the consultant provide simple dilution with distance from outfall for each scenario, and doesn't Ecology need that?

There are different ways to do this work, but I find the document very confusing. No reporting of dilution in the TDZ (acute), only the RMZ (chronic) and a bunch of confusing things (e.g., "acute boundary" dilution). Doesn't Ecology need the dilution at the TDZ and RMZ as fundamental info?

If Ecology is going to require a m.z. smaller than the default TDZ and RMZ, is the assumed "current performance" concentration agreed-upon?

Is outfall improvement, specifically getting it submerged at all times, feasible and on the table?

Does windspeed matter? Their assumption is skewed high (8 m/s)

Thanks. -BC

Ben Cope, Environmental Engineer
Office of Environmental Assessment
EPA Region 10
Seattle, Washington
206-553-1442

From: "Ahmed, Anise (ECY)"