Appointment

From: Bolt, Matthew [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=2456E92CF5334FA5B89AF3DBB9A69119-BOLT, MATTH]
Sent: 5/16/2017 1:58:15 AM
To: Vollmer, Jared [Vollmer.Jared@epa.gov]; Jade Dickens [Dickens.Jade@azdeq.gov]; Kyle W. Palmer [Palmer.Kyle@azdeq.gov]; Sablad, Elizabeth [Sablad.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
CC: Maurano, Stephen [Maurano.Stephen@epa.gov]
BCC: R9SF-Room-15324-8-KlamathRiver [R9SF-Room-15324-8-KlamathRiver@epa.gov]; R9SF-ConferenceLine-WTR-Card2 [R9SF-ConferenceLine-WTR-Card2@epa.gov]

Subject: Queen Creek TMDL Telcon with ADEQ
Location: R9SF-Room-15324-8-KlamathRiver; R9SF-ConferenceLine-WTR-Card2

Start: 5/18/2017 5:00:00 PM
End: 5/18/2017 6:00:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Phone:
Conf Code:

The main concerns/questions I have are:

Can you walk me through how the unnamed tributaries' designated uses determined as ephemeral?

The hardness numbers have been updated, what data was excluded and included for this update? What was the error being corrected? How can we support you on this in future hardness based TMDLs?

Can you walk me through how the copper modeling was done and how the overland flow from oak flat was determined to be a major contributor? Was the copper model updated with the new hardness data?

Given the likelihood that this area will see a substantial amount of growth and disturbance through the proposed mine, what is the benefit of choosing an implied margin of safety and/or would an explicit MOS make this a more robust TMDL?

I am very uncomfortable with forecasting that the unused portion of the already permitted WLAs will remain unused in part or in whole and thus available as a MOS; effectively relying on a permittee to not use their full allotment. What other options can be considered here?

There is concern about the 319(h) paragraph, suggested language is forthcoming. I want to preserve all flexibility for ADEQ to tackle legacy and permanently inactive mine contributions.

- Matt