From: Brett M. Converse
To: Tanner Weisgram; June Bergquist (June.Bergquist@deq.idaho.gov); Nickel, Brian
Subject: RE: NPDES Questions
Date: Friday, July 15, 2016 8:36:02 AM

Hi June:
The only official planning we have done at this point is in the 2007 facilities plan which put cost to some alternative which we are comparing to some rough cost for an outfall extension/relocation. We'll have some better cost information soon by updating the facility plan and generating better cost for the outfall and the expected cost for regional participation (pipe there, % of plant capacity, O&M, etc.).
Regarding the Nearshore TMDL:
The Near Shore TMDL (NSTMDL) only allocated load from two sources:

Runoff from land flowing directly into the lake (flow without significant accumulation into a stream, creek or river)

Groundwater seepage flowing directly into the lake

The TMDL did not look at surface flow including large tributaries like Pack River or smaller tributaries like Boyer Slough (nor stormwater point source); therefore, we were not expecting the TMDL to allocate a load to Boyer Slough or Boyer Slough dischargers. However, the loads from the tributaries were accepted in the overall water quality evaluation for the lake and therefore Boyer Slough (and sources) have an allocation similar to Pack River (in methodology, not magnitude). At this point, we are assuming the outfall could be extended/relocated somewhere near the mouth of Boyer Slough where the existing load enters the lake (Beyond low pool). We'll take a hard look at the bay and spend some time this summer and next winter evaluating the conditions. I agree there will be details to work out.

Tanner has started scouting routes for the pipe to Sandpoint and we are preparing a phasing plan to connect to Sandpoint early before their plant is moved. These efforts are underway to increase the quality of our cost estimating efforts. As you know KPSD did not get a planning grant but was close to being funded. Do you know if everyone accepted their grand money or if money may be left over?

Regards

Brett

From: Tanner Weisgram [mailto:TannerW@NCTV.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2016 1:55 PM
To: Brett M. Converse
Subject: FW: NPDES Questions

From: June.Bergquist@deq.idaho.gov [mailto:June.Bergquist@deq.idaho.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2016 1:06 PM
To: tannerw@nctv.com
Cc: Nickel.Brian@epa.gov
Subject: RE: NPDES Questions
Hi Tanner,

We are open to discussing an outfall in Pend Oreille Lake. It might be something best addressed in your master planning effort. But if you are far enough along with this idea and know the details you could propose it as an option that you want considered in this renewed permit. Submit this option during the public comment period for the draft permit. Your comment letter should contain the details of the project as Brian lists below and amount of time you would need to complete the project. I would also need progress milestones for each year of the compliance schedule.
You are probably aware that Pend Oreille Lake has a near-shore TMDL for phosphorus and that if you wanted to discharge phosphorus into the lake it would have to be beyond the limits of this TMDL (depths beyond 16 meters or 52.5 feet). There may be other details we need to consider.
June

June Bergquist
Regional Water Quality Compliance Officer
Idaho Department of Environmental Quality
Coeur d'Alene Regional Office
2110 Ironwood Parkway
Coeur d'Alene ID 83814
Phone: (208)666-4605

From: Nickel, Brian [mailto:Nickel.Brian@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, June 29, 2016 10:07 AM
To: Tanner Weisgram
Cc: June Bergquist
Subject: RE: NPDES Questions

Tanner:
I agree that the extending the outfall into the lake is something that would be worth discussing. However, Idaho DEQ should be involved in any such discussions. I have copied June Bergquist at DEQ in Coeur d'Alene.
The discharge would have more water available for dilution if it were located in the lake. However, in order for the District to take advantage of that, Idaho DEQ would need to authorize a mixing zone for the new outfall. The EPA does not have the authority to authorize mixing zones in Idaho; only DEQ can do that. In order to obtain a mixing zone for a discharge to a non-flowing water, Idaho's mixing zone policy requires outfalls to be equipped with a diffuser, and shore-hugging plumes are not allowed. The mixing zone could extend no farther than 100 meters from the point of discharge, and DEQ may find that the mixing zone needs to be smaller than that in order to avoid unreasonable interference with beneficial uses.
Idaho DEQ was considering including an option in the City of Sandpoint 401 certification (which would have, in turn, been included in the permit) for an outfall extension. They may be able to do so for KPSD.
There are some questions that would need to be answered before EPA and the State could fully evaluate this, including:

- Exactly where will the new outfall be located?
- What will be the design characteristics of the new diffuser (number, size, and angles of the discharge ports)?
- How deep will the outfall be?

If this option continues to look promising, then I agree that an update to the permit application, providing the details of the proposed new outfall, would be a good way to document this for the record. However, I think that's premature until we can discuss the District's plans with DEQ.

Thanks,
Brian Nickel, E.I.T.
Environmental Engineer
US EPA Region 10 | Office of Water and Watersheds | NPDES Permits Unit
Voice: 206-553-6251 | Toll Free: 800-424-4372 ext. 6251 | Fax: 206-553-1280
Nickel.Brian@epa.gov
http://epa.gov/r10earth/waterpermits.htm
Please conserve natural resources by not printing this message.

From: Tanner Weisgram [mailto:TannerW@NCTV.com]
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2016 7:33 AM
To: Nickel, Brian <Nickel.Brian@epa.gov>
Subject: NPDES Questions

Hi Brian:

Regarding the pending draft permit: ID-0021229; Kootenai-Ponderay Sewer Treatment Plant

I have been reviewing the draft 401 certification and proposed limits and what treatment technologies and improvement will be needed to meet those limits. We have put some rough costs to the alternatives and all of them are expensive. A potential management option is to extend the outfall past Boyer Slough into the lake which would eliminate several issues. I am wondering if the application for permit renewal should have some language included stating that moving the outfall may be needed to comply with future limits. Or if our planning effort points us toward and outfall extension after the permit has been renewed, we can go about requesting and extension at that time.

Thank you

Tanner Weisgram
Kootenai-Ponderay Sewer District
Operations Manager
Cell:208-290-5979
Office:208-263-0229
E-Mail: tannerw@nctv.com

This e-mail and any attachments involving J-U-B or a subsidiary business may contain information that is confidential and/or proprietary. Prior to use, you agree to the provisions found at edocs.jub.com. If you believe you received this email in error, please reply to that effect and then delete all copies.