**Marcia Lagerloef**

08/27/2003 10:56 AM

To: carolyn_scafidi@fws.gov, shelley_spalding@fws.gov, thomas.hooper@noaa.gov
cc:
Subject: Draft work assignment for BA -- need your comments

EPA HQ has found some funding for us to hire a consultant to do the BA for the Washington wqs review. We already have a contract with Tetra Tech for the BA for our Oregon wqs promulgation of temperature criteria, so we're looking at adding to that contract. Could you look at this draft work assignment, which I've cut and pasted from the Oregon assignment (which was coordinated with the Services down there) and let me know what you think. We're really pressing on the time elements, but having the Oregon BA to work from will help immensely. Probably the biggest unknown is how we're going to handle the temperature and use designation issues in WA. Another unknown is what kind of analysis to do on the various policies in the wqs.

Can we talk about these things in our call this afternoon? Who is calling whom? I'll be at my desk -- 206-553-0176.

WA REVIEW BA WORK ASSIGNMENT.wp

Ken Berg
Jim Weick
Jim Hughes
Steve Landino
Shelley Spalding

# Proposed Water Quality Standards
## April 25, 2003

**Schedule:**

- **Meet with Director next week - April 28th**
- **Beginning of June all documents (rule, EIS) need to be complete so they can go to the code reviser**
- **Rule must be adopted by July 1, 2003**
- **First week of July submit adopted rule to EPA**

## Temperature

**Existing Proposal that went out for public review**
**Existing Proposal plus protection of summer spawning where we have data**

## Dissolved Oxygen

**Proposal that went out for public**

## Antidegradation

**Existing Proposal that went out for public review**
**Existing proposal with an option that allows some degradation in Tier III**

## Bacteria

**Proposal that went out for public**
**Do not make changes**
**Existing plus proposals criteria for enterococci**

Released under FOIA

**"Hicks, Mark" <mhic461@ECY.WA.GOV>**

04/22/2003 04:35 PM

To: Marcia Lagerloef/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
cc:
Subject: Preparing thoughts

I want to suggest a few issues you may want to think about in advance of Friday.

Is there any flexibility to allow de minimis (non-measurable) degradation in Tier III so that a state can make it more functional, and not need to have both a Tier III and a Tier II 1/2 to have and effective program?

If the state adopts only enterococci for marine waters, and fecal at less than the EPA recommended level for fresh waters, will you still be pressuring us to change to *E. coli*?

Would not changing the dissolved oxygen criteria mean that it would not be subject to EPA review and ESA approval?

How important to EPA is it that spawning be singled out some way for protection over and above just having a healthy rearing number?

How would EPA view a package that comes in without specific protection noted for char migration zones?

Mark Hicks, Senior Analyst
Surface Water Quality Standards

<<Hicks, Mark.vcf>> Hicks, Mark.vcf