

# CARA Review Committee

## February 20, 2013 Meeting Summary

---

### Meeting Attendees

Committee members that attended the meeting:

- Steve Davenport\*\*, Spokane County Building and Planning
  - Lloyd Torgerson, Torgerson Properties
  - Ned Wendle, Mead School District
  - Guy Gregory, Washington State Department of Ecology
  - Steven Holderby, Spokane Regional Health District
  - Eric Meyer\*\*, Spokane Regional Health District
  - Jeanne Barnes, Spokane Association of Realtors
  - Jim Harakas, GeoEngineers, Inc.
  - Bryce Robbert, Avista Utilities
- \*\* alternate committee member

County staff and consultants that attended the meeting:

- Bruce Rawls, Spokane County Utilities
- Rob Lindsay, Spokane County Utilities
- Mike Hermanson, Spokane County Utilities
- Mike Murray, HDR Engineering
- Michael Kasch, HDR Engineering
- Sarah Hubbard-Gray, Hubbard Gray Consulting
- Stan Miller, Inland Northwest Water Resources

Members of the public that attended the meeting:

- Doug Greenlund, City of Spokane, Environmental Programs

### Welcome and Introductions

Sarah Hubbard-Gray, the meeting facilitator, welcomed the committee members and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Sarah provided a reminder about the CARA Review process and milestones. Then she explained that the goals of the meeting are to 1) provide an overview of the draft Tech Memo 4 and associated CARA recommendations, 2) gather feedback and input from the committee members, 3) provide an opportunity for discussion relating to the recommendations, and 4) prepare the committee members to provide written comments on draft Tech Memo 4 by Friday March 1<sup>st</sup>.

Sarah asked if there were any comments or clarification on the December 12, 2012 CARA Review Committee meeting summary. No comments were provided.

## **Overview of Draft Tech Memo 4: Nitrogen and Phosphorus Wastewater Loading Considerations, Review of Predictive Modeling/Tools Development, and Preliminary Recommendations for CARA Modification**

Michael Kasch and Mike Murray provided an overview of Tech Memo 4. The presentation included information on:

- Purpose of the CARA Review project.
- Review of the study area.
- Recap of the project progression.
- Summary of the stakeholder input provided to date.
- Overview of the recommendations in draft Tech Memo 4 that combine the policy and regulations, science and data, and stakeholder input:
  - Recommending a three-level nitrogen and phosphorus process to be flexible and accommodate different site conditions and allow for different treatment levels.
  - Recommending a CARA Spreadsheet that uses data to assess hydraulic, nitrate and phosphorus loading (includes project input values, County values, hydraulic output values, nitrate output values, phosphorus output values, and assessment results).
  - Level 1 process incorporates set input values provided by a variety of maps and look-up tables with minor adjustments.
  - Level 2 process allows use of more detailed site specific information with documentation.
  - Level 3 process is a detailed site specific study and analysis.
  - Phosphorus assessment would be required in “Phosphorus Analysis Zones” where phosphorus in groundwater might be recharged to surface water. Rob Lindsay explained that these areas are being delineated by Spokane County.
  - Mike Hermanson explained that the recharge rate map is being updated by Spokane County using a new approach that will provide information relating to smaller geographic areas – more site-specific.

## **Perspectives on Predictive Modeling/Tools and CARA Modification Recommendations – Roundtable Discussion**

During and after the presentations, a variety of questions and comments were provided by committee members and County staff, including:

- The method being used for the recharge rate map update was discussed. Mike Hermanson explained that different methods were considered and that the Modified Thornthwaite-Mather Soil-Water-Balance Code for Estimating Groundwater Recharge was chosen because it is an established method that requires data that is available for Spokane County.

- Questions were asked about the CARA Spreadsheet input values. Michael Kasch and Mike Murray provided more information and explained how more site specific information can be used with references and justification in the level 2 analysis.
- The accuracy of the depth to groundwater map was raised. It was explained that more site specific information can be used (e.g., from site well logs). It was explained that there were no plans to update the depth to groundwater map and that the need will be considered. Stan Miller explained how the map was developed and that the depth relates to the first usable water.
- The soil unit weight was discussed – it was explained that it is a dry unit weight and that there is more adsorption as the density goes up.
- It was asked if the phosphorus input value should be lower since Spokane County has laundry and dishwasher detergent bans. HDR will consider if lower values would be appropriate for the level 1 or level 2 analysis.
- Need to include accurate and up-to-date information in the look up tables. Committee members were asked to provide information they have to be included.
- It was asked if multi-family development outside the UGA should be required to perform the same analysis.
- It was asked if the draft CARA Spreadsheet could be available for review. The County agreed to provide the draft spreadsheet to committee members that requested it.
- It was suggested that a guidance document be developed.
- No concerns were raised about the 3 level approach and associated recommendations.

Discussion then turned to administrative related CARA update recommendations. Rob Lindsay explained that as the science and technical approach is being wrapped up, the County will begin drafting the CARA standard update with the technical approach and incorporate administrative recommendations (e.g., associated with land use changes, changes in loading, County review process). Rob explained that the County is interested in having the CARA Review Committee meet for two or three additional meetings to review the CARA standard language and administrative recommendations. Rob indicated that he hopes to have the final draft CARA standard update developed by mid-June 2013. After this time it would go to the County Planning Commission for their review and a formal public hearing process.

None of the committee members indicated concern about the extra meetings. However, it was recommended that the various agency representatives meet to discuss the CARA language and administrative recommendations separate from and before the CARA Review Committee to iron out details.

## Next Steps

Sarah explained that:

- Written comments on draft Tech Memo 4 are due by Friday March 1, 2013. Comments should be sent to Rob Lindsay.

- Suggestions related to the administrative CARA standard recommendations should be sent to Rob Lindsay by Friday March 1, 2013. They will be considered as the draft standard is written, along with responses to the CARA Survey.
- HDR's draft final report on the technical approach, that incorporates the information from the draft tech memos and address the comments provided, will be posted two weeks before the next CARA Review Committee meeting. All committee members are asked to complete their review of the draft final report before the meeting, so final comments can be discussed.
- The County's draft CARA standard that incorporates the technical approach and administrative recommendations will be posted one week before the next CARA Review Committee meeting. All committee members are asked to complete their review of the draft standard before the meeting, so comments and suggestions can be discussed.
- The notice for the next CARA Review Committee meeting will be sent out at least three weeks before the meeting. It will be on a Wednesday in the afternoon, and may start at 1:00 pm to allow an extra hour for discussion of the administrative recommendations.