

Conference call to discuss Yacolt General Sewer Plan
November 29, 2010
Meeting Notes

Participants: Chuck McDonald, Greg Zentner, Dave Knight, John Stormon, Cathi Read

This conference call was a follow-up to our meeting in Yacolt on November 15.

Update on groundwater discharge at church property and railroad property

Chuck said he has looked at the church property a little more since our meeting on November 15, but he has not been able to access groundwater flow data on the Dept. of Health website yet. Chuck (and Pete?) are meeting with the Clark Public Utilities (CPU) Manager next week to further discuss the church site. After that meeting, Chuck will call Dave to share the results of the meeting.

At the November 15 meeting the town informed Ecology that the “railroad property” is no longer being considered as a discharge site, due to unfavorable groundwater flow direction in the vicinity of the CPU wells.

Possible new groundwater discharge site

Chuck said that he and Pete have identified a possible groundwater discharge site in the southeast part of town, just south of the MCI repeater station. This area is approximately five feet higher than surrounding area, and Pete is more comfortable with this site (than other sites in the south part of town) regarding the depth of soil. The property owner might consider selling.

Surface water discharge standards for temperature

Chuck said he will be modifying this section in the General Sewer Plan (GSP) to reflect clarifications made at our last meeting (i.e., change 17.5 degrees to 16 degrees C). Because he has only three years-worth of temperature data, he was not able to do the 7Q10 analysis. More monitoring will be done once the exact location of the possible outfall is known. Dave pointed out that the new temperature standards use a seven-day average of daily maximum temperatures. Dave asked Chuck to make an estimate in the GSP as to what the 7Q10 would be, acknowledging that this estimate will change in the future with additional data.

Dave’s Pre-Meeting Assessments of the GSP

Next we reviewed an e-mail Dave had sent out before the November 15 meeting which provides his assessment on various parts of the GSP; some of the issues were addressed at the November 15 meeting and some were addressed today.

1.a. (regarding groundwater flow in north part of town) John is concerned with the uncertainty of groundwater flow direction near the church property. For now, Ecology’s position is that one year of flow direction monitoring is needed (in the GSP) if the city decides to use the church property for discharge, UNLESS Clark Public Utilities and Dept. of Health say they are not concerned with the location. Ecology will let Chuck know right away if their position changes.

2.d. & 12. (regarding surface water pollutants and anti-degradation issues) After much discussion, Ecology said:

- For the MBR in summer – the GSP provides enough information regarding treated effluent characteristics; future calculations/ analysis can wait to be done in the Facilities Plan
- For the Biolac system – there is not enough information in the GSP regarding treated effluent characteristics; more information must be provided in order for Ecology to be able to approve the GSP.

Dave's comments also referred to proposed discharge to the river during the 'critical season' – Chuck asked what the definition of 'critical season' is. Dave answered that what he is actually interested in is 'critical conditions.'

How much detail on a cooling tower must be provided in the GSP? Ecology said to include general sizing criteria that would be used – enough detail so that the cost of alternatives can be compared.

5. (regarding redundancy requirements for Biolac system) Chuck asked if Ecology had changed its requirements regarding redundancy; in conversations with another community it appears that the redundancy requirements are different? John explained that what Ecology needs is leak detection – this can be accomplished in different ways (e.g., double liners or single liners with monitoring wells). If a single liner and monitoring wells is used, the monitoring wells are meant to provide leak detection. Ecology also said that older facilities have not been required to retrofit to these standards.

Miscellaneous

- Greg said that he thought that Chuck's notes from the November 15 meeting did not accurately reflect the gist of the discussion; Ecology considers Cathi's notes to be the official meeting notes.
- Chuck asked who has the authority to interpret the Water Quality standard WACs; Greg said that he and other Ecology staff rely on Ecology's standards staff for interpretations of the WAC, and that he is providing the town with their interpretation.
- John asked Chuck to add any data he has from MW-4 to the next version of the GSP

Next steps

- At this point, Chuck is planning to send re-written sections of the GSP to Ecology by the end of the year (unless this proves to be confusing because there are so many, in which case he will send a whole new document).
- Once the GSP is approved, we will have a 'Facilities Plan kick-off meeting' (or conference call) to clarify Ecology's expectations about what must be included in the Facilities Plan (Greg invited Chuck to come to Ecology and read some approved Facilities Plans for similar projects)