

**Meeting Summary**  
**Utah Water Quality Standards Workgroup**  
**March 23, 2015**

See agenda and supporting materials at <http://www.waterquality.utah.gov/WQS/workgroup.htm>

**Antidegradation Implementation Guidance**

Nicholas Von Stackelberg asked if the group had comments on the revised guidance. The group provided the comments and suggestions below. The commenter's initial are provided in parentheses.

1. Line 230. The text as written is misleading because degradation is allowed in Category 1 and 2 waters for existing discharges and if the degradation will be temporary and limited (LK). The text should be revised perhaps by just stating that a review is not required for Category 1 and Category 2 waters.
2. Line 266. The word adequate was changed to necessary but required is more accurate (LM). The words adequate and necessary are unclear and could be interpreted to require more than what the rule requires whereas require would be unambiguous because it ties back to the rule.
3. Line 272. "Expanded actions are increases in load or concentrations" was deleted but should be retained because the wording matches the rule (LM). Also consider defining in the glossary.
4. The requirement that a P.E. approve the alternatives analysis should be reconsidered because not all treatment processes would require this level of expertise (LM).
5. Line 377. The word optimization should be defined or clarified (LK).
6. Line 525. The term "freshwater terminal lake" is unclear (LM). No explanation is provided why these warrant additional considerations.
7. Line 528. No reasons are provided for the additional analyses for Level II antidegradation reviews for Great Salt Lake (LM). Any requirements need to be consistent with the rules.
8. Line 568. The strikeout text should be retained (LM).
9. Line 636. The strikeout text should be retained because it is consistent with the rule (LM).
10. Line 662. The strikeout text should be retained (LM). The green strikeout indicates text that was moved but retained. DWQ will evaluate whether the text should remain in both places.
11. Line 776. The strikeout text should be retained.
12. Line 869. The reliance on Net Present Value and that discount rate is the same as inflation rate should be reconsidered (LM).
13. Line 891. The language regarding affordability should mirror the rule language (LM).

**Proposed Revisions to R317-2.**

Chris Bittner provided an explanation for each of the proposed revisions. The workgroup had no comments and the proposed revisions will be presented to the Water Quality Board at the April meeting.

**Mollusk Survey of Jordan River**

David Richards presented the methods and findings of the mussel survey for the Jordan River. The survey did not find evidence of the unionid mussels in the Jordan River. The workgroup discussed the methods used. Chris Bittner noted that DWQ's primary concern with the survey was the lack of detail to

support that mussels could not re-establish in the Jordan River for one of the CFR131.10.(g) factors. Not all of the watershed was surveyed and shells of unknown age were found in Spring Creek. Richard said that the report was being revised to address some of the noted concerns. Richard also suggested that the counties be made aware of the sensitive vulnerable habitats at some of the spring-fed creeks in the Jordan River watershed.

Action Items: David Richards will submit a revised report to DWQ. Chris Cline will review the existing report. Chris Bittner will contact the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources.

### **Nutrient Criteria for Headwaters**

Jeff Ostermiller briefed the workgroup on the status of nutrient criteria being proposed for Utah's headwaters (Antidegradation Categories 1 and 2). Combined criteria that are based on both numeric criteria and measures of biological response are being proposed. Lareina Guenzel explained USEPA's expectations for how combined criteria should be developed and implemented. Theron Miller recommended that when the numeric criteria were exceeded but biological response data are not available, that the water be prioritized for additional study as opposed to an impaired determination. Jeff indicated that concerns regarding the rule language were being discussed with the USEPA and the Nutrient Core team. The language was anticipated to be finalized within the next couple of months.

### **Next Meeting**

The next workgroup meeting is scheduled for Monday June 15, 2015 at 1:00.