

ATTACHMENT 1

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES WORKSHOP

November 17-18, 1997

Breakout Session

Subject: Standard #5 - Water Quality Meets State Standards.

Issue: How will/should the water quality standard be assessed?

What kind of water quality monitoring should be done?

Action: Is a statewide policy needed?

GROUP FINDINGS:

Statewide *Interim* Guidance is needed to address the following points (it should be interim in nature due to the fact that WDEQ is still establishing policy and procedures directly related to determining whether water quality standards are met, beneficial uses satisfied, criteria for deciding limitation, etc.).

Wyoming BLM has already established an interdisciplinary Water Quality Workgroup (WQ Workgroup), its membership determined by District and Area Managers. Members (alternates-*) include:

Worland <u>District</u> Bill Wilson	Rawlins <u>District</u> Mike Stewart	Rock Springs <u>District</u> Dennis Doncaster	Casper <u>District</u> Glen Nebeker
Roger Inman	Greg Bautz	Arlan Hiner-*	Joe Myer-*
Steve Kiracofe-*	Ken Peacock Bill Watters-*	Bernie Weynand-*	

This group has already entertained the following and other water quality related issues during several meetings and should prepare, in consultation with other staff and WDEQ, the appropriate interim policy.

1. Determining whether the standard is met:

a - checking the State's 303(d) Water Quality Limited Segment list (i.e., waterbodies not meeting the standards or satisfying established beneficial use) should be our starting point;

b - consultation with WDEQ and other agencies regarding available water quality or related data should be common practice during allotment evaluation; also, allotment assessment priorities should be coordinated with WDEQ (moved to their high priority) to ensure BLM/WDEQ monitoring efficiency, etc., is maximized;

c - one option is to obtain an immediate ruling from WDEQ regarding whether water quality standards are being met on waterbodies in question (on our priority assessment allotments)___the lack of a WDEQ ruling would force BLM to initiate one of the following actions; proceed with our own ruling and make certain to coordinate with WDEQ to ensure their support; or enter unknown for Standard #5 on the assessment checklist and then wait for WDEQ to make a ruling on #5 while we proceed with actions on all other Standards;

2) Water quality monitoring approach:

Background explanation: the State's current standards are quantitative and traditional water quality monitoring (e.g., for chemical constituent concentrations) is time consuming and costly with ≥ 3 samples per stream per year for 3-5 years.

a - a viable option is to establish/utilize *repeatable* "indicator" monitoring methods (looking at physical or biological characteristics that are closely related to chemical water quality) including PFC, macroinvertebrate, channel cross sections, etc.; also, use of meter readings of pH/temperature/TDS/DO, etc., might be investigated;

b - these optional approaches must be discussed with WDEQ to ensure their support;

3. The nature and scope of the monitoring workload will depend on the options selected; an additional workload (primarily for the few remaining hydrologists) will result unless all waterbodies are listed as *unknown* for meeting water quality standards and WDEQ tasked with answering this question; staffing options, contracts, and interagency agreements will need to be considered.

OTHER BACKGROUND TOPICS DISCUSSED DURING S&G MEETING:

- WQWG (BLM) recommendations for Solicitor's opinion
- State Water Quality Advisory Board

- 1998 Priority list 60/300 Segs
- Monitoring coordination on State's TMDL workplan
- WDEQ & BLM policy for WQLS nomination - on going
- WDEQ/BLM MOU (WQ Standard)
- Addressing water quality limitation vs. riparian, stream channel stability, upland erosion
 - low flow
 - State established methods
 - physical features>bank stability, cobble embeddedness
 - chemical concentrations
 - biological> macro/microinvertebrates
- Certain methods we can use? DEQ direction
- Focus on physical and biological characteristics
 - PFC
 - macroinvertebrates indicators (hydrologist help)
- 1. Starting Point > State 303(d) list (re. to BLM's priority allots)
 - Elevate waterbodies in State's priorities based on BLM management needs
- 2. WQ data or other anecdotal data from WDEQ and other agencies during allotment assessment process
- 2a: Focus on physical (e.g., PFC, Rosgen, etc.) and biological characteristics (State methods) to prioritize allotments/waterbodies to get WDEQ's call on exceedance of a water quality standard.
 - (Based on Classes I-4 to prioritize and look at our data within high priority I Category allotments).

ATTACHMENT 2

Other **DRAFT** Interim Resource Management Options (relative to TMDL/WQLS program)---Thinking Points from the August 1997 WQ Workgroup meeting:

1. Maintain traditional management approach, (i.e., business as usual with no special attention to WQLS or TMDLs) - allow interested parties to appeal decisions affecting WQLS (e.g., activity plans) and promote action by the State.

2. Take a *supporting* role in TMDL development for future BLM activity plans:

- In circumstances where stakeholders are agreeable, BLM could identify its high priority WQLS/TMDL needs (in relation to State priorities), prepare *management options* with key stakeholders (which would include objectives and BMPs to remedy causes of impairment and meet appropriate State water quality standards), and present the latter to the State that it might establish the required TMDL;

- In contentious circumstances, BLM could identify high priority WQLS/TMDL needs to the State and promote its consideration and action.

3. *Wait for the State to develop TMDLs for all WQLS*; if Bureau authorized activities are identified as a source of impairment, or contributing to an impairment, the Bureau would initiate activity plans whereby management practices and treatments, or State approved BMPs, would be identified and implemented like any landowner.