

**Lower Clark Fork River Watershed Advisory Group
May 22 Meeting Summary and Action Items**

Actions Items/Important Dates:

- June 9
 - 1-2 pm: Temperature Sub-group phone call to discuss shade curves used and target development (Scheduled attendees: Kevin Davis, Tom Worden, Scott Marshall, Mark Shumar, Bob Steed, Jenna Borovansky. Others welcome.)
 - WAG Comments Due. On draft sediment TMDL (May 2006) and SBA and TMDL (April 2006) to Jenna to be incorporated into next draft.
- June 16
 - DEQ delivers hard copy of complete update of TMDL to WAG for review. I will flag items changed based on comment. An updated draft of the metals TMDL will be included.
 - Results of Temperature Subcommittee meeting provided to full WAG, if recommendations for change to targets are made, DEQ will provide both current and proposed changes for WAG consideration in the draft document.
- June 26: WAG Meeting 9am-12 at Bonner County Extension
 - WAG operating procedures discussed, representation from each stakeholder group will be helpful.
 - WAG comment/recommendation on updated metals TMDL
 - Review of temperature sub-group meeting and recommendations
 - WAG comment and response to changes in pre-public release draft of SBA and TMDLs.
 - Request for WAG recommendation to BAG to prepare all TMDLs for public comment (with any recommended changes), or schedule of next meeting to review items that still need work.
 - Discussion of public comment period strategy/needs (i.e., locations, meetings, public summary documents)
- End-July: If recommended, release of public comment draft of SBA and TMDL!!

5/22/06 Meeting Notes

Sediment TMDL

- Tyson Clyne presented a summary of the approach used to allocated sediment loads to individual land owners. (See Powerpoint presentation.)
- Draft Sediment TMDL with specific load reductions and allocations to land owners was provided. (Available on web-site.) Questions were taken and WAG is requested to review results of model, specifically consider:
 - Do all streams with allocations seem appropriate for targeting sediment reduction resources?
 - Are there areas that the model did not reflect as needing load reductions that should have reductions?
 - Multiple tables of information are presented, WAG preference for summary tables, or leave “as is” in document.
- Question was asked regarding whether the focus is fine sediment or bedload. The model does not differentiate between fines and bedload, however the assumption in this basin is that the majority of impairment is from excess bedload.

Table X. Current sediment load, background load and load capacity at sediment target for watersheds above sediment load target.

Watershed	Load type	Watershed acreage	Modeled % above background	Estimated existing load (tons/year)	Natural background (tons/year)	Load capacity at 54% above natural background (tons/year)	Load Reduction Required (tons/year)	% Load Reduction Required	Estimation Method
Rattle Creek	Sediment	6,770	228%	636	194	299	337	174%	Modeled
Wellington Creek	Sediment	6,405	177%	407	147	226	181	123%	Modeled
Char Creek	Sediment	2,139	139%	118	50	77	41	85%	Modeled
Quartz Creek	Sediment	3,226	139%	130	54	83	47	85%	Modeled
Lightning Creek mainstem*	Sediment	42,724	70%	3,820	2,241	3,451	369	16%	Modeled
Twin Creek	Sediment	7,567	71%	297	174	268	29	17%	Modeled
Johnson Creek	Sediment	9,166	66%	352	212	326	26	12%	Modeled

* Main stem Lightning Creek including Spring, Cascade, Porcupine and East Fork Creeks and excluding Rattle, Wellington, Char, Quartz, Morris, Savage and Lightning Creek headwater streams above Moose Creek.

Note:

- Those watersheds within the Lightning Creek drainage that do not have a specific, additional load reduction indicated above, have the 16% load reduction relevant to the entire Lightning Creek drainage applied.
- The USFS and Tyson will review data for Quartz Creek, as the estimate of sediment delivery seemed high at first review.

Temperature TMDLs Tributaries

- Figures with existing and target loads were provided to WAG (see Powerpoint)
 - Input that zooming in more closely on specific watersheds will be helpful
 - Background with land ownership will replace photos to better show land owner temperature reduction allocations
- Hard copies of updated temperature load allocation tables were provided (available by request)
- Additional description of vegetation shade curves used to represent forested watersheds was provided.
 - Discussion regarding appropriateness of Mattole (redwood) shade curve.
 - Issue not resolved, follow-up conference call on June 9 1-2 pm (PT). See attached memo to Temperature Sub-group for details, if additional participants wish to join the call, please let Jenna know.

Temperature TMDL – Mainstem Update

- DEQ and EPA are considering leaving the mainstem listed for temperature without a TMDL at this time. The need for a TMDL would be revisited in 2011 during IDEQs five-year review of the Lower Clark Fork River TMDLs and listings.
- A model to determine the natural background condition, as well as potential influence of upstream dams into Montana would aid IDEQ (and MDEQ) in determining a coordinated next step.
- IDEQ will discuss this option with MDEQ and continue EPA discussions.
- Current available information and the recommendation to leave the mainstem temperature impairment without a TMDL will be included in the next draft of SBA.

Total Dissolved Gas – Mainstem Update

- Draft TDG TMDL presented to the WAG, hard copies provided and available on the web-site.

Metals TMDL- Mainstem Update

- DEQ is revising Metals TMDL to include more information on the history of the metals listing in Idaho.
- DEQ is adding appendices that report all data considered in TMDL.
- DEQ will revise discussion of allocations at the border to reflect comments from MDEQ to clearly reflect that the desired outcome is that Idaho water quality standards are met at the border during all flows.
- The next version will be included in the June 16 WAG review draft and WAG comment will be taken at the June 26 meeting.

Schedule and WAG process

- Draft review schedule suggested and outcome reported at top of this summary.
- To date, WAG has not formalized operating procedures. Before proceeding with recommendation to the BAG that the document is ready for public review, the WAG should decide on procedures, if consensus is not reached.

(Fyi, memo to Subgroup. If additional participants are interested in conference call participation, please let me know.)

Date: May 25, 2006
To: Temperature Subgroup Lower Clark Fork WAG
From: Jenna Borovansky
Re: Effective Shade Curves

Enclosed is a CD with all the effective shade curves that DEQ has to choose from to represent the Lower Clark Fork River, including the four used in the draft TMDL. Please reference the tables for individual streams that were provided at the WAG meeting (and enclosed for those that were not at the meeting). The critical column is the “natural stream width”, which is the width on which the effective shade target is based. Also, please review the description and justification for current choice of shade curves provided via e-mail and in the packet at the WAG meeting.

The next page shows three scenarios: current draft of the TMDL shade curves; current draft curves minus the Mattole; and current draft minus the VRU10 vegetation type. There is a fairly limited range of widths that are impacted by these changes as summarized below.

- Stream Width Targets Impacted by removal of Mattole Shade Curve: >10 meters in width, the target class would drop one class.
- Stream Width Targets Impacted by removal of the VRU 10 Curve: 21-24 meters in width would be raised one class.
- The only areas within the subbasin that have estimated natural stream widths > 10 meters in the forested vegetation class are:
 - Mainstem Lightning Creek from below Gem Creek to mouth
 - East Fork Lightning Creek – bottom 5.6 km of the Creek
 - WF Blue Creek in Idaho – bottom 1.1 km of Creek

I have contacted all of you to try to set up a time for a conference call to discuss this and will confirm via e-mail a time and date (currently proposed for June 9). Since the mainstem Lightning Creek is the area that is primarily impacted by the proposed changes in shade curves, I suggest when reviewing the vegetation types you consider their representativeness of the riparian communities, soil and aspect of the mainstem, as the narrower tributaries are less sensitive to changes in shade curves used, i.e., at narrow widths almost all vegetation types will be provided extensive shade in a full potential riparian area.

Targets as Proposed

Targets without the Mattole to show the stream widths that are most influenced by Mattole.

Effective Shade Curves	Stream Width (m)													
	2	4	5	8	10	12	14	18	19	21	24	28	40	54
VRU 8	95	92	89	85	81	75	72	65	63	58	56	49	40	31
VRU 10	90	89	80	73	68	62	54	45	46	42	39	35	36	20
Willamette Basin	94	88	86	81	77	73	64	55	54	52	49	44	38	30
Average	93	89.7	86	79.9	75	70	63.3	55	54.3	48	48	42.7	38	27
Target Class (%)	95	95	85	85	75	75	65	55	55	45	45	45	35	25

Targets without the VRU 10, which is the lower tree heights, putting more emphasis on larger riparian area trees.

Effective Shade Curves	Stream Width (m)													
	2	4	5	8	10	12	14	18	19	21	24	28	40	54
VRU 8	95	92	89	85	81	75	72	65	63	58	56	49	40	31
Mattole River	92	92	92	91	90	89	87	84	83	82	78	75	64	52
Willamette Basin	94	88	86	81	77	73	64	55	54	52	49	44	38	30
Average	93.7	90.7	89	85.7	82.7	79	74.3	68	66.7	64	61	56	47.3	37.7
Target Class (%)	95	95	85	85	85	75	75	65	65	65	65	55	45	35