

DRAFT

Summary of the Second Lake Thunderbird TAC Meeting on January 17, 2012

The meeting welcomed the addition of the Cleveland County Conservation District to the committee. The district is represented by its education director Chris Ward.

The committee agreed that the content of the project website was sufficient.

Andrew Fang of ODEQ presented a detailed update on the development of both the watershed model (HSPF) and the lake model (EFDC). Please refer to the meeting slides (ODEQ) for details. The calibration of both models is near completion. HSPF needed more work on TP and TN, and EFDC on Chl-a. A draft modeling report is expected by the end of March, which will include the load reductions needed to achieve the 10 µg/L Chl-a water quality standard in the lake. The next steps and an estimate of a timeline for completing the TMDL/watershed plan were also presented.

Greg Kloxin of OCC, with input from Shanon Philips of OCC and Mark Derichsweiler of ODEQ, presented a comparison of two water quality management planning alternatives: developing a TMDL for the lake (TMDL and Plan or "TAP") vs. a Watershed Management Plan in lieu of TMDL (Plan in Lieu of TMDL or "PILOT"). Please refer to the meeting slides (OCC) for details. Mark summarized what a TMDL was and the required elements in a TMDL. Shanon provided a brief introduction to the TAP vs. PILOT. Greg provided a detailed comparison of the two alternatives and emphasized that the state already has a regular watershed management plan (WBP) accepted by EPA for the Lake Thunderbird watershed, and with the addition of the TMDL, will have both components (i.e., a TAP). Greg emphasized that a regular WBP is an implementation oriented document, and for Oklahoma, serves as a medium to implement the nonpoint point sources component of TMDLs. He emphasized the living and adaptive nature of a regular WBP, which can be established with or without a TMDL. Greg also outlined the difficulty of getting a PILOT "accepted" by EPA, and the ambiguity of EPA region 6 in dealing with the issue of allowing a PILOT. He noted that since the concept of a PILOT arose 4-5 years ago, only one such plan has been submitted to EPA Region 6, and that plan cost more than 1 million dollars to complete. Furthermore, it's not clear if EPA has fully "accepted" that plan yet. Greg emphasized the necessity and sense in putting what is already limited funding toward action (BMPs to abate pollutants) and not development of a plan that is subject to change as it's implemented. ODEQ and OCC stated that the best approach to our Lake Thunderbird project is to have a TMDL established and use the TMDL as the basis to update the current regular watershed plan for the implementation of the TMDL (i.e., a TAP). ODEQ and OCC would like to hear the TAC's opinion on this issue.

ODEQ also briefed the meeting on the lawsuit filed by COMCD against ODEQ for not completing a TMDL/watershed plan for the lake by April 2010. The date was set in an agreement between ODEQ and COMCD, which itself was a result of a lawsuit filed by COMCD against ODEQ on the issuing of Oklahoma City's stormwater permit in 2007. ODEQ's attorneys were working on a response to the current COMCD lawsuit.

The next meeting was tentatively scheduled for the afternoon of Tuesday, April 24, 2012 at DEQ. Topics will include the discussion of the modeling report and the choice between a TMDL and a Watershed Management Plan in lieu of TMDL.