

Attendees:

Tom Mixner (for Shela M), Julia F, Kathy A, Melanie M- phone  
Colleen F, Lee D, Krista O, Randy M, Marc D, Jason S, Jennifer M- in person

Reviewed previous action items

Lee supplied some information about historic OAW language  
Colleen sent NM information  
Webpage link is up and running

Colleen- good water quality- proposed to omit WQ entirely- ADEQ should not tie concept of good WQ to the SWQ standards

WQ collected for baseline purposes only

Marc- believes that SWQS are still needed

Lee- we may list an OAW even though it may be impaired if there is no WQ data

**Meeting Topic 1**- What actions should be taken on OAWs

Lee- what additional work can we do outside of permitting? NPS, Natural Background?

What is the expectation for the public?

Colleen- we should be monitoring, especially if there is a known upset in the watershed

Julia- share BMP with land managers to implement

ADEQ should work with the nominators to do more monitoring, data review etc.

Consensus that there should be focused monitoring post designation- Colleen and Marc- yes

Levels of monitoring- prioritize based upon suspected changes in watershed that may impact WQ  
Kathy- need additional WQ data (flow regimes and WQ data)- ADEQ should collect data if needed, especially those that we would regulate under antidegradation.

No degradation under storm conditions could be determined if no data had been collected

Julia- does not believe that stormwater should be included in OAW nomination

Colleen- look only at low flow when collecting water quality data- how would this apply to storm water AD?

Lee- the WQ really ties back to AD impacts

Can we use a tiered nomination approach? Members did not seem to think so

If we protected for the other uses- how would we protect without WQ data as that relates back to ADEQ's CWA authorities?

**Meeting Topic 2**- What actions should ADEQ take if WQ is degrading in an OAW?

Marc- OAW is like a use, TMDL should be developed- prioritize it for development

Depends on the use as to what actions should be taken

Should look at the other OAW impacts too

What happens when an OAW becomes impaired- Marc and Colleen say that it should be protected, Lee- agrees but depends on original data

Kathy- how would we handle a future issue that may arise for OAWs

Melanie- we should ID the sources and clean it up for all citizens

Colleen- once made they (OAWs) should remain

Jennifer- if there needed to be a way out then it would need to follow the rulemaking process

Outstanding Arizona Waters December 21, 2017

Kathy- what if the water was impaired at time of nomination? What would we do then?

Melanie- need to consider long term drought and climate change

Colleen- issue with D3 language

Tom- bad is not good, defined by not impaired

Julia- ADEQ should prioritize parameters that would be needed post director's determination- fill data gaps post adoption (post classification report)- does not need to be in rule

Generally speaking OAWs should be protected but there should be some provision to revisit if needed- consensus agrees

#### **Good water quality follow-up action items**

- What are other states doing (Colleen will look into Nevada), Kathy shared western states OAW write up; Jennifer will help if needed  
Related topics to look at in other state examples- Flow regime, antideg, water quality requirements
- Look at the antideg too- see Kathy's summary
- Look at EPA AD IP review- JS9 to send to KO, KO to send out to the group
- What have we done in the past (rule-making and nominations) - ADEQ action item
- When did good water quality come into rule, look at Triennial Review preambles for ADEQ justification- ADEQ action item