

STATE OF COLORADO



Colorado Department
of Public Health
and Environment

Annual Report to the Colorado Legislature and Water Quality Control Commission Fiscal Year 2005-2006

Submitted to the Colorado Legislature and Water Quality Control Commission
by the Water Quality Control Division
Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
October 2006

FOREWARD

I am pleased to submit the Water Quality Control Division's (Division's) Annual Report to the Water Quality Control Commission (Commission) for the period from July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006 (FY 06). Pursuant to CRS Section 25-8-305, the Division is to file with the Commission, on an annual basis, a report on the effectiveness of its efforts under the state Water Quality Control Act. In particular, the Division is to:

[I]nclude in such report such recommendations as it may have with respect to any regulatory or legislative changes that may be needed or desired. Such report shall include the then current information that has been obtained pursuant to Section 25-8-303 [monitoring] and information concerning the status of the Division's implementation of the discharge permit program established in part 5 of this article.

Further, in accordance with the requirements of section 25-8-305 of the Colorado Water Quality Control Act, this report is also filed with the House Agriculture, Livestock, and Natural Resources Committee and the Senate Agriculture, Natural Resources and Energy Committee.

Dennis E. Ellis
Executive Director
Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
October 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. NECESSARY LEGISLATIVE OR REGULATORY CHANGES1**
 - A. Legislative Changes1**
 - B. Regulatory Changes2**

- II. MONITORING ACTIVITIES2**
 - A. Routine Sampling.....2**
 - B. Special Studies.....3**
 - C. Lake and Reservoir Monitoring3**
 - D. Aquatic Life and Habitat Studies3**
 - E. Nonpoint Source Monitoring Requirements4**
 - F. Cooperative Monitoring Activities4**
 - G. Augmented Monitoring Funds5**

- III. PERMIT PROGRAM5**
 - A. Permit Backlog Reduction5**
 - B. Stormwater Program.....6**
 - C. Permitting for Environmental Results.....6**
 - D. Environmental Agricultural Program7**
 - E. Water Quality Information Systems Improvement Projects.....8**
 - F. Proposed Major Waste Water Treatment Plant Self-Certification Program..8**

- IV. CONCLUSION.....9**

APPENDICES

- A. Water Quality Forum Work Groups Status**

I. NECESSARY LEGISLATIVE OR REGULATORY CHANGES

A. Legislative Changes

In 2003, the state legislature, facing budget difficulties, found it necessary to remove all general fund monies from the Division. These monies, which amounted to approximately two million dollars, were temporarily replaced by the levy of additional fees upon wastewater dischargers (a 66 percent increase in permit fees) and the creation of a new fee payment system for drinking water purveyors (SB 276). These additional fees were allowed to “sunset” on June 30, 2005 and in lieu of those fees, the legislature provided the Division general funds totaling \$1.88 million.

Senate Bill 276 also directed the Division to file a report with the state legislature by December 1, 2004 that addressed a number of specific questions. These questions were directed to both the current business practices of the Division and future Division funding options. In assembling the data and information necessary to complete the SB 276 mandated study report, the Division held numerous stakeholder meetings and circulated two customer surveys. A report, which reflected stakeholder input, was completed and can be currently found on the Division’s website (see <http://www.cdphe.state.co.us/wq/wqhom.asp>). The Division included in the SB 276 Report what it termed a “gap analysis,” i.e., an indication of potential future staffing needs, taking into account both recent additional Clean Water Act and Safe Drinking Water Act mandates and legislative and regulatory requirements which are on the horizon.

As a result of the “gap analysis” in the SB 276 Report, the Division began a series of meetings with interested parties to discuss how that gap in staffing levels should be addressed. As part of that effort, the Governor included funding for Division staffing in his state budget request to the legislature, and the legislature provided the Division additional general funds totaling \$760,000 and \$56,000 increase in cash spending authority to fund 6.5 Safe Drinking Water Act positions and 3.5 Clean Water Act positions. The department believes that additional resources should be made available to the Division over a three to four year period. In the event there continues to be strong support among the interested parties, funding proposals may be submitted for the 2007 legislative session.

Two other significant pieces of water quality legislation were passed in the 2006 session. House Bill 1337 establishes a new Water Quality Improvement Fund. Senate Bill 171 transferred rulemaking authority from the Board of Health to the Water Quality Control Commission with respect to: primary drinking water regulations (5 CCR 1003-1); the Drinking Water Revolving Loan Fund (5 CCR 1003-3); the Drinking Water Grant Program (5 CCR 1003-8); fees for the Biosolids program (5 CCR 1002-7); and Individual Sewage Disposal System (ISDS) Guidelines (5 CCR 1003-6).

B. Regulatory Changes

With reference to regulatory changes that may be needed or desired, the Commission is fully aware of the on-going efforts of the Division to address a variety of issues through collaborative work group processes, including those formed under the auspices of the Water Quality Forum. The stakeholder community is advancing many work group proposals. A recent status report on work group efforts is attached as Appendix A.

The Commission will need to revise the provisions of Sections 61.13 and 61.17 of Regulation No. 61 to reflect changes to the federal concentrated animal feeding operation (CAFO) regulation that are anticipated

in response to the federal appellate ruling in Waterkeeper Alliance Inc., v. U.S. EPA, 399 F.3d 486 (2nd Cir. 2005) in which the Second Circuit Court of Appeals vacated key portions of the federal CAFO Rule.

The passage of HB 1337 requires the Commission promulgate rules regarding administration of the Water Quality Improvement Fund, including rules defining criteria for eligibility and grants.

II. MONITORING ACTIVITIES

The Division's surface water monitoring activities for FY 2006 were grouped into four general types: (1) routine sampling; (2) special studies; (3) lake and reservoir monitoring; and (4) aquatic life and habitat studies. In FY 2006, the majority of the Division's sampling efforts were devoted to the collection of water chemistry samples from the four major river basins across the state. River and stream sites in these basins are sampled for the purposes of reviewing and developing standards for triennial reviews, water quality assessments, developing total maximum daily limits (TMDLs), section 303(d) listing determinations, and for reporting trends and water quality status in Colorado's section 305(b) report.

A. Routine Sampling

The Division uses a rotating basin approach for primary stream monitoring. The entire state is sampled on a five-year cycle that matches the Commission's schedule for triennial reviews of basin standards and classifications. For the purposes of conducting the triennial reviews, the state has been divided into four major river basins. Each of the four major river basins is sampled intensively once every five years. This allows the Division to concentrate its limited resources in one basin in order to provide a complete set of data in preparation for the triennial review scheduled for that basin. In every fifth year of the cycle, there is no need to intensively sample one of the major basins, and sampling is more evenly allocated among the long-term trend sites in the four basins.

The number of sites and the number of times each site is sampled each year is controlled by the Division's fixed monitoring budget, which in FY 2006 was \$470,000. These funds are a combination of mostly permits fees and a small percentage of federal funds. These pay for water chemistry analysis of the samples performed by the department's Laboratory Services Division. Depending upon the amount of data sought for a particular site and the accessibility of the site, sites were visited on a regular schedule, such as monthly, bimonthly or when weather and road conditions allowed. In FY05, routine water chemistry samples were collected from a network of 230 sampling sites located across the state. The Division concentrated 64 percent of the sampling in the Arkansas and Rio Grande River Basins. The remainder was allocated to the South Platte Basin (12 percent), Upper Colorado River Basin (6 percent), and Lower Colorado River Basin (19 percent). This sampling resulted in 966 sample sets collected. Samples were analyzed for a suite of constituents including metals, inorganics, nutrients and *E. coli*. Field parameters such as dissolved oxygen, pH, conductance, and temperature were also collected.

B. Special Studies

Special studies monitoring includes synoptic sampling events for total maximum daily load determinations, spill and fish kill investigations, fish tissue sampling, and other water quality investigations. In FY 2006, there was no synoptic sampling conducted. Fish tissue sampling to detect the presence of mercury was completed at 16 reservoirs from across the state. Arsenic and selenium

were also analyzed in tissues from these reservoirs. This sampling resulted in about 1,300 composite tissue samples for analysis by the department's Laboratory Services Division.

C. Lake and Reservoir Monitoring

The amount of lake and reservoir sampling was increased substantially in FY 2006. The Division monitored 29 reservoirs/lakes and collected 146 sample sets during the algal growing season from June through September. At each lake, depth profiles of dissolved oxygen, pH, conductance, and temperature are collected at 1-meter intervals. In addition, water quality samples are taken near the surface and near the bottom. Samples were analyzed for chlorophyll a and a suite of chemical parameters including nutrients, metals, inorganics and *E. coli*.

D. Aquatic Life and Habitat Studies

Macroinvertebrate and habitat samples were collected at 67 sites across the state. All samples were collected for the purpose of filling in data gaps in our reference site database. At each of the habitat sites, water quality samples were taken and analyzed for the standard suite of constituents measured in routine stream monitoring. The data are used in the development of expected conditions and assessments of aquatic life.

The U.S. Forest Service provided information on streams in an effort to remove segments from the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) list for possible sediment impairment of those segments on U.S. Forest Service lands. Sixteen segments were identified for retention on the M&E list and will be sampled again by the Division in the 2006-2007 field season. Fifty-eight segments were removed from the M&E list. The Division accompanied the U.S. Forest Service to the field to verify removal status for four segments. Approximately seven large main stem river segments remain on the list for the Division to monitor. The Division participated with EPA and U.S. Forest Service in three post-TMDL monitoring studies in which measurable results were used to evaluate TMDL effectiveness.

E. Nonpoint Source Monitoring Requirements

Nonpoint source projects that conduct on-the-ground restoration and remediation activities are required through Clean Water Act Section 319 grant conditions to report measurable results from the efforts. EPA defines measurable results as "restoring waters to partial or full uses and standards, or as a minimum, reducing pollutant loads such as nutrients and sediment." To accomplish this, existing nonpoint source impacts must be better quantified in order to provide the water quality baseline information necessary to measure improvements. Surrogate measures, such as a record of the best management practices installed, can be used to evaluate the total project effort, but do not provide data that equate to water quality improvements. Few project sponsors have the expertise needed to draft an adequate sample and analysis plan to assess changes in water quality. In view of this, the Division is reviewing its approach to monitoring and evaluating nonpoint source projects. Starting with the 2004-2005 Nonpoint Source Section 319 project cycle, sponsors will be required to provide more definitive water quality baseline data, and subsequent post-project data to substantiate project outcomes.

The Commission approved the 2006 Supplement to the Colorado Nonpoint Source Management Program in August 2005. One new feature of the supplement is to implement nonpoint source management activities by using a focused watershed-based approach. This approach will be initiated by synchronizing nonpoint source monitoring needs with the five-year, basin-monitoring schedule used to collect water quality data to establish classifications and standards for water bodies in Regulation Nos.

32 through 38. This information will assist in assessing improvements to water bodies impaired by nonpoint sources.

F. Cooperative Monitoring Activities

To ensure that the maximum amount of relevant data is assessed each year, the Division issues a “call for data” to numerous cooperators, including: federal and state entities, basin authorities, dischargers, and watershed groups, as well as River Watch and Section 319 sponsors. Through this mechanism, the Division collects a considerable amount of data beyond what it can directly sample and analyze.

As a charter member of the Colorado Water Quality Monitoring Council (Council), the topic of cooperative monitoring efforts has been discussed with other stakeholders. To facilitate data sharing, the Council has initiated a Data Sharing Network. The Data Sharing Network is a statewide, web-based, water quality database and interactive map. Anyone who would like to share water quality data can upload their data through a template on the Internet. This data can be accessed (read only) by anyone. Anyone accessing the map can zoom into a particular watershed and click on a monitoring site (dots on the map) to find out who is monitoring at that site, what parameters, and if the monitoring entity has uploaded data, the data can be viewed and downloaded. The data that is uploaded must comply with the STORET (EPA national database) requirements so that it is in a standard format that is usable by EPA and the state.

The software tools for the Data Sharing Network were donated by the EPA Region X and the network will be maintained by EPA Region XIII. A non-point source section 319 grant from the Division is funding this project and includes development of training materials, user training, and outreach to publicize the network and to seek out monitoring data to populate it. The U.S. Geological Survey is uploading the data to help make this a statewide data-sharing tool.

Other initiatives designed to advance cooperative monitoring include:

- “10 Elements”. In 2003, EPA issued a document entitled the *Elements of a State Water Monitoring and Assessment Program*. The document was intended to serve as a tool to help EPA determine whether a state’s monitoring program met the prerequisites of CWA Section 106(e). The document outlined 10 basic elements, or criteria, and is commonly referred to as the “10 Elements.” As part of the Division’s periodic monitoring program plan update, the Division is specifically evaluating how to move from the “call for data” approach to a cooperator approach where specific monitoring needs could be identified proactively, e.g., fixed network stations with specific sampling requirements.
- Data Entry Tool. EPA has developed and is managing an internet-based, data entry tool which allows cooperators (and others) to enter data into EPA’s national database (STORET) via an intermediate software screen such as the STORET Import Module (SIM) which alerts cooperators of Quality Assessment/Quality Control problems that need to be fixed before the data can be uploaded to STORET.

G. Augmented Monitoring Funds

To upgrade state monitoring efforts and encourage implementation of “10 Elements” plans, EPA placed an additional \$17 million in the Section 106 state grants dedicated to monitoring purposes in the EPA 2006 budget. Colorado received \$441,900 of these “Monitoring Initiative” funds to facilitate the implementation of EPA’s 10 Elements document and to conduct a statewide lake survey of water

quality. The Division has earmarked these funds for increased biological and habitat monitoring, biological data management, training in geofluvial morphology to help in assessing sediment impacts, risk assessments for fish tissue analysis, additional monitoring of rivers and lakes, and ambient ground water monitoring for specified areas.

III. PERMIT PROGRAM

A. Permit Backlog Reduction

The Division developed a permit backlog reduction plan in May of 2000 that set goals to reduce the backlog of major individual process water permits to 10 percent by December 31, 2002, and the minor individual process water permit backlog to 10 percent by December 31, 2005. This plan was reviewed and approved by EPA and has, since that time, been reflected in the Performance Partnership Agreement between the Department and EPA. The Division did reduce its major permit backlog to 10 percent by December 31, 2002 and its minor permit backlog to 10 percent by December 31, 2005.

In the time since the Division received approval of the backlog reduction plan, EPA's backlog reduction program has expanded to include individual stormwater permits and general process water permits. The next step for the Division's backlog reduction efforts is to achieve backlog reduction goals for these program areas, while maintaining an acceptable level of backlog for major and minor individual process water permits. The Performance Partnership Agreement between the department and EPA for federal fiscal years 2007 and 2008 includes a goal of 80 percent current (20 percent backlogged) for all permits included in EPA's backlog reduction program.

Another important element of EPA's backlog reduction efforts is priority permits. EPA considers any renewal permit that has been expired and administratively extended, and any new permit that has not been issued, for two years or more to be a candidate priority permit. As part of the Performance Partnership Agreement between the department and EPA, EPA requires 95 percent of each state's priority permits to be issued during the fiscal year. This is a continuing priority for the Division for the coming year.

B. Stormwater Program

Stormwater discharges are generated from runoff from land and impervious areas such as paved streets, parking lots, and building rooftops during rainfall and snow events and often contain pollutants in quantities that could adversely affect water quality. Most stormwater discharges are considered point sources and require coverage by a permit. The primary method to control stormwater discharges is through the use of best management practices. EPA's stormwater regulations went into affect in two phases. Commission regulations, which adopted Phase I of EPA's stormwater regulations, were finalized in September 1993 and Phase II of the regulations were finalized in March 2001. Because of the newness of the stormwater program, it continues to develop at a fairly rapid pace.

Most stormwater discharges in Colorado are authorized under general permits, which cover a category of discharges, such as construction, municipal storm sewer systems, and industrial sectors. Authorizations to individual discharges are issued in the form of certifications under a general permit. During FY 2006, a total of 1,974 new stormwater certifications were issued, a 15.6 percent increase over the previous fiscal year. As of June 30, 2006, there were 5,035 active general permit certifications for industrial and construction activities and one individual permit. As of June 30, 2006, there were 116

active Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) general permit certifications for Phase II municipalities and five MS4 individual permits for Phase I municipalities.

The Division's compliance assurance strategy for stormwater discharges implements both compliance assistance and inspection/enforcement to enhance water quality protection. A variety of educational materials is available and the Division staff conducts presentations for stakeholder groups. The Division's stormwater inspection program continued to grow during the past year, with a total of 335 compliance evaluation inspections having been performed.

C. Permitting for Environmental Results

The Permitting for Environmental Results (PER) initiative is a multi-year effort by EPA and the states to improve the overall integrity and performance of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. The initial effort was completed in 2004 which culminated in EPA's assessment of the Division's permitting program, documented in a report, *NPDES profile: Colorado and Indian Country*. This is available on EPA's website at:

http://www.epa.gov/npdes/pubs/colorado_final_profile.pdf). EPA's purpose in preparing these state profiles is to develop an information base for EPA's identification of NPDES program strengths and opportunities for enhancement.

Another effort under PER is a comprehensive review of each state's legal authorities for permitting. This effort was conducted by EPA contractors with assistance from each state and is still ongoing. The Division is in discussion with EPA concerning regulatory enhancements that may be appropriate that can be accommodated during the routine review of the permitting regulations by the Commission.

D. Environmental Agriculture Program

In August 2005, the Division's Animal Feeding Operation Initiative was reorganized into the Environmental Agriculture Initiative (Ag Initiative). The Ag Initiative is the department's first sector-based Initiative that is focused on providing regulatory, permitting, compliance assistance and compliance assurance services to the agriculture sector. The Ag Initiative meets its statutory and regulatory obligations by ensuring compliance with water quality and air quality protection regulations specific to housed commercial swine feeding operations (HCSFOs) and water quality regulations specific to small animal feeding operations (AFOs) and concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs). The Initiative leverages resources from three divisions, Water Quality Control, Air Pollution Control and Sustainability and is staffed by 3.0 FTE from the Water Quality Control Division, 1.0 FTE from the Sustainability Division and 0.5 FTE from the Air Pollution Control Division. One of the primary goals of the Ag Initiative is to approach environmental issues using a holistic approach that takes into account the interaction and environmental impact of air, water and waste together versus making decisions one media at a time.

In way of background, small AFOs are facilities that stable or confine less than 1,000 cattle or the equivalent number of other animal species (e.g., 700 mature dairy cows) for a total of 45 days or more in any 12-month period in a lot or facility that does not sustain crops, vegetation or other forage growth during the normal growing season. Initiative staff responded to three citizen complaints about these operations and worked with two of the three facilities through informal enforcement actions to bring them into compliance. In addition, four other AFO facilities were inspected during FY 2006.

Concentrated animal feeding operations, on the other hand, are large livestock operations with 1,000 or more cattle or the equivalent number of other species. Permitting requirements for these facilities are contained in the Commission's Regulation No. 61, the Colorado Discharge Permit System Regulations (section 61.17). During FY06, Ag Initiative staff spent a considerable amount of time analyzing and determining the impact of a decision handed down by the U.S. Second Circuit Court of Appeals on February 28, 2005 concerning federal CAFO rules promulgated in February 2003, in addition to a new federal rule issued on February 10, 2006 that extended certain compliance dates established in the 2003 federal CAFO rules. Also, on the last day of FY 2006 (June 30, 2006) the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency issued proposed revisions to its 2003 CAFO rule in response to the federal appeals court decision. In addition to the legal complexities of the federal court decision such as striking the "duty to apply" provision from the 2003 CAFO rule, the impact, on the Ag Initiative and the CAFO industry is substantial. For example, the changes to the federal rule no longer make Regulation No. 61 and the department's general discharge permit in line with federal CAFO requirements. As a result, the state must revise the regulation and the general permit in order to comply with the requirements of the federal CAFO regulation, as required by statute (section 25-8-504, C.R.S.). A rulemaking action is scheduled for October 2006 to address the stringency issue and to allow the Ag Initiative to move forward with certifying CAFOs under a revised general discharge permit. In the interim period, 16 of 18 currently permitted CAFOs are seeking to renew general discharge permits. Approximately 15 CAFOs are awaiting certification pending the October 2006 rulemaking.

Regarding compliance assurance activities, one CAFO was issued a Notice of Violation, staff responded to two complaints from citizens about CAFOs and 64 facilities were inspected. Work continues on finalizing a state CAFO inventory, which currently lists 230 facilities.

Housed Commercial Swine Feeding Operations are facilities that are capable of housing 800,000 pounds or more of swine at any one time. A citizen referendum in 1998 required the Commission adopt regulations for HCSFOs. A total of 11 HCSFOs hold active individual permits that were originally issued in 1999. Renewal applications were submitted by December 31, 2004 and were reviewed. Permit renewals for 10 of 11 permits were completed prior to July 2006. With respect to compliance, staff responded to two HCSFO water quality related complaints and wrote four informal HCSFO enforcement documents as well as spent a significant amount of time addressing two ongoing formal enforcement (notice of violation) matters. In addition, three local health departments conduct inspections at each permitted HCSFO facility twice each year for a total of 186 HCSFO inspections. Staff meets quarterly with local health department personnel on matters pertaining to CAFO and HCSFO inspections and related compliance assurance matters.

Future goals of the Ag Initiative include developing a self-certification tool for verification of Regulation 81 groundwater protection requirements, developing a single cross media air and water permit for HCSFOs, and working with the Solid Waste Unit of the Hazardous Materials Waste Management Division on outreach to the agricultural sector on the environmental benefits of composting manure and mortalities versus use of current practices, i.e., burial and rendering.

E. Water Quality Information Systems Improvement Projects

The Division maintains several dispersed databases to support the compliance, enforcement and billing activities of the facilities-based Clean Water Act programs. All of the databases are outdated technology. Two are no longer supported by the department, and at least two require constant maintenance to prevent imminent failure. Some managers track essential program information in Excel spreadsheets because the existing databases do not include needed functionality.

Consistent with the department's strategic plan and the goals of the National Environmental Information Exchange Network, the Division has undertaken a major modernization effort. Investment in database improvements over the next three to five years is focused on providing a single solution, the Clean Water Information System, to replace legacy systems, preparing for EPA-required use of its modernized national NPDES database (ICIS), and creating the technical solution to conduct business via the Internet. Completion of phase one, data conversion, is scheduled for July 2007. Integration of enhancements and electronic data collection will follow.

F. Proposed Major Wastewater Treatment Plant Self-Certification Pilot Program

The Clean Water Act and EPA, via the Performance Partnership Agreement, require the Division to conduct annual inspections at all major dischargers. The Division has met this requirement for a number of years and has determined, over time, that many major dischargers do not need to be inspected annually to ensure compliance. Conversely, the number of minor dischargers in need of compliance assistance and possibly, compliance assurance activities from the Division is significant. The Division, while increasing its resources, is proposing to better focus its resources on dischargers with compliance problems by launching a pilot program to allow major dischargers with very good compliance track records to self-certify compliance in lieu of an annual inspection. The systems deemed eligible for self-certification would be inspected every three to five years instead of annually. The resources saved by not conducting these inspections will be devoted to improved follow-up with minor dischargers with compliance problems. Specific targets have been set to improve compliance rates at minor dischargers. The Division believes that this pilot program, if successful, could be permanently implemented and assist the Division to operate more efficiently, achieve greater compliance rates and increase environmental benefits. The Division is currently in the process of securing EPA approval to launch the pilot program, and hopes to do so before the end of 2006.

IV. CONCLUSION

The Division continues to plan and implement improvements to its critical monitoring and permitting programs. In the face of increasing expectations in these and other programs, the Division continues to explore innovative ways to improve its efficiency and performance so that the need for additional resources to meet program requirements is minimized while continuing to ensure that public health and the environment is protected.

Water Quality Forum Work Groups Status

Last Updated September 14, 2006

Work Group	Chair/Coordinator/ I. WQCC Contact	Next Meeting(s)	Status
1. Ammonia Standards and Implementation	Pat Nelson (720-286-5070)/Ravi Srivastava (970-498-0604)/ Jeff Bedingfield	No meeting planned.	Work group has developed information for dischargers and others regarding upcoming hearings to implement the new Basic Standards ammonia criteria into individual basin water quality standards and on issues regarding the implementation of new standards into discharge permits.
2. Membrane Treatment work group (formerly Reverse Osmosis Roundtable)	Dave Akers (x3591)/Laurie Rink (303-777-0188) (co-chairs)/ Robert Sakata	September 5, 2006 (First Tuesday of each month); 9:00 to 11:30; Farmers Reservoir and Irrigation Company (FRICO) offices.	Work group has a final draft mission statement and has convened two subcommittees (Regulatory and Technical) that are working to produce a proposal for use/disposal of reject water from membrane treatment systems.
3. Practical Quantitation Limits Guidance	Dave Akers (x3591)/ Paul Grundemann	September 21, 2006 1:00 p.m.	Commission informational hearing scheduled for October 10, 2006.
4. Nutrient Criteria	Joni Nuttle (x3533)/Lucia Machado (x3585) (co-chairs)/Mary Fabisiak (303-430-2400 x2187)/ Paul Grundemann	None currently scheduled.	Draft update of the 2002 Nutrient Criteria Development Plan circulated for comment; no comments received; data request letter will be circulated in early 2006; EPA/CU study of montane stream nutrient thresholds presented to work group in February; March meeting to discuss lake/reservoir criteria.
5. Sediment Guidance	Christy Pickens (x3584)/ C. Brian Nazareus	None currently scheduled; likely fall 2006.	Commission approved revised guidance in Administrative Action Hearing on May 9, 2005. Staff researching sediment criteria for sandy-bottom plains streams.

6. Aquatic Life Classification	Chris Theel (x3558)/Barb Horn (970-382-6667) Robert Sakata	September 26, 2006 9:00 a.m. CDPHE Carson Room	Continuing efforts to fill reference sites in plains and xeric bioregions; continuing efforts to work with DOW and EPA on fish index of biotic integrity (IBIs) and fish observed over expected (O/E) model for Colorado; continuing efforts to refine current aquatic life use classifications.
7. Temperature Standards	Sarah Johnson (x3609)/Aimee Konowal (x3530) (co-chairs)/Amy Woodis (303-286-3240)/ Brian Nazareus	September 6, 2006 1:00 p.m. CDPHE Carson Room September 20, 2006	WQCC approved Policy 06-1, Temperature Criteria Methodology. Proposal for January 2007 rulemaking hearing to be filed by September 15, 2006.
8. 303(d) Listing Methodology	Phil Hegeman (x3518)/ Brian Nazareus	September 7, 2006 1:00 p.m. CDPHE Sabin Room September 28, 2006 October 12, 2006 October 26, 2006 November 9, 2006 November 30, 2006 December 14, 2006	Work group has been re-activated to work on development of the Listing Methodology for the 2008 listing cycle. A May 15, 2007 WQCC Administrative Action Hearing has been scheduled to consider approval of the proposed methodology.
9. Discharge Permit Regulations	Dave Akers (x3591)/Janet Kieler (x3599) (co-chairs)/Carol Webb (970-221-6231)/ Paul Grundemann	October 24, 2006 2:00 p.m. CDPHE Cleere Room	Work group will discuss issues to be addressed in a February 12, 2007 Routine Review Informational Hearing regarding the Colorado Discharge Permit System Regulations.
10. Spill Reporting and Response	Dave Akers (x3591)/Dave Meyer (303-430-2400, x2376)/ Martha Rudolph	September 14, 2006 1:00 p.m. CDPHE HFD Training Room	Work group will discuss issues related to requirements for reporting of spills, and other related topics to be included in guidance/policy.