PROPOSED RULE MAKING



CR-102 (July 2022) (Implements RCW 34.05.320)

Do NOT use for expedited rule making

CODE REVISER USE ONLY

OFFICE OF THE CODE REVISER STATE OF WASHINGTON FILED

DATE: July 18, 2023

TIME: 8:05 AM

WSR 23-15-085

Agency: Department of	of Ecology A	O # 22-06i		
⊠ Original Notice				
☐ Supplemental Noti	ce to WSR _			
☐ Continuance of W	SR			
⊠ Preproposal Stateı	ment of Inqu	iry was filed as WSR 22-18-039	; or	
☐ Expedited Rule Ma	kingPropo	sed notice was filed as WSR	; or	
\square Proposal is exemp	t under RCV	N 34.05.310(4) or 34.05.330(1); oı	•	
\square Proposal is exemp				
This rulemaking would Washington. We propose adding a r	make chang new section:	•		ity Standards for Surface Waters of the State of
We propose amendme WAC 173-201A-020 WAC 173-201A-330	nts to the fol Definitions Tier III – Pr	lowing sections: otection of Outstanding Resource	Waters	s by water resource inventory area (WRIA). nventory area (WRIA) – WRIAs 4 and 26
or more information o	n this rulema	aking, please visit: https://ecology.v	va.gov/R	,
Date:	Time:	Location: (be specific)	Comme	nt:
Thursday, Sept. 7, 2023	5:30 p.m.	Webinar – Join the Webinar	the hear We are online m	ation, question and answer session followed by ring. holding this hearing via webinar. This is an neeting that you can attend from any computer ternet access.

			The presentation will focus on the proposed Soap Lake ORW designation.
Wednesday, Sept. 20	·	Bavarian Lodge Hintertux Room 810 US Hwy 2	Presentation, question and answer session followed by the hearing.
		Leavenworth, WA 98826	The presentation will focus on the proposed Napeequa River ORW designation.

Date of intended adoption: December 13, 2023 (Note: This is NOT the effective date)

Submit written comments to: Assistance for persons with disabilities:

Name: Marla Koberstein Contact Ecology ADA Coordinator

Address: Send US mail to:

Department of Ecology

Phone: 360-407-6831

PO Box 47600, Olympia, WA 98504-7600

Send parcel delivery services to:

Department of Ecology
Water Quality Program

Water Quality Program

Email: Submit comments by mail, online, or at the hearing(s). Fax: N/A

Fax: N/A TTY: People with speech disability may call TTY at 877-833-

6341. People with impaired hearing may call Washington

Relay Service at 711
Other: Online at Email: marla.koberstein@ecy.wa.gov

https://ws.ecology.commentinput.com/?id=sUiNmjf5V

By (date) September 27, 2023 Other: N/A

By (date) Thursday, Aug. 31, 2023____

Purpose of the proposal and its anticipated effects, including any changes in existing rules:

We propose designating four waterbodies as Tier III(A) or Tier III(B) outstanding resource waters (ORWs). Outstanding resource waters are identified as having exceptional water quality, ecological and recreational values, or unique attributes that distinguish them among state waterbodies and warrant special protection. An ORW has the highest level of protection assigned to a waterbody under the Tier III Antidegradation rule in our water quality standards.

We propose designating the following waterbodies as Tier III(A) ORWs:

- Portions of the Napeequa River and tributaries (Chelan County)
- Upper watershed of the Green River and tributaries (Skamania County)
- Upper watershed of the Cascade River and tributaries (Skagit County)

A Tier III(A) designation is the highest level of protection. Proposed activities that would result in new or expanded sources of pollution in an ORW are prohibited, except in limited cases.

We propose designating the following waterbody as a Tier III(B) ORW:

Soap Lake (Grant County)

Any new or expanded source of pollution to a Tier III(B) ORW cannot cause a measurable change in water quality. This level of protection would place extra requirements on new or expanded point source discharges to ensure pollution from wastewater is kept to a minimum. For nonpoint sources, this designation would require that certain Best Management Practices are used to limit pollution from runoff to below measurable levels where total elimination is not feasible.

We also propose changes to WAC 173-201A-330 to revise our review process. The rule currently states that Ecology will consult with federally recognized tribes in the geographic vicinity of the water (WAC 173-201A-330(3)(a)). We have revised this to state that the public review process will include "consultation with tribes." We will not limit tribal consultation only to those within the geographic vicinity of the proposed waterbody, nor will we limit consultation to only those tribes that are federally recognized.

Other proposed changes to Chapter 173-201A WAC are as follows:

- WAC 173-201A-020 to add a definition for outstanding resource waters
- WAC 173-201A-602 to note where an ORW exists on waterbodies with specified use designations within Table 602

Reasons supporting proposal:

This rule proposal is in response to nominations we received in 2021. On April 2, 2021, the Soap Lake Conservancy and the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation submitted a nomination to designate Soap Lake as a Tier III(B) outstanding

resource water. On June 24, 2021, the Pew Charitable Trusts, American Rivers, Cascade Forest Conservancy, Wild Salmon Center, American Whitewater, Washington Wild, and Trout Unlimited submitted a nomination to designate portions of the three rivers as Tier III(A) outstanding resource waters.

The goal of designating waterbodies as ORWs is to protect and maintain our state's highest quality and most valued waters from actions that would lower water quality.

For each nomination, we reviewed the waterbody to determine if it met at least one of the eligibility requirements under WAC 173-201A-330(1). During this review, which must be completed within 60 days of when we receive the nomination, we contacted tribes in the geographic vicinity of each nominated waterbody, as well as local jurisdictions and other stakeholders, to notify them of the nominations. We determined that each waterbody submitted for consideration met one or more of the eligibility criteria.

We informed the public of our intent to conduct a public review of the nominations during the 2021 Triennial Review process, and we received a comment letter on behalf of over 50 organizations in support of formally reviewing the ORW nominations. During the rule development phase, we gathered more information on each nominated waterbody and conducted additional tribal and stakeholder outreach.

We are now holding a formal public review of each nomination before we consider adopting an ORW designation. After considering public comments and weighing public support for each proposed ORW, we will make a final decision on whether each waterbody should be adopted into chapter 173-201A WAC as an outstanding resource water, and whether that waterbody should be given Tier III(A) or Tier III(B) protection, as described under 173-201A-330(5).

Washington has yet to designate any waterbody as an ORW. If we adopt an ORW designation for any of the proposed waterbodies, it will be the first time Washington will assign this highest level of protection for a waterbody under our antidegradation section of the water quality standards.

Statutory authority for adoption: Water Pollution Control, Chapter 90.48 RCW, which provides Ecology the authority to revise the surface water quality standards. The federal Antidegradation Policy and Implementation Methods at 40 CFR 131 12 require states to adopt an antidegradation policy that includes protection of outstanding resource waters

131.12 require states to adopt an antidegradation policy that includes protection of outstanding resource waters.				
Statute being implemented: Chapter 90.48 RCW, Water Pollution Control t				
ls rule necessary	because of a:			
Federal Lav	w?		☐ Yes ☐ No	
Federal Co	urt Decision?		☐ Yes ⊠ No	
State Court	Decision?		□ Yes ⊠ No	
If yes, CITATION:				
matters: For more	e information, see the Te	s, if any, as to statutory language, implemen schnical Support Document, Ecology Publication liminary Regulatory Analyses, Ecology Publicat	n XX, the draft Rule Implementation	
Type of proponent: □ Private □ Public ⊠ Governmental Name of proponent: (person or organization) Department of Ecology				
Name of agency personnel responsible for:				
	Name	Office Location	Phone	
Drafting:	Marla Koberstein	Headquarters - Lacey	360-628-6376	
Implementation:	Chad Brown	Headquarters – Lacey	360-522-6441	
Enforcement:	Vincent McGowan	Headquarters - Lacey	360-407-6405	
Is a school distri If yes, insert state	•	ent required under RCW 28A.305.135?	□ Yes ⊠ No	
The public may obtain a copy of the school district fiscal impact statement by contacting:				

Name: N/A

Address: N/A Phone: N/A Fax: N/A TTY: N/A Email: N/A Other: N/A

ls a co	st-be	nefit analysis required under RCW 34.05.328?		
\boxtimes		A preliminary cost-benefit analysis may be obtain	ed by c	ontacting:
		me: Marla Koberstein		
	Ad	dress: Department of Ecology		
		Water Quality Program PO Box 47600		
		Olympia, WA 98504-7600		
	Ph	one: 360-628-6376		
		x: N/A		
		Y: People with speech disability may call TTY at 8	377-833	-6341. People with impaired hearing may call
		ashington Relay Service at 711 nail: swqs@ecy.wa.gov		
		ner:		
		Please explain:		
		Fairness Act and Small Business Economic Im	nact S	tatement
		overnor's Office for Regulatory Innovation and Ass		
		ation of exemptions:		
This ru	le pro	posal, or portions of the proposal, may be exemp		
			s, consu	ult the exemption guide published by ORIA. Please
		x for any applicable exemption(s):		
		proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt up		
		ely to conform and/or comply with federal statute o		ations. Please cite the specific federal statute or escribe the consequences to the state if the rule is not
adopte		is rule is being adopted to comorn or comply with	, and di	escribe the consequences to the state if the rule is not
		description:		
 □ Thi	s rule	proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt be	ecause	the agency has completed the pilot rule process
		CW 34.05.313 before filing the notice of this propo		
☐ This	s rule	proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt up	nder the	e provisions of RCW 15.65.570(2) because it was
adopte	d by a	a referendum.		
☐ This	s rule	proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt un	nder <u>R(</u>	CW 19.85.025(3). Check all that apply:
ı		RCW 34.05.310 (4)(b)		RCW 34.05.310 (4)(e)
		(Internal government operations)		(Dictated by statute)
1		RCW 34.05.310 (4)(c)		RCW 34.05.310 (4)(f)
		(Incorporation by reference)		(Set or adjust fees)
1		RCW 34.05.310 (4)(d)		RCW 34.05.310 (4)(g)
		(Correct or clarify language)		((i) Relating to agency hearings; or (ii) process
				requirements for applying to an agency for a license or permit)
⊠ This	s rule	proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt un	nder <u>R</u> (CW 19.85.025(4) (does not affect small businesses).
☐ This	s rule	proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt un	nder R0	CW
Explan	ation	of how the above exemption(s) applies to the prop	osed ru	ule:
				s (see the Preliminary Regulatory Analyses for this
				ny necessary changes in compliance behavior by any
				rming additional analyses under RCW 19.85.025(4), an agency is able to demonstrate that the proposed rule
				Iments do not meet the criteria for the requirement to
				9.85.030(1)(a), which states, "In the adoption of a rule
			ısiness	economic impact statement: (i) If the proposed rule will
impose	more	e than minor costs on businesses in an industry."		
We exa	amine	d the set of landowners around the proposed ORV	N-desig	gnated waterbodies, including nine business locations.
We als	o ider	ntified a special permit holder for annual hydroplan	ne races	s on Soap Lake. As these businesses have not been
		affecting current qualities of the proposed ORWs,		
				pansion or development to be regulated by baseline laws
				ne proposed rule amendments. The amendments would cases of unexpected developments or changes to the
regulat			gory iir (sacco of anoxposica acvelopments of changes to the

2) Scope of exemptions: Check one.					
The rule proposal is fully exempt (<i>skip section 3</i>). Exemptions identified above apply to all portions of the rule proposal. ☐ The rule proposal is partially exempt (<i>complete section 3</i>). The exemptions identified above apply to portions of the rule proposal, but less than the entire rule proposal. Provide details here (consider using this template from ORIA): ☐ The rule proposal is not exempt (<i>complete section 3</i>). No exemptions were identified above.					
3) Small business economic impact statement: Complete this section if any portion is not exempt.					
f any portion of the proposed rule is not exempt , does it import businesses?	ose more-than-minor costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2))				
□ No Briefly summarize the agency's minor cost analysis and how the agency determined the proposed rule did not impose more-than-minor costs					
Yes Calculations show the rule proposal likely imposes more-than-minor cost to businesses and a small business economic impact statement is required. Insert the required small business economic impact statement here:					
The public may obtain a copy of the small business economic impact statement or the detailed cost calculations by contacting:					
Name: Address: Phone:					
Fax: N/A TTY: People with speech disability may call TTY at 877-833-6341. People with impaired hearing may call Washington Relay Service at 711. To request ADA accommodation for disabilities, or printed materials in a format for the visually impaired, call Ecology at 360-407-7668 or visit https://ecology.wa.gov/accessibility . Email: Other:					
Date: July 18, 2023	Signature:				
Name: Heather Bartlett	16-01 DR Hoff				
Fitle: Deputy Director	Hather Clewicy				