

Lee Napier, Lee Daneker, Charles Pitz, John Mudge, Kernen Lien, Terry Willis, Chad Stussy, Bruce Jones, Steve Craig, Kahle Jennings, Brian Peck, Chanele Holbrook Shaw, and Mark Swartout were present.

Groundwater Assessment-WMP Action 2

Lee Napier introduced Charles Pitz, Department of Ecology. Through his program at Ecology, he can provide some technical insight, in the form of staff support, regarding development of a scope of work to implement WMP Action 2 AND Interim Milestone 1.2 from the Draft DIP.

Charles explained to the group that he was willing to advise the group as they develop the scope of work. He asked the group to consider developing a focused goal for this project. He cautioned the group that he was not fluent with the regulatory side of water resource management. He advised the group to keep in mind the objectives. Possible objectives might include:

- Is the group looking to develop tools to manage water resource for a basin or answer localized questions?
- Or is the group somewhere in between at a subbasin level?

He encouraged the group to think about managing resources at a basin scale, but cautioned that is an enormous task.

Charles requested copies of the Level II work. Napier will get him copies of the Level I Assessment and Water Quantity Balance. He will use this as the foundation for his efforts to work with the group. Mark suggested he might also be interested in the prioritization work described in the Watershed Management Supplement.

Steve suggested taking the bibliography work and turning that knowledge into a GIS project that highlights the Basin and data sources. Bruce suggested a GIS data layer inventory would also be helpful for Charles.

Mark pointed out that maybe we could tweak Interim Milestones (IM) to describe how Charles could help the group. Napier directed the group to IM 1.2 and the tasks which in her opinion highlight what this projects will likely produce

The group discuss possible questions/goals to answer through this effort:

- Where can our communities grow?
- Where is the water supply in the Basin?
- We need to understand how the groundwater relates.

The group agreed that we need to know where work has occurred and a need to prioritize where you need to gather data. Charles stressed again that if you want to manage water resources it needs to be at a basin level.

A short term objective might be answering the question if the basin closure is still applicable. Should Ecology reconsider the need to keep the basin closed?

Charles asked the group to read the Report of the Technical Advisory Committee on the Capture of Surface Water by Wells, August 1998, prepared by Ross & Associates Environmental Consulting Ltd.

www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wr/plan/images/pdf/cap-rept.pdf He felt this report would be helpful to understanding and developing goals and objectives for the proposed scope of work.

To initiate this project and work towards the ability to model, the group would need:

- A basin wide groundwater monitoring network component and/or data set. That data should be from similar points in time.
- Determine the use and location, which will be the hardest information to gather.
- Seepage evaluation. Field measurements of the surface water budget. Identify the first cut for primary locations for interaction between surface and ground water. This should be one of the easier data sets to gather.

In addition STC members will think about a problem statement (Charles' homework assignment may provide insight), what resources they can bring to the table and when to meet (after the STC meetings).

Lee Daneker reviewed all the components of his final report which will be out next week and an update from Phase I.

- Initially he did not hear back from many of the 38 systems contacted. He did contact some directly which resulted in a response from about half.
- He still needs to change the format based on input from STC in August. He did not make the changes sooner because the STC provided mixed input last month.
- On the Table, Deliverable 1, the water rights, last year surplus(deficit), and planning period columns were suggested as columns that should be near the front.
- At the CBP meeting, someone asked if he had reversed the numbers for Elma. He double checked and confirmed that he had not reversed the numbers. He reviewed his notes and found that they had corrected some lost water problems.

Regarding his Phase II work, at the August STC meeting he asked for feedback from group. He did not hear anything between meetings. He did receive a comment from agriculture, at the CBP meeting, regarding the water conservation and the use it or lose it scenario. He will revise the options to incorporate this comment.

Kahle mentioned a recent lawsuit that challenges the change in definition for municipal water purveyor. The outcome of this lawsuit may impact the work of the Partnership. He will send out the notice he received.

DIP

The group discussed the final draft DIP, which is scheduled for consideration by the CBP on September 23rd.

Bruce was not happy with the final product because most of the work assignments went to the STC. Terry was encouraged because a lot of new people attended the meetings. Napier was somewhat discouraged when more people did not step up to take on implementation assignments.

Bruce distributed a letter from QIN to the CBP. QIN feels the CBP missed the key issue to manage water resources. In developing the DIP the CBP missed the objectives. The group discussed the need for the Partnership to become more involved in the discussions leading to the decisions. The group discussed some options such as longer meetings, same length but limit the agenda items and better preparing them for a discussion. The group felt focused agenda, with time for discussion and a 2-2.5 hour limit would be the best approach.

Steve asked Bruce to work with the Chehalis Tribe to determine if they have similar concerns. If they do, could they put together suggested changes to the DIP? Bruce will start by working with his staff to provide additional comments.

Mark reminded the group about the process the STC developed to prioritize our objectives and the workshop approach we choose to follow to fill in the gaps.

CBP Agenda for September

The group again discussed the need to improve the CBP agenda by spending more time helping Lee to draft the agenda.

Discussion/action for the September meeting:

- Ask Lee Daneker to attend the meeting and provide a similar presentation to the CBP.
- The STC will not make a recommendation regarding the DIP. Mark asked members to provide input during Napier presentation. He will not be able to attend.
- Should the CBP consider extending the comment period to allow for QIN to submit comments? Napier will distribute an electronic copy of their correspondence.