

Dave Rountry, Holly Fuller, Doug Fricke, Chad Stussy, Kahle Jennings, Commissioner Beerbower, Terry Willis, Ron Wisner, Patrick Wiltzius, J. Roach, Dave Jarzynka, Brian Peck, Brady Engvall, Gary Waltenburg, Curt Crites, and Lee Napier were present.

### **Welcome, Introductions, and House Keeping**

Willis opened the meeting and welcomed the group. She asked the group for comments regarding the meeting minutes. Fricke requested that the minutes include a list of attendees in the meeting summary. The minutes were accepted as written with the addition of meeting attendees.

Willis reviewed the action items from the last meeting:

- ❖ The Department of Agriculture agreed to draft a bullet for inclusion in the roles section. That was provided and incorporated in the operating procedures manual. Fricke asked that a copy of the revised committee description and role document be sent out electronically.
- ❖ The group directed staff to draft a letter for consideration by the Partnership regarding the EPA temperature standards. The Partnership agreed to send the letter. A copy was sent electronically to all the contacts on the water quality issue distribution list (same list for all committee announcements).
- ❖ A request was made to contact representatives from Briggs Nursery regarding a presentation. Briggs will present later in the meeting.

### **TMDL 102**

Jennings handed out two handouts for his presentation (TMDL Process, TMDL 102 Presentation 12-12-02, Status of TMDLS in the Chehalis Basin, and Key Concepts). He reviewed this information for the group.

Comments and questions asked during the presentation<sup>♦</sup>:

- ❖ How do you determine your sampling set/schedule? *It really depends on the violation. For example, dissolved oxygen's critical period is during low flows, so the sampling would occur during that "critical" time and conditions when the environment needs the most protection. The*

---

<sup>♦</sup> The summarized responses to questions are shown in italics.

regulations require data submissions during the most sensitive/critical time period.

- ❖ How many 303d-listings in the Chehalis Basin? *The exact number was unknown, but will be provided to the group. Under the original TMDL process, a waterbody can be listed as impaired, complete the TMDL study, and would be removed from the list once EPA approved the TMDL study. That process has since changed to reflect five levels of a listing status. Ranging from not listed because the water is clean, to listed but under cleanup through an alternative to a TMDL, to cleanup underway according to a TMDL detailed implementation plan.*

<u>Chehalis TMDL's</u> <u>(listed segments)</u>	<u>WRIA 23</u>	<u>WRIA 22</u>
Dissolved Oxygen-	24	none
Fecal Coliform Bacteria	19	3, plus 24 found during TMDLstudy
Temperature	19	6
Pesticides		5
Phosphorous	1	
PCB's	2	
pH	2	

- ❖ A question was about the determining the source(s) for fecal coliform exceedance areas? *The technology (DNA sampling) is under development, but at this point is not implemented due to financial and technology deficits. There is a recommendation to change the bacteria standard from fecal coliform to EPA's recommendations of E. coli for fresh water and Enterococci for marine water. In the meantime, fecal coliform bacteria will continue to serve as the standard indicator for marine waters, because the federal Shellfish Protection Standards still require FCB for a food safety threshold.*
- ❖ If a citizen calls about an impaired system is the data that determined the impairment available? *The data for the impairment comes from either regular ambient monitoring program or information from other entities that are monitoring the systems. The citizen can be told the type of impairment (fecal coliform or temperature), but they cannot be told the source (human vs wildlife).*
- ❖ *In the Chehalis Basin, there are currently five TMDLS (Upper Chehalis DO, Black River FCB, Upper Chehalis Temperature, Humptulips Temperature, and Grays Harbor/Chehalis FCB). All except the Grays Harbor/Chehalis FCB have been submitted and approved by EPA.*

- ❖ Where does the streambed condition(s) (such as gravel movement) come into play in this process? There are several examples of projects that manipulated the streambed and achieved positive results for fish returns and it seems appropriate for the TMDL process to include something to address this issue. *It is the opinion of some technical staff that natural conditions, such as system migration, is a natural process/natural hydrology and should be allowed. The watershed planning processes are an opportunity to further discuss and recommend changes to the current methods.*

### **Preview and Discuss Draft Implementation Plan (DIP)**

Rounry explained that the DIP's are required to be developed within a year of acceptance from EPA for the TMDLs. The DIP's build on the Summary Implementation Strategy (SIS). He would like to see the DIP become a component of the watershed plan. To accomplish that objective, he will work with the committee to develop a DIP that meets the group's goals. He distributed a preliminary draft DIP which is about 2/3 complete.

Comments and questions asked during the presentation<sup>♦</sup>:

- ❖ Are the public/Partnership's comments and recommendations reflected in this document? *The Grays Harbor/Chehalis TMDL process provided feedback that is inclusive and influenced how we are approaching development of the DIP. The final SIS reflects many comments received during as well as after the formal public comment process. The "Responsiveness Summary" section of the SIS explains how comments have been reconciled. The SIS revisions especially answer public questions about how the cleanup process works. A key clarification describes that the SIS is meant to be a work-in-progress. The DIP is the next step in the TMDL process. It follows the development and submission of the SIS to EPA. Once the SIS is accepted by EPA, then a DIP is developed.*
- ❖ During the public hearings, public comments are stated, but where are they heard? The documents do not seem to reflect public comment/sentiment. This is very frustrating to the public.
- ❖ There was concern about pages 7 and 8 (Pollution Sources and Organizational Responsibilities section) that excluded livestock from direct access to surface water and dairy farm planning certification of the DNMP. The DIP needs to more clearly state the objective, then the statements might be more acceptable. *If the group can provide feedback as to how*

---

<sup>♦</sup> The summarized responses to questions are shown in italics.

*they work with entities to address the questionable statements, then that can be included in the document.*

- ❖ *Staff understands that prescribed actions for clean up need to be described in the DIP and future associated documents.*
- ❖ *At what point does the natural background conditions get consideration? The water quality regulations state that if natural sources create a condition where the standards are not met, then human sources cannot further impair the system.*
- ❖ The DIP needs to include a component that describes current efforts and coordination of resources. For example, the water quality sampling by the Conservation District and salmon recovery habitat restoration projects.

The group will review and send comments to Rountry. He will send out a copy electronically and people may send back their edits, (**please use the edit tool**), to Rountry. The document shows areas where he needs comments in brackets []. He asked the implementing entities to provide information to better describe their activities that assist with clean up. He will incorporate that description into the DIP. He handed out an example for the group.

**During the January 9 meeting**, the group will spend a majority of the time reviewing and discussing the DIP.

## **Briggs Nursery**

Dave Jarzynka introduced the group to the Briggs Nursery and the operation. They are the largest nursery operation in the state. The operation, and management, will move from Olympia to the Porter site, which currently employs about 50 people. The Porter site was purchased in 1990. The appeal of the site included more conducive to agriculture practices, more light, and the topography of the site allows the irrigation to drain to designated areas and away from the Chehalis River.

The nursery operation does require compliance with regulatory agencies. The agencies prescribe the applications such as treatment of weeds. Generally, Briggs application is less than the maximum allowed. Concerning the application of fertilizer, Briggs incorporated the fertilizer into the soil. Weekly monitoring of the stock helps to identify those plants that are deficient are treated or eliminated from the stock.

What is the source for the irrigation water? *Well water is used and there are secured water rights for the use. The operation does not require a transfer of rights from the Olympia site.*

Does the nursery have an operation plan? *The nursery industry is highly regulated. Any time chemicals are applied, the operation must log the use and that log is reported to the Department of Agriculture.*

What is the collection pond for irrigation and site drainage? *The surface water collects in a former gravel pit pond.*

Is the water sampled at the pond? *No, the sampling is done at another location on the site.*

After a majority of those present left, an "issues" paper prepared by Jill Lagergren was distributed. The questions were:

1. How can we avoid underground water or aquifer contamination by chemicals when there is no topsoil to percolate the chemicals as they mix with rainwater, or runoff in a spill?
2. What reassurance do we have that the Porter site will not become a future toxic site.

The document was provided to Jarzynka.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15. The next meeting is January 9, 2003 at the Forestry Building.