

Terry Willis, Doug Fricke, Brady Engvall, Ron Schillinger, Jim Fleming, Lee Napier, Curt Cook, Patrick Wiltzius, Kahle Jennings, and Charles Pitz were present.

Willis welcomed the group and asked each person to introduce themselves.

Coordinated Water Quality Monitoring Framework

Napier reminded the group that they wanted to further examine the Chehalis Watershed Monitoring Framework Plan, September 2003, developed by Tetra Tech. At the last meeting several members wanted to further examine Section 1, which described the Organization and Schedule. One concern was the organizational schematic and description found on pages 2, 3, and 4.

Jennings asked the group to consider an offer that he continues work on this document, with the Water Quality Committee, to further develop this Plan (QAPP). The group wondered how this would work for specific projects and how it differed from the guidance document prepared by Ecology.

Fleming asked if the protocols for the groundwater assessment were contained in the Chehalis QAPP? Jennings responded no, but that is the goal of his work plan for the next year. Pitz suggested the group consult Ecology's QAPP guidance document. Fleming commented that the TOC contains pages that are not included in the document.

Schillinger-Page 4, first bullet, is this reasonable? Jennings-This plan provides the structure that someone can follow through with, but there is no intent to obligate anyone, but instead lays out the road map to achieve acceptable water quality. This section also needs amending due to changes by the Partnership to the Watershed Management Plan.

Commissioner Beerbower shared past experiences when agencies offer to contribute technical support, but do not always carry out the plan developed by the local constituency. This appears to be just lip services. Jennings views this current proposal as an opportunity to lay out monitoring priorities (current and projected) in a locally accepted document.

Wiltzius asked if this would be a Partnership document or an Ecology document. He is concerned that if it is a Partnership document, how do you get their input while developing the document. Fleming suggested that it be a mixture that includes protocol for Ecology compliance and an acknowledgement from Ecology

that the document is approvable. This would relieve some of the burden that the Partnership would encounter when considering adoption. This approach would separate the Ecology's protocol from local direction. Jennings will explore this option.

Fricke expressed concern that when the group reviews documents, there is a tendency to find statements that they can't support as a policy. Napier reminded the group that the Partnership encountered the same problem with the Watershed Plan. Issue papers were prepared to discuss the "technical" merits of an issue, and then the Partnership struggled with how to merge the technical and policy sides of an issue. One solution is to keep them separate and labeled as such.

The group felt coordinating should not be a position, but an action.

Watershed Management Plan Next Steps

Napier asked for feedback regarding the Water Quality Actions contain in the draft plan, especially related to action item 2.14. Jennings added that the Ecology's current proposal is to transition from class base to use base standards. Most of the Chehalis is a class A water body, with two exceptions. The use base standards would describe the uses that a water body is expected to support. This would allow sections to have more rigorous criteria for areas that could support a particular use instead of a "blanket" classification. The use would be based on current use and potential use. The difficulty with 2.14 is that Ecology already recommended a use base standard. He believes the intent of this recommendation was more of a request for a Use Attainability Analysis. This analysis would examine the sections of the water body and then determine appropriate uses and criteria. Fleming believes this is a carry over from the review/comment period for proposed changes to the water quality standards. The Committee felt it was a valuable task, but should be revised. They suggested the following revision "The implications of the use base standards should be evaluated and the potential for conduction a Use Attainability Analysis should be explored.

Wiltzius asked if 2.12 is already mandated. How is it implemented locally? The group felt it should remain.

Schillinger was surprised that 2.17 was not in bold. He will mention this item during the Partnership meeting.

What does Good Water Initiative mean in recommendation 2.19?

Groundwater Assessment Program

Jennings pursued an opportunity through his agency to secure staff resources to conduct a pilot groundwater assessment. This pilot project would assess how the water flows and the background quality of that water. He felt it was consistent with the Partnership's work and so he submitted a proposal. Jennings is hopeful that the group can help them make contact with property owners for access, or directed to sources of information. Currently there is limited information regarding groundwater, which is supported by local plans.

Charles Pitz introduced the pilot program. One reason for the study is that the state does not currently have a systematic approach to monitoring the ambient background condition of groundwater. Ecology developed a QAPP and proposes an approach in the form of a pilot project to evaluate and refine technical approaches and future programs.

He went on to give details about the assessment. He stressed to the group that he describes the conditions. He does not assign blame or solutions for the condition(s).

Fleming offered access and/or information related to some of Centralia's WWTP program.

Pitz commented that the schedule changed from the schedule described in the October 2003 document. The current schedule includes the completion of a seepage run in October. Installation of Piezometer network around May 2004. Conduct a well inventory May –October 2004. Plan and install monitoring wells in April 2004. The final assessment report describing the groundwater system is due June 2005.

The monitoring wells developed for this project, could be turned over to a local group for management, with the understanding that Ecology would periodically monitor in the future.

He concluded with a request for assistance in the following areas:

- Help gaining access to existing wells for monitoring.
- Help gaining permission from public landowners to install permanent monitoring wells.
- Local knowledge/data about the groundwater system.
- Opinions on good locations for permanent monitoring wells.
- A local agency interested in taking over long-term ownership of the monitoring wells we install.

The group would like Pitz to share this project with the Partnership in January.

Closing comments

Jennings has the opportunity to request agency assistance, in the form of staff time, to help with Chehalis Basin issues. Two options that he would like the group to consider is flow monitoring and the QAPP. Fleming suggested temperature monitoring.

For next meeting the group will review the Water Quality Coordinated Plan. Fricke would like to further discuss the Partnership's position regarding policy and technical components.

The next meeting is January 8, 2004.