

Present: Wisner, Willis, Peck, Wiltzius, Napier, Engvall, Roach, Wick, Fleming, Jennings, Schillinger, Stussy, Rountry, Commissioner Beerbower, and Emerson.

Welcome Introductions and Housekeeping

Willis opened the meeting at 9:00 am. The agenda was revised by moving the Briggs topic to the top.

Follow up to Briggs Nursery

Willis shared with the group that a representative from Briggs Nursery addressed the group regarding the Porter operation last month¹. After the meeting adjourned a letter was submitted. The letter was prepared by Jill Lagergren, a neighbor, who has some concerns about the operation. The group felt their role was to become better informed regarding local water quality issues, but did believe they could facilitate extensive discussions at this time. In the future, this may change as the group evolves. The group asked Department of Agriculture to follow up with this letter.

Preview and Discuss the Draft Detailed Implementation Plan

- ❖ The document should include a glossary of terms.
- ❖ What is the next step after the DIP is submitted? *The schedule is tentative. The office calendar schedules the DIP for completion by October 31, 2003. The final draft will be completed by June 2003. To allow time for the Partnership to review and consider the DIP as part of the Watershed Management Plan. During the development, he (Rountry) will continue to work with the WQ Committee and will work to gather input from other stakeholders.*
- ❖ Why can't the public provide input before the final draft DIP is distributed in June? This creates the appearance that the work is completed by the time the draft DIP is released. *Ecology actively involved affected interests early and throughout the Bacteria TMDL development (described on pp. 30 and Appendices of the Grays Harbor/Chehalis Watershed Fecal Coliform Bacteria TMDL Submittal Report, December 2002, publication No. 01-10-025 WQ.)* She has real concerns with some of the implementation programs discussed in the SIS, document. It is her understanding that some of the programs cannot be implemented due to funding constraints. Wiltzius cited page 23, which describes the vision statement to achieve improved water quality. To him this describes a strategy for further exploration, which could occur during the DIP and if after further investigation the items described for implementation cannot be achieved, then it would be removed as an implementation strategy. This work is intended to be a framework towards prioritizing pollution issues in this area. *Rountry*

♦ The summarized responses to questions are shown in italics.

realizes that it will take some time to fully implement cleanup programs and achieve water quality standards throughout the watershed. The DIP provides a phased approach and schedule for implementation. There are many regulations in place that could resolve the issues on an enforcement level, without a TMDL. This TMDL effort is intended as an alternative method to coordinate efforts and to bring together resources to resolve the issues on a more cooperative rather than enforcement scale. The portion that discusses review by the Environmental Health Departments of septic systems may be accomplished by current methods. For instance, this could include a review of on-site systems when a landowner applies for a building permit, which is the current practice. This does not necessarily mean creating a new process, although the more comprehensive programs mentioned as options in the Bacteria TMDL were part of the "wish list" recommended by the Health Departments..

- ❖ Page 3 "This plan was developed by the Water Quality Committee..." Is this accurate? Will the group feel comfortable stating they developed the document or would the group feel more comfortable stating they reviewed the document. Members reminded each other that the Partnership did not direct the group to developed documents. They were directed to review and comment on items. *Rountry asked the group to postpone a decision on this item until after the document is further refined. Until that time, the group would like to see This plan was developed in collaboration with the Water Quality Committee of the CBP.*
- ❖ Page 5 include resident with anadromous fish resources.
- ❖ Page 5 – how can you include voluntary for NPS and involuntary for PS. The law seems clear that pollution cannot occur. Voluntary should be removed. The second sentence under The Approach section needs revision. One suggestion was to include an alternative describing possible solutions to address NPS such as funding to help investigate and resolve pollution issues. The sentence might be revised to read "It is based largely on the belief that implementing existing regulations is the best way to achieve lasting improvement in the basin." *The Watershed Planning process presents an opportunity to share direction and suggestions for improving water quality. If the group believes water quality management should be more equitable, then that thought should be further examined and included in the forthcoming plan(s).*
- ❖ Page 6- Implementation will be contingent upon funding. Does this statement apply to both nonpoint and point sources? *The group had lot's of discussion about this and acknowledged the differences in voluntary and non-voluntary implementation and enforcement discretion of the regulatory agencies. Point and non-point source implementation has been supported by financial assistance, with significantly more awarded consistently to point source facilities. Rountry will respond to this question in more detail later.*
- ❖ Page 7 – "Livestock will be excluded from direct access..." this needs to be clarified. Surface water should be included in the glossary. *Rountry has heard concerns that some people fear that the statement would cause mud puddles to become regulated. Of course that's not the intent. He is working with a staff person and cattleman to improve this section.*
- ❖ Page 8 – "... through management of reseeding, diverting clean water and ... " It seems as though this statement is too wordy and prescribes how the issues will

be resolved. One solution may not resolve each issue. The sentence should describe the objective to achieve, implementation through BMP's and then maybe include some examples. Change surface water to waters of the state, which includes a definition. *Rountry and Willis will work on this section and bring the changes back to the group.*

- ❖ Page 8 – the CAFO statement needs clarification as to when NPDES permits are required and the criteria for CAFO. Because not all dairies that are CAFO's are required to have an NPDES permit. *Rountry will consult technical staff for clarification.*
- ❖ Page 9 – please define and/or better describe, "sweep."
- ❖ Page 11- Define riparian vegetation. Include some discussion regarding other regulatory practices such as the shorelines, agriculture, and a description of forestry practices. *Emerson and Rountry will work on this section to clarify concerns.* Better describe sediment. Does this include gravel or just dirt and mud? Gravel transport, whether it's removal or further study, should be included somewhere in this report. Chad Stussy described a permit process available in the Chehalis for limited kinds of channel sediment management. The discussion on page 11 about the respective roles of natural and unnatural processes for management of channel width-to-depth ratios will be reviewed for clarification.
- ❖ The Stormwater section needs correction to reflect recent EPA changes that effect the cities. Describes changes and impacts. Identify or list some of the other stormwater management plans and projects from other facilities, beside cities, in the basin. The only TMDL requirements for stormwater in the Basin are to control bacteria discharges from Cosmopolis, Hoquiam, and Aberdeen. Additional federal stormwater requirements will probably cover other cities. Several of the other cities are already developing and implementing stormwater programs. The DIP can describe those programs even though they are not all required by the TMDL.
- ❖ Roles and Responsibilities – Conservation Districts do not administer CRP as a general role. Some Districts provide assistance. Change "...financial assistance to dairy operators and small farm landowners.... " *Wisner will work with Rountry to revise this section.*

The group did not complete review and discussion of this draft. The group should send additional comments to Rountry who will incorporate all changes for the next draft. The group will review the next version during the March meeting.

Jennings advised the group the Ecology is also developing a DIP for the Humptulips TMDL. Craig Graeber is the staff person and he could come talk to the group next month.

Water Quality Standards

Jennings is still working to get a response to the October questions.

Jennings announced that the draft standards are out for review. The group will discuss possible comments during the February meeting.

Water Quality Financial Assistance Program

Many of the TMDL implementation activities are eligible for financial assistance, including: County septic system programs, Government stormwater management, environmental monitoring, and public education/outreach. Ecology's annual financial assistance program opened Jan. 2 and deadline for applications is March 5th, 2003.

For next month, the group needs to consider how they want to recommend ranking of the water quality projects next month.

The meeting adjourned at about 12:00.