

Present: Terry Willis, Ron Wisner, Ron Schillinger, Lee Napier, Brady Engvall, Dave Rountry, Kahle Jennings, Lee Daneker, Ann Wicks, and Margaret Rader were present.

Terry Willis welcomed the group and asked for changes to the agenda. The agenda did not change.

Presentation regarding the EPA/FDA Bacteriological Indicators

Lee Daneker's presentation was intended to provide additional background, at the Committee's request, regarding the Department of Ecology's proposal to use new indicators for water quality monitoring to protect humans from acute gastrointestinal illness. The Ecology proposal is to use *E. coli* for freshwater recreation and enterococci for marine water recreations. The Ecology proposal would retain the current indicator (fecal coliform) for protection against illness from shellfish consumption. If it were to be adopted, this proposal would require monitoring for more than one indicator in the same water body.

When the new indicator proposal was discussed at the Partnership, a number of members stated that monitoring for more than one indicator didn't seem to make sense. Lee volunteered to try to get the group some more information, and the Water Quality Committee invited him to share what he learned.

He distributed a discussion draft memo dated June 11, 2003 that summarized his findings for the group. This document covered the background of the indicators, discussed the indicators, summarized relevant legislation, and discussed what issues must be addressed before the indicators could be changed to avoid double monitoring. He said that EPA recommended the proposed changes in indicators because they had good epidemiological data indicating that *E.* and enterococci were better predictors of disease from swallowing small amounts of water while swimming than the current indicator (fecal coliform). EPA scientists believe that enterococci would also be a better indicator for shellfish consumption, but additional study would be required before EPA and FDA could propose such a change. If Congress appropriated monies to conduct the necessary studies it probably would be 5 to 10 years before the federal and state government could adopt one indicator for both recreation and shellfish consumption.

Committee members expressed the following concerns: The two standards may give the public a false sense of security regarding clean water -- a marine water body might test positively for clean water using the enterococci indicator, while fecal coliform bacteria would be above the shellfish limit. The oyster growers find two standards at the same time troubling for their industry. This is complicated by the fact that the oyster growers do not control their sampling. How would a possible future change to enterococci for shellfish affect their ability to export oysters? How did EPA consider the shellfish industry when it developed its recommendations for the new indicators? Would POTW's and others be affected by the changes in water quality monitoring standards? How will this affect their sampling workload and costs? How much better are the proposed new

indicators? Are the advantages of adopting them sufficient to justify the costs of making the change?

The following information came out in the discussion: Currently Ecology is reviewing the comments submitted in response to its indicators proposal. Based in this review, they may adopt the new indicators as proposed, make changes, or retain the current system. If the new indicators were adopted, Ecology would monitor fresh water for two or three indicators for at least a period of time to calibrate the relationship between the indicators and to make sure that fresh waters were not carrying fecal coliform levels that would harm shellfish operations. Kahle Jennings pointed out that *E. Coli* is a type of fecal coliform, and that by monitoring *E. Coli* we would be monitoring the most significant form of fecal coliform, rather than monitoring all forms. Kahle said that it would be analogous to protecting humans from bear attacks by monitoring only Grizzly Bears, which are most prone to attack humans, rather than all bears.

Daneker will try to gather more information to address the questions and issues that arose and will report back to the group either in person or by revising and sending his draft memo. If people have comments or concerns about the draft discussion memo, please provide them to Daneker by July 11, 2003 (note –this date is later than Lee requested at the June 12 meeting) at 206-553-1380 or daneker.lee@epa.gov.

Humptulips Temperature TMDL

Rountry shared that Graber could not attend today, due to conflicting meetings. Graber did distribute the draft document for review and comments.

DIP for the Chehalis/Grays Harbor TMDL

Rountry reported that the most recent version, June 6, 2003, has been significantly revised. The Committee received hard copies. The following bullets summarize some of their comments.

- What does additional water withdrawals, on page 38, an excerpt from the Chehalis Temperature TMDL, mean? Jennings responded that the model and the statement used existing flows in the river and that those flows need to be protected. The Committee would like to see this clarified.
 - Briggs Nursery submitted a letter opposing any language relating to restrictions of water usage from wells. Jennings clarified that in this particular case, the language relates to land in the Upper Chehalis. The Briggs operation is in the Porter area and outside of the area mentioned in the text.
- Dairy nutrients and confined animals (CAFO and AFO) regulations were transferred to the Department of Agriculture through recent legislation. The DIP (Pollution Sources and Organizational Responsibilities section) should mention/discuss this change.
- The Committee discussed if the existing programs, described in the DIP, should be evaluated and constructive comments provided to suggest program improvements. A suggestion was made to elaborate on the roles and

responsibilities for the programs listed on the bottom of page 2 and top of page 3 by describing how the programs could be enhanced.

Rounry needs comments for this draft by June 20. This would allow him time to incorporate the changes into a final draft for distribution during the June 27 meeting of the CBP. An electronic version, with highlights to show the significantly changed areas, would be sent to the entire Water Quality distribution list.

Briggs Nursery-response to citizen

Willis will draft a letter.

Closing Comments and Agenda Items for Future Meetings

The Committee expects something from the STC such as the water quality monitoring plan.

The meeting adjourned. The next meeting is July 10, 2003.