

Present: Wiltzius, Willis, Engvall, Jennings, Napier, Holbrook, Beerbower, Rounry, Amrine, and McKee.

Welcome, Introductions, and Housekeeping

Willis introduced Kim McKee, Department of Ecology's Section Supervisor for this area for the Water Quality Funding Program.

The agenda was adjusted to delete discussion concerning the Humptulips DIP. This item will be reviewed during the April meeting. The target date for submittal is June 30, 2003. The group would like to receive a copy via e-mail as soon as it can be released.

Water Quality Funding Program Local Review

Jennings reported that the submittal date was March 5. To his knowledge, applications were received from Grays Harbor and Lewis Conservation Districts, Cities of Centralia and Chehalis.

The applications receive bonus points if the projects are reviewed and rated locally. In the past, the Partnership supported a local review process. Past reviews included project sponsors reviewing projects in the other WRIA or the Committee reviewed the projects regardless of their location. The Partnership directed the Committee to develop a local process for this year. The ranking must be completed during April. Willis participated in the process last year and believes that last year's process worked. The group will evaluate the proposals during the next meeting, which is April 10.

Check the Ecology's website for the posting of project submittals.

Draft Detailed Implementation Plan for the Humptulips

Discussion postponed until April 10. The group will receive an electronic copy of the report before the meeting.

Continued Discussion Regarding the DIP for the DO, Temperature and Fecal Coliform Bacteria in the Chehalis/Grays Harbor Watershed

Rounry reported that he has worked to incorporate past comments. He still needs more information from the implementing organizations regarding descriptions of their activities and timelines. He received text from Lewis

Conservation District after distributing the last version. He shared his schedule of upcoming meetings with other stakeholders who will provide information for the DIP. A suggestion was made to contact Thurston CD and invite them to participate in the meetings.

The following represent comments during the meeting:

Page 9- Onsite septic. How will each county be represented in this document? Will there be a broad statement or individual prescriptions for each county? Some entities received grant funding that would help to develop and run implementation programs. The statements about which entities received this type of funding is only informational. The state surveys for protection of the shellfish. That survey is then passed on to the local health departments for further investigation and compliance. This approach does not seem to work. There is some funding available, such as the oyster grower's Washington Reserve Fund. Engvall suggested the process include a prioritization for the work, beginning with the areas that provide the largest impact such as the harbor. Then work with the entities to find funding to help with implementation. Jennings felt this process would identify projects that would lead to exploration of ways to fund/accomplish the work. This issue is a definite obstacle for the DIP.

Wiltzius would like a summary section of what the entities are pursuing to improve water quality. This would help with readability of the document. Rounry agreed that a table needed to be developed. He handed out a sample table to the group. The DIP needs to articulate reasonable assurance that the implementation will be carried out.

Page 10 paragraph before Section 5. Is the statement correct that West Farms is planting poplars?

Page 11 reference to dredging at the bottom of the page. The use of dredging is misleading. Willis requested that dredging be removed from the document. Rounry responded that the text was background information for the reader/reviewing group and not intended to be part of the final document. The document describes the desired conditions, but including dredging discounts what the public supports due to the implications of that term. The group would like to see future discussion on this issue, as noted in the brackets.

Please double check the CAFO section (page 8) for accuracy. Willis thought the numbers may need double checking and some of the text.

Beginning on page 12-stormwater section. How does a city address fecal coliform bacteria when the stormwater system includes impoundments? Is it

through comprehensive plans and/or critical areas ordinances? Rountry cited the City of Cosmopolis as a good example of how it can be accomplished (see page 12). The question was asked and Rountry needs help addressing this comment. What strategy would the group recommend? Amrine shared past projects-China Creek, which provided landowners the chance to acquire and plant along the creek. The project also included a cleanup component. The current Centennial Clean Water grant application, sponsored by Lewis CD, continues this effort in the Port area.

Rountry asked the group to consider timelines for completing this draft and then circulate for public review. To allow this document to be part of the watershed plan, he needs to finalize the document during June. He asked the group to suggest how he should proceed. The group suggested that Dave continue to revise the document based on his one on one interaction/interviews with various stakeholders.

Rountry asked the group to consider how they would like public outreach accomplished. Willis suggested that he ask the Partnership for their input.

Closing comments

Holbrook announced that the Scatter Creek HCP process sponsored by the Thurston Conservation District halted. There is still significant interest from the property owners to continue work as a local council.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45. The next meeting is April 10 at the Forestry Building.