

Terry Willis, Chanele Holbrook, Patrick Wiltzius, Lee Napier, Ann Wick, Commissioner Beerbower, Chad Stussy, Dave Jarzynka, Ramn Iymer, Lee Daneker, Andrew Kolosseus, and John Sims were present. Cynthia Carlstad and Bob Wheeler participated by conference call.

Coordinated Water Quality Monitoring

Cynthia Carlstad reviewed for the group the schematic developed by the Committee during the July 10, 2003 meeting.

Questions from the group:

- Is this schematic dependent upon the CBP becoming a legal entity?
- The schematic directs agencies to communicate with stakeholders that may have ineffective lines of communication. A suggestion was made to change that to something that implies providing operating guidance or help with focusing localized efforts.
- It was clarified that the boxes listed near the bottom represent the groups currently monitoring for water quality. The schematic, or a description, needs to clarify possible sources vs. recipients.
- For the Data Manager role, who will oversee the methodology? The monitoring plan better describes that role.
- The monitoring is not trying to set up a separate effort it should provide a forum, more opportunities for input, and the collection of additional data.

Since the last Committee meeting, the document and concepts were presented to the CBP in July. They supported the concept.

The final draft will include some revisions that better address public outreach, and Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP). The items will be addressed through additional outreach to stakeholders, written documents such as the Drops of Water, and the development of a generic QAPP.

Follow up presentation to Water Quality Standards

Lee Daneker, at the request of the Committee, agreed to investigate further some of their questions related to water quality standard indicators. During the June 12 meeting, the group asked him to follow up on the following questions: the nature of the indicators, cost effectiveness related to the transition to other indicators, how have other states handled the issue, and how can the additional laboratory costs be justified.

Nature of the indicators?

- *E. coli* is a type of fecal coliform enterococci is not a type of fecal coliform.
- Warm blood animals are not the only source of fecal coliform.
- The indicators do not directly cause the illnesses, they contribute to gastroenteritis intolerance.

Are the indicators good enough to warrant the cost?

- Indicators are not generally pathogenic themselves.
- Pathogens are disease-causing microorganisms that include viruses, protozoa, and bacteria.
- Monitoring for the many illness-causing pathogens is difficult and costly.
- A study initiated in 1972 concluded the following:
 - Of the indicators measured during the studies, *E. coli* and enterococci showed the strongest correlation to swimming associated gastroenteritis.

Why are the levels (fecal coliform counts) different between water systems? The loading allocation may relate to the contributions that each system can add to the Estuary. The Estuary has a target number.

How do other states handle the issue?

- Daneker shared a handout that summarized bacterial water quality standards for states, tribes and territories by EPA region.
- Most states have a use base system opposed to a class base system.

Lab costs?

- They will be higher for equipment and training, but probably not huge depending on the jurisdiction's current laboratory capacity.

Recent changes to the water quality standards by Ecology.

Andrew Kolosseus provided background to the group. During the comment period, Ecology received over 1400 comments, which were considered and the standards were finalized. At this time, the standards are subject to review by EPA, NMFP, and USFWS. Until those agencies approve the standards they do not take effect.

He shared a handout with the group.

- The new standards changed the bacterial indicator to enterococci for secondary contact (wading) in marine waters.
- The temperature standards included changes such as the addition of core rearing, non-core rearing and rearing only criteria.

- Antidegradation Tier II was revised to reflect the groups concerns regarding the awkwardness of the language.
- Antidegradation Tier III waters do not currently exist. The method for this classification is through a nomination process with rigid standards.
- At this time, the streams are not put into the Tiers.
- Oxygen standards proposed for change was scrapped and will not be changed.

He shared with the group the documents related to the development of the standards. Copies are available on the website www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/swqs/index.html

Future Meeting Topics and Closing Comments

Raman would like to see the modify schematic for the water quality program circulated to the Committee.

Department of Agriculture is monitoring surface and ground water for pesticides. At this time, the Chehalis is not scheduled, but the group should be thinking about their needs.

How do you begin to examining aquifers and funding?

Possible items for the next meeting:

- The flow chart
- Environmental Finance Center

The meeting adjourned at 12:00. The next meeting is October 9, 2003.