

Jim Fleming, Lee Napier, Kahle Jennings, Bob Amrine, Terry Willis, Dave Rountry, Dave Jarzynka, Ron Schillinger, Tony Barrett, and Margaret Rader were present.

Coordinated Water Quality Monitoring

Jennings distributed copies of the Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) prepared by the Chehalis River Council. He recommends that the Committee consider using this document as a template for the Chehalis plan.

One of the outstanding questions relates to monitoring site locations. Jennings distributed a section from the Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP), page A-50, that describes a ranking scheme to establish possible priority sites. Jennings clarified that the table is arranged by river mile. The columns include numbers that reflect rankings from the original TMDLs. The highest priority numbers begin with 1 and descend to 22. Column 5 was added to the table to show a cumulative ranking that would assist with identifying a priority ranking for all pollutants. He asked the group for guidance on this column.

Schillingers suggested renumbering the columns (starting with the highest number as the highest priority) and then add the number for a cumulative score for column 5. Currently column 5 numbers are an average of columns 2-4. This approach would favor streams with multiple pollutants.

Rader would like to see something folded in that allows this to not be the sole criteria for future projects. She suggested the table be considered more guidance rather than prescriptive. Her suggestion would apply to projects that have circumstances that warrant a high ranking, but were not included or known at the time the table/TMDL was developed.

Jennings distributed another table, as an example of how to view the priority rankings. This table includes only the TMDL data for the Lower Chehalis and shows the rankings based on % of reduction needs to meet standards and % of total load to Grays Harbor. Rountry suggested that the group determine its objectives for the tables and then the formatting will be more useful.

Jennings will begin to draft the QAPP and incorporate the comments received today for further consideration by the group next month.

Follow up DIP

Rounry will include some of the recommendations from today in the DIP. He asked the group to clarify if they agreed to rearrange the ranking numbers. He will also present both tables shared by Jennings to the CBP at the August meeting. Rader ask for the note to be included that the work described in the table is contingent upon availability of funding.

Willis shared some of the comments from the CBP meeting about the DIP. There are still concerns about Washington state water quality standards. Should this concern be addressed in the DIP discussions or should it remain part of the standard setting process? If the group agrees to the DIP, then are we accepting the standards? Maybe this issue could be addressed through the consensus process. This would allow members to state their concerns in the decision making process.

The next step for this item is consideration by the CBP during the August meeting.

Rounry shared that EPA approved the clean up plan. He also shared a letter, dated July 22, 2004, to Ecology from EPA.

Brainstorm for grant applications ideas

The Committee discussed and brainstormed possible ideas or future projects that could become grant proposals. The list below highlights that discussion.

Ideas for next steps to implement Watershed Plan

- Data collection
- Coordination a water quality program*
 - Staff
 - Equipment
 - Outreach
 - CBP work program
- Develop loan programs to repair failing septic systems
 - Consider Pacific County's program as a role model
- Aquifer impact study
 - Continue work similar to pilot project
- Continue to support individual projects
- Address reoccurring problems
 - Temperature on the Humptulips
 - Fecal Coliform in Elk Creek
 - High bacteria in areas with dense populations of beaver

* Group felt initiating action on this item would continue the momentum of the CBP

Possible criteria for project selection

- Cost vs. benefit
- Unique or innovative work
- Includes monitoring to evaluate success of best management practices (BMP)
- Work accomplished, or initiated within a short time period (18-24 months)
- Implements actions identified in the Watershed Management Plan or the Habitat Work Plan.
- Clearly identifies responsible entity and a commitment of long-term funding.

Napier will develop a proposal describing a work program that could help the CBP and the Committee continue their work. The funding objective would primarily focus on maintaining the core water quality functions of the CBP and begin to examine options to implement plan recommendations.

Agenda for Next Meeting

Topics for next meetings agenda: review work proposal for future grant cycles, review progress from QAPP, discuss action by CBP regarding the DIP.

The next meeting is September 9, 2004.