

Terry Willis, Lee Napier, Dave Rounry, Harry Pickernell, Samuel Iwenufu, Chad Stussy, and Kyle Braden were present.

Willis reviewed the revised agenda. The group introduced themselves. Iwenufu announced that Kyle Braden will cover the meetings in his absence.

### **Scope of Work for Coordinated Water Quality Program**

The group worked with Napier to revise the scope of work.

#### *Performance Goal*

Iwenufu asked how does the CBP use/view the various levels of monitoring data? Napier responded that the group acknowledges all data collected, but the application may vary depending upon the application.

Rounry suggested tracking implementation of activities.

Iwenufu asked about baseline and trend data. Do we want to do both? Was there baseline data for project funded through grants? Rounry replied yes, in some cases (ie. Ambient monitoring programs). Is the information comprehensive enough to use as baseline? The group agreed that generally there is not enough for baseline data. Iwenufu responded that baseline establishes the condition of that waterbody prior to beginning to disturbed. In practical terms, baseline is the collection of data for a period of time (3-5 years).

Willis asked how or who would decide where to establish new data collection sites. Stussy suggested encouraging input from the monitoring groups for additional collection sites.

What about data collection? The data would be transmitted to the coordinator. They would do a QAQC to identify the level (protocol) of the data, summarize (not trend analysis), and disseminated. Rounry suggested that the coordinator facilitate consistency in monitoring, data reporting, and collection to increase usefulness and public access to the information. The coordinator would work with a committee to determine which data would be relevant to the group's work. This person would review the data for changes in water quality conditions and is not expected to perform independent trend analysis.

Rounry asked about the role of the coordinator to assist with the development of grant applications to facilitate implementation?

Rounry referred to the letter for the DIP. "The Partnership expects to continue serving as a focal point for coordinating implementation of local elements of the Detailed Implementation Plan. We also expect to continue to advocate for cost-effective protection of water quality, and will support efforts to obtain financial support so local governments and organizations can implement water quality protection strategies."

Goundwater and surface water monitoring in not distinguished in this scope. One of the CBP recommended action is to develop a better understanding regarding this interaction. However, this group will concentrate on surface water only until more information becomes available.

Iwenufu add PH, NTU to water quality standards. Willis asked about the exclusion of chemicals? Chemical monitoring can be too expensive for this type of proposal. Rounry added that there is potential for all water quality parameter, but for certain those that are know to be within the Basin.

Iwenufu-In the case when a stakeholder cannot pursue additional funding would the CBP reserve the right to assist with the collection of that sample to provide the data back to the Partnership? The group felt there needs to be flexibility to provide assistance when a stakeholder is at a road block.

Implementing TMDL-Rounry flagged page A-48, a section of the DIP related to performance measures that are different from effectiveness monitoring. Exclude effectiveness monitoring-change to implementation monitoring. Data could be used for compliance monitoring.

DIP describes a need for the development of a monitoring plan.

Group homework decide which actions, from the Watershed Management Plan, support the scope as revised by the group today.

### **Roundtable to share information-**

Iwenufu shared that the Quinault Indian Nation monitors sites within the reservation. The QIN would like to monitor off reservation, but need money. This would include hiring a person. They have the equipment.

Stussy shared that the Lower Chehalis Riparian Assessment is complete and begins to fill a data gap identified in the Limiting Factors Analysis.

Stussy shared that Mason Conservation District is performing a barrier assessment in Mason County and Grays Harbor County.

A Water Quality Coordinator could help with dissemination of this type of information.

Rounry- mentioned the shellfish protection loan fund administered by Puget Sound Action Team. Pacific County used this money. There may be an opportunity to use the fund in Grays Harbor County.

Iwenufu mentioned that in the Moclips area, some people are camping and using the area as a toilet, which impacts the water quality and clam digging.

### **Agenda for Next Meeting**

Topics for next meetings agenda: review work proposal scope of work, review progress from QAPP, report on status of groundwater pilot project. Willis asked if the group would be interested in inviting representatives from groups to share information. Any suggestions?