

Terry Willis, Lee Napier, Dave Jarzynka, Dave Rountry, Kahle Jennings, Harry Pickernell, and Patrick Wiltzius, were present.

Progress status reports

Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP)

Kahle shared his understanding of the comments shared by the group via Dave R. and Lee, from the last meeting. He distributed a document, electronically, explaining the project and highlighting portions from other documents that support this project.

Dave J. concerns about the different levels of data collection is better addressed through the information provided by Kahle.

The group discussed the need to prioritize monitoring work. The TMDL DIP prioritizes clean up priorities, page 52-57. Other prioritization work could occur based on healthy waters or "unknown" waters. If this were to occur, that prioritization effort might become part of the watershed implementation work.

Patrick stressed it should be user friendly at a glance. Make it clear where sampling occurs and where it should occur. Don't get bogged down re-stating what other documents already stated.

The group discussed how the data would be stored and managed. This is a common question within the CBP. Dave R. added and shared a handout from a WRIA 20 meeting. This group was also discussing the collection, storage, and management of data. This appears to potentially be a statewide issue as the group wondered last month.

Patrick asked for an overall outline for this document to see how it will be set up.

Kahle reviewed the document with the group and the group provided the following comments:

- Okay with removing the QAPP reference and changing the name to reflect a comprehensive monitoring strategy/plan.
- Add in the introductory language a statement that we are doing this to insure local involvement in water quality.
- The table on page two shows the sequencing of this project. Patrick suggested an additional box for collecting the data and then an arrow directly that box back to #2.
- Who's the local community? Generic term for basin residents.
- What does it mean that the local community has not participated in the prioritization? The group interpreted it to mean we reacted to water quality issues and now is the time to become involved in decisions that effect the Chehalis.
- Goals and objectives are action items and this would seem beyond the scope for this document. Because we develop this plan, it will help accomplish the goals, but not necessarily accomplish all the goals. Rephrase the "establish standards for data quality for various uses and meet all agency reporting needs" objectives.
- Section 3.3, last sentence revise to describe the current work of the committee and the CBP and don't include the statement that most groups have representatives on the CBP.
- Section 4 is good. Kahle may revise the format to look more like the nature mapping table, which has various level of data collection.
- Section 5-Are we determining monitoring sites? In some instances yes. For sites and parameters related to TMDL they are described in the DIP. The schedule would be part of the QAPP which would be developed by the monitoring entity.

- The Guidelines for Preparing a QAPP was updated in July 2004. The current link is <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/biblio/0403030.html>
- What about the section that states the specific plans for this issue? The group would like this information in the introductory paragraphs. It may be appropriate to include some of this information later in the document or as appendices.
- What about including habitat monitoring as part of this project? Members of the group supported habitat, but are struggling to complete the water quality piece. The group felt at this point in the project development, habitat and flow topics should just be a placeholder until the water quality piece is developed further.
- Section 3 related to the TMDL Plan- when talking about the various monitoring you might include a statement that a particular type of monitoring requires level X standards for data collection.
- Section 4-what does Ecology's QAPP say-explain why this isn't a QAPP. This could also be explained by showing the outline of require elements of a QAPP.

Next steps- Kahle will put together an outline and share revised documents with the group next month.

Dave R. hoped that the efforts of the committee would lead to a product that included more timelines/schedules and implementation details that would help to implement the DIP for the TMDLs. He wonders how we can encourage entities to help with the implementation aspect of this project.

Lee reminded the group that several months ago they set a deadline for completing this document by July, of this year. This would enable potential project sponsors to use/reference it for upcoming water quality grants.

Plan 2 Fund

Lee updated the group regarding the STC's effort to use Plan 2 Fund. During April meeting the STC reviewed work plans resulting from the past meeting(s) work. The work plans are draft implementation strategies for the objectives from the Watershed Management Plan. She shared the work plans related to water quality actions/objectives.

Committee members were encouraged to attend the next STC meeting on April 21, 2005.

Agenda for the Next Meeting

The group will continue to review the Monitoring Plan, formerly known as the QAPP. Because we are trying to finish this project by July, this will be the only agenda topic.