

Terry Willis, Lee Napier, Jim Fleming, Dave Jarzynka, Dave Rountry, Karl Braden, and Patrick Wiltzius, were present.

Willis announced that the agenda would be revised to discuss the QAPP and the Scope of Work together.

General Announcements

Rountry announced a grant opportunity, Terry Husseman Account, through the Coastal Protection Fund, that is currently open until March 8, 2005. Application would need to be submitted through Rountry. The money is intended for on the ground restoration projects. Past recipients include the Chehalis Basin Educational Consortium and a water quality monitoring effort in Pacific County.

Willis would like to add as a standard agenda item review and acceptance of the meeting summaries.

Progress status reports

Groundwater Pilot Project

Napier shared an e-mail regarding the status of this project. Charles Pitz reported that we're tying up our field work on the project, and now are just making occasional checks on some water level recorders we have suspended in wells. We have completed pretty much all of the wide-area groundwater quality sampling, and the early indication that groundwater quality in the study area is really very good – there are a few issues with boring stuff like iron (nothing that people didn't already know). Data analysis is really getting underway. This will probably occupy us for several months, and then comes write-up of results. We're aiming to publish the final report around July, and I suspect we'll be planning public presentation of the results shortly after that.

A question was asked if there would be long term monitoring? Napier responded not to her knowledge. This was a pilot project and unless the report indicates otherwise, monitoring was limited to this study period.

The group would like to hear from Charles before the report is released. Napier will try to book Charles before that July release date.

Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP)

Napier distributed a copy of the draft QAPP prepared by Kahle Jennings. Jennings asked the group to review the first section and provide him with feedback.

Jarzynka questioned the third paragraph, on page one, because it seems to indicate that data standards were not that relevant because some would have rigorous application while others would not be subject to a rigorous application. The intent of this section was to encourage volunteer monitoring as well as required monitoring. Fleming added that he recalled the intent to encourage the collection and repository for all data to be

considered. Would this be clarified in the field and laboratory procedures sections? If that is the case, then add a reference to direct the reader.

Napier suggested an introduction section to better describe a QAPP and to hopefully begin to resolve the issue brought up by Jarzynka. She suggested inserting in the first paragraph—"The Quality Assurance Project Plan, or QAPP, is a written document that outlines the procedures a monitoring project will use to ensure that the samples participants collect and analyze, the data they store and manage, and the reports they write are of high enough quality to meet project needs."

Fleming commented that the second paragraph, page one, states this is a water quality committee project. Napier suggested that reference be changed to cite the CBP's WMP water quality recommendation on page 24. "A basin-wide water quality monitoring program is needed..." Development of the QAPP is an action item intended to implement this recommendation.

Wiltzius suggested that the relationship text, starting on the bottom of page two, become a separate section. The introduction seems too long in the current format.

The group discussed the intent for this document. The group agreed that this was designed to be a template or framework for project sponsors to use. The document should describe how project sponsors could use the document. One option discussed by the group envisioned project sponsors reviewing this document and determining if their project met the quality assurance described. The group would like to see that concept introduced in the opening paragraph(s). This text should describe that this QAPP is meant to assist project sponsors. If a sponsor has a QAPP, then they could use their QAPP. Another application of this QAPP may be to use this document, but to attach a separate SOW that better describes the respective project. The group wondered if the study design section describe how an individual would apply the QAPP.

Napier asked about describing the monitoring efforts on page 4. She suggested describing the sample group's monitoring efforts to limit the amount of text. The section could describe the types of groups that monitor and the nature of their work as examples. The group agreed that this section could give examples of group monitoring and some advise to direct project sponsor to the group(s).

Goals and Objectives Section, page 4:

- Change study to plan.
- Add a goal that describes how this document is a template for project sponsors to streamline their project efforts.
- Delete goal 3 and 4 because they should be the goals for the respective projects and not outcomes of this effort.
- Add goal using language from the WMP recommendation to encourage basin wide water quality monitoring in the Chehalis Basin.

The group though a section should be added that describes how to use the document. After some discussion about how to use the document and the intent behind developing this document, the group asked Kahle to develop a document outline. During the next meeting the group would review the outline.

Coordinated Water Quality Monitoring Scope of Work (SOW)

Napier reminded the group of the history surrounding this effort. She developed a SOW late summer with intention of submitting it to the Department of Ecology for grant funding. After reviewing the application, she realized the proposal was not ready for funding consideration. She thought it was a project the committee could help by providing input, but she is wondering if the timing is appropriate. The group discussed the sequencing of this effort. The advancement of this project probably requires more involvement from Ecology. Until we have more direction regarding dedicated staff maybe we should put this on hold.

The group asked several questions in determining how to proceed with this task. What is a Water Quality Coordinated Monitoring Program? Does it mean a person to coordinate the task? Or someone to gather the data? Napier will send out the sections from the Coordinated Water Quality Monitoring report prepared by Tetra Tech to help the group determine how to proceed with this topic.

Plan 2 Fund

Napier updated the group regarding the STC's effort to use Plan 2 Fund. During the months of January and February, the STC worked with the Environmental Finance Center (EFC) to develop decision rules, which would be used to prioritize the objectives from the Watershed Management Plan. This is one action item of a longer list of task necessary to apply Plan 2 Fund and to develop an implementation plan. The STC agreed upon six rules: Is it a primary objective? How many planning goals does the objective satisfy? Is the objective time sensitive? Is it a long term or short term benefit to the Basin's health? And. Required by local, state, or federal law or other agreements?

The STC also assigned a range of points for each rule. The STC independent reviewed each objective against each rule and assigned a score. Once the ranges/scores were assigned, the STC weighted the rules and then sorted the objectives in descending order based on the score assigned. The STC applied several weighting schemes to this model. After reviewing all the weighting scenarios, the STC felt that one scenario seemed the most logical. This weighting valued the requirement by law as the highest, followed by how many planning goals are met, then primary objectives and how achievable is the objective. This scheme is labeled "Weight 5."

Questions from the group.

Why were some of actions contained in the Watershed Management Plan (WMP) not listed on the spreadsheet? The STC reviewed the 56 actions from the WMP and determined is the actions were goals, objectives or tasks. Once the STC understood which actions were objectives, they began the effort of prioritizing the objectives using the model developed by the EFC. The next step in the implementation planning process is to develop tasks to achieve the objectives. In developing the list of tasks, the STC will brainstorm for ideas, they will use the actions from the WMP that are considered tasks and they will use the tasks developed by the group for Action 39.

How will the Partnership use Plan 2 Fund? Plan 2 Fund asks for a project's goals, objectives, tasks, priorities, and estimated funding. The Partnership cannot input data into the tool directly from the WMP. Because Plan 2 Fund is more of an implementation tool, there are some formatting discrepancies, which the STC is trying to address. This includes clarifying the actions with respect to the labeling of goals, objectives, and tasks.

The WMP did not prioritize actions, so the group needed to develop a process to enable input into Plan 2 Fund. The WMP did not require the development of a list of tasks to implement, while Plan 2 Fund asks for that information. Once the Partnership agrees upon a prioritization scheme for the objectives, a list of tasks for the objectives, estimates funding, and determines timelines, then information can be entered into Plan 2 Fund. Concurrently the EFC is refining Plan 2 Fund as they see necessary based on feedback from the Partnership.

The STC will meet on March 3, 2005 to continue their work on developing a list of tasks. The group was encouraged to attend.

Agenda for the Next Meeting

The group will continue to review the QAPP and review the background information related to the coordinated water quality monitoring.