

Terry Willis, Lee Napier, Jim Fleming, Dave Jarzynka, Dave Rountry, Jennifer Eklund, Commissioner Beerbower, Karl Braden, Samuel Iwenofu, and Patrick Wiltzius, were present.

Terry introduced Jennifer Eklund, Mason Conservation District Director, to the group. Jennifer replaced Mike Madsen.

### **Progress status reports**

#### Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP)

Lee distributed a copy of the follow up document prepared by Kahle Jennings, dated February 8, 2005. Lee reviewed her discussion with Jennings regarding the group comments on the last version of the draft QAPP.

Dave J again expressed concerns regarding the different levels of data collection standards. Dave R suggested language under section 4 and he shared a copy of the Monitoring Overview from [www.fish.washington.edu/naturemapping/water/3monover.html](http://www.fish.washington.edu/naturemapping/water/3monover.html). This language described the different levels of monitoring. The group would also like this issue clarified in the introductory section.

Samuel suggested two separate QAPPs to avoid confusion.

Terry was surprised to see canopy cover and did not recall the inclusion of habitat. Lee added that habitat became part of the proposal when the idea was circulated and habitat reps asked to have it included.

At this point, the group felt they needed to reconsider the elements for the QAPP. Patrick felt the list could be expanded if work already existed to supplement the QAPP (ie work for wastewater treatment plants or similar water quality types of projects) .

Samuel asked for clarification regarding the goal of the QAPP. Is the goal for monitoring purposes only or the collection of additional data? Dave R shared his recollection of the goals and objective for this project. It was conceived to be more than just a QAPP. It was meant to be a comprehensive guidance document to encourage a variety of monitoring activities. It was meant to encourage all levels of monitoring ranging from volunteers to the rigorous monitoring of agencies. This document should show the framework that explains how the different levels of monitoring related to other projects in the watershed. How viable is the document over time when field protocol and parameters change? Dave R reminded the group of the QAPP by the Chehalis River Council as an example of an easily understood document that was accepted the Department of Ecology. Terry suggested the document include language that describes the update procedures and timelines.

Patrick suggested inserting established procedures when they existed and not develop new procedures. Bob shared that Conservation Districts viewed the document as a

template. He would use portions and then describe the equipment he would use and other details that would be specific to his project. Since he won't be monitoring for all parameters, his QAPP would be refined to describe only the parameters and equipment addressed by his project.

What does the group mean by stand alone document? Dave R thought it meant the use of this is not dependent upon the use of another document. You can use it entirely or portions that address a respective project. Grays Harbor Conservation District might have used this document when they were monitoring water quality monitoring. Commissioner Beerbower felt anything the group could develop to help direct other groups towards proper protocol would help. Patrick felt it should be just a QAPP that outlines what should be in a QAPP and then list protocols. He suggested as document components: introduction, required components of the QAPP, a sample QAPP and then a list of sampling protocol and parameters, and a limited list of goals and objectives.

Jim asked if the group has come full circle with this project? It was his recollection that we started with the template concept and then decided that a stand alone would better serve the group. Have we gone back to the template?

Lee asked how this project related to the Framework QAPP developed by the CBP. Patrick thought that document include information that would not be necessary for the current proposal.

Next steps- Lee will share the following information with Kahle Jennings.

- One QAPP does not fit everyone, so it should be a template.
- Use the CRC protocols, describe use of document, sampling methods.
- Does Ecology have a guidance document? Yes, *Guidelines for Preparing QAPP for Environmental Studies, Publication No. 01-03-003, February 2001*
- If we develop a guidance document, then which pieces do we need and delete from Dec 2003 report.
- Monitoring plan and QAPP need to be separate.

#### Coordinated Water Quality Monitoring Scope of Work (SOW)

Lee shared sections from the QAPP, prepared by Tetra Tech, that was provided in response to questions from the group last month. Patrick felt this was part of implementation and this idea may be premature. Until the CBP decides how to proceed with implementation and organization structure, work on this issue should be postponed.

Patrick asked if anyone was waiting for this product? Lee said, no. However, Dave R feels that there is an expectation for something to evolve to help integrate the greater efforts. The TMDL describes timelines to improve water quality. Will these timelines be met without this program?

Patrick asked if this was an issue surfacing in other watershed plans across the state? Terry suggested we approach Ecology with this proposal in anticipation that it will become a state issue. We could suggest to Ecology that they pilot this project in the Chehalis. Lee will try to follow up on the suggestions from the group and report back after progress is made on the QAPP.

Plan 2 Fund

Lee updated the group regarding the STC's effort to use Plan 2 Fund. During March, the STC continued to work with the Environmental Finance Center (EFC) to develop tasks to implement the objectives from the Watershed Management Plan.

Committee members were encouraged to attend the next STC meeting on April 7, 2005.

**Agenda for the Next Meeting**

The group will continue to review the QAPP and possibly discuss the scope of work for the coordinated water quality monitoring program.