

Terry Willis, Ron Schillinger, Dave Jarzynka, Samuel I, Bob Amrine, Kahle Jennings and Lee Napier were present.

Coordinated Monitoring Plan

The group started by reviewing the outline prepared by Kahle and the revisions suggested by Patrick. Patrick's revisions were primarily a reorganization of the outline.

Willis asked how is this different from the Tetra Tech report? This will identify specific locations where we need to monitor at specific locations. The Tetra Tech report does not go into specific that this document should include.

Samuel asked about the groundwater pilot study which is due out in June. Napier will ask Charles Pitz to attend an upcoming meeting.

Dave Rountry submitted commits electronically. He suggested adding four levels of monitoring and an excerpt from the TMDL DIP. Kahle had intended to include this description in Section B.

A question was asked how Dave's levels of monitoring is different from Kahle's? Kahle's section would describe how different groups can monitor and the applicability of their efforts. This would apply to groups monitoring for educational purposes verses monitoring at a higher level for regulatory actions.

The group talked about Dave's comment related to a point of coordination for monitoring. Schillinger asked if this didn't already exist at Ecology. Kahle said no. This person would supplement the monitoring staff by providing a local point of coordination.

The group then discussed who should be monitoring. Over the last few years, members of the Partnership have stated that state agencies should provide this function and then stated that the Partnership, or some local organization, should provide this function. The group, after some discussion, recognized the need for coordination to occur at the local level.

The group discussed the establishment of a coordination entity within an established organization that already had the capacity to monitor, such as a conservation district or a city. Napier elaborated that she supported this approach rather than building capacity through the lead agency. She felt this made more sense because it could support organization that may be struggling to continue current monitoring efforts and they already have the built in capacity. She felt this was a logical approach for the Partnership to consider on several of

the implementation action. The group stressed that organization would not be expected to take on these types of responsibilities without funding such as grant.

After reviewing Kahle's outline, the group decided to accept this and asked Kahle to begin filling in the blanks. The group will review Kahle's next draft during June meeting. The group would like to take this to the CBP in July. During the June meeting, the group will review possible subbasin break out based on the geographic boundaries used by the salmon recovery groups. Napier will send the map to Kahle.

The next meeting is June 9, 2005