

Joint Data, Livestock, Irrigated Ag, RCIM, Working Group Meeting with Presentation (Workshop) from HDR and PGG

Charge from Groundwater Management Area Advisory Committee

None at this time

Working Group Members

Jim Trull (Chair, Irrigated Ag), Kirk Cook (Chair, Data), Charlie McKinney (Chair, Livestock/CAFO), Bob Farrell (Chair, Residential, Commercial, Industrial, Municipal)

Meetings/Calls Dates

Location: Radio KDNA Granger

Date/Time: Thursday, March 6, 2014 / 5:00pm – 7:00pm

Phone Line: (509) 574-2353 – PIN 2353#

Participants

Jim Trull (Roza-Sunnyside Joint Board of Control), Kirk Cook (WSDA), Charlie McKinney (Department of Ecology), Bob Farrell (Port of Sunnyside), Vern Redifer (Yakima County), Steve Swope (PGG), Jay Decker (HDR), Jean Mendoza (Friends of Toppenish Creek), Jim Dyjak (Concerned Citizens of the Yakama Reservation), Troy Peters (WSU), Dan McCarty (WSDA DNMP), Steve George (Yakima County Farm Bureau), Kathleen Rogers (Lower Valley Representative), Stuart Turner (Tuner & Co. Inc.), Gordon Kelly (Yakima Health District), Stuart Crane (Yakama Nation), Tom Ring (Yakama Nation), Bob Stevens (Citizen), Larry Fendell (Citizen), Dan DeGroot (Dairy Commission), Jason Sheehan (Yakima Valley Dairy), Kevin Lindsey (GSI Water Solutions), Mike Shuttleworth (Benton County), Andres Cervantes (DOH), *Tom Eaton (EPA), Penny Mabie (Facilitator, EnviroIssues), Don Gatchalian (Yakima County Staff Support), and Troy Ross-Havens (Yakima County Staff Support)

*Participated by telephone

Key Discussion Points

Welcome & Meeting Overview

Penny welcomed the group and gave an overview of the meeting agenda.

BMP Effectiveness Workshop – Mike Murray, HDR (90 minutes)

- Mike Murray reviewed the HDR tasks completed to date to set a context for this presentation.
- Mike went over the Draft BMP Effectiveness Evaluation Summary (Technical Memorandum #2) dated February 27, 2014 and provided a methodology overview of the document and the associated hierarchal approach provided as a tool to organize the associated objectives, management targets, and BMPs.
- The purpose of the BMP Effectiveness Evaluation is to create a tool for the GWAC to use. HDR defined the proposed evaluation criteria framework for the BMPs shown on Table 2 (page 7 of February 27, 2014 report), as well as working through several examples drafted by HDR.
- Following the examples, Mike proposed the next task for the working groups:

ACTION for Working Groups:

Each individual technical working group will review the proposed evaluation criteria shown on Table 2 of the Draft BMP Effectiveness Evaluation Summary, Technical Memorandum #2, dated February 27, 2014 and evaluate for sufficiency or completeness. If not complete or sufficient, the working groups are to strike, add, or modify evaluation criteria as they see fit. HDR expects comments to be provided to Don Gatchalian (donald.gatchalian@co.yakima.wa.us) by March 20, 2014

- After HDR receives the comments on the proposed evaluation criteria, HDR will then populate the form using the criteria established. The next workshop will discuss what HDR has filled in which will have incomplete information. The technical working groups will then complete the form, and if necessary prioritize the BMPs.
- Members of the working groups added that the BMP Database should be a flexible tool not to be set in stone, but to be modified as more data is collected or evaluated.
- General agreement within the group centered around the addition of counter effects of BMPs or noting that certain BMPs should be used with others (synergisms)

Data Gaps and Potential Groundwater Monitoring – Presentation of Report Findings by Steve Swope, PGG (30 minutes)

Steve Swope introduced himself to the participants and began discussing the Potential Groundwater Monitoring Stations document prepared by PGG for the LYV GWAC dated December 3, 2013.

Steve discussed the following points presented in the report:

- Available data sources and related dates
- Nitrate concentration hot spots (2X MCL or 20 mg/L)
- Concentration distributions
- Nitrate background levels and locations
- Average well depth
- Nitrate trends for municipal wells

Steve updated the group on PGG's next step on selecting wells for long term monitoring. PGG's potential monitoring well locations are proposed to monitor or address spatial data gaps, hot spots, increasing trends, basin-wide monitoring, water supply aquifers, BMP effectiveness, and health risks within the LYV GWMA. Regarding the amount of potential monitoring wells, Steve explained that 667 well locations were sent to the Yakima Health District, 320 of which are contracted by the County for the Health District to complete well surveys. PGG is expecting a positive response rate of about 15% of these 320, or roughly 50 potential monitoring wells.

Discussions followed the presentation regarding well construction, groundwater flow directions, Yakima Health District well survey data, potential bias, and sampling strategies.

Other Topics

Vern R. stated that at the GWAC's request, the County has not been posting draft documents on the GWMA website (<http://www.yakimacounty.us/gwma/>) without GWAC approval. The inadequacy to the current website is that it does not provide a central location for GWAC members to reference draft documents they are working on yet to be approved by the GWAC. Vern mentioned that the County is exploring options on how to provide a central electronic location for the draft documents to be referenced or downloaded. One idea being explored is to have two sources on the web – one for public viewing (documents presented to and agreed by the GWAC for posting) and the other for draft working documents.

Resources Requested

None at this time

Recommendations for GWAC

None at this time

Deliverables/Products Status

None at this time

Proposed Next Steps

- Working groups will provide comments on the evaluation criteria framework proposed by HDR to evaluate BMPs applicable to the LYV GWMA. Members will submit comments to Yakima County, Attention: Don Gatchalian (donald.gatchalian@co.yakima.wa.us) by March 20, 2014. Don will consolidate the comments and forward to the consultant.
- After HDR receives the comments, HDR will incorporate them, finalize the evaluation criteria, populate the form with BMP information and prepare a draft for the working groups to review. At that time, workshop # 2 will be scheduled.