

1
2
3
4

5 LOWER YAKIMA VALLEY GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREA ADVISORY 6 COMMITTEE (GWAC)

7
8

MEETING SUMMARY

9
10

Thursday, August 21, 2014

11
12
13
14

Radio KDNA
121 Sunnyside Ave, Granger, WA 98932

15 *Note: This document is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It is not intended to be a
 16 transcription of the meeting, but an overview of points raised and responses from Yakima County
 17 and Groundwater Advisory Committee members. It may not fully represent the ideas discussed or
 18 opinions given. Examination of this document cannot equal or replace attendance.*

19

20

I. Call to Order

21
22
23
24
25

Roll Call: The meeting was called to order at 5:03 pm by Angie Thomson, Facilitator.

Member	Seat	Present	Absent
Stuart Turner	Agronomist, Turner and Co.	✓	
Chelsey Durfey	Agronomist, Turner and Co. (alternate)	✓	
Helen Reddout	Community Association for Restoration of the Environment		✓
Wendell Hannigan	Community Association for Restoration of the Environment (alternate)		✓
Kathleen Rogers	Lower Valley Community Representative Position 1	✓	
Bud Rogers	Lower Valley Community Representative Position 1 (alternate)		✓
Patricia Newhouse	Lower Valley Community Representative Position 2	✓	
Sue Wedam	Lower Valley Community Representative Position 2 (alternate)		✓
Doug Simpson	Irrigated Crop Producer	✓	
Jean Mendoza	Friends of Toppenish Creek	✓	
Eric Anderson	Friends of Toppenish Creek (alternate)		✓
Jan Whitefoot	Concerned Citizens of the Yakama Reservation		✓
Jim Djak	Concerned Citizens of the Yakama Reservation (alternate)	✓	

Steve George	Yakima County Farm Bureau	✓	
Justin Waddington	Yakima County Farm Bureau (alternate)		✓
Jason Sheehan	Yakima Dairy Federation	✓	
Dan DeGroot	Yakima Dairy Federation (alternate)	✓	
Jim Trull	Roza-Sunnyside Joint Board of Control	✓	
Ron Cowin	Roza-Sunnyside Joint Board of Control (alternate)		✓
Laurie Crowe	South Yakima Conservation District	✓	
Jim Newhouse	South Yakima Conservation District (alternate)		✓
Robert Farrell	Port of Sunnyside	✓	
John Van Wingerden	Port of Sunnyside (alternate)		✓
Rand Elliott	Yakima County Board of Commissioners	✓	
Vern Redifer	Yakima County Board of Commissioners (alternate)	✓	
Gordon Kelly	Yakima County Health District	✓	
Dr. Kefy Desta	WSU Irrigated Agriculture Research and Extension Center		✓
Dr. Troy Peters	WSU Irrigated Agriculture Research and Extension Center (alternate)	✓	
Tom Eaton	U.S. EPA	✓	
Marie Jennings	U.S. EPA (alternate)		✓
Elizabeth Sanchez	Yakama Nation		✓
Tom Ring	Yakama Nation (alternate)	✓	
Lonna Frans	U.S. Geological Survey		✓
Matt Bachmann	U.S. Geologic Survey (alternate)		✓
Kirk Cook	WA Department of Agriculture	✓	
Virginia "Ginny" Prest	WA Department of Agriculture (alternate)	✓	
Andy Cervantes	WA Department of Health	✓	
Ginny Stern	WA Department of Health (alternate)	✓	
Charlie McKinney	WA Department of Ecology	✓	
Tom Tebb	WA Department of Ecology (alternate)		✓
Lino Guerra	Hispanic Community Representative	✓	
Rick Perez	Hispanic Community Representative (alternate)		✓

*by phone

26

27

28

29

II. Welcome & Meeting Overview

30

31

Moment of silence.

32
33 Introductions.
34
35 Due to the amount of budget information to be reviewed it was decided to adjourn the meeting at
36 7:30 pm instead of 7:00 pm.
37

38 **III. Committee Business: Angie Thomson**

39
40 The June 19 meeting summary was approved, pending changes that were submitted to Penny by a GWAC
41 member prior to this meeting and discussed at this meeting. A request was made for a mechanism to
42 address factual inaccuracies in summaries. The member further requested timely distribution of draft
43 meeting summaries, noting it is difficult to remember meeting discussions that took place almost two
44 months before the minutes are distributed.
45
46

47 **Member Absences and Path Forward**

48
49 A statement was read aloud by a committee member announcing the resignation of Helen
50 Reddout of Community Association for Restoration of the Environment (CARE). Helen
51 indicated that neither she nor any member of CARE will attend future GWAC meetings.
52

53 A member asked if it is possible to recruit another environmental group to sit at the table. It was
54 noted that this is an Ecology decision, but one that can be discussed with the GWAC at the
55 September or October meeting.
56

57 Charlie McKinney announced that USGS no longer plans to participate as a member of the
58 GWAC but will be available as needed by the group.
59

60 **Recommendation:** In the future a formal letter should be sent asking the inactive member what
61 his/her intentions are regarding meeting attendance. The member will be given a deadline to
62 respond; if no response is received then the seat would be vacated or offered to another
63 representative of that interest group.
64

65 **IV. GWMA Budget: Vern Redifer**

66
67 Vern stated that 17 budget proposals have been submitted for the committee's consideration. He
68 compiled all the proposals, plus a placeholder for the Groundwater Monitoring Plan, and
69 organized them in a one-page spreadsheet for ease of reference. Each working group will have
70 three minutes to present each proposal. This will allow time for all proposals to be broadly
71 presented. Following the presentations, he advised that he will go back through the list and ask
72 the committee members to rank each proposal as high, medium or low priority. This is a first cut
73 to get an idea of the GWAC's priorities; ideally he would like to get two or three projects started.
74

75 **V. Budget Requests**

76 **CAFO/Livestock - 1: Dairy Pens and Manure Storage Sampling**

77 Determine the extent of nitrate movement in the subsurface soil profile by investigating dairy
78 pens and manure storage areas for nitrate contamination. **Cost: \$60,000.** Ranking by
79

80 committee members: High 9, Medium 6, Low 2. Scalable? Yes, data from fewer than 10
81 dairies would still be valuable.
82

83 CAFO/Livestock – 2: Lagoon Assessment Based on EPA Data

84 Analyze and interpret data from dairy lagoon assessment that will be obtained from dairy
85 cluster/EPA project. **Cost: \$10,000.** Ranking by committee members: High 6, Medium 5,
86 Low 6. Scalable? No, unless data comes to us already largely analyzed and interpreted.
87

88 DATA - 1: Nutrient Loading all Sources – Database, Analysis, Reporting

89 Develop a GWMA nitrogen loading assessment. **Cost: \$57,000.** Ranking by committee
90 members: High 13, Medium 2, Low 1. Scalable? Depends on the amount of grower surveys
91 but the estimate is pretty accurate.
92

93 EPO – 1: Educational Outreach Campaigns

94 Promotional ad campaigns that will include outreach to at-risk populations, promotion of
95 community surveys, the RCIM resource hotline, the abandoned well outreach, the GWMA
96 website and other GWAC-approved initiatives. **Cost: \$54,000.** Ranking by committee
97 members: High 6, Medium 12, Low 1. Scalable? Yes. Projects can be eliminated or
98 downscaled as determined by the GWAC.
99

100 EPO – 2: Community Outreach Surveys

101 Community outreach survey effort focused on getting information out to the general public and
102 at-risk populations about their shared or private wells, water quality, general information or
103 concerns with nitrate levels in the groundwater, resources available, and the GWMA. **Cost:**
104 **\$40,000.** Ranking by committee members: High 0, Medium 9, Low 10. Scalable? Yes. The
105 total number of surveys or attempts to complete the surveys can be reduced based on feedback
106 from the original work completed by Heritage University in 2013.
107

**108 EPO – RCIM – 3: RCIM Resource Hotline (Pilot Project) and RCIM Resource Hotline
109 (Full Resource Project) Addition to Pilot Project**

110 This is a pilot project to provide a bilingual, RCIM telephone referral hotline to serve the public
111 within the LYV GWMA. This could be scaled up for other working groups. Pilot Project: **Cost:**
112 **\$10,000.** Ranking by committee members: High 0, Medium 2, Low 17. Full Resource
113 Project: **Cost: \$40,000.** High 0, Medium 3, Low 16. Scalable? Yes, we can gauge the
114 success of the first year pilot project to determine if a second attempt is warranted.
115

116 EPO-RCIM – 4: Abandoned Wells and Septic System Maintenance Outreach

117 This project is a community outreach and education program targeting Lower Yakima Valley
118 GWMA property owners to obtain information on abandoned wells and provide information on
119 proper septic system maintenance. **Cost: \$5,000.** Ranking by committee members: High 11,
120 Medium 6, Low 3. Scalable? Unknown. Still under discussion.
121

122 EPO – 5: Redesign and Maintain GWMA Website

123 This website is a central clearing house for information exchange. This proposal would contract
124 with a third party to create a user-friendly, bilingual site. **Cost: \$10,500.** Ranking by committee
125 members: High 5, Medium 10, Low 3. Scalable? No. It is the lowest cost option. Assumes
126 Yakima County will be responsible for administrative web postings (GWAC and working group
127 meeting calendars, meeting records; presentations and reports).
128

129 **EPO – 6: Wellhead Risk Assessment Surveys – Phase 2**
130 This is a community outreach and data collection effort focused on getting information out to and
131 from the public about their shared or private well. Water quality samples are being included to
132 get information on nitrate levels in the groundwater. **Cost: \$150,000.** Ranking by committee
133 members: High 6, Medium 10, Low 2. Scalable? Yes. The total number of surveys or
134 attempts to complete the surveys can be reduced based on feedback from the original work
135 completed by the Yakima Health District. *Note: a summary of the 2014 High Risk Well*
136 *Assessment results was distributed to the group.*

EPO – 7: Bilingual Outreach Coordinator Position (Pilot)

139 The first year is a pilot program, partnering with Heritage University (or similar) to identify the
140 demand for—and information garnered from—a pilot coordinator position. Based on evaluation
141 outcomes, position could be expanded to full-time in the second year. **Cost \$89,151 (FY 2014-15**
142 **- \$10,000 one year pilot program; FY 2015-16 – up to \$79,151 for an FTE)** Ranking by
143 committee members: High 3, Medium 7, Low 10. Scalable? Yes. The pilot program allows
144 the GWAC to evaluate the effectiveness of the position for one year on a test basis. The
145 professional level position includes salary and benefits. Twenty percent of cost is startup and
146 recruiting.

IRRIG – 1: Deep Soil Sampling (Proposed Additional 100 Samples)

149 This proposal adds 100 samples to the DSS program, and takes sampling to growers instead of
150 expecting growers to come to agencies. **Cost: \$150,000.** Ranking by committee members:
151 High 9, Medium 8, Low 1.

IRRIG – 2: Irrigation Water Management Workshops

154 Presentations on nutrient and irrigation water management. **Cost: \$14,000.** Ranking by
155 committee members: High 10, Medium 9, Low 0.

IRRIG – 3: Mobile Lab – On Farm Evaluation of Irrigation Water Management

158 GWMA will send an employee to evaluate for efficiency and/or uniformity and give the grower a
159 report of their system operation and suggestions for improvement. This would be conducted in
160 conjunction with deep soil sampling. **Cost: \$396,000.** Ranking by committee members: High
161 4, Medium 10, Low 6. Scalable? Yes. The Irrigated Ag Committee has scaled the original
162 price back to **\$350,000.**

RCIM – 1: Abandoned and/or Improperly Constructed Wells

165 This is a two-phase effort. The first phase will involve public outreach and education to identify
166 and locate abandoned and improperly constructed wells. The second phase will require properly
167 decommissioning the identified wells. **Cost: \$150,000.** Ranking by committee members: High
168 8, Medium 8, Low 2. Scalable? It may be possible to begin development of this program with
169 a slightly reduced budget. The second phase may be reduced if additional, non-GWAC sources
170 of funding can be developed.

REG – 1: Comprehensive Regulatory Review for the Lower Yakima Valley Groundwater Management Area

174 Phase one is to review current regulations under federal, state, county and local jurisdictions with
175 respect to groundwater protection. Phase two is to evaluate information in the “catalog of
176 regulatory and non-regulatory strategies” from other areas of the six western states concerning
177 agriculture and contamination of groundwater. **Cost: \$264,000.** Ranking by committee

178 members: High 2, Medium 2, Low 15. **Scalable?** The group suggested phase one could be
179 completed without moving into phase two.
180

181 **Yakima County – 1: Database Maintenance, Analysis, and GIS (Monitoring, Wellhead, etc.)**
182 Maintain, update and analyze GWAC databases including GIS analysis and reporting. Link
183 GWAC databases to other pertinent data sources and overlay GWAC data. This effort will keep
184 the database up to date. **Cost: \$60,000.** Ranking by committee members: High 12, Medium 6,
185 Low 0.
186

187 **Placeholder: Groundwater Monitoring Plan – Planning, Analysis, and Implementation**

188 No money was originally set aside for the plan. This placeholder will allow the County to write
189 the actual implementation of the plan as well as establish the methodology. **Cost: \$604,000.**
190 Ranking by committee members: High 16, Medium 2, Low 0.
191

192 Vern suggested the GWAC should begin the nutrient loading database, analysis and reporting
193 because most committee members ranked this a high or medium. Committee members generally
194 agreed although no decision was reached about funding the nutrient loading database before the
195 full budget has been developed. The group asked for a straw budget to be developed and brought
196 back to the next meeting. It was further suggested that the committee continue the budget
197 discussion at a September meeting instead of waiting until the scheduled October meeting. A
198 member added that he would like to see the working groups develop and bring back more detailed
199 scopes of work and budget justifications for each proposal.
200

201 **VI. Groundwater Monitoring Plan: Kirk Cook**

202 In the interest of time, the plan was not discussed.
203

204 **VII. Public Comment:**

205 There was no public comment.
206

207 **VIII. Next Steps:**

208 Action items:

209

- 210 Based on tonight's discussion, Vern will develop and present a straw budget at the
211 September 18, 2014 meeting.
- 212 Working groups will develop more detailed scopes of work and budget justifications
213 for the September meeting.
 - 214 ○ EnviroIssues will develop a scope of work template and distribute it to the
215 working groups.
- 216 • The Groundwater Monitoring Plan will be presented at a future meeting.
217

218

219 **IX. 2014 Meeting Calendar:**

- 220 • January 16, 2014
- 221 • February 20, 2014
- 222 • April 17, 2014
- 223 • June 19, 2014
- 224 • August 21, 2014
- 225 • September 18, 2014

226 • October 16, 2014

227 • December 18, 2014 (as needed)

228

229 The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 pm.

230

231 Meeting summary approved by the GWAC on October 16, 2014.