

John Van Wingerden III	Port of Sunnyside	✓	
Jay Decker	Port of Sunnyside (alternate)		✓
Rand Elliott	Yakima County Board of Commissioners		✓
Vern Redifer	Yakima County Board of Commissioners (alternate)	✓	
Ryan Ibach	Yakima Health District		✓
Dr. Troy Peters	WSU Irrigated Agriculture Research and Extension Center	✓	
Lucy Edmondson	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	✓	
Nick Peak	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (alternate)	✓	
Elizabeth Sanchey	Yakama Nation		✓
Stuart Crane	Yakama Nation (alternate)	✓	
Gary Bahr	WA Department of Agriculture		✓
Perry Beale	WA Department of Agriculture (alternate)	✓	
Andy Cervantes	WA Department of Health		✓
Sheryl Howe	WA Department of Health (alternate)		✓
David Bowen	WA Department of Ecology	✓	
Sage Park	WA Department of Ecology (alternate)	✓	
Lino Guerra	Hispanic Community Representative		✓
Rick Perez	Hispanic Community Representative (alternate)		✓
Jessica Black	Heritage University		✓
Matt Bachmann	USGS	✓	

- 13 **II. Welcome, Meeting Overview and Introductions:** Everyone introduced themselves. Vern
 14 provided an overview of the agenda – there were no additions. The group discussed
 15 progress on the plan and noted that despite Jim Davenport’s absence Yakima County
 16 personnel continue to move forward with the work.
 17
- 18 **III. Complete the Discussion of Alternatives (last blue items):** Vern informed the group that
 19 Jean Mendoza had rewritten the alternatives related to enforcing the Washington State
 20 Clean Air Rule and displayed Jean’s five rewrites on the screen (since it was not possible to
 21 provide them to the group prior to the meeting). Some of the alternatives were identical to
 22 each other but assigned responsibility to four different agencies – DOE, WSDA, EPA and
 23 YHD. David Bowen asked Jean if she had rewritten these to address and clarify the
 24 remaining blue alternatives. Jean said yes. A discussion ensued. Some of the members
 25 thought that there should be one lead agency rather than four. Some of the members also
 26 voiced concern about spending and/or requesting funding to obtain data on a relatively low
 27 contributor of nitrogen to the groundwater. Lucy Edmonson stated that she had recently

28 learned that the EPA was developing modelling tools through an evolving program called
29 CMAQ that could be used to look at atmospheric deposition across the nation and how it
30 effects air and groundwater. Lucy did not know the timing, however. Vern noted that the
31 atmospheric deposition numbers he had calculated for the GWMA while working on the
32 Nitrogen Availability Assessment were accurate when compared to the calculations for the
33 Tulare Basin information. WSDA personnel performed their own calculations and compared
34 them – they were accurate as well. Ultimately the group agreed that Vern and Lucy would
35 work together to craft language for these alternatives to reflect the GWMA’s support of this
36 EPA endeavor outlined by Lucy for the LYV GWMA.

37

38 Vern announced that the group had now completed their review of the suggested
39 alternatives and added that the next step would be to try to write cogent statements to
40 combine the duplicative alternatives and therefore collapse the list. Once the list was
41 agreed upon in its final format the alternatives would be discussed at the Funding Working
42 Group meeting in order to explore funding possibilities.

43

44 **IV. Nitrogen Availability Assessment (Distribute Comments on Draft NAA):** Vern asked the
45 group if they would be agreeable to postponing a discussion on the responses to the
46 comments that had been made on the NAA. He was concerned that no one had had a
47 chance to review the responses since they had not been provided previous to this evening’s
48 meeting. The group agreed to place this on the November 2 agenda.

49

50 **V. GIS Applications:** Vern gave the group a tour of the GIS applications which reflect what the
51 group has learned to date about nitrates in the GWMA. He explained he would provide a
52 link for everyone so they could access the web based application. This would allow
53 everyone to try it and view different GIS layers for themselves. He also pointed out that the
54 speed of the program would be proportionate to the internet connection. Vern went on to
55 explain that any geographic components in Yakima County could be analyzed and gave the
56 following examples: Where biosolids were permitted and or applied, locations of CAFO
57 pens and compost areas, corrals and feed lots, hobby farms, all septic tanks including LOSS
58 and COSS, residential lawns and crops. Also flow paths of groundwater from the USGS
59 study, ground contours from surface topography, aerial photography, water elevation
60 maps, and water quality testing done (not including the USGS testing until after December).
61 He added that this information was totally updateable. In addition, the GIS layering
62 provided the user the ability to click on any one of these items and the GIS web application
63 would provide additional details like crop type, irrigation type, land size, loading rates by

64 type (RCIM, Irrigated Ag, etc., with applicable percentages of contribution per the NAA),
65 field data, etc. Vern said that based on a comment in the NAA a new map was prepared
66 including the number of septic tanks per square mile. A member asked about atmospheric
67 deposition loading contributions and Vern reminded the group that atmospheric deposition
68 had been included in the CAFO and Irrigated Ag portions of the NAA.

69
70 Vern encouraged members to look at this application in depth to see if there are likely
71 conclusions that should be drawn, suggestions of useful changes/additions or if anything
72 was missed. He emphasized that no member could hurt, break or ruin the web based
73 application and that it was brand new technology that will continue to be added to as new
74 information became available. A member asked if there was any way to take individual test
75 sites and break them down further. Vern said yes this could be done for the 160 sites USGS
76 is testing because well logs were required. Matt thought that the well logs might be
77 scanned in as well. Also data reflecting test methods, who took the test and the depth of
78 the test, etc., was available as well for other sample wells.

79
80 When asked what they thought members responded and said they felt the tool would be
81 quite useful. Vern provided members with the address to access the information. It was
82 <http://arcg.is/1ie9mP>. Vern indicated he would email to members a hyperlink to the site
83 and added that the site would provide up-to-the-minute updates. Vern agreed to have
84 Mike Martian (from GIS) put a print button on it too.

85
86 **VI. Committee Business:** The October 5, 2017 meeting summary was approved as presented.

87
88 **VII. Public Comment:** There was no public comment. The meeting adjourned at 6:55 PM.

89
90 **VIII. Next Meeting:** November 2, 2017.

91
92 **IX. Next Steps:** 1) Lucy Edmondson and Vern Redifer will rework the five alternatives Jean
93 Mendoza proposed to reflect the GWMA's support of the EPA endeavor outlined by Lucy as
94 it pertained to the LYV GWMA. 2) A discussion on the comments on the draft NAA will be
95 placed on the November 2 agenda. 3) Vern will send the group a hyperlink to the web
96 based application containing LYV GWMA GIS information previewed by the group.

97
98 **X. Meeting Summary** approved by the GWAC on _____.