

Southern Willamette Valley Groundwater Management Area (SWV GWMA)
Committee Meeting Minutes
April 21, 2016
Junction City Community Center
175 W. 7th St. Junction City, OR. 97448

In Attendance: *GWMA Committee members

*Pat Straube (CAFO, resident, business owner), *Rich Margerum (Univ. of Oregon, and Long Tom Watershed Council), * Samantha Murray (Oregon Environmental Council), *Jerry Marguth (farmer), *Mindi Thornton (farmer), *George Pugh (farmer), *Mike Kessler (Surecrop), *Bill Emminger (Benton County Environmental Health), *Dennis Boeger (business), *Anne Schuster (Benton County Commissioner)

Wesley Miller (Benton Farm Bureau, farmer), Jiajia Lin (NRC, EPA), Jana Compton (EPA), Denise Kalakay (LCOG), Zach Loboy (DEQ), Bill Mason (DEQ), Priscilla Woolverton (DEQ), Wym Matthews (ODA), Susanna Pearlstein (ORISE), Chrissy Lucas (OSU Extension), Brittany May (Linn County), Shawn Stevenson (OHA), Michael Mattick (OWRD)

8:30 Announcements, Introductions
Jerry Marguth, Chair

8:10 Approval of Last Meeting Minutes
Jerry Marguth, Chair

- Minutes approved

8:15 What's Happening in the GWMA: Short Updates
Wym Matthews, ODA

- Fertilizer updates; pricing and contents
 - 2015 HB passed, which increases registration fee on soil amendments, fertilizers, compost and lime and an inspection fee for lime.
 - Product registration fee increase from \$25/ yr to \$35/ yr, begins July 1, 2016.
 - Lime products will have an inspection fee of \$0.05/ ton, begins July 1, 2016.
 - New minimum fertilizer inspection fee of \$15/ reporting period, begins July 1, 2016.
 - Statewide RFP will go out in next couple of weeks for fertilizer-related projects, e.g. application efficiency etc. About \$70,000/ yr will be awarded; this money can help leverage other funding sources.
 - In the process of wrapping-up: a two year fertilizer research grant with Susanna Pearlstein and Benton SWCD; a three year fertilizer research grant in Morrow County (Lower Umatilla GWMA).
- CAFOS
 - ODEQ issued new permit, so ODA in process of renewing CAFO permits from 2009 to 2016 permit.

- Previously, permit had a narrative effluent limit of “zero,” and the new permit has quantified an effluent of “0.” A non-detect (ND) reported in a lab analysis does not mean “0,” it represents the detection limit of the methodology used by the analytical lab.
- New permit requires increased soil sampling, i.e. post-harvest soil nitrate test. Publication [PNW 8832](#) indicates what soil-N should be post-harvest for different crops.

Priscilla Woolverton, DEQ

- Winners of the SWV GWMA logo and tagline survey
 - 23 total votes for logo survey
 - 20 votes total for tagline survey



Make the Link to What You Drink.

- B. Emminger: request to have logo and tagline emailed to Committee members

Open Floor to Committee and Attendees

- No other updates

8:50 DEQ Program Update

Input from Committee on GWMA Coordinator Position and Priorities

Zach Loboy, DEQ

- Audrey Eldridge’s position will not be filled as previously intended due to budget constraints, so various activities previously performed by the GWMA Coordinator will be reduced moving forward.
 - Staff time for organizing and facilitating meetings will be reduced. We recommend meeting on a less frequent schedule and going from three to four meetings a year to two meetings a year. Meeting less frequently also takes into account a general reduction in the work being completed in the SWV GWMA.
 - One of the areas that the GWMA Coordinator will be dedicating less time to is facilitating the subcommittee meetings for updating the Action Plan. DEQ would like to have the subcommittees organize themselves to meet independently and report back to DEQ with recommendations for updating the SWV GWMA Action Plan.
 - D. Kalakay: That will not happen; organizing and facilitating subcommittees should be a staff person’s responsibility.
 - Z. Loboy: I thought the subcommittees were already formed.
 - D. Kalakay: Well, kind of, but not really.

- Z. Loboy: Please describe what the subcommittees are for.
- D. Kalakay: These were formed to come up with priorities and strategies specific to the various components of the Action Plan. It tends to be led by staff and takes a lot of coordination on the part of staff.
- Z. Loboy: DEQ can commit to establishing subcommittees, but what level of facilitation is needed from staff for an already established subcommittee?
- R. Margerum: The agricultural subcommittee has been the most active, but a lot of it is dependent on what the data is telling us. I think we need to revisit the strategies in light of the current trends in the data and we need staff to take a lead role in this.
- D. Boeger: I'm so busy I wouldn't have time to run the framework of setting-up and facilitating a subcommittee. If a meeting is set-up for me, though, I could attend and provide feedback. I need staff to set it up, though. We can provide technical input. I haven't spent a lot of time on this, so I don't even know what's going on with the residential and other subcommittees.
- C. Lucas: 319 grant funding supported me in reaching out and getting feedback and updates from subcommittees, but it was so hard to get people together that me and Audrey ended up reaching out to people individually for feedback, so it took a lot of time.
- P. Straube: If you need input, than bring people [subcommittee] together, but if you don't need any input and you're just reporting on stuff...
- J. Marguth: I agree with Pat. The Action Plan that was developed originally was very good, but periodic review by DEQ staff is needed- especially since activities in the GWMA are being reduced. That way DEQ can report back to the Committee what is and isn't happening and the Committee can make recommendations for how to move forward.
- P. Straube: Have we even cured anything? Have we made anything better? That's what I want to know. We aren't getting the information that we want to hear when we come to these meetings.
- P. Woolverton: When I send the agenda out to you ahead of the meeting, that is your opportunity to let me know if the agenda doesn't reflect what you want to hear and discuss. Please contact me anytime if something comes up that you would like to see on the next meeting agenda.
- B. Emminger: It would be good to go over the various parts of the Action Plan with the Committee at a future meeting.
- D. Kalakay and Rich Margerum: Yes, that's a good idea, let's go over the addendums as well.
- S. Stevenson: We updated the public drinking water system part last year, but it should be reviewed by the Committee at this point.

- J. Marguth: What do you think about reducing meetings to two a year?
- A. Schuster: We could do fewer meetings, but have them be three hours instead of two hours. The third hour could be used for subcommittee meetings.
- J. Marguth: A lot of times, the Committee doesn't say much.
- G. Pugh: Yes, our input can be as slow as changes in groundwater sometimes. Two times a year for meetings seems reasonable.
- D. Boeger: My initial reaction was that this is a dramatic reduction. Unless we ramp-up communications between meetings, it might not be enough.
- M. Thornton: I'm good with that- we're all electronically connected, and we can address in the future if a third meeting is needed.
- D. Kalakay: the reduction in 319 funding would mean that a reduction in staff time would take place because they aren't doing 319 work.
- P. Straube: With LCOG leaving, what's left? Are we, the Committee, even necessary? What are we?
- R. Margerum: The first few years there was a lot of energy to build from the ground-up, and now as much energy isn't needed to refine the plans and move forward.
- Z. Loby: Yes, the Committee is important and is still needed.
- C. Lucas: I can do a 0.05 FTE in the GWMA as part of my Small Farms assignment in Benton and Linn Counties, but that's it.
- B. Emminger: It strikes me that we are moving into an entirely different mode. When we do meet, we should be reviewing the data, trends and provide technical assistance on what we should be doing moving forward. The tone of the meetings should address these concerns.
- J. Marguth: I will request that we have a three hour meeting in October and go over the Action Plan current status and needs, as well as any trends in the data.

8:35 BREAK

8:45 Prioritizing Areas of Action Plan Implementation - Denise Kalakay, LCOG, GIS Mapping of high nitrate areas and neighborhoods, GWMA Outreach messages to rural residents, Input from Committee on areas selected and outreach messages

- D. Kalakay: We had never pulled all of the monitoring sample events into one map before, so this is the first comprehensive map we've compiled. Looking at clusters of higher [N], as well as how people use the transit corridors for commuting and stuff, informed how "neighborhoods" for outreach were delineated.

- Rich Margerum: This is really great to see all of the data represented on one map and applied in this way.
- D. Boeger: Is there, moving forward, an opportunity to hear what staff says about monitoring moving forward with reductions that are taking place. Also, it's helpful to see with this map the "what" and "where."
- D. Kalakay: Hopefully, in the future, we could do another synoptic event.
- W. Matthews: Paul Measles wanted me to share that this map fits nicely with what ODA is working on in regards to "focus areas." These delineations of areas that have issues could be incorporated into the District's focus area approach for working with hobby farms, etc.
- D. Kalakay: It would also be great to bring rural residential and farmers within an area together to have discussions and not just limit outreach to specific stakeholder groups.
- A. Schuster: It looks like areas outside of the GWMA have also been tested, but they're all low in [N].
- D. Kalakay: That stood out to me too, there are "cold spots" too.
- B. Mason: For outreach purposes, this defines things really well.
- B. Emminger: This is the first time I've seen all of this together. I think it will be important to see a map of the monitoring locations in the GWMA with the arrows showing trends.
- B. Mason: We brought a map like that, but our technical problems are preventing us from sharing it today. We'll have one at the next meeting.
- Question: What was the date range on the real estate transfer data?
- D. Kalakay: I think it is from the last 15 years up to 2014.
- R. Margerum: This is for outreach messages, so what will we do with this?
- D. Kalakay: Glad you brought this up. The idea is to do specific outreach in these "neighborhoods." It basically allows us to personalize the outreach message, e.g. include information that is specific to your neighborhood and the area you live, as well as treatment system options, what N contamination means for you.
- Question: Of those people who know they have contamination, how many people get treatment systems?
- D. Kalakay: That's a question that Priscilla and I have been discussing. We don't know, but we are interested in pursuing this and finding out.
- P. Straube: The well at our home has been tested for 10 years. We get a sheet that shows the data, and ours was high. We never received information about what that means for my health or information about treatment options. I wish there was more of a follow-up.
- A. Schuster: You list several reasons for high [N], but there's no explanation for the specific reason any one hot spot exists.
- B. Mason: That's something I can help with through some additional analyses. For example, Coburg has a very high density of onsite systems.

10:05 GWMA Monitoring Program Update - Priscilla Woolverton and Bill Mason, DEQ, Current status of Monitoring Program, Discussion of data exploration and questions needing answered by the data

- P. Woolverton: The reduction of staff and resources in the GWMA was also an impetus for us to reduce the monitoring sample design for the GWMA, as well. We wanted to continue to sample each groundwater and drinking water well at least once a year, so instead of cutting wells from the sampling design, we decided to look at the data and make recommendations for reducing some well monitoring from quarterly to annually. For those wells that show a lot of spread in the data (a lot of variability) and/or consistently hit above the [N] threshold, we kept on the quarterly monitoring schedule. But for wells that are pretty consistent and/or stay below the threshold, we reduced to only annual sampling.
 - No questions asked
- P: Woolverton: Next, Bill Mason will speak with you about what types of questions you would like to ask of the data. This information will help us organize the data as we move from Excel spreadsheets to a database.
- B. Mason: I've heard you want is to be doing trend analysis, but are there other questions that you want to have answered.
 - B. Emminger: I have some well data that you may be interested in seeing- it is from outside the GWMA, though...
 - B. Mason: Yes, please send that to me.
 - Rich: Looking at these wells you can see that some of them used to have decreasing trends, but now seem to be increasing in [N]. It would be nice to try to understand why this may be happening.
 - A. Schuster: Is there research in [N] going on at Oregon State University?
 - S. Pearlstein: Roy Haggerty and John Selker did a lot in the 1990's and the RARE/PINE project does partner with OSU Extension.
 - J. Compton: Nutrient uptake and efficiency is being studied, but not much research, to my knowledge, is being done in regards to where nitrogen is coming from.
 - G. Pugh: I'm interested in seasonality.
 - B. Mason: We do see a lot of seasonality, so that would be a good investigation.
 - J. Compton: I think changes in agricultural practices will greatly help with the interpretation of these data, as well as changes in septic systems etc.
 - B. Emminger: I saw some LiDaR at some point that helped show where the Willamette used to meander. That might help explain how nitrogen is being short-circuited and ending up where it does in the GWMA.
 - A. Schuster: Does this tie-in to Willamette Water 2100 work? I think Haggerty is involved with that.

- D. Kalakay: That's more surface water focused. It's a big climate change/ water study.
- J. Compton: 2100 is also looking at future water scenarios.
- A. Schuster: A meeting for 2100 is coming up soon; this information may be of interest to someone here.
- D. Kalakay: Soil sensitivity may also be interesting/ informative to look at.
- B. Mason: Soil sensitivity is related to infiltration, sorption properties etc. Sorption isn't relevant to nitrate because it doesn't adsorb.
- Rich: There's been a lot of reporting at previous meetings. It would be interesting to go the next step and see how this impacts actions moving forward.
- P. Straube: Yes, within the Action Plan, please highlight what there is funding for.
- B. Emminger: Most of the Plan relies on partners.
- A. Schuster: If there was some way to make this information County-specific, I could send this info out to Council of Governments.
- Brittany May: I get a lot of calls about nitrogen contamination in the water. Using Denise's presentation would be great for the outreach I do.
- C. Lucas: There is a whole section on the GWMA website with materials too.
- B. Emminger: We heard a lot today about reductions and support disappearing. I think we're also interested in getting more info out to the GWMA. I motion that the Committee support other stakeholders when they apply for grants and other sources of funding to support outreach in the GWMA.
- D. Boeger: Second motion.
- Motion passed.

10:30 Adjourn