

GWMA Regulatory Meeting Summary – May 13, 2015

Lower Yakima Valley Groundwater Management Area Advisory Committee May 13, 2015

Regulatory Framework Working Group

Charge from Groundwater Management Area Advisory Committee

[Insert Charge]

Working Group Members

Jean Mendoza, Chair (Friends of Toppenish Creek), Andres Cervantes (Department of Health), Bill Dunbar (Environmental Protection Agency), Charlie McKinney (Department of Ecology), Chelsea Durfey (Turner and Co.), Dan DeGroot (Yakima Dairy Federation), Ginny Prest (Department of Agriculture), Jason Sheehan (Yakima Dairy Federation), Jim Dyjak (Concerned Citizen of Yakama Reservation), Laurie Crowe (South Yakima Conservation District), Patricia Newhouse (Lower Valley Community Representative), Steve George (Yakima County Farm Bureau), Sue Wedam (Lower Valley Community Representative), Vern Redifer (Yakima County Public Services), Jim Davenport (Yakima County Public Services)

Meetings/Calls Dates

Meeting: May 13, 2015 1:00PM – 3:00 PM

Call Number: 509-574-2353 CODE #2353

Participants

Present: Jean Mendoza, Andy Cervantes*, Bill Dunbar*, Ginny Prest*, Charlie McKinney, Jason Sheehan, Jim Davenport, Larry Fendell, Lee Murdock, Laurie Crowe*, Patricia Newhouse, Dave Newhouse, Steve George, Vern Redifer, Jim Dyjak, Lee Murdock, Greta Smith (Yakima County Support Staff)

*via phone

Key Discussion Points

- Ground Rules
- What does the Final Product for the Regulatory Working Group need to include?
- Who do we need to hear from in order to evaluate the regulatory and non-regulatory programs?
- Timeline for the Study Sessions
- What are the Goals & Objectives for the Regulatory Working Group?

Ground Rules

Jean Mendoza started the discussion of Ground Rules by asking the Working Group what is a quorum? Who is able to vote? And how should multiple viewpoints be presented? There was a summary that at the last GWAC meeting there was clarification that work groups could have members who were not GWAC members as all decisions made by the work groups are presented to the GWAC. The decision was then between allowing all in attendance at a work group meeting to vote or only Formal work group Members. Jean stated that the past decision regarding this could not be located and that she wanted the group to discuss. Pros and Cons for each was discussed. Feedback themes included concern that members of the public would not maintain involvement without a voice in work group voting and that recommendations should come from meaningful conversation and not just a vote of individuals who show up. The decision moving forward was that the work group would maintain consensus for recommendations presented to GWAC. With no vote, the issue of quorum was not further discussed. Regarding circumstances where there are multiple viewpoints identified, it was determined both should be presented to the GWAC for final decision should no consensus be reached by the group.

Final Product of the Regulatory Working Group

Jean began this topic discussion by asking if any members had any preconceived ideas of what the final product of the work group should be or look like. There was discussion about the work group plans that were developed in the past and distributed to the GWAC members. There was a request that it be brought to the next meeting for reference. Jean distributed WAC 173.100.100 for additional review to assist the group in ensuring they are following the law. There was clarification that the work group plans came directly from the WAC with added roles. Jean reminded the group that a lot of time was spent developing a mission for the Regulatory group in the past, but as of yet have not developed goals and objectives for the final product. To accomplish this, Jean asked the group how much time they were willing to spend working online to develop the final product. It was recommended by the group that review of materials online was acceptable, but should there be a complex issue regarding decision making it would be best to meet face-to-face. There was also agreement that providing materials online to review prior to meetings was very helpful to set expectations and enables the group to arrive at the meeting prepared. Additional discussion regarding the shape of the final product of the work group continued into the following agenda items.

Timeline for the Study Sessions

At this time there are monthly study sessions set through September. Jean asked if it feasible to have a study session and work group debrief on the same day. There was agreement that the presentations are information heavy and difficult to process a week or two after the fact. There was a request that outlines be submitted beforehand to give participants an opportunity to ramp up prior to the presentation. There was a decision to schedule 1 hour post presentation to process the information. There was a suggestion that a quick summary after the meeting could be produced and sent out to the GWAC for educational purposes which lead to a discussion regarding the goals for the study sessions and the role of the work group. The group agreed that rather than educating the GWAC on all of the regulations, that the Regulatory group was the

main body that would become educated on the relevant regulations in order to make recommendations to the GWAC and ultimately to the final program.

Action: Jim and Jean will move forward with scheduling presenters

Jean led the discussion pointing out that it is challenging to identify the gaps between the current regulations and that more information is needed. She suggested that the group look the regulatory and non-regulatory programs that CAFO, Irr/Ag, and RCIM interact with and determined how they affect/contribute to the each of those sources. There was a question about the Gap Analysis that Lee had started to produce after the last work group meeting. There was also clarification regarding the definition of a Gap Analysis. Specifically, that it did not necessarily only look for gaps in regulations, but rather looks at the need (problem definition), current resources, and identifies that gap between those two things. Lee agreed to provide an outline of the process for the next work group meeting for the group to review. The issue of the final product of the work group was tabled until the next meeting.

Action: Lee will write up an outline for the proposed Gap Analysis and present it at the next meeting.

Goals & Objectives for the Regulatory Work Group

While there was initial discussion around goals & objectives, in the interest of time this topic was tabled until the next meeting.

Meeting Adjourned: 3:15 PM

Resources Requested

-

Recommendations for GWAC

-

Deliverables/Products Status

-

Proposed Next Steps

- Next meeting: Wednesday, June 10, 2015, 12:00 PM-3:00 PM at First Street Conference Center, 223 N. 1st Street