

Meeting Notes 5.18.10

1. Recap and Questions

- a. Where are the shellfish growing areas?
 - i. Distributed a map of the current harvest areas. Green areas of the maps are approved and red are prohibited
 - ii. Harvest sites change annually.
 - iii. No harvest sites in the prohibited areas
 - iv. The two red prohibited areas in the North.
 1. One is a marina
 2. The other doesn't meet the water quality standards.
 - a. Pollution is coming from bulkhead discharge pipes and small tributaries.
 - b. It was reported that a property owner that has cattle where runoff goes into a stormwater pipe that drains to the beach.
 - c. Possible pollution sources in the tributaries may be wildlife and suspect septic systems
- b. Are septic systems a problem in the Nisqually Reach?
 - i. Flow of water is along the shoreline. Not like an inlet where the water circulates around.
 - ii. Handout showing past sanitary survey results.
 1. Those that failed in the Nisqually from 1994-1999 of 27% while other inlets were at 14%.
 2. The data from Henderson and Nisqually were from systems where the owner volunteered to have it tested.
 3. Nearshore systems in the Nisqually show a 50% failure rate.
 4. 60% of the failures are usually minor repairs.
 5. Soils are tight throughout the survey areas with a few pockets of better draining soils.
 6. Totten inlet has lower density of systems.
 7. The systems that were found to be failing have been repaired. But since the voluntary requirement the other systems have probably not been repaired.
 8. Kitsap county has found that the catastrophic repairs go down over time but about the same percentage of failures.
 - iii. A statement was made that there is no large streams emptying into the Nisqually Reach. Finding the sources may be easier because there is a smaller area being drained.
 - iv. The Nisqually River discussion
 1. FC continues to look good.
 2. There are large spikes due to the first flush of the year.
 3. Lots of effort has been spent to improve agricultural practices.

4. McAllister Creek data is looking better. It meets freshwater quality standards of 100 colonies/? But the problem is that the marine standards are 14 colonies/?

2. Formulate Proposal

- a. Boundary of area
 - i. Adopted by the BoCC and BoH
 - ii. FC won't pass from Lake St.Clair to McAllister Springs.
 - iii. Nisqually tribe is building a high tech. sewage treatment plant.
 - iv. First suggestion was to cut off south of Yelm Hwy. – no consensus
 - v. Next suggestion was to only include areas that can contribute to the Nisqually Reach area. Use LiDAR to help determine the boundary. The group agreed to this suggestion.
- b. Name
 - i. Nisqually Reach Watershed Protection Area.
- c. Inspections: Criteria for intensity and frequency
 - i. Dye test methods will work in the Nisqually Reach area.
 - ii. No changes to proposed program
- d. Enforcement: Level and methods
 - i. The Board just adopted a regulatory requirement that when a property is sold the health department needs to provide a notice on whether the septic system is in compliance. This will go into effect on September 1st.
 - ii. If a system is out of compliance no county permits can be issued until it is brought back into compliance.
 - iii. The group accepted what was proposed with no changes.
- e. Service Providers: Who does the inspections, what are the qualifications
 - i. The group accepted what was proposed with no changes.
- f. Funding formulas and billing mechanisms – how to calculate and collect program fees
 - i. Incentives.
 1. The group accepted keeping the same incentives with no changes or additions.
 2. Incentives will be built into the program costs – agreed to by the group.
 3. Need to consider what incentives are restricted by what the county can provide funds for.
 4. There was a question on whether the riser rebate program should be included.
 - a. Good for social marketing to change the behavior.
 - b. The county is noticing great renewals probably due to the riser rebate.
 - ii. Fee per system or per parcel discussion.
 1. A proposal was put on the table to have a fee per system.
 2. Staff will bring back some idea of number of parcels with multiple systems.

iii. Adaptive management:

1. If the group decides to go with fee per system then can we amend the Henderson program to make the same change.

g. Recommendations

3. What next?