

## RSMP Effectiveness Studies Workshop 1

Report-out for Topic Table \_Raingardens

Proposal title:

---

1. Kirkland – res. Raingardens – **show of permittee hands - vote by group: 3|1|1|2 -- 7 total**
2. King Co – Flow control/pollutant redux in commercial sized bio retention fac – **3|4|3|3 --13T**
3. Stewardship Partners – citizen-based monitoring of res. Raingardens – **11|2|2|1 --16T**
4. King Co – PCB cycling – **5|4|2|1 --12T**

### ***Summary of feedback given during the Topic Table discussions***

---

Why are permittees interested in getting this info? How are they going to use it?

All studies could be helpful in sizing RG/bio retention

1: no specific comments (not much support for this concept expressed at tables – other than project proponent)

2 & 4 would also be helpful for industrial permittees – results could translate to the industrial setting

2: Comparison of systems and ability to vary flow/etc. valuable for permittees, may inform design/function

3: Results would help to promote RGs to homeowners; supports public ed programs

-Informs: site assessment and RG function overtime; maintenance requirements for homeowners; how homeowners are maintaining their systems

4: Informs where this treatment type should be used – how it can be optimized for treatment

What are the barriers or obstacles to getting the information, or concerns about its use? Is there anything missing?

Concern that raingardens can lead to varied results bc the systems are innately variable and dependent on local conditions (such as native soils) and how the system was designed/maintained etc

All projects concern about where the runoff will come from

1: Missing pre-condition assessment of sites

3: Could be used to develop a protocol for assessment/maintenance that could be used broadly

4: Add to study questions PCB content in plant tissue

March 20, 2014

## RSMP Effectiveness Studies Workshop 1

How will you make this proposal regionally relevant and/or informative? Opportunities?

All studies could be regionally relevant...

1. Concern that this would not result in regionally relevant info due to scale of proposal

2: As a retrofit project – this study would result in good data that would be regionally relevant

Concern also expressed due to the limited scale of the proposal

Would also be helpful for scaling up or down the design of systems

3: Regionally Relevant –

Helpful in illustrating how homeowners are maintaining RGs;

Study is expansive – target more area and people

if RGs are reducing basement/structure flooding

Illustrate long-term effectiveness of RG

Informs future permit requirements

4: Regionally Relevant –

Answers toxics question (where are PCBs going)

Study Methods results in comparable data

Site could be added in Puyallup