

# STORMWATER WORK GROUP

Wednesday, February 15, 2012 9:10 AM – 1:00 PM  
USGS conference room  
934 Broadway, Tacoma

## Draft Summary

OF THE MEETING'S KEY DISCUSSIONS, DECISIONS AND AGREEMENTS

### ATTENDEES:

*Work Group Members and Alternates, and the Organizations or Groups and Caucuses they Represent:*

**Shayne Cothorn** (WDNR), State Agencies; **Jay Davis** (USFWS), Federal Agencies; **Dana De Leon** (Tacoma), Local Governments; **Rich Doenges** (Thurston Co.), Local Governments; **Jonathan Frodge** (Seattle), Local Governments; **Dick Gersib** (WSDOT), State Agencies; **Heather Kibbey** (Everett), Local Governments; **Dino Marshalonis** (USEPA), Federal Agencies; **Mel Oleson** (Boeing), Business Groups; **Kit Paulsen** (Bellevue), Local Governments; **Tony Paulson** (USGS), Federal Agencies; **Tom Putnam** (Puget Soundkeeper Alliance), Environmental Groups; **Jim Simmonds** (King Co.), Local Governments and the Work Group's Chair; **Carol Smith** (WSCC), Agriculture; **Bruce Wulkan** (Puget Sound Partnership), State Agencies.

*Others in attendance:* **Neil Aaland**, Assn. of WA Cities and WA Assn. of Counties; **Todd Hunsdorfer**, Kent; **Kurt Marx**, Washington Stormwater Center; **Lorna Mauren**, Tacoma; **Bill Taylor**, Cardno TEC.

*Work Group Staff:* **Karen Dinicola** (Ecology), Project Manager.

### WORK GROUP APPROVES 2012-2013 WORK PLAN

The Work Plan Subgroup compiled the proposed work plan updates provided by the subgroups and developed a new work plan for the coming two years. The task list in the new work plan is similar to the current work plan, with "Status and Trends Oversight" separated into distinct tasks for the marine nearshore and small streams components; and deletion of the "Action Agenda Updates" task. The work plan includes two overall categories of tasks: implementing our previous recommendations and expanding the regional monitoring program within the framework described in the 2010 Strategy. Due to our missed meeting during the January snowstorm, the dates indicated for many work plan tasks and work group discussions need to be adjusted. Work group members added to Task 9: "scope and launch one or two new subgroups" according to new criteria that will be developed this spring. With these updates, work group members approved the new work plan.

Before the next work group meeting, each subgroup will identify a chair if it does not currently have one. Each subgroups should also discuss staffing needs and ideas for augmenting the minimal staffing currently provided to our many subgroups by our lone project manager. The Agricultural Runoff Subgroup sets a good example for providing the necessary capacity to successfully expand implementation of the recommendations in our June 2010 Strategy.

### WORK GROUP CONSIDERS PROCESS AND CRITERIA FOR EXPANDING SWAMPPS

In the process of discussing work plan updates, work group members considered what new areas are likely to be the next priorities for expansion. WSDOT is interested in starting a Transportation Subgroup to set priorities for monitoring focused on roads and highways. The business community is interested in developing monitoring recommendations for the next industrial stormwater NPDES permit. Other topics of interest for future subgroup work may include: construction stormwater; lakes; combined sewer overflows; and clean-ups.

Work group members agreed that it will be important to have a transparent process to identify our next set of subgroups that will develop recommendations for new land uses, permits, or water bodies. At our next meeting we will discuss a "gap analysis" of the current plans for implementing the June 2010 Strategy (Tom Putnam and Karen Dinicola will work on this). Mel Oleson offered to draft a list of criteria for identifying new subgroups. The

criteria will be discussed by the Work Plan Subgroup in a conference call to be arranged by Jim Simmonds. Work group members suggested that the criteria include: timing of permit issuance or other identified need; interest and capacity of a work group member's agency and/or other organization to both staff and chair the new subgroup; ability for the work group to meaningfully review and discuss the recommendations for timely approval; and likelihood that a funding source can be identified to implement the new recommendations.

### **NEW AGRICULTURAL RUNOFF MONITORING RECOMMENDATIONS DISCUSSED**

The Agricultural Runoff Subgroup is developing separate recommendations for pesticides, habitat monitoring, nutrients, and bacteria throughout the course of this year. They will propose an implementation plan for all of the approved recommendations in 2013. At today's meeting the work group discussed the subgroup's initial three recommendations for pesticide monitoring and one for habitat monitoring. For pesticides, the subgroup recommends the current USDA/Ecology weekly monitoring mid-March through September, increasing the sampling effort during peak flows, and geographically expanding the monitoring. For habitat, the subgroup recommends supporting the status and trends monitoring component of the regional stormwater monitoring program.

Work group members appreciated the subgroup's efforts and requested additional information about current monitoring of agricultural runoff to improve their contextual understanding of the recommendations. Work group members specifically asked the subgroup to articulate the monitoring questions that the current and proposed monitoring are intended to answer and also to consider adding a rotating panel of sampling sites and to reflect on the overlap between agricultural, residential, and commercial pesticide uses.

This discussion highlighted a broader need for the work group to define expectations and criteria for new stormwater monitoring recommendations in advance of launching new subgroups. At a minimum we need all of our technical subgroups to articulate in their recommendations: priority questions that need to be answered; specific elements of current monitoring efforts that should continue to provide information to answer monitoring questions; targeted additional data collection and analyses needed to answer the questions; and a means of implementing the new monitoring over time (including funding, staff, and other resources).

### **WORK GROUP CONSIDERS EFFECTIVENESS STUDY TOPICS AND SELECTION PROCESS**

The Effectiveness Subgroup will be meeting February 29 to discuss (1) the final literature review, and particularly, the work to be done to determine the extent to which our recommended priority study topics have been sufficiently answered to date; and (2) the process and criteria for selecting study proponents. For the latter, work group members discussed the need to get the best study design proposals and to ensure that the combined capacities and expertise in the region will be utilized to get the work done via public-private partnerships. Work group members request that references to an "RFP" process in the work plan and in permit-related documents be replaced with "process for contracting" to ensure flexibility.

### **SOURCE IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION REPOSITORY (SIDIR)**

The Source Identification Subgroup is working to better define purpose if and needs for the repository and to develop specific next steps for creating the repository. Kurt Marx of the Washington Stormwater Center (WSC) joined Dana de Leon (a co-chair of the subgroup) in presenting a visioning memo and tasks to undertake in the next several months. Kurt and Dana described how the GROSS (grants of regional or statewide significance) proposal by King County to develop a field screening manual fits into the overall SIDIR concept. Proponents of the GROSS proposal are coordinating with the subgroup.

The vision articulated for the SIDIR is that two distinct categories of information need to be stored and shared: information about strategies and actions to control, identify, and remove sources of pollution; and data associated with each of those strategies and actions that can be used to support and prioritize regional efforts to reduce sources. Permittees (with varying levels of expertise), non-permittees, Ecology, and the broader water quality community all have roles to play. A peer network for sharing information will be a key element of the SIDIR.

Between now and the end of September WSC staff will develop a series of interview questions for local government and other experts in source control, source identification, and source removal. Dana and co-chair Mindy Fohn (Kitsap County) are identifying between 15 and 20 people that will be interviewed. Louise Kulzer of Seattle has volunteered to be a “guinea pig” first interviewee to ensure that good information will result from the interviews. WSC will compile the information in a report to the SWG by the end of October. The report will include: a review of published literature on strategies and actions for identifying and removing sources; results of the interviews; suggested questions to include in a broader paper survey; and specific recommended next steps for creating the SIDIR.

### **WORK GROUP AGREES ON MESSAGES FOR NEXT SWG REPORTER ISSUE**

Work group members agreed that we should distribute the summary of our accomplishments over the past year in our next SWG Reporter, with updates to the public comment period references. The next SWG Reporter will also include updates on subgroup progress on effectiveness, source identification, and status and trends.

### **WORK GROUP DESIGNATES HEATHER KIBBEY AS SWG SPOKESPERSON AT PSEMP**

The Puget Sound Ecosystem Monitoring Program Steering Committee has approved a work plan and is working on guidance and direction for topical work groups. Both Heather Kibbey and Heather Trim sit on the steering committee. Heather Kibbey is the more regular participant of the two in SWG meetings, and work group members agreed that she will be the primary spokesperson. Work group members expect that Heather Trim will also add her perspective during steering committee conversations that affect the work group.

At future meetings, the work group will discuss needed points of communication and contact with other formally-commissioned topical work groups and other monitoring efforts.

### **WORK GROUP HEARS ABOUT PUGET SOUND ACTION PLAN**

Bruce Wulkan briefed work group members about the status and process for finalizing the action agenda, which will continue to support implementation of the work group’s recommendations. Bruce recommends that we identify specific funding needs as part of the work plan, particularly for discrete, small studies and technical staff support for the Effectiveness and Status and Trends Oversight Subgroups (and perhaps new ones).

### **UPCOMING MEETINGS AND PLANNED MEETING DATES**

The work group’s upcoming meetings and expected discussion topics are:

- March 21 from 9-1: Approve scoping paper for source identification literature review; approve recommendations for agricultural runoff pesticide and habitat monitoring; discuss public comments on Oversight Committee Charter; discuss implementation of broad SWAMPSS strategy; discuss criteria and framework for SWAMPSS expansion; hear status of implementing our work plan; hear from PSEMP Steering Committee and about other monitoring activities
- April 18 from 9-12: Hear about findings of effectiveness literature review and discuss crosswalk with list of topics; discuss proposed outline of process to select effectiveness studies; hear findings of the stream gauging network analysis recently published by USGS; decide on messages for the next SWG Reporter; hear status of implementing our work plan; hear from PSEMP Steering Committee and about other monitoring activities
- May 16 from 9-12; June 13 from 9-12; no meetings in July-August