

STORMWATER WORK GROUP

Wednesday, March 16, 2011 9:15 AM – 1:10 PM
Tacoma CTP Visitor Center
2201 Portland Avenue, 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:

Neil Aaland (Assn. of WA Cities and WA Assn. of Counties), Local Governments; **Fred Bergdolt** (WSDOT), State Agencies; **Mark Biever** (Thurston Co.), Local Governments; **Jay Davis** (USFWS), Federal Agencies; **Dana de Leon** (Tacoma), Local Governments; **Tim Determan** (WDOH), State Agencies; **Jonathan Frodge** (Seattle), Local Governments; **Heather Kibbey** (Everett), Local Governments; **Dino Marshalonis** (USEPA), Federal Agencies; **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** (WA Conservation Commission), Agriculture; **Heather Trim*** (People For Puget Sound), Environmental Groups.

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

Ecosystem Monitoring Program Staff: **Ken Dzinbal*** (Puget Sound Partnership), Program Manager.

Others in attendance: **Scott Collard***, Ecology; **Bruce Crawford****, NOAA; **Chris Konrad***, USGS; **Mike Milne**, Brown and Caldwell; **Joy Rodriguez**, City of Puyallup.

* first half of meeting only

** brown bag presentation only

REVISED AGENDA FOR THIS MEETING

The revised meeting agenda is provided as an attachment to this meeting summary. We did not get to everything on our agenda, including: subgroup reports on pooled resources oversight and agricultural runoff; updates on the Partnership's coordinated monitoring program and target-setting process; Ecosystem Coordination Board stormwater discussions; funding; and Ecology's updated permit issuance schedule.

WORK GROUP AGREES TO INDICATORS FOR STREAMFLOW GAUGING NETWORK ANALYSIS

Chris Konrad of USGS led a discussion of the streamflow gauging network analysis being funded by EPA; his PowerPoint presentation will be posted on the SWG webpage. This assessment was a task listed among our October 2010 recommendations to Ecology. The products of this analysis will include descriptions of the spatial and temporal coverage and gaps, and the value of filling gaps to improve model estimates of streamflows at ungauged locations. A WRIA-scale analysis might be doable within the scope; but the primary purpose at this stage is to inform our Sound-wide status and trends monitoring program. The quality of the available data will not be assessed as part of this effort.

Chris proposed three indicators to use in his quantitative assessments with the available data: frequency of high flows, seasonal timing of high flows, and wet season low flows. The subgroup and work group members concurred that these are appropriate indicators to use for this analysis.

The work is expected to be completed by the end of this calendar year. Chris expects to have the data compiled by June and the results of the analyses by September. Work group members will provide Chris with names and information for several counties not yet contacted, and Chris will renew his outreach effort to get more station location and period of record information.

WORK GROUP AGREES TO INCLUDE FIRST ORDER STREAMS IN STATUS AND TRENDS MONITORING

Scott Collyard of Ecology's Environmental Assessment Program led a discussion of site selection for the small streams status and trends monitoring; his slides will be posted on the SWG webpage. Following discussion of the quality of the Sound-wide data and maps available, the definition of 0-order streams, and possible differences inside and outside Urban Growth Area (UGA) boundaries, work group members agreed that it makes sense to include first order streams in our design.

EPA's protocols for random site selection for EMAP separate streams by order for weighted selection within each stream order. The work group agreed that for our questions it makes more sense to lump the stream orders together without stratification or weighting prior to the random site selection. The data analysis might proceed differently.

WORK GROUP DISCUSSES NEARSHORE STATUS AND TRENDS MONITORING DESIGN

The Nearshore Status and Trends Monitoring Oversight Subgroup, concerned about the tremendous amount of variability associated with the shorelines within UGAs asked Scott to investigate other possible ways to identify strata for the marine nearshore status and trends monitoring; the original question posed by the work group was to compare nearshore conditions in urban and rural areas. Scott presented his initial findings to the work group (his slides will be posted to the SWG webpage) and recommended that the permittee-funded sampling be conducted in the UGAs as recommended in October 2010. Work group members tentatively agreed, and expressed a desire to ensure that the sites be associated with stormwater outfalls. The subgroup recommendation to focus on the shallow subtidal area (0 to one fathom) for the permittee-funded monitoring was accepted by the work group. The subgroup will work with Scott to define an appropriate distance from the shoreline and from a stormwater outfall or stream mouth for selecting sites, so that Scott can do the sample draw.

Work group members also requested that Maggie Dutch (also of Ecology's Environmental Assessment Program) perform an analysis of the existing PSAMP data in the nearshore (fathom to 30 meters depth) to inform us as to the extent to which our questions about comparisons of conditions inside and outside UGAs can be answered. Maggie will be invited to our meeting next month.

This subgroup has not yet discussed fecal coliform sampling design but will do so at its next meeting on March 23.

COMMUNICATION SUBGROUP ASKS WORK GROUP MEMBERS TO DISTRIBUTE MATERIALS

The Communication Subgroup has developed an FAQ sheet and a 1-page summary of our October 2010 recommendations; they are in the process of developing a "perspectives" piece based on interviews with several caucus representatives. When the new website is up and running, SWG caucus reps should distribute it broadly to help with the effort to get interested parties providing informed and constructive comments on the preliminary draft permit language Ecology plans to release for public comment in May.

WORK GROUP EXTENDS DEADLINE FOR SUBMITTING EFFECTIVENESS STUDY IDEAS

Some work group members expressed concern about the deadline for submitting effectiveness study ideas, because the municipal stormwater permittees' annual reports are all due March 31, 2011. The work group agreed to extend the deadline one month, and to also invite comment on the criteria proposed for ranking the study ideas.

The work group also discussed outstanding questions about the regional effectiveness studies, in particular whether or not there will be an "opt-out" approach as the work group recommended in October 2010, and what the total "pool" for regional studies is going to be. The Ecology representative was not present at the meeting, so the project manager was asked to find out when is the soonest these answers can be provided.

The Effectiveness Subgroup should consider (1) providing updates throughout the process, *i.e.* "these are the topics we are evaluating"; (2) hosting a workshop early in the process of selecting study topics to get folks

comfortable with the approach and more ready to buy into the outcome; and (3) presenting this as a first cut. The SWG is making recommendations to Ecology as to what to include in the formal draft permit. Ecology and the SWG are expected to respond to comments on the topics that were recommended.

WORK GROUP HEARS ABOUT SALMON RECOVERY MONITORING

Bruce Crawford of NOAA Fisheries gave our first brown-bag presentation to learn about monitoring efforts of other groups; his slides will be posted on the SWG webpage. Bruce is currently engaged in an analysis of salmon recovery monitoring efforts to determine whether the efforts are providing the information needed to know whether or not major population groups are recovering. Bruce considers this effort to be parallel to the SWG in that both fall under the Puget Sound Partnership's ecosystem monitoring program as presumed initial "work groups" – both of which are out in front of the overall coordination effort. The group is committed to providing transparency and confidence in their calculations, and to asking hard questions about the strategy to get the most important information.

The current effort is focused on measures of salmon populations (adult abundance, productivity, spatial distribution, and diversity). Salmon habitat monitoring (including physical habitat and water quality measures: what is the status/level of degradation and what improvements are needed?) will be addressed in a future effort: this is an important nexus for the SWG and we should keep in communication with Bruce as that work moves forward. The salmon recovery monitoring will likely follow a WRIA-dense probabilistic site selection approach. We want to ensure our protocols are aligned and our efforts are leveraged.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

The work group's upcoming meetings, expected major discussion topics, and scheduled brown-bag presentations are:

- Wednesday April 20, 2011 from 9am-12pm at the USGS office in Tacoma: discuss ideas submitted for effectiveness studies; plan to implement effectiveness study topic ranking process; discussed proposal for pooled resources oversight; approve SWG comments on Action Agenda updates; hear about the Washington Stormwater Center. The meeting will be followed by the second in our series of brown bag presentations from other monitoring groups, from **noon-1pm: Randy Shuman on Toxics Loadings**.
- Wednesday May 18, 2011 from 9am-12pm at the USGS office in Tacoma: review and discuss Ecology's preliminary draft monitoring language for NPDES municipal stormwater permits and Pooled Resources Oversight Subgroup recommendations for SWG comments; hear about initial findings of the effectiveness literature review. The meeting will be followed by the third in our series of brown bag presentations from other monitoring groups, from **noon-1pm: Jennifer Bayer and Phil Larsen on PNAMP**.
- Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 9am-12pm at the USGS office in Tacoma: approve pooled resources oversight recommendations to deliver to Ecology; hear initial findings of effectiveness literature review; determine messages and timing for next SWG Reporter. The meeting will be followed by the fourth in our series of brown bag presentations from other monitoring groups, from **noon-1pm: Dave Hallock on freshwater quality monitoring**.