

# STORMWATER WORK GROUP

Tuesday, November 17, 2009 9:00 AM – 3:10 PM  
USGS Conference Room  
934 Broadway, Tacoma

## Draft Summary

OF THE MEETING'S KEY DISCUSSIONS, DECISIONS AND AGREEMENTS

### ATTENDEES:

#### *Work Group Members, and the organizations or groups they represent:*

**Neil Aaland** (Washington State Assn. of Counties), Local Governments; **Allison Butcher** (MBA of King and Snohomish Co.), Business Groups; **Shayne Cothorn** (WA Dept. of Natural Resources), State Agencies; **Jay Davis** (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service), Federal Agencies; **Tim Determan** (WA Dept. of Health), State Agencies; **Mindy Fohn** (Kitsap Co.), Local Governments; **Jonathan Frodge** (Seattle), Local Governments; **Dick Gersib** (WA Dept. of Transportation), State Agencies; **Heather Kibbey** (Everett), Local Governments; **DeeAnn Kirkpatrick** (National Marine Fisheries Service), Federal Agencies; **Bill Moore** (WA Dept. of Ecology), State Agencies; **Mel Oleson** (Boeing), Business Groups; **Kit Paulsen** (Bellevue), Local Governments; **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; **Gary Turney** (U.S. Geological Survey), Federal Agencies; **Heather Trim** (People for Puget Sound), Environmental Groups; and **Bruce Wulkan** (Puget Sound Partnership), State Agencies.

#### *Work Group Staff:*

**Karen Dinicola** (Ecology), Project Manager; **Leska Fore** (Statistical Design), Facilitator and Communication Lead

### NOVEMBER 10 WORKSHOP PROVIDED USEFUL FEEDBACK

The work group discussed the recent public workshop that we hosted to roll out the first volume of the draft monitoring strategy and get ideas for launching the implementation plan. Members' impressions of the workshop were that participants seemed encouraged and engaged, that we succeeded in generating participants' interest in providing comments on the document, and that while affirming the direction in which the strategy appears to be heading (and considering it reasonable, and a good start) participants remain uncertain about it and named quite a few gaps to be filled. Members agreed that the shift in purpose for the workshop was appropriate, about half thought the timing of sending out the document was probably just right, and some thought that more time might have been spent included in explaining the document in detail. Since most participants had not read it, the discussion questions might have been more helpful if oriented more toward asking, "what *should* the document say?" and perhaps oriented around specific sections.

The work group asked Karen Dinicola to post the list of participants on our webpage and to send a thank you email soon to all of the participants with a reminder to submit comments. Work group members were reminded that their summaries of the group discussions they facilitated are due to workshop facilitator Margaret Norton Arnold today.

## **WORK GROUP ASSESSES PROGRESS ON DRAFT STRATEGY DOCUMENT**

Not all work group members have read the latest (Nov 4) version of the document, but the group as a whole agreed that the document is significantly improved over the last (Oct 21) version and that it is ready for other eyes. The main body of the document is, in most members' opinion, in much better shape than the appendices, which are a hodgepodge and do not as a whole contain the things that are identified as priorities in the text. Carol Smith was disappointed that the experimental design for livestock management efficacy was removed.

## **LESSONS LEARNED DURING THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPING THE DOCUMENT APPLY TO OUR FUTURE WORK**

We have come a long way in the past year as a group and have made very tangible progress. And we will have a lot of comments to address, and more difficult decisions to make, in order to complete our work. We are moving into another difficult phase of decision making, and what we have learned will help us move forward. Our facilitator noted that the group is very good at expanding our effort, and it is more difficult to narrow and focus. We also need to do more work in parallel and less in sequence.

Attached to the end of this document is a copy of the flipcharts created during the group's discussion of lessons learned. Much of this discussion addressed the process of writing and compiling the document, with members reflecting on the pros and cons of utilizing writers who were not part of the work group. The writing teams' drafts were necessary to move us forward and forced us to make some decisions. There was a mix of agreement/disagreement as to whether we drifted from our mandate, or our agreed upon work plan. We must avoid having writers work without adequate guidance. All agreed that better interaction with and clearer direction to the writers will improve our process, and that a single "coach/editor" in charge of coordinating, collecting, and organizing the pieces developed by multiple authors into a coherent document is absolutely necessary. This person needs to document, explain, and elevate major content decisions for work group discussions. A "gap trap" for what's missing from the document would help keep track of what's missing and why (*i.e.*, decision vs omission).

Another area of broad discussion within this agenda item was how to improve work group members' readiness to participate in committee discussions of draft documents. Many work group members are not reading the multiple attachments or large documents sent with meeting agendas, so more targeted direction to will help members come to meetings better prepared. In early drafts, writers can make use of "dear reader" boxes to highlight areas of disagreement or other uncertainty for the work group to discuss. We can also make more effective use of the caucus system. Future work plans need to provide for more time for the work group to discuss, redirect, and make decisions.

Overall, work group members feel that our effort is shaping up as a model process and that we are making significant progress although the process is messy at times.

## **WORK GROUP MEMBERS WILL CONTRIBUTE TIME AND STAFF TO COMPLETE THE STRATEGY**

Very little funding capacity remains for paying outside consultants to complete the strategy document. Work group members agreed that we need to provide additional capacity and new skill sets to write and review new material to address the comments we receive. Up to now, most work group members felt that their level of effort was just about right, but about 40% of the group said they are willing and able to do more in the future. Each work group member will come to the December 15<sup>th</sup> meeting with offers for themselves or other staff in their organizations and the writing or technical skills they have so that we can assign them appropriate tasks to complete in the month following our next meeting. We all want to ensure a revised document of sufficient quality for the work group to adopt at our January 27<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## **WORK GROUP PREPARES TO DISCUSS COMMENTS AT DECEMBER 15<sup>TH</sup> MEETING**

Public comments and formal peer reviews will be posted to the subgroup support page on December 1<sup>st</sup> (assuming the peer reviews are submitted on time). Work group members understood and agreed that each member is responsible for reading all of the reviews, and particularly the five formal peer reviews, in advance of the next meeting. At the December 15<sup>th</sup> meeting the work group will need to provide specific, explicit, clear direction to each person we assign to address comments.

To compile and sort the comments, six work group members (Mindy Fohn, Heather Kibbey, DeeAnn Kirkpatrick, Kit Paulsen, Tom Putnam, and Jim Simmonds) volunteered to “bin” the comments into the following ten categories: gaps, priorities, approach, scale, technical details, existing programs/data, additional science needs, typos/editorial, implementation planning, and other. The “dear reader” boxes and 11 questions from the workshop (which are posted on our webpage for on-line commenting) also need to be fit into these categories. Karen Dinicola will develop a spreadsheet, assign a similar number of comments to each volunteer, and also will ask the public workshop facilitator to organize the feedback from the morning discussions into similar categories.

Each volunteer will also identify the top five or so comments among those they categorized that they think the work group should discuss together. The binned comments and “top fives” will be sent to all work group members by December 9<sup>th</sup>. At the meeting on the 15<sup>th</sup> we will start the day with a review of each category of comments to get a feel for the range and scope, and then we will break into subgroups by categories to go over comments and decide how to address them. Subgroups will determine which comments need to be teed up for discussion or decision by the entire work group; these are generally issues of priorities or shifts in focus, or major additions or deletions. For each comment not elevated to the work group, the subgroup will decide how to address the comment: clarify, address now, address later (depending on capacity available), address in implementation plan, do not address (why). Each subgroup will write a paragraph for the beginning of each category: this is what we heard and this is what we decided.

Karen will also go through the five formal peer reviews and identify the themes that the work group will discuss at the December 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. She will begin compiling the response to those reviews and identify any areas of conflict that need to be resolved.

At the end of the day on the 15<sup>th</sup> we will have compiled a priority list of issues to address and who will address each.

## **SUBGROUP TO SCOPE WORK PLAN FOR COMPLETING VOLUME 2: IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

Work group members agreed that we need to begin following up on the feedback that we got during the afternoon discussions at the public workshop, and begin to plan our approach for writing volume 2 of the strategy. Jonathan Frodge, Mindy Fohn, Dick Gersib, DeeAnn Kirkpatrick, Jim Simmonds, Heather Trim, Gary Turney, Bruce Wulkan volunteered to participate in a subgroup (staffed by Karen Dinicola and Leska Fore) that will review what we’ve said will be in the implementation plan and to scope out a work plan for how we will proceed and what the effort will take. Subgroup members are reminded to keep aware of the importance of caucusing for making implementation planning decisions, and thus to provide sufficient time for those discussions to occur at key points in the process.

## **MORE EXTERNAL COMMUNICATION PLANNED BETWEEN NOW AND MID-DECEMBER**

Work group members agreed that after Karen sends the thank you and reminder to the workshop participants (and all other interested parties), another email should go out to everyone on the morning of the 30<sup>th</sup> with a final reminder that comments are due and that they should look for more information soon. The communication subgroup will compose another update email to send

once the comment period is over and the peer reviews are received and posted, likely in early December. Allison Butcher volunteered to draft this message, and Kit Paulsen volunteered Joyce Nichols to review it.

#### **CHAIR AND PROJECT MANAGER TO BRIEF SCIENCE PANEL ON NOVEMBER 18<sup>TH</sup>**

Work group members discussed a draft presentation prepared by Jim Simmonds and Karen Dinicola, with input from Kit Paulsen and Heather Trim and Scott Redman, to be given at the Puget Sound Science Panel meeting the following day. Group members were concerned about the level of detail and confirmed that the goal of the briefing is to provide them with a special audience so that they know what we are doing and are invited to provide comments within our time frame, and so that this effort serves as the model topical work group it is intended to be. Work group members suggested sharing the executive summary of the December 2008 report of the Puget Sound Monitoring Consortium to the Legislature, and the letters from Jay Manning and David Dicks, with the Panel.

#### **WORK GROUP MEMBERS UPDATED ON ACTIVITIES RELATED TO OUR EFFORTS**

Bill Moore told the group about 2 related proposals received in response to a recent Ecology RFP. The City of Puyallup, together with WSU and UW, submitted proposals for a stormwater technology center and evaluation of new and proprietary technologies. Final scopes of work are due December 1<sup>st</sup>. Bill also told the group that a new LID standards committee has held a joint meeting and a technical committee meeting, and will hold an implementation committee meeting soon. The purpose of the group is to define LID, add performance standards, and define feasibility.

Bruce Wulkan told the group that PSP has a set of documents out for which comments are due soon, and to ask him if you have questions.

#### **WORK GROUP SCHEDULES AN ADDITIONAL MEETING FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 13<sup>TH</sup>**

Work group members agreed that, in order to successfully meet our deadline and keep work group members involved in the decision making to complete the scientific framework, and to begin implementation planning, we will have two meetings in January.

**THE WORK GROUP'S NEXT MEETING WILL BE  
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 15, FROM 9AM-3PM AT THE USGS OFFICE IN TACOMA**

## SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS FROM THIS MEETING

### All work group members:

- Read all five formal peer review comment letters before the meeting on December 15<sup>th</sup>
- Read the “big issues” raised by the members that “binned” the public comments
- Read the comments for each of the major categories raised for committee discussion
- Come to the meeting with specific ideas for staff in your organizations that can provide specific writing or technical skills to complete the scientific framework document

### Karen Dinicola:

- Send a thank you to workshop participants with a reminder to submit comments
- Send another reminder to everyone on the morning of the 30<sup>th</sup>
- Send the proposed categories of comments to Margaret Norton Arnold
- Develop a spreadsheet for “binning” the public comments
- Post all comments to the webpage
- Assign comment letters to the six volunteers for “binning”
- Set up a work group meeting for January 13<sup>th</sup>
- Set up a meeting of the “Implementation Plan Approach Subgroup” before January 7<sup>th</sup>
- Send out the email approved by the communication subgroup, in early December
- Review the five formal peer reviews and identify themes for the work group to discuss

### Mindy Fohn, Heather Kibbey, DeeAnn Kirkpatrick, Kit Paulsen, Tom Putnam, & Jim Simmonds:

- Fill in the spreadsheet Karen develops with the comments assigned to each of them and decide which category (or occasionally 2) to which each comment belongs
- Select about five topics/issues from among your set of comment letters for discussion by the entire work group
- Send these items to Karen by December 8<sup>th</sup> so that she can compile them and send out to the work group on the 9<sup>th</sup>

### Karen Dinicola, Leska Fore, Jonathan Frodge, Mindy Fohn, Dick Gersib, DeeAnn Kirkpatrick, Jim Simmonds, Heather Trim, Gary Turney, Bruce Wulkan:

- Form a new “Implementation Plan Approach Subgroup”
- Meet before the January 13<sup>th</sup> meeting
- Review what we’ve promised will be in the implementation plan
- Create a work plan for completing the implementation plan for discussion at the January 13<sup>th</sup> meeting
- Include in the work plan a realistic estimate of the resources and skill sets needed to complete the implementation plan
- Include in the work plan sufficient time for caucus discussions to inform key decision points
- Send the proposed work plan out to work group members by January 7<sup>th</sup>

### Allison Butcher:

- Draft another email update that will be sent after all of the public and formal peer review comments are posted to the webpage

### Joyce Nichols:

- Review Allison’s draft prior to sending to the communication subgroup for approval

### Leska Fore, Karen Dinicola, and Jim Simmonds:

- Design a meeting agenda for December 15<sup>th</sup> that allows the group to understand the range of comments, provides for parallel resolution of most of the comments, and facilitates group discussion and decisions on major comments raised.

## FLIPCHART NOTES FROM THE DISCUSSION ON LESSONS LEARNED

Agree: Writers earlier involved

Agree: Better direction to writers

80/20: Work group needs more time for decisions

50/50: We drifted from mandate (*alternately: we drifted from process*)

Agree: Better interaction between SWG and writers

Agree: Dear Reader boxes were good

Agree: ONE coach/editor

We were not clear in explaining our active/default decisions in the document

Major content decisions should be made at the SWG committee meetings

50/50: Monthly meeting materials not being fully reviewed by SWG members (large documents or multiple attachments)

Strategy: tee up discussions so can work effectively without reading everything

Strategy: coordinator will track changes in writing and bring them forward for SWG review/approval

Need to review “lost” content items (gaps) in current version

Strategy: use webpage for “gap trap” – identify what’s missing

Conflict between schedule and hands-on decisions at SWG

Process is messy but still moving forward

40/60: Willing or able to do more: Tom, Dick, Mindy, Bruce, Jon

Could SWG do more to help people do more? Comments ahead, etc.

50/50: We are using caucuses effectively (locals/enviros agree; bus/state/feds disagree)

95/5: Workshop input was good

Workshop implementation discussion may have been premature

Audience response was positive (a good start)

50/50: Sending document 6 days prior to workshop wasn’t sufficient for fully useful workshop

Need to be clear about purpose of workshop (rollout vs comments vs generate interest) and align the workshop activities to the purpose

Need more substance on document in presentation

Strategy for moving forward:

Three categories of comments: Public workshop comments; formal peer review comments; other comments (email and web)

Need to compile and bucket/bin by December 9<sup>th</sup> for SWG members to be able to fully prepare for the December 15<sup>th</sup> meeting discussion.

## FLIPCHART NOTES FROM THE BRAINSTORMING SESSION ON GAPS

Roads use (highways versus small roads)  
Toxics not adequately addressed  
Forest/Agriculture  
More rural hypotheses  
Collection of Ho's do not equal an integrated and comprehensive monitoring program  
(links are missing)  
Wetlands  
Hydromodification  
Experimental designs do not match document priorities  
Coordination with CSO and other permits; how does other NPDES monitoring fit in?  
EPA?  
Statistical design: # sites, location, criteria, etc. Specific question.  
Link LID Ho to ECY LID feasibility process and other monitoring efforts  
Source ID experimental design concepts  
Governance umbrella to plug into  
Residential LU needs more tiers  
Recontamination of sediment  
Explain how biota is linked to stormwater  
How to isolate SW effects  
Balance of three types of monitoring  
Missing water body types: geographic locations and scales  
Evaluate and assess current data and knowledge