

Stormwater Funding Program Stakeholders Work Group



Ecology Headquarters
Room ROA-32
November 18, 2013

DEPARTMENT OF
ECOLOGY
State of Washington

November Meeting Summary

VC	Andy	Rheume	City of Redmond	P	Jessica	Schwing	Ecology
VC	Anne	Dettelbach	Ecology	TC	Jon	Morrow	City of Ellensburg
P	Bill	Moore	Ecology		Laura	Merrill	Washington State Association of Counties
	Bruce	Wulkan	Puget Sound Partnership	P	Pat	Brommer	Ecology
P	Carl	Schroeder	Association of Washington Cities	VC	Rebecca	Ponzio	Washington Environmental Council
VC	Darcy	Nonemacher	Washington Environmental Council		Rick	Romero	City of Spokane
P	Dave	Tucker	Kitsap County Public Works	TC	Ron	Wierenga	Clark County
P	Dawn	Anderson	Pierce County	P	Russ	Connole	Spokane County
	Debbie	Terwillegger	Snohomish County		Gerry	O'Keefe	Washington Public Ports Association
P	Doug	Howie	Ecology	P	Marcia	Davis	City of Spokane
P	Jeff	Nejedley	Ecology		Denise	Clifford	Ecology

Agenda

- 1:00 Review Work Group Goals and Discuss Work Plan
- 1:30 Update on 2013 Planning and Design Grants
- 1:40 Low Impact Development Discussion
- 2:00 Review of Existing Ecology Stormwater Grant Guidelines and Application
- 2:30 Break
- 2:40 Discuss Project Evaluation Criteria for 2014 Funding Cycle

Meeting Purpose/Goal

Develop recommendations for revising interim funding program (\$66M) guidelines.

Review of Workgroup Goals and Work Plan

Discussion: The group agreed that the funding guidelines for the \$66M did not need to go out for public comment, and that the stakeholder group comments would be able to provide sufficient input, however the larger program may require an opportunity for public input since there pool of eligible applicant would be expanded. The group also expressed a desire to have better availability of meeting materials to share with other interested parties.

Action Items: Jessica will continue to update the work plan and schedule meetings, and will distribute meeting materials via email and post on the Stormwater Funding webpage once the webpage is available.

Project Planning Update

Discussion: Ecology provided an update to the group on how the pilot program was progressing.

Action Items: Ecology will continue to provide updates. Jessica will provide a list of permittees that accepted the 120k planning grant.

Getting on the Same Page with LID

Discussion: Ecology noted that LID is described slightly differently in different reference materials, with the key points being that LID practices aim to restore natural hydrology through infiltration. There are practices listed in LID handbooks that do not provide infiltration, one example being tree boxes. On the opposite end of the spectrum are “grey” practices such as infiltration systems that do provide infiltration. The group also discussed benefits outside water quality that may be created with LID.

The challenges of appropriately sizing LID features in retrofit situation were noted as was the inability to meet standards with some LID practices such as green roofs. There was also a concern about having a different definition than the definition in the permit. The group decided to use the definition used in the Phase I and II permits for the interim program and maintain the option to re-visit the issue in the long-term program.

Action Items: Continue discussion after 30% design projects are submitted and reviewed by Ecology. Review examples of projects.

Review of Ecology Grant Funding Guidelines, Grant Application

This time on the agenda was used to review the 2012 Supplemental Stormwater Funding Program Guidelines and develop a recommendation as to if these elements should remain the same, be changed for the \$66M or potentially change in the long-term funding program.

Program Purpose-There was discussion as to if the funds are intended to be used to meet permit requirements or to go above and beyond permit requirements. WEC representatives felt that funding should be directed toward projects that provide benefits beyond meeting permit requirements, and Carl, the AWC representative, felt that dollars should be going to those projects that provide the best water quality improvements. There was also discussion about the use of the funds for activities/operating vs. capital projects and how projects such as enhanced street sweeping would fall into these categories. There was interest in including things like enhanced maintenance, basin planning, and technical analysis in the long term program.

Action Item: Darcy and Ecology will check on limitations on the use of capital budget funds.

Eligible Applicants -set by legislative language to be cities and counties for the \$66M. The long term program may be expanded. The group will discuss how the eligible applicant pool will be expanded at future meetings.

Funding Amounts-there was general agreement that \$1M/project was an appropriate funding limit.

Previously funded and executed projects- ineligible

Projects without water quality benefit (ex: fish passage)-ineligible (remains the same)

Construction for new or redevelopment /potential growth- discussed revisiting this when defining the long-term program in order to address the idea of acquiring land for preserving natural drainage areas from future development. For the \$66M, the group decided that projects solely for future growth or new development would not be eligible, but the funds could pay for a portion of BMPs sized to treat flow from new and existing development.

Run off from industrial/commercial/private property- this has not been eligible in the past, but the group agreed that this could be eligible if the local community took on ownership and maintenance of the BMP by acquiring the land or an easement.

Flood control- group acknowledged that stormwater projects may provide flood control, and some flood control projects may improve stormwater quality, however flood-control projects should be ineligible

Stream restoration - this program will benefit streams but should not fund in-stream work

Land Acquisition – in the past, only acquisition of the footprint of the BMPs has been eligible, going forward acquisition of land to relocate an existing facility may be eligible.

Non-stormwater related portions of projects – items such as road grading may be eligible but it will be up to the applicant/recipient to make the case that the activity was necessary in order to build the water quality elements. Items such as street lighting or trees should not be eligible.

BMPs that have not received TAPE GULD rating- should not be eligible for the \$66M but will be discussed when developing guidelines for the long term program.

There was also a suggestion to include projects that separate stormwater from CSO as long as the project includes treatment for the stormwater. Rebecca (WEC) wanted to ensure that funds were not being used for mitigation or requirements of an administrative order including the separation of CSOs.

Discussion of Project Evaluation Criteria

This item will be moved to the next meeting.

Next Meeting

The group decided to meet in both December and January. Darcy and Carl requested that the January meeting be held prior to the start of the legislative session on January 13th.

Darcy also requested that we assemble a short progress report for the legislature in February or March.

Action: Jessica will schedule two meetings and add a short report for the legislature onto the work plan.

NEXT MEETING DATES:

December 20, 2013 9-12 at Ecology HQ

January 7, 2013 1-4 at Ecology HQ