

Stormwater Funding Program Stakeholders Work Group



Ecology Headquarters
Room ROA-05
January 7, 2014

DEPARTMENT OF
ECOLOGY
State of Washington

January Meeting Summary

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

Other Attendees: Cynthia Wall, Ecology; Bill Lief, Snohomish County

Agenda

1:00 Review/Discuss Meeting Notes from 12/20

Purpose/Goal: Re-visit action items.

1:20 Overview of Ecology Integrated Program

Purpose/Goal: Review Ecology's existing grant programs that will be integrated with the new Stormwater program.

1:40 Continue to Review Example Applications and Discuss Scoring

Purpose/Goal: Confirm that the scoring criteria fit the objectives of the funding program, brainstorm ways to develop more quantitative assessments of program value and how to score projects with different scales.

11:45 Wrap-up

Purpose/Goal: Assess where we are in the discussion, capture key points and action items.

Meeting Notes

Updates and revisions to the 12/20/13 meeting notes include: 1) correct the planning in the third paragraph, 2) correct next meeting date from 2013- 2014.

Overview of Integrated Program

The stormwater program will be combined with Ecology's State Revolving Fund, 319 Non-point, and Centennial funding programs as part of the Integrated Water Quality Funding Program. SRF loans may be used to meet permit requirements and Centennial funds are 319 funds and are not funding stormwater projects. These existing programs include a consideration for hardship which is typically calculated based on the increase in utility rates. A portion of SRF funding is reserved for LID or infiltration projects through the Green Project Reserve. There was

discussion on how to calculate hardship for stormwater but no general consensus or support for including a hardship factor in the interim stormwater program. Carl commented that he had received calls from jurisdictions where the water, sewer, and stormwater fees combined may qualify for hardship and requested that these fees be looked at together. Other benefits discussed included the ability to use loan funds as match and to combine projects and funding sources.

Application Review

Technical Planning Process- The group discussed the difference between Q3 – which asks the applicant to identify the extent of the water quality problem, and Q5 which asks about the technical planning process used. The difference is that question three is focused on how the applicant determined what types of water quality problems they are dealing with and where problems are located, and what tools they used to determine the problem. Q5 is looking for the decision making process that the applicant used to determine that the project they put forth is the best possible solution to that problem. The group suggested that Ecology revise the question to include additional guidance that would give applicants a better understanding of the difference between the two questions since the term “planning” does not always translate between engineers, planners, and application reviewers.

The group identified that there are two levels of planning questions, one at the regional or watershed based scale and one at the project level scale. One of the challenges identified was an inconsistent level of planning efforts across the state. The Puget Sound region and Phase I communities have engaged more high level planning efforts while in eastern Washington, communities are more isolated and in some cases jurisdictions do not have any other communities with which to coordinate. This carries through to the project level where eastern communities have issues that they have identified through experience and observation rather than a formal planning effort.

One of the possible tools suggested to evaluate project-level planning was the 30% or pre-design report. This level of design would provide reviewers with enough detail to assess the project but this level of detail at the submittal process may prove to be an obstacle for smaller communities that do not have the resources to do design work and are seeking funds for design/build.

Readiness to Proceed- This element provides additional points to projects that have already invested time and money into design work. Completion of the SEPA and cultural resources process helps to ensure that there are no major obstacles to completion of the project. Having this as a separate task penalizes design/build projects, which could be remedied by offering separate planning grants.

At this point the group discussed the difficulty of marrying the funding cycle and the construction season, and explaining to the Legislature why funds are not disbursed immediately after appropriation.

The group also discussed the need to develop a more tangible connection between the projects and the results. The group discussed sending the final 2 page post project summaries to Legislature as they come in.

Schedule- Overall Ecology is looking to see that the project proponent has a reasonable schedule proposed and that they have included time for things like permitting. Dave and Doug pointed out that the American Society of Civil Engineers has resources for gauging reasonable schedules for construction and cost estimating for design engineering.

Ideally, the funding program would look to separate out the planning and design funding and plan one year and construct the next. The group also determined that it would be important to show the cycle of how the money spent.

Next Meeting

February 11, 2013 from 12-3pm at Ecology HQ