Stormwater Funding Program Stakeholders Work Group

Ecology Headquarters
Room ROA-05
March 20, 2014

DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY
State of Washington

Draft March 2014 Meeting Summary

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

Intros/Housekeeping

Review/Discuss Meeting Notes from 2/11/14

Purpose/Goal: Follow-up

Hardship

The issue of developing hardship criteria was revisited. The group briefly discussed looking at information including per capita income at the community level. Jodi offered to share the recent data put together by the Ecology Toxics program and Nancy suggested looking at how FAC determines hardship.

Action Item: Jessica and Pat will review the available data and Jessica will present options at our next meeting.

Legislative Review

Carl and Rebecca suggested that they would like a summarized document of the group discussion on different documents that will show how the program has changed to help them prepare for the next legislative season. There was consensus among the group that this type of document would be helpful for everyone.

Action Item: Jessica will prepare a summary table for the April meeting.

Rebecca was interested in what type of project list would be available and if it would be available for the next legislative season. Jeff explained that the list would be the draft offer list developed after the integrated application closed in November. We expect that with the applications being open to all cities

and counties and not just permitees, we would receive additional requests for project funding beyond those being developed using the project-specific planning and design funds.

Review Work Plan

Purpose/Goal: Discuss our end products and timeline.

We are on schedule for drafting guidelines, and the final document will be published in July as part of the Integrated program guidelines. The group discussed how our schedule fits in with the legislative schedule. Rebecca expressed a desire to move up the schedule so that she would have more information to take to the legislature prior to the start of the legislative session. The group decided not to take a long break over the construction season and instead add meetings in June, July, October, November and December to further discuss the long term funding program.

Action Item: Jessica will send out draft stormwater funding program guidelines with April's meeting agenda.

Review 2013 Legislation Language

Purpose/Goal: Identify ambiguities in the 2013 Proviso language and discuss items that need clearer definitions.

Stormwater Projects line 21 – are considered capital building projects. According to Carl the "or" in line 21 of the proviso language can be considered inclusive, ergo the $66 million can fund projects and(or) activities that have been proven effective at reducing environmental degradation. MTCA funds can fund both.

Stormwater Activities line 21 – The group discussed the idea of set-asides and did not come to a consensus on the establishment of set-asides for activities like education and outreach. There was also concern that activities that can quantify benefits, enhanced maintenance for example, would be hard to compare to a typical education and outreach project that does not have a direct benefit to water quality. The group felt that additional guidance should be provided to applicants with instructions to provide numbers where possible. Pat reminded the group that reviewers will be comparing based on project type and the group felt that it would be reasonable to look at quantifiable activities such as enhanced maintenance more like a facility rather than an activity.

Proven Effective line 22 – BMPs in an approved manual or that have recieved a GULD rating. Applicants proposing activities will need to provide back-up/rational as to the effectiveness of the proposed activity. Activities like basin planning, while necessary, are not proven effective and will not be eligible in this round.

High Water Quality or Ecologic Benefit lines 24, 25- generally refers to cost effective projects that deal with permitted or listed contaminates. As we discussed in November, flood control and salmon restoration projects will not be eligible.

Existing Development lines 25, 26 – The group discussed how re-development fits into this definition. After some discussion, the group determined that Ecology would come up with a draft definition/guidance and the group would review it in April.

Pat and Jessica will work out a definition and bring it to the group.

Budget Request - Jeff

Purpose/Goal: Overview of Ecology 2015-2017 Biennial budget process.

Ecology has begun the process of preparing a request for stormwater funds for the 2015 biennia. The budget will be going through internal review through the end of this fiscal year and Jeff will continue to provide updates to the group.

Next meeting May 21, 2014 12:30 – 3:30 Ecology HQ