

Stormwater Funding Program Stakeholders Work Group



Ecology Headquarters
Room ROA-05
March 20, 2014

DEPARTMENT OF
ECOLOGY
State of Washington

Draft April 2014 Meeting Summary

vc	Andy	Rheume	City of Redmond	x	Jessica	Schwing	Ecology
vc	Anne	Dettelbach	Ecology		Jon	Morrow	City of Ellensburg
x	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	x	Rebecca	Ponzio	Washington Environmental Council
x	Darcy	Nonemacher	Washington Environmental Council		Rick	Romero	City of Spokane
x	Dave	Tucker	Kitsap County Public Works		Ron	Wierenga	Clark County
	Dawn	Anderson	Pierce County		Russ	Connole	Spokane County
vc	Bill	Lief	Snohomish County		Gerry	O'Keefe	Washington Public Ports Association
	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

Carl will need to call into the May meeting.

Review/Discuss Meeting Notes from 3/20/14

Purpose/Goal: Follow-up. Revisit hardship criteria.

No changes to minutes. Group decided to respond to proposed hardship criteria via email.

Discuss any Comments on the Program Comparison Document

Purpose/Goal: Note and incorporate any changes or additions to the document

When is it ok to pay for stormwater improvements for new/re development? Do we want to use the \$66M to meet or go beyond the permit? Group felt the funds should not be used for new or redevelopment, only for existing development, funds may be used to pay for a portion of a BMP that will treat run-off from existing development but there was interest in re-visiting that for the long term program.

Action Item: Language regarding new/redevelopment language needs to be clarified. –Jessica made the change.

There was discussion about the current \$1M /project, \$5M per jurisdiction funding limit. Andy did not think basing limits on population would be beneficial to smaller jurisdictions. Marcia explained that funding multiple \$1M projects is not beneficial to larger jurisdictions where it is often more efficient to do a single larger project. There was concern among multiple members of the group that larger

jurisdictions would take up most of the funding if limits were not in place. Most members of the group agreed that the per jurisdiction limit was the most important.

Action Item: Jessica will investigate the distribution of funding from previous years and bring the information to the May meeting.

The next item discussed centered on the idea of determining a base/threshold level of funding that would support the stormwater program. This data does not appear to be readily available and a suggestion was made to survey the jurisdictions.

The group began a discussion of how to look at activities funding for the short term program. Darcy was concerned that the program needed to remain marketable and did not want a backlash from unfunded projects. We need to be clear about what will be funded. Dave that activities such as additional illicit discharge detection and elimination (IDDE) would be above and beyond permit requirements. Bill M suggested that a more narrow scope would be more likely to be successful and suggested limiting activities to enhanced operations and maintenance, IDDE, and education and outreach. Jeff also suggested that activities be well- defined. Dave was concerned that ed and outreach would not be competitive and Doug felt that there should be a set-aside. Darcy was ok with activities competing for funds but clear sideboards will be necessary.

Action Item: Ecology will put together some sideboards for discussion at the May meeting.

Action Item: Andy and Carl will distribute the comment matrix to others outside the group to get collective feedback. Andy will collect the answers and send them to Jessica by May 9. Jessica will combine the comments for discussion in May.

Discuss Draft Guidelines Table C:1

Purpose/Goal: Discuss any additions or ambiguities.

This table is designed to illustrate the different funding sources and what type of facilities/ activities each can fund. After reviewing the document for a few minutes the group decided to send comments via email.

Discuss Needs for the Upcoming Legislative Session – Carl (lead) Darcy, Rebecca, Laura

Purpose/Goal: Provide group with perspective on the strategy for securing funding for the long-term program.

There may be an upcoming work session to discuss funding of stormwater, water supply and flood projects in May.

Update on Ecology Budget Request - Jeff

Purpose/Goal: Revisit the discussion of how to get at a benefits analysis.

Ecology is in the process of preparing a budget request for the 2015-17 biennia. The initial draft includes a request for \$100M.

