

# Stormwater Funding Program Stakeholders Work Group



Ecology ERO  
June 17, 2014

DEPARTMENT OF  
**ECOLOGY**  
State of Washington

## June 2014 Meeting Summary

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

### Overview of morning site visits:

Marcia provided a brief overview of the sites visited by some members of the group earlier in the day. (see tour guides for more detail)

### Enhanced Maintenance:

Anne provided feedback from the Ecology permit managers regarding what types of activities would qualify as providing enhanced maintenance.

Ecology MS4 Team Thinking re: Enhanced Permit Activities (Maintenance, IDDE, Source Control)

### MS4 Team Criteria for qualifying "enhanced MS4 program" activities

1. clear, durable environmental benefit
2. goes 'beyond base permit requirements' of current permits
3. Supports/advances outstanding programs (vs. deferred/delayed activities)
4. No other funding available [Suggested addition to list]
5. Duration and timing of benefit [Suggested addition to list]

Activities for consideration (as discussed by the Stormwater Grants Advisory Group)

Qualifying Activity	Workgroup Comment/Recommendation
Phase II business source control inspections (if includes pollution)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. General support; prevention (vs. correction)</li> <li>2. PH I may not qualify</li> </ol>

correction element)	
Private system inspection programs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Some support, as these systems contribute to MS4</li> <li>2. Note that newer private systems must be inspected (per permits) so this program should focus on older, existing systems</li> </ol>
Materials testing and disposal costs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support at May meeting; not actively discussed in June</li> </ol>
Data-driven source tracing (IDDE)—priority for commercial/industrial areas (where we see greatest pollutant levels)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strong support; emphasis on prevention/correction before pollutants reach MS4</li> <li>2. Do not require lab-grade testing (in all cases)</li> <li>3. Grants should support equipment, staff time, WQ analyses</li> <li>4. Concern about “slippery slope”—when does IDDE source tracing transition into qualifying activity?</li> <li>5. Focus on hotspots</li> <li>6. Can this be linked to investments in retrofit/construction projects?</li> </ol>
High-efficiency/regenerative air sweeper (purchase, operation)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strong support especially as new permeable pavement projects introduced</li> <li>2. Note that can be added to construction grant request (e.g., for perm pavement projects)</li> </ol>
Actions described in Appendix 2/TMDLs or S4.f Adaptive Management Programs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Did not support inclusion</li> </ol>
Line cleaning in areas with legacy pollutants (in addition to regular catch basin inspection)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Minimal support; some see as part of existing permit requirement (slippery slope concerns)</li> </ol>

Participants expressed interest in advancing ‘non-capital’ categories but acknowledge that many Permittees struggle to meet basic permit requirements and would be challenged to locate 25% match needed to attract grant. Uncertainty about 2015 funding source may inform Ecology’s decision about what to allow (setting expectations re: what is eligible—is it better to start small and expand as 2015 funding source allows OR support all eligible categories, recognizing that 2015 funding source may be highly constrained).

The group also discussed the possibility of overlap between the stormwater activities and the toxics program. One suggestion was that the tracing and detection would be a stormwater project and the source clean up would be a toxic clean up project.

#### Discussion of Local Governments

The group considered several options for how to define “local governments” to determine applicant eligibility. The group considered options ranging from limiting the definition to Phase I and II permittees to expanding to include all “public bodies” which would encompass tribes, quasi-municipal governments, conservation districts, etc. The group landed on defining local governments as cities, counties and ports. The group felt that this would be in line with the 2014 program, address high risk polluters, and provide assistance to those communities that may be on the verge of coming under a permit while limiting the potential for duplicative programs within the same region and encouraging communication between group such as conservation districts and permit holders. This definition will also help to balance the distribution of funding across the state and prevent areas with many districts from monopolizing the funding opportunities.

There was additional discussion about the value of pass-through funds for permittees. Darcy agreed to work with Carl to provide some background on current legislative opinions and what types of funding sources may be available to fund the program at our next meeting.

Roundtable:

Andy- would like an update on the final 2014 program

Ron- would like to see match requirements reduced to 5 or 10 %.

Jeff- initial decision package for 15-17 budget is in place.

Ron- would like to provide input on funding agreement templates/scope of work, would like to re-visit prioritizing LID for planning dollars, and would like to continue to discuss capacity grants.

Dawn- is concerned that the cap of 5 projects/per jurisdiction will be an issue for larger jurisdictions. Would like to re-visit that in 2015.

Bruce- would like to consider NEP watershed characterization in the long term program.

Anne – updated to May meeting notes- Phase I permits do not allow stream restoration as a tool to meet stormwater objectives.