

# Stormwater Funding Program Stakeholders Work Group



Ecology Headquarters  
Room ROA-05  
February 11., 2014

DEPARTMENT OF  
**ECOLOGY**  
State of Washington

## Draft February Meeting Summary

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

### Agenda

#### **12:00 Intros/Housekeeping**

#### **12:10 Review/Discuss Meeting Notes from 1/7/14**

**Purpose/Goal:** Ensure everybody is on board with the eligibility recommendations discussed during the last meeting. Re-visit action items.

#### **12:20 Look at Draft Application**

**Purpose/Goal:** Provide Ecology with feedback on the instructions for each question and determine if a supplemental sheet will be required.

#### **1:40 Break**

#### **1:50 Discuss Set Aside/Funding Priorities**

**Purpose/Goal:** Determine if the group wants to provide additional assistance to hardship communities, specific types of projects, projects with multiple benefits etc.

#### **2:30 Discussion of Long Term Program**

**Purpose/Goal:** Bring everyone up to speed on bills that have been proposed and how they might affect the stormwater program. Discuss the elements that we need to discuss to develop the long term program i.e. explaining the program need, collaboration/integration with other relevant programs, potential funding sources, etc.

#### **3:00 Adjourn**

## **Draft Application**

In order to meet the goal of combining the stormwater program grant application with Ecology's integrated multi-program grant program application the group reviewed a cross walk table.

The table has three columns. Column 1 of the cross walk table lists the application questions that were part of the 2012 Stormwater Grant program application and includes the guidance that was provided to the applicant to assist them in answering the question.

Column 2 lists in purple the relevant fields in the EAGL system that provides the applicant with a place to enter the same types of information that was requested in the 2012 application. EAGL (Ecology Administration Grants and Loans) is the online tool developed by Ecology to replace the paper grant application and management. Column 2 also includes the guidance provided to applicants to assist them in filling the online EAGL forms.

Column 3 lists the information provided by program staff to Ecology staff assigned to review individual applications to help the reviewers identify essential components and determine the final application score.

A significant portion of the discussion centered around how to provide guidance that would direct the applicant to provide enough information to allow the reviewer to understand the how the project was developed and how much treatment it would provide without penalizing smaller jurisdictions, particularly those that do not have money to do design work. The group felt that they needed guidance on how provide a benchmark to show an increase in capacity. Some suggestions included a dollars/CFS treated, or using something similar to Appendix 11 of the Phase I Permit. Many in the group felt that it was not appropriate to use something designed for Phase I permittees for all applicants, while others felt that elements of this tool could be adapted to something that would work statewide. Overall the group summed up the issue in three questions 1) How did you estimate? 2) Did you have good cost control in place? 3) Describe how this project results in a good value. Discussion of the issues was continued via-email after Appendix 11 was sent out to all the work group members. Opinions brought out in subsequent emails echoed those expressed in the meeting. Ecology will continue to bring take comments and will seek further input at future meetings.

### **Other Comments on the Integrated Program Application Questions.**

- In the scope of work question, the idea that the scope of work should demonstrate the applicant's understanding of all the steps that would be required to complete the project resonated with the group.
- It would be helpful for project applicants to see the guidance that is provided to the reviewers.
- It would be helpful to include more information under program guidance that explains the process Ecology reviewers use to determine a good value.

- Specifically requesting the value engineering process for larger projects or the QA/QC process for smaller projects may help reviewers.
- A language change on the EAGL Water Body and Water Quality Needs Addressed form “*protection or restoration of shellfish harvest habitat*” was suggested.
- Additional language in the forms guidance was requested to ask recipients to define exactly how the proposed project will address listing parameters or TMDL requirements was suggested.
- There was concern that the Coordination with State and Federal Priorities form did not pickup all relevant water quality issues.
- On the Project Development, Local Support, and Past Performance form additional guidance language was suggested to specifically include partnership planning language.
- There was a suggestion to provide additional direction and guidance to application reviewers to look for key partnerships but not to deduct points from projects in areas that do not have available partnerships.

Project Team and Readiness to Proceed questions and forms were not reviewed as group since they appeared to be relatively straightforward and the group agreed to review them individually and send comments to Jessica.

#### Funding Priorities/Set –Aside

Group looked at the concept of rewarding projects that provide additional benefits for hardship communities or an environmental justice benefit. The existing integrated program defines criteria for hardship communities and provides an additional 50 points for projects that serve this population. The group generally agreed that it was reasonable to continue to incorporate this in the integrated stormwater program.

Long Term Program

#### Next Meeting

March 20, 2014 from 12:30-3:30pm at Ecology HQ