

STORMWATER WORK GROUP

“CORE GROUP” MEETING

Tuesday, November 25, 2008 9:00 a.m. – noon
University of Washington, Tacoma Room GWP 320

DRAFT SUMMARY

OF THE MEETING’S KEY DISCUSSIONS, DECISIONS, AND AGREEMENTS

Facilitator’s note: A number of participants at the last meeting were unavailable for this meeting, a number unavailable for last meeting attended this meeting, and a number attending this meeting were doing so for the first time.

Attendees and the organizations or groups they represent:

Emmett Dobey (Mason County), Local Governments; **Jonathan Frodge** (Seattle), Local Governments; **Heather Kibbey** (Everett), Local Governments; **DeeAnn Kirkpatrick**, NOAA Fisheries; **Bill Moore**, Washington State Department of Ecology; **Erik Neatherlin**, Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife; **Kit Paulsen** (Bellevue), Local Governments; **Gary Turney**, U.S. Geological Survey; **Bruce Wulkan**, Puget Sound Partnership; **Karen Dinicola** (Ecology), Project Manager; and **Damon Diessner** (Environmental Strategies in Action), Facilitator.

CORE GROUP CLARIFIES CATEGORIES OF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

Before working through the prioritization spreadsheets, key terms were clarified:

- “Ambient” monitoring is a subset of “Status and Trends” monitoring and is for assessing the beneficial uses of aquatic resources and understanding how stormwater affects them. Not all monitoring done under this category will be long-term (trends).
- “Stormwater Characterization” is another subset of “Status and Trends” monitoring and is for assessing the stormwater itself (i.e. end of pipe) and providing data to calculate pollutant loadings.
- “Efficacy” is not status and trends monitoring; these are studies.

The Core Group reiterated that the Stormwater Work Group is working on a part of a regional monitoring strategy that will work with and build on other monitoring efforts including the status and trends monitoring for the Chinook recovery plan. The Science Panel (not the Work Group) will describe what constitutes a healthy Puget Sound.

CORE GROUP AGREES ON PRIORITIZATION MATRIX

The matrices are intended to help establish monitoring priorities using numeric ranking values. These values can later be adjusted as/if needed to assure reasonable prioritization decisions. The Core Group briefly reviewed the earlier proposed criteria for prioritizing assessment questions. Group members described the two new draft prioritization matrices they had developed. The Group then reviewed the refined list of assessment questions (see Appendix 1 of the Work Plan document) that was discussed at the previous meeting. The Group created a list of “Big Questions” to guide

STORMWATER WORK GROUP

development of the monitoring strategy and ensure that the regional stormwater monitoring program we design will answer relevant questions.

The Group combined elements of the two decision matrix proposals into one decision-making tool containing prioritization criteria for the Big Questions. The Group tasked Karen with modifying the spreadsheet to reference the assessment questions in the revised Work Plan Appendix 1 that are associated with each Big Question. The tool will be used in a two-step process: first we need to get agreement on the Big Questions, and then we need to prioritize the specific questions to address underneath each Big Question.

The Group agreed on:

- A draft decision-making tool (matrix/spreadsheet and associated refined list of questions)
- The “Big Questions” in the decision-making tool
- Proceeding with Work Group review and discussion of the above

CORE GROUP CONSIDERS HOW TO MOVE FORWARD

The Group discussed a proposed seven-step process for decision making:

1. Identify policy direction
2. Use technical/management criteria to prioritize BIG policy questions
3. Task groups develop strategies for each of the three main monitoring categories
4. Review task group recommendations
5. Reviews draft priority questions, approach, and likely entities
6. Priority questions, approach, and potential entities reviewed and approved by Partnership and Ecology by June 2009.
7. Task groups to further refine monitoring strategies (SOP/QAPP etc. for NPDES - and Partnership) if requested

Most of these elements are addressed in the work plan, albeit differently. The Stormwater Work Group will give the future task groups direction in developing the monitoring strategies. The Group recognizes that we need a scientific monitoring design for each of the three main monitoring categories and a proposed implementation strategy defines roles and clarifies who does what. The intent is to forward to Ecology and the Partnership a strategy that all caucuses support, recognizing that “one size fits all” monitoring will not be sufficient to address many questions about the diverse Puget Sound region. The overall process for moving forward will be discussed at the December 11th Stormwater Work Group meeting.

NEXT STEPS

The full Stormwater Work Group will consider the prioritization matrix at its next meeting on Thursday, December 11th and make decisions at the following meeting in January 2009.

Also at the December 11th meeting the Stormwater Work Group will:

- Briefly review the Work Group’s goals, objectives, and decision process
- Adopt the Charter, Bylaws, and Work Plan as living documents.
- Confirm the “Big Questions” for stormwater monitoring.
- Begin to prioritize more detailed questions and agree to next steps in developing a regional stormwater monitoring strategy.

STORMWATER WORK GROUP

Karen will revise the draft documents needed for the December 11th discussion based on today's Core Group discussion.

At the December 11th work group meeting we will need to spend part of the time on process issues, particularly adopting the "founding documents" and discussing the status of caucusing. Local governments are making meaningful progress but will not formalize their reps until January 9th. Karen brought to the group's attention the issue that while local governments, businesses, and environmental groups were expressly invited to participate as caucuses, the wording of the invitation letters to state and federal agencies was rather for them to designate agency reps, not form caucuses. The state and federal reps present at the 11/25 Core Team meeting expressed that caucusing should likely be doable.

Karen will set up a meeting schedule for Work Group and Core Group meetings through June for consideration at the December 11th meeting.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

The Stormwater Work Group will have its next meeting on Thursday December 11, 2008 from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. at the Rhodes Center, Orcas Room, in Tacoma.

The Core Group is not scheduled to meet in January.