A PUGET SOUND COORDINATED MONITORING PROGRAM

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, 18 October 2007 9:45 AM – 12:10 PM
Tacoma Nature Center, 1919 S Tyler St., Tacoma

Final Summary

OF THE MEETING'S KEY DISCUSSIONS, DECISIONS AND AGREEMENTS

ATTENDED: **Sarah Brace**, Puget Sound Partnership; **Paul Bucich**, Federal Way; **Luanne Coachman**, King County; **Bob Cusimano**, Ecology; **Dana de Leon**, Tacoma; **Karen Dinicola**, Ecology; **Ken Dzinbal**, Ecology; **Tracy Fuentes**, U. S. Geological Survey; **Gary Gill**, Battelle PNNL; **Marilyn Gutherie**, Port of Seattle; **Kris Holm**, Business Groups; **Sue Joerger**, Puget Soundkeeper Alliance; **Heather Kibbey**, Pierce County; **Daniel Nidzgorski**, Jefferson County; **Kit Paulsen**, Bellevue; **Tony Paulson**, U.S. Geological Survey; **Andy Rheaume**, Seattle; **Jim Simmonds**, King County; **Dan Smith**, Federal Way; **Mike Stevens**, Washington State Department of Transportation; **Heather Trim**, People for Puget Sound; **Richard Tveten**, Washington State Department of Transportation; and the facilitator, **Jim Reid**.

COMMITTEE AGREES ON CRITERIA FOR SELECTING "PILOT" PROJECTS

The Technical Advisory Committee agreed on the following criteria for evaluating and selecting "pilot" projects when the time comes to do so. (They are listed, generally, in the order of importance.)

- builds the credibility of the process
- tests working relationships
- provides credible and meaningful information that addresses the framework questions
- encourages leveraging of resources
- voluntary ("a coalition of the willing") and attracts additional participants over time
- simple
- can get going in less than one year

COMMITTEE BRAINSTORMS IDEAS FOR "PILOT" PROJECTS

After discussing and agreeing upon the criteria, Committee members brainstormed potential "pilot" projects. The Committee anticipates that the number of ideas will be reduced before any of them are "scoped" by the full group or by subcommittees.

(*Note*: Karen Dinicola and Jim Reid clustered the ideas under some headlines to make it easier for the Committee members to review and, if appropriate, consolidate the ideas before scoping.)

Standard SOP/QAPP development projects; data sharing:

- QAPP for ambient monitoring of small streams
- SOPs for continuous flow/temperature monitoring; common database
- SOPs and database for macroinvertebrates (BIBI)
- Why are industries doing grab samples and municipalities doing flow-weighted composite sampling of stormwater?
- Stormwater characterization QAPP/SOPs
- BMP evaluation QAPP for public domain designs
- Improve SOPs for looking at toxics in shellfish
- Develop trained-dog-sniffing approach to identifying failed septic systems in shellfish growing areas

Intercalibration exercises:

- Laboratory intercalibration exercise for key media and constituents – pick one that lots of folks are currently doing
- Habitat protocol comparison study

Review of existing information & gap analysis:

- Pick any resource and do a synthesis review of existing information, look for status and trends
- Look at Ecology's NPDES monitoring requirements and see how they can fit together

Study designs:

- Ambient water monitoring to evaluate effectiveness of Best Management Practices (BMPs) at boatyards for removing metals; identify/evaluate benchmarks
- Complementary Puget Sound basin ambient monitoring and stormwater characterization studies that leads to answering regulatory effectiveness questions
- Evaluate a retrofit project
- Look at exposure to mixtures of contaminants
- Nutrient delivery from urban versus rural streams
- Microbial source tracking/rapid detection methods
- Identify BMPs that work to remove high concentrations of metals from stormwater at industrial/boatyard sites
- Compare open ditches with retrofitted ditches for water quantity and quality treatment

Expansion of existing monitoring programs:

- Add upland component to the Puget Sound Ambient Monitoring Program (PSAMP):
  - Stream sediments
  - Sediments in stormwater catch basins
  - Freshwater, and particularly small streams

- Puget Sound-wide characterization study of a toxic pollutant of interest (fill in gaps)
- Puget Sound-wide study of nutrients in freshwater and marine waters
- Link long-term sites to what's going on in the watersheds

- Seasonal first-flush toxicity sampling requirements for Phase I NPDES, look at different seasons/conditions to better characterize stormwater toxicity

NEXT STEPS IN DEFINING AND SCOPING THE IDEAS

There were a number of proposals for how to winnow the list of brainstormed ideas to a number that would be manageable to scope. Based on the various suggestions, facilitator Jim Reid proposes this process:

1. Define the idea in three or four sentences, including the intended outcome or goal of the "pilot" project. If an idea is not further defined, the idea drops off the list.
    - complete by the person who suggested the idea.
    - complete by 5 p.m. on Tuesday, the 23rd
    - send to Jim Reid (falconer@seanet.com) and Karen Dinicola (kdin461@ecy.wa.gov)

2. Jim and Karen will simply "cut and paste" the more defined ideas onto a list before sending them back out to the group.
    - complete on the 24th

3. The group will review the list and via email offer any thoughts about collapsing or combining ideas. At the same time, each person will suggest 5-7 ideas to be scoped, and any that he/she recommends the Committee should not scope. (In the interest of transparency, each person should copy everyone else when responding to Karen and Jim.)
    - complete by 5 p.m. on Monday, the 29th

4. Jim and Karen will tally the preferences and report back to the group.
    - complete by 5 p.m. on Tuesday, the 30th

5. If it appears we have a manageable number of proposed "pilot" projects to scope, we will ask for volunteers to work on scoping each one. If it appears the list may still be too long, we will organize a subcommittee of volunteers to further define the ideas and to try to narrow the number to be scoped.
    - determine by Friday, 2 November

TWO IMPORTANT ISSUES RAISED BY THE COMMITTEE

Two important issues were raised by Committee members during the review of the Governance Committee's first meeting on October 3rd, and during the discussion about the criteria. The issues and the clarification of each were:

1. The relationship of a Puget Sound Coordinated Monitoring Program to other efforts, such as the Puget Sound Partnership and the federal caucus on the Puget Sound, is not yet clear. The Technical Advisory Committee should "reach out" to people involved in these various efforts to determine how they should work together and support one another.

2. While the legislation granting Ecology funding to initiate this effort did not explicitly state that funds should be used for "pilot projects," that was discussed when the legislation was being reviewed and debated, and there is an assumption that some portion of the funding would be used to launch pilot projects. Furthermore, both Ecology and the Governance Committee support launching pilot projects, even before the governance structure for the program is put into place and the relationships clarified.