STORMWATER WORK GROUP

Wednesday, January 13, 2010 9:00 AM – 3:00 PM
USGS Conference Room
934 Broadway, Tacoma

Draft Summary

OF THE MEETING'S KEY DISCUSSIONS, DECISIONS AND AGREEMENTS

ATTENDEES:

Work Group Members in attendance, and the organizations or groups they represent:

Allison Butcher (Master Builders Assn of King and Snohomish Co.), Business Groups; **Dana de Leon** (City of Tacoma), Local Governments; **Tim Determan** (WA Dept. of Health), State Agencies; **Emmett Dobey** (Mason Co.), Local Governments; **Mindy Fohn** (Kitsap Co.), Local Governments; **Heather Kibbey** (Everett), Local Governments; **DeeAnn Kirkpatrick** (National Marine Fisheries Service), Federal Agencies; **Julie Lowe** (WA Dept. of Ecology), State Agencies; **Kit Paulsen** (Bellevue), Local Governments; **Tom Putnam** (Puget Soundkeeper Alliance), Environmental Groups; **Jim Simmonds** (King Co.), Local Governments and the Work Group's Chair; **Carol Smith** (WA Conservation Commission), Agriculture; **Gary Turney** (U.S. Geological Survey), Federal Agencies; **Heather Trim** (People for Puget Sound), Environmental Groups; and **Bruce Wulkan** (Puget Sound Partnership), State Agencies.

Work Group Alternates in Attendance: **Neil Aaland** (Washington State Assn. of Counties), Local Governments; **Tony Paulson** (U.S. Geological Survey), Federal Agencies

Others in Attendance: **Mark Biever**, Thurston County; **Alison Chamberlin**, Mason County; **Mark Rettmann**, Port of Tacoma; **Barb Wood**, Thurston County

Work Group Staff: **Karen Dinicola** (Ecology), Project Manager; **Leska Fore** (Statistical Design), Facilitator and Communication Lead

WORK GROUP MAKES DECISIONS ON SOME OF THE MAJOR ISSUES RAISED IN COMMENTS

The work group discussed a series of proposals developed by subgroups that teed up issues for discussion at today's meeting. The group is mindful that at the end of this decision-making process, which will continue at our next meeting, we will need to ensure that the decisions all fit as a package and work together, and that we have the capacity to implement each decision.

Modeling: the work we're doing needs to feed into the modeling work that is needed (and vice versa). For example, Toxics Loading committee has a list of modeling needs. The document needs to identify this step and we need to create this list for stormwater. The group **agreed** to modify the current section on models to say:

1. There are different types of models that 1) model problems and mechanisms, 2) extrapolate results from small scale studies to regional (urban and rural) effects, and 3) extrapolate the benefits associated with different management actions.

2. Our goal is to connect our monitoring to the models that support actions to restore watershed health, but the specifics of all the possible connections is outside the scope of this document.
3. In the meantime, author might describe an appropriate, relevant example of how we would connect to a program (for example, HSPF/WHM or others).
4. Process to determine what we need to collect. Go through/identify the list of most relevant models that are out there and identify their data needs. (What priorities have been identified by PS Science Panel? What suits focus of what we need for stormwater management?) State intention that we'll collect data under this monitoring plan that we know is needed for many stormwater-related models, and key relevant data gaps. Cross boundaries to see where our efforts inform other activities.

Connecting the three categories of monitoring: Horner's comments recommend: Progress Evaluation (roughly equivalent to our Status & Trends category) and a Diagnostic Tier (roughly equivalent to our Source Identification category). His comments also address Adaptive Management (roughly equivalent our Effectiveness category and his Compliance monitoring; however we did not decide whether/how to address compliance yet). Horner's comments also recommend a research category but we are not addressing Research in this topic discussion.

The group **agreed** to modify the text to apply Horner's ideas to our current three categories of monitoring to explain how they fit together logically – but to retain the names of our three categories of monitoring. We also agreed to add text to clearly describe how change is made.

Other discussion points: are there goals for all watersheds in PS that suit this approach? Do biotic endpoints suffice for this? Can we extrapolate based on what we are learning in certain areas? Note that Horner's recommendations assumed watershed-based *permitting*.

Loads/characterization: the group **agreed** to include characterization in the source identification text section in the following manner: define characterization (variation in relevant indicators/ variables across the landscape and through time), the need for it in various studies, and what info we can get out of literature for a particular study. Relate back to an identified problem (S&T, existing literature, etc).

Other discussion points: Where are sources of problems and how much is coming from each source, to inform actions. Will need a certain characterization study design to calculate loads (not currently in strategy; different data gap). This might be included in a research category.

The group also **agreed** to add to the text that a targeted literature review is needed before designing and conducting specific studies.

We also **agreed** to add text stating that we may modify the list of parameters in Appendix E in the future, and that we consider this as a list of examples and need to review it as a group.

We also **agreed** to add text describing how we will, as a group, decide what hypotheses to address and what experimental designs to use. The new text should describe the process by which these decisions will be made. Also, when we identify a problem (or early warning signal) through status-and-trends monitoring or literature, we will design an appropriate study with appropriate indicators to address the problem. We need both the short term process of describing the initial study design and long term process to add/connect. Process includes review/evaluation/vetting of new studies. Need a better discussion of what examples are included in the strategy.

The group **generally agreed** that we should add a paragraph that talks about our need to address the uncertainty range as an overarching goal of the strategy: to articulate the credibility of and confidence in each of our experimental designs. Study designs also need to reflect our collective/joint ability to sustain the effort to provide the answers we need. This new text connects to the description of how we are prioritizing our efforts: what, where. We do need to articulate the scale, how much, how often, and what we get for the effort, and be honest and transparent in approach to creating the overall study design, and ensure that level of

confidence is clearly articulated and appropriate for decision makers. Concern remains among that studies are not yet defined, and implementation details are yet to be decided.

New Figure 2 and Table 1: The group **agreed** that it would be okay for the subgroup to develop a new proposal to replace figure 2; but not yet to drop the current figure. The group **agreed** that all basic land use types should be included in a new figure and that groundwater should be added, and that the subgroup should incorporate stressors and pathways, review the arrows, and explain the boxes. Kit P, Heather K, Bruce W, Heather T, Phyllis Varner, and Jonathan Frodge will work on this.

Some group members' concerns about Table 1 are its reliance on best professional judgment and not citing literature. The group did not agree to replace Table 1 with another table that lists all of the beneficial uses and in which water bodies they are present, but agreed that it might be helpful to review Ecology's water quality assessment to inform its revision. Concern remained that if we dropped Table 1 entirely we would be losing a lot of relevant information about stormwater impacts that helped us move forward, and that the table generally did a good job of articulating the impacts we know about and where they occur. The group **agreed** that it would be okay for a couple of people to work on revising the table for an alternate proposal: The title would need to be changed to one that explains the role of the table in showing what are the most sensitive water bodies, where; make it more comprehensive for both land uses and beneficial uses; and make the content in the cells consistent. The associated text would need to explain role of table 1 in prioritization. Gary T and Jim S will work on this.

The group **agreed** that it would be okay to for Kit and Jonathan to develop a new proposal for text to address monitoring program in which this strategy is housed and how all of the pieces fit and how to tie to other efforts. The text will be based upon key recommendations from the Monitoring Consortium's reports.

MORE DECISIONS WILL BE MADE AT OUR NEXT MEETING

Four topics that were teed up for today's discussion will be taken up at our next meeting. In addition, there are topics that have not yet been teed up. Tom P is working on the gaps; John Lenth is working on experimental design; DeeAnn K will work on ancillary data; and Karen D will work on "increased/improved stormwater management efforts".

The agenda items "Writing and Editing Assignments" and "SWG Response to Formal Peer Reviews" will be addressed at our next meeting. We also will need to plan our next external communications and decide on the approach and work plan for developing volume 2 of the strategy, the implementation plan.

LEGISLATIVE AND OTHER UPDATES

Dennis McLerran was named the EPA Region X Director.

HB 2685, sponsored by Rep. Upthegrove, proposes to change the legislative language that established the current Partnership to remove the barriers to their setting up a non-governmental organization to conduct monitoring.

THE WORK GROUP'S NEXT SCHEDULED MEETINGS ARE:

Wednesday, January 27th, from 9am-3pm at the USGS Office in Tacoma (brown bag lunch)
Tuesday, February 23rd, from 9am-3pm at the USGS Office in Tacoma (brown bag lunch)