STORMWATER WORK GROUP

Tuesday, March 24, 2009 from 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Room CP 106 in the Cherry-Parkes Building at UW-Tacoma

DRAFT SUMMARY

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

ATTENDEES

Work Group members and the organizations or groups they represent:
Pam Bennett-Cumming (Mason Co.), Local Governments; **Jay Davis** (U.S. Dept of Fish and Wildlife), Federal Agencies; **Dana de Leon** (City of Tacoma), Local Governments; **Tim Determan** (WA Dept of Health), State Agencies; **Jonathan Frodge** (City of Seattle), Local Governments; **Dick Gersib** (WA Dept of Transportation), State Agencies; **Kris Holm** (Association of WA Business), Business Groups; **Heather Kibbey** (City of Everett), Local Governments; **DeeAnn Kirkpatrick** (NOAA Fisheries), Federal Agencies; **Lionel Klikoff** (WA Dept of Natural Resources); **Bill Moore** (WA Dept of Ecology), State Agencies; **Jim Simmonds** (King Co.), Local Governments; **Carol Smith** (WA Conservation Commission), Agriculture**; Heather Trim** (People for Puget Sound), Environmental Caucus; **Bruce Wulkan** (Puget Sound Partnership), State Agencies.

Work Group alternates and the organizations or groups they represent:
Emmett Dobey (Mason Co.), Local Governments; **Andy Meyer** (Association of WA Cities), Local Governments;

Meeting Observers:
Neil Aaland, WA State Association of Counties; **Abby Barnes**, Kennedy/Jenks; **Mark Biever**, Thurston Co.

Work Group Staff:
Damon Diessner (Environmental Strategies in Action), Facilitator; and **Karen Dinicola** (Ecology), Project Manager.

WORK GROUP COMPLETES ITS PRIORITIZATION OF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

Two of the Technical Expert Groups further prioritized their categories of assessment questions for stormwater monitoring (Work Plan Task 3). The Work Group agreed with those recommendations. The full list of questions discussed at the previous Work Group meeting, including the revised priorities recommended today, will be forwarded to the Task Groups charged with further developing regional monitoring strategies (Work Plan Task 4) and presented to the participants at the May 19 workshop for their feedback and potential revision. The list of questions is attached to this summary.

WORK GROUP REFINES FUTURE ASSIGNMENTS TO COMPLETE TASK 4

The Task 4 Planning Subgroup described proposed assignments for and desired composition of the Task Groups that will design the regional monitoring strategy (Work Plan Task 4). The Work Group agreed to the proposal to move forward with two task groups; one to develop recommendations for a combined "Stormwater Impacts and Characterization Monitoring and Assessment Strategy" and the other to develop recommendations regarding a strategy for "Monitoring and Assessment to Assess Effectiveness of Stormwater Management Actions."

Work Group members suggested a number of specific changes to the "Tasks and Target Deadlines for both Task Groups" section of the March 19, 2009 proposal for additions to the detailed additions to Work Plan Task 4. Staff will incorporate those changes and disseminate the revised work plan details with the meeting minutes. Specific topics of discussion for implementing the work plan included:

- Clarify that the Task Groups report to and take direction from the Stormwater Work Group
- Goal is a holistic approach that is scalable both scientifically and programmatically
- The extent to which this monitoring program can address multiple mandates and build on past and existing efforts
- How to get the right people involved and committed
    - APWA Stormwater Managers group wants a say in how we address current practices
    - Consider having each Task Group oversee a consultant to do the design and writing
- Cost sharing approaches
- How to keep all of the caucuses involved in the development and review of the strategy
- Ideas/considerations/cautions for the Peer Review Strategy

The Task 4 Planning Subgroup will (1) continue to refine the proposed work plan for the Task Groups, (2) contact potential Task Group participants to determine their availability and interest, (3) propose the group's initial membership, and (4) defining a possible role of consultants in supporting Task Group efforts. Dana de Leon and Tim Determan will join the subgroup members who volunteered at the February 24th Work Group meeting. Karen will lead the contracting process.

WORK GROUP DISCUSSES BUDGET

Project Manager Karen Dinicola briefly summarized the SWG budget for the remainder of this Fiscal Year and solicited Work Group members' input on targeting Work Group resources to most wisely use the remaining funds. The Work Group has a little over $40K of the $80K allocated to it by the Monitoring Consortium, and also has access to some of the capacity of the Consortium's contracted facilitator to assist in these efforts. Work Group members expressed that having independent facilitation of the large group meetings is a priority, as is providing for a successful workshop in May and ensuring adequate resources for the Task Group efforts to launch Work Plan Task 4.

Work Group members are to forward names of consultants appropriate to future Work Plan Task 4 activities to Karen. A Budget Advisory Subgroup was formed to work with Karen to further develop budget strategies for possible action before and discussion at the next meeting. Bruce Wulkan, Bill Moore, Susan Saffery (per Jon Frodge), Emmett Dobey, and Dana de Leon volunteered.

WORK GROUP PLANS MAY 19 PUBLIC WORKSHOP (TASK 7)

The Task 7 Workshop Planning Subgroup proposed an agenda and budget for the workshop planned for May 19th (Work Plan Task 7). The Work Group approved the agenda with some modifications and confirmed the May 19 date. The Task 7 Workshop Planning Subgroup will refine the workshop title and develop a "Save the Date" announcement to be sent out soon, with the understanding that registration for the workshop will open in mid-April. The Task 7 Workshop Planning Subgroup will confirm the venue and other logistics arrangements and recommend a workshop facilitator. The availability and interest of each of the speakers in the proposed agenda has been confirmed. Karen will secure the venue.

The Task 7 Workshop Planning Subgroup will finalize the "Save the Date" announcement via email and asks Work Group members to assist in assuring its wide distribution, including asking the Partnership's representative on the Work Group to send it to distribution lists for the various Topic Forums (Water Quality, Land Use, Human Health, Habitat, etc.). Karen will set up an Ecology email account to facilitate workshop registration.

Some of the workshop planning elements discussed included:

- Encourage a wide range of participants, ensure we elicit comments from all
- Make the workshop free and including lunch
- Hold the workshop at the Renton Community Center
- Develop an enticing and descriptive title
- Aim for attendance by up to 200 participants, invite them to participate in developing the regional stormwater monitoring strategy
- Ask all speakers to address the full range of rural to urban land uses
- Include the priority research questions in the breakout discussions
- Use existing mailing lists to attract participants and post notice to the SWG webpage
- Explore tie-ins to the agricultural community

KEY DECISIONS OF THIS MEETING

- The Work Group approved its prioritized list of assessment questions.
- The Work Group approved the May 19 Public Workshop Agenda, speakers and venue and agreed to send out a "save the date" announcement.
- A Budget Advisory Subgroup was formed to facilitate decisions on how to most wisely use the remaining funds allocated to the Work Group's efforts.
- Each Subgroup should conduct as much business as possible via email and conference calls.

NEXT STEPS

- The Task 4 Planning Subgroup will present a proposal at the next Work Group meeting regarding Task Group composition, assignments, and needed resources for Work Group discussion and approval.
- Local government caucus representatives and other Work Group members with consultants on retainer who might be helpful in developing the regional stormwater monitoring strategy are to send those names to Karen as soon as possible together with a sense of their ballpark hourly rates.

- A Budget Advisory Subgroup will recommend a strategy and steps to most wisely use the remaining funding allocation and staff capacity for the Work Group's efforts.
- A May 19 workshop "Save the Date" announcement refined by the Task 7 Planning Subgroup will be distributed to potential interested participants.
- Karen will secure the May 19 workshop venue and set up an email account to handle registration.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

Future meetings are scheduled from 9 a.m. to noon on Tuesday April 28th, Wednesday June 3rd, and Tuesday June 23rd at the Rhodes Center in Tacoma. Work Group members should also plan to attend the May 19th Workshop from 9 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. at the Renton Community Center.

Karen will explore changing the venue for meetings scheduled on the 4th Tuesday of July and beyond.

* * * * *

MARCH 24, 2009 PRIORITY ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS FOR STORMWATER MONITORING

Answers to the questions below will feed into answering these two overarching questions:

1. Given limited resources, what combination of targeting new development and retrofitting existing development is most effective in minimizing the impact of land use/stormwater to receiving waters?
2. How effective are the Clean Water Act permit-mandated municipal (including highways), industrial, construction, livestock, and dairy stormwater programs?

<u>For efficacy of management actions, the priority questions are</u>:

- Among the most widely used practices and promising new practices that are available, what specific retrofits or restoration practices are most effective in reducing pollutant loads, restoring hydrologic function, and recovering damaged habitat?
    - To what extent can retrofits and application of BMPs at redevelopment sites reverse past impacts? To what extent can the water and sediment quality and hydrologic conditions necessary to support beneficial uses of water bodies be restored in sub-basins that already have some degree of development? At what degree of development, or under what other specific conditions, is a particular retrofit strategy most likely to be successful?
- How effective are source control and other programmatic stormwater management practices in reducing pollutant loads from existing development and from other specific land use activities such as agriculture?
- Are our stormwater management actions preventing and reducing future disruption of natural hydrologic conditions and minimizing pollutant loads in areas of new development in Puget Sound?
    - What is the effectiveness of subbasin-scale to watershed-scale combinations of stormwater management actions (techniques) at reducing impacts?

For impacts to beneficial uses, the priority questions are:

- *Where* does stormwater significantly impact receiving waters, resources, species, or beneficial uses in the lowland streams, lakes, rivers, ground, and marine waters of the Puget Sound basin?
    - What is the current condition of streams, lakes, rivers, and nearshore marine waters, by representative land use?
        - What are the worst spots, when, and why?
        - What areas should be targeted for protection?
- Over time, how effective are source control, prevention, and retrofit efforts? Are beneficial uses improving in response to our stormwater management actions?

For characterization and pollutant loadings, the priority questions are:

- How does land use influence pollutant concentrations, flow volumes, and loadings? What land uses or land use combinations are of greatest interest for applying and improving our stormwater management actions?
    - What is the variability in stormwater pollutant concentrations and flow volumes by land use and geographic area?
    - What is the variability within and among WRIA level basins for similar land uses?
    - What factors within a land use control pollutant concentrations and flow volumes?
        - How do differences in stormwater infrastructure (i.e., pipes versus ditches, developments built at different times under different standards) affect pollutant loads and flows from similar land uses?
        - What proportion of the pollutant loads reach receiving waters and what are the explanations for the differences (i.e., due to losses)?
    - What proportions of the pollutants in stormwater are from various sources such as air deposition and transport, spills, erosion and resuspension?
- What variables influence the temporal distribution of pollutant loads? (seasonal & trends)

For research, the priority questions are:

- What are the best indicators of stormwater impacts to water or sediment quality, streamflow, habitat, and biota?
    - What are the best indicators of various categories of chemical pollutants? Of solid-phase versus dissolved phase chemical pollutants?
- What are the synergistic effects of pollutants from stormwater?
- What is the toxicity in surface waters impacted by stormwater?
    - What is the seasonal and annual variation and the variation within the hydrograph?
- What are the effects of stormwater up through the food chain/food web?