

STORMWATER WORK GROUP

Wednesday, September 9, 2009 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM
USGS Conference Room
934 Broadway, Tacoma

Draft Summary

OF THE MEETING'S KEY DISCUSSIONS, DECISIONS AND AGREEMENTS

ATTENDEES:

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

Allison Butcher (MBA of King and Snohomish Co.), Business Groups; **Dana de Leon** (City of Tacoma), Local Governments; **Tim Determan** (WA Dept of Health), State Agencies; **Mindy Fohn**, (Kitsap County), Local Governments; **Dick Gersib** (WA Dept of Transportation), State Agencies; **Heather Kibbey** (City of Everett), Local Governments; **Jay Davis** (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service), Federal Agencies; **Bill Moore** (WA Dept of Ecology), State Agencies; **Kit Paulsen** (City of Bellevue), Local Governments; **Jim Simmonds** (King County), 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 Staff:

Derek Booth (Stillwater Sciences), Technical Lead/Scientific Framework; **Karen Dinicola** (Ecology), Project Manager; **Leska Fore** (Statistical Design), Facilitator/Communication Lead; **John Lenth** (Herrera), Technical Lead/Experimental Design; and **Joy Michaud** (Herrera), Technical Team Staff.

Others in Attendance:

Abby Barnes, Kennedy/Jenks; **Sarah Brace**, Soundwide Starrfish Environmental Consulting; **Julie Lowe**, Ecology; and **Keith Wolf**, KWA Ecological Sciences.

WORK GROUP DISCUSSES DRAFT SCIENTIFIC FRAMEWORK FOR MONITORING STRATEGY

Each person present was asked to offer 1-2 minutes of verbal feedback to the consultant team. Work group members were also asked to submit written comments, but only 5 questionnaires were turned in (completed forms can still be emailed to karen.dinicola@ecy.wa.gov). At the end of this meeting summary is a bulleted list of the comments offered by everyone present. The roundtable was followed by discussion of a few key issues raised:

- Map the Universe: the work group (and intended audience) want the document to articulate the comprehensive need for stormwater monitoring and explain the prioritization approach in a way that addresses both what is included in the strategy, and why, and what is not included, and why.
- Hypotheses: At this stage, work group members generally agreed that it is more helpful to have a more specific and detailed statement of the hypotheses that provides some specificity about indicators to link among hypotheses in the experimental design.

- Source Identification: could be a program effectiveness study or an assessment to focus resources where the problems are greatest. Scale is included in this issue.
- Transportation: the work group thinks the organizational approach of land uses and receiving waters is good, however the transportation system within each land use, and for highways, is not clearly addressed and needs to be. Roads are both a source and a conveyor of pollutants.
- Document structure: There is a lot of crossover between the scientific framework, experimental design, and introduction/context sections of the report. As the document progresses, the writing team will continue to improve the organization and flow of the document.

Action items for all work group members:

1. Provide links to other monitoring programs not mentioned in the scientific framework document and with whom we need to coordinate to Derek at dbooth@stillwatersci.com;
2. Send comments on the outline to Karen at karen.dinicola@ecy.wa.gov and Leska at leska.fore@gmail.com.

At the end of the discussion, the work group tasked the Strategy Document Subgroup with continuing to provide interim feedback and guidance to the writing team as the document progresses. Bruce Wulkan will rejoin and Heather Trim will join the subgroup, which will have its next meeting on September 17.

**WORK GROUP APPROVES DRAFT PEER REVIEW PLAN AND LETTER TO SCIENCE PANEL;
DIRECTS SUBGROUP TO REVISE AND SEND**

The Work Group discussed the draft Science Input and Peer Review Plan created by the subgroup and offered the following comments:

- The criteria for selecting the panel (vs. each member) should include knowledge of other efforts, programs, and areas of research that might help us avoid reinventing the wheel. This is an opportunity for us to get feedback on whether we picked the most critical things to start with.
- The criteria for selecting the panel (vs. each member) should include related, relevant areas of science, i.e., stormwater science, or water quality science, or monitoring methods, etc. so that we get breadth of expertise on the peer review panel. There are multiple disciplines addressed in the strategy, and we won't get them all but we should aim for a cross section.
- While asking the peer reviewers to avoid policy judgments is appropriate, work group members suggest an alternate example: "triggers for changing actions."

The work group also discussed the draft letter to the Science Panel and recommended that the three purposes of the letter be clearly stated up front: to update them, to ask for a briefing once the strategy is complete, and to get their feedback on the peer review approach we've proposed.

The work group tasked the subgroup with making the suggested revisions to both documents and sending the letter and attachment to the Science Panel within the next couple weeks.

WORK GROUP TASKS SUBGROUP WITH SELECTION PROCESS FOR PEER REVIEWERS

The Peer Review Subgroup will cull the list of nominees to those who meet the criteria and, if the number of candidates is appropriate, then contact individuals to gauge interest and availability. A mix of local and national experts is desired. If further selection is needed then an email polling process will be initiated with SWG members. The subgroup will extend formal invitations to selected reviewers in the next couple weeks.

WORK GROUP IDENTIFIES NEW SUBGROUP TO PLAN NOVEMBER 10 PUBLIC WORKSHOP

This new subgroup (Abby Barnes, Sarah Brace, Shayne Cothorn, Karen Dinicola, Leska Fore, Jim Simmonds, Heather Trim) is charged with sending out a save the date notice in the next couple weeks. The subgroup will develop a draft agenda and propose a venue. We want this workshop to be as successful as the first.

The Communication Subgroup, with the addition of Sarah Brace as a new member and John Clemens as a continuing contributor, will continue to develop a broader communication strategy that addresses all of the groups we need to communicate with during the development of the strategy and the implementation plan.

PUGET SOUND PARTNERSHIP DEVELOPING “STORMWATER RESULTS CHAINS”

The Puget Sound Partnership is in the midst of developing a series of “results chains” for the Near Term Actions in the Action Agenda. Results chains are logic chains that are built to track activities intended to result in environmental outcomes; this is the approach PSP has chosen to help meet their legislative mandate for accountability. There are several results chains being developed for stormwater, one of which is for creating a regional monitoring program for stormwater. Several work group members are involved in the process. A link to the PSP site is on the support page’s sidebar <http://sites.google.com/site/pugetsoundstormwaterworkgroup/>

PUGET SOUND PARTNERSHIP AND ECOLOGY CONSIDERING A “STORMWATER SUMMIT”

Both PSP Director David Dicks and Ecology Director Jay Manning are concerned about stormwater management in Puget Sound and want to have a broad, strategic conversation about what’s going right, what’s not, and how to fill in the gaps. No date has been set, and still need to plan the content, but there is a desire that the summit or series of workshops take place before the legislative session begins in January. We should move ahead with our November public workshop; PSP is aware of that event. Bruce Wulkan will inform work group members as plans are made and a date is set.

ECOLOGY REQUESTING PROPOSALS FOR STORMWATER TECHNOLOGY CENTER BY 10/14

At the last legislative session, Ecology was directed to start a Stormwater Technical Resource Center as money becomes available. No funding was appropriated, but Ecology is starting the process with State Toxics Account funds that must be given as grants or loans to local governments. Ecology is seeking proposals by October 14, each grant will be up to \$500,000 and proposals can be bundled. No match is required. The successful proposal might be a pilot project or it could be a scoping process (i.e., identifying stakeholder interests, governance model, reviewing what is being done elsewhere). Bill Moore notes that both the WSU Puyallup Research Extension Center and the UW Urban Waters Institute are interested in partnering; he hopes to see a number of proposals. Karen will send the web link to the work group.

ECOLOGY LAUNCHING PROCESS TO ADDRESS PCHB RULING ON LID

A committee has been selected through a nomination process, and Ecology has hired an outside facilitator (Kate Snider). The first meeting is at the Tacoma Convention Center on October 13. The process should conclude in early spring 2010.

THE WORK GROUP’S NEXT MEETINGS:

TUESDAY, **SEPTEMBER 29**, from 9am-noon at the USGS Office in Tacoma

TUESDAY, **OCTOBER 27**, from 9am-noon at the USGS Office in Tacoma

Attachment: 9/9/9 Feedback on the Draft Scientific Framework

- Like the biological emphasis
- Concerned about the extent of the literature review. Need more synthesis of info about what AQ's are already answered.
- Take out "MEP" language (maximum extent practicable, possible, etc.)
- Like "what the document/strategy is/is not"
- Does the table represent an appropriate judgment of higher/lower impact?
- The 4-bullet summary of the AQ's is good
- "Are we improving biota?" is a broader question than BIBI – add fish to Ho's
- Land uses are mixed. Impact is on the receiving waters.
- How will this strategy interact with other monitoring programs?
- The document relies heavily on PS toxics documents, i.e. residential land use is the biggest source. It is likely that roads and transportation have a bigger impact.
- Broaden the Figure on p. 10 which is currently limited to streams
- On p. 14 #6 under effectiveness monitoring, WDOH already has some successes
- Need a measure of the level of uncertainty (what will decision makers accept?)
- Step back broader and tie into Ecology status and trends program
- Still too early to know if we're "there"
- Like having hypotheses. Moving in the right direction.
- Be clear on priorities: why making choices, not reinventing
- Need strong alignment/connection with PSP and Ecology. Link to management/policy work. Have a dialogue to know their definition of success.
- Good documentation of what to monitor – need who and how.
- Look at PSAMP report – link findings to management.
- On p. 14 #5 under effectiveness monitoring, please provide examples.
- Need more about how – this is the heart of the matter. Outline says description will be "general" and we might need more specifics.
- Loop back to management and uncertainty
- More tie-in to PSP threats/indicators work. The indicator list just came out. The threats ranking was done in April. [Bruce will forward these to Derek.]
- Table on p. 11 add impact on freshwater flow for groundwater
- Add upper watersheds, forests, open areas
- Transportation needs its own column
- Need air
- Issue of nesting and scale needs to be addressed
- Map the universe before we jump into details
- Examples of projects we can start on and build from
- Source control/source ID – how to better spend resources
- Build on local government source ID work and improve it
- Like the stated purpose – overarching strategy. The document doesn't do this yet.
- Describe how the document is laid out
- Why is adaptive management (AM) up front? – and say why it's important
- Is there a reason for the order of the list of stormwater monitoring programs? If so, describe it, and if not, switch to alphabetical order
- PSAMP discussion is not a description of the program

- Conceptual framework is too narrow: effectiveness. Need impacts on resources. And information about discharges.
- On p. 12 the 4 bullets are too narrow a retelling of the AQ's
- Need more.
- Lay out the universe and then prioritize on a subset.
- Well written
- AM section is a treatise – better in an appendix? What's the point? Needed but too much up front.
- Add ties to PSP/Ecology
- Weasel wording about practicable/possible
- What will be an important finding? Somewhere between 50-95% confidence level
- List more hypotheses than give examples for
- Allow others to address the priorities not in the strategy
- Missing the punch line on AM: so what are we going to do about it?
- Need sharp hypotheses – a few to start on
- Need more to know what nuts and bolts might be
- Don't lose emphasis on flow
- Large investment in source ID
- Need to know where to apply management actions
- We need to articulate what/why we're not addressing as well as we explain what we will do
- Clear intent of document? Actions/opportunities?
- Add research questions that tie in
- Tie into core indicators being used by PSP
- Box or table showing how indicator would trigger management action
- Like description of programs. Add clear tie-in, link this strategy to them, collaborate
- Core indicators are important for decision making process
- ID/articulate weak link in AM: make objectivity stronger than subjectivity
- Priorities versus sequencing. Need both done in a way that makes sense.
- Is there equity between protection and restoration goals?
- Design approach clear
- Needs more narrowing to tie into permits. AM works well for 5-yr cycle.
- Like hypothesis testing – focused and site specific, more beneficial to stormwater managers
- More examples of status and trends.
- More literature review. Additional looks at different things.
- Expand the first bullet on p. 13