



STORMWATER WORK GROUP

Wednesday, May 14, 2014, from 9:05 am to 11:25 am
USGS, 934 Broadway, Tacoma WA, 98402

Draft Summary

OF THE MEETING'S KEY DISCUSSIONS, DECISIONS AND AGREEMENTS

See the last page for a list of acronyms

ATTENDEES:

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

Mark Bieber (Thurston Co), Local Governments; **Jay Davis** (USFWS), Federal Agencies; **Dick Gersib** (WSDOT), State Agencies; **Heather Kibbey** (Everett), Local Governments and the PSEMP Steering Committee Chair; **Bill Moore** (Ecology), State Agencies; **Kit Paulsen** (Bellevue), Local Governments; **Tom Putnam** (Puget Soundkeeper Alliance), Environmental Groups and the Work Group's Vice-Chair; **Jim Simmonds** (King Co), Local Governments and the Work Group's Chair; **Bruce Wulkan** (PSP), State Agencies.

Others in attendance: **Leska Fore** (PSP); **Melva Hill** (Bainbridge Island); **Curtis Nickerson** (CardnoTEC); **Ben Parrish** (Covington); **Bill Taylor** (Taylor Aquatic Science); **Kelly Uhacz** (Battle Ground).

Work Group Staff: **Karen Dinicola** (Ecology, SWG Staff); **Brandi Lubliner** (Ecology, RSMP Coordinator).

WORK GROUP CONSIDERS LIST OF RSMP EFFECTIVENESS STUDIES FOR INITIAL FUNDING ROUND

At our last meeting on March 19, we discussed the pair of RSMP Effectiveness Studies Workshops scheduled to take place between that meeting and today's meeting, on March 20 and May 6. At the first workshop we narrowed a list of 23 pre-proposals to a list of 12. Two of the 12 were combined with other studies resulting in full proposals for 10 studies that address 4 of the 6 priority topics that were identified in our June 2013 recommendations to Ecology.

Ecology staff review of the top 12 pre-proposals was conducted between the two workshops and shared with the project proponents. During their presentations the project proponents stated how they addressed feedback from the Ecology review and during the discussions at the first workshop.

Project proponents' brief written descriptions of their studies were used for a permittee survey to rank the projects; 63 permittees voted. All of the projects were ranked in the top 3 studies of interest by multiple permittees. At the second workshop, the top 5 studies as ranked by the permittee survey were of interest to between 16 and 18 (all) of the participating permittees, with each jurisdiction getting one vote. The 7th ranked study was of interest to 12, the 6th and 8th to 10, the 9th to 6, and the 10th to 9 of the participating permittee representatives. We also got feedback from the other participants at the workshop.

The second workshop resulted in a number of recommendations that were outlined in the agenda for today's meeting. Below is a revised version of those recommendations reflecting feedback from today's discussion that should be considered and discussed further by the PROC at its next meeting on June 3. The discussion at the upcoming local government caucus meeting on May 19 will also inform the PROC's discussion of these recommendations.

- No fewer than the top five, and perhaps all ten studies that came out of this process should move forward for the Ecology contracting process. All of the studies were of interest to at least a third of the permittees participating in the May 6 workshop.
 - Each of the work group members present today recommended funding 6, 8, or all 10 of the proposals. Most of the members favored moving forward with all of the studies unless fatal flaws are identified during the contracting and review processes.

- Work group members present today generally agreed that the interest of the permittees should be balanced with soundness of the proposals in our final recommendations to Ecology.
- Specific, project-specific suggestions for consideration include:
 - Add disposal costs to the catch basin maintenance data evaluation.
 - Consider adding funding for the substantial staff time that will be required to collect data for the catch basin and source controls studies.
 - Add an additional year of monitoring and evaluation of the wet pond in the bioretention effectiveness study.
- A third party technical and scientific review of each study design including statistics will identify fatal flaws and improve the projects. Because RSMP funds are not yet available, this might not be feasible.
 - Ask Ecology staff to review the full bioretention proposal and give feedback as to whether, and the extent to which, their concerns about the pre-proposal have been addressed.
- Do a close inspection of estimated costs in each proposal, including contracting processes and overhead rates on pass-through funding. Consider appropriate contingency funding. Find opportunities for equipment sharing or rental in lieu of purchase.
- The PROC should recommend sequencing that considers the flexibility of the projects, the proposed schedules of deliverables, timing to inform the next permit cycle.
- Look at the difference between pre-proposal cost estimates and full proposal cost estimates.
- Ask project proponents to provide cost estimates for additional tasks outlined above.
- Costs are expected to go up as reviews are completed and adjustments to scopes of work are requested.
- Do a gap analysis in advance of requesting another round of proposals in about 2 years to allocate the remainder of the funds.

We could conceivably fund all ten full proposals, as the total amount currently requested is about \$3.6M and permittees will be contributing about \$6M. We cannot fund all of them in the first year, however, because the funding comes in at about \$1.5M per year. We do want to demonstrate the success of this process and fund as many of these studies as appear doable. This was a very engaged process of narrowing down to a few good proposals. We are still aiming for consensus but might put forward some majority recommendations noting minority concerns.

Our recommendations are needed in advance of the pooled resources contributions coming in to Ecology in mid August so that contracts can be completed over the summer and studies may begin shortly thereafter. The PROC will meet on June 3 to discuss this feedback and revise the recommendations accordingly. At our meeting on June 11 the work group will make a final decision on which if not all of these ten RSMP Effectiveness Studies we recommend should move forward for the contracting process at Ecology.

Many thanks to Leska Fore for facilitating the workshops and today's discussion!

WORK GROUP CONSIDERS CHANGES TO SCOPE OF WORK FOR STATUS AND TRENDS MONITORING

At our last meeting, we heard about the initial meeting of the PROC and plans for the budget discussion at the second PROC meeting April 22. The PROC detailed its recommendations to the SWG in a memo; the track change notes made on that memo during today's discussion are attached to this meeting summary. Note that today's discussions address only the RSMP scope of work; the requirements for the opt-out permittees were detailed in a separate scope of work put out last fall by Ecology as guidance for permittees making their decisions as to whether to participate in the RSMP status and trends monitoring or to conduct their own individual, densified monitoring within their own jurisdictions.

The PROC recommends some major changes to the scope of work outlined last summer. These changes are expected to bring the RSMP Status and Trends monitoring costs in line with the available budget of about \$3.5M while still meeting the main objectives of the program and being strategic with our overall investment. The changes, tradeoffs, and important contextual notes are:

1. Monitor all 100 stream sites for stream benthos and sediment chemistry but reduce overall the number of WQI sites from 100 to 60. These sites require monthly visits and the level of confidence is only reduced from 95% to 90%. Add metals and PAHs to the remaining 60 WQI sites to get more stormwater-specific information of interest.
2. Reduce the periphyton monitoring from 100 sites to 30 sites inside the UGA boundary.
3. In lieu of conducting monthly marine nearshore bacteria monitoring, conduct an analysis in 2017 of the fecal coliform and enterococcus data collected by BEACH, King County, Kitsap County, Bainbridge Island, Pierce County, Bellingham, WDOH, and others and make recommendations for future bacteria monitoring.
4. Add a line item for continued study of approaches to flow monitoring.
5. Ensure adequate quality assurance at the project and data management levels.

Chances are very good that our scope, or at least our findings, will be expanded by coordinating with the USGS NAWQA study next year and perhaps using some USGS Cooperative Water Program funding. Specifically, pressure transducers might be deployed at many of our ungaged sites; and sediment chemistry parameters or other measurements might be added at some or all of the RSMP stream sites.

Our recommendations to Ecology are needed as soon as possible so that contracts for conducting the stream monitoring work can be completed this summer. The work group will make the final decision on the scope of work for status and trends monitoring during the work group the meeting on June 11.

Note that a new set of PROC members will be selected at our next meeting. They might decide to call themselves something else in the future.

WORK GROUP HEARS UPDATES RELATED TO OUR WORK AND OUR SUBGROUPS

- The next issue of our SWG Reporter will go out following our June 11 meeting.
- Karen will schedule a SWG Source Identification Subgroup meeting to discuss what has been entered via the online IDDE incident tracking form so far and begin scoping the SIDIR Results and Findings analysis as well as development of a new form for permittees' use next calendar year.
- Heather Kibbey is the new Chair of PSEMP Steering Committee. Yesterday's PSEMP meeting was cancelled but Heather convened an ad hoc group to discuss direction and support of the committee. There is a sense that the committee has lost momentum and needs more clarity of purpose. The Ruckelshaus Center's audit findings are due in June.
- WSDOT announced that the Washington Stormwater Center is considering convening a half-day session on roads and highways research as part of the Urban Stormwater Conference scheduled for November 5th and 6th. This was a recommended outcome of the SWG's Roads and Highways Subgroup.
- NEP directors from the west Coast are convening next Tuesday. Bruce Wulkan requested that Karen Dinicola give them a presentation about the RSMP.

NEXT MEETING DATE AND PROPOSED DISCUSSION TOPICS

Wednesday, June 11 from 9:00 am – 12:00 pm at the USGS Office in Tacoma:

- Approve RSMP Effectiveness Studies list and sequencing
- Approve changes to RSMP Status and Trends scope
- Discuss approval of agricultural effectiveness monitoring recommendations
- Hear from our subgroups about the status of implementing our 2014-2015 work plan
- Determine messages and timing for next SWG Reporter
- Hear from PSEMP Steering Committee and other PSEMP workgroups

Other work group meetings in 2014 are scheduled on September 17 and November 12.

LIST OF ACRONYMS USED IN THIS MEETING SUMMARY

BEACH: Beach Environmental Assessment, Communication, and Health Monitoring Program

IDDE: Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination

NAWQA: National Water Quality Assessment

NEP: National Estuary Program

PROC: Pooled Resources Oversight Committee

PSEMP: Puget Sound Ecosystem Monitoring Program

PSP: Puget Sound Partnership

RSMP: Regional Stormwater Monitoring Program

SIDIR: Source Identification Information Repository

SWG: Stormwater Work Group

USFWS: United States Fish and Wildlife Service

USGS: United States Geological Survey

WQI: Water Quality Index

WSDOT: Washington Department of Transportation