

SWG Work Plan Subgroup discussion document
October 27, 2014

2010 Strategy – items accomplished to date and planned via RSMP; and gaps

http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wg/psmonitoring/ps_monitoring_docs/SWworkgroupDOCS/2010SW.pdf

Overall Summary

The Stormwater Work Group, since submitting its Key Recommendations for creating a regional stormwater monitoring and assessment program to Ecology and the Puget Sound Partnership in 2010, has continued to make recommendations, take advantages of funding opportunities, support Ecology's willingness to support a pooled funding approach through the municipal stormwater NPDES permits, coordinate with other PSEMP Workgroups, and collaboratively move the process forward. Much has been accomplished in advance of and since the onset of permittees' funding. Receiving water status and trends monitoring will begin in January 2015. Effectiveness studies are already underway.

SWG Role

The SWG's role is evolving. When the *2010 Strategy* was written PSEMP did not exist. The other workgroups are now at a point where we can have more formal interaction with them on areas of overlap and where stormwater is a contributor to their topics of interest.

Status and Trends Monitoring

Accomplished for small, wadeable streams monitoring

- Decision to change from watershed-based strata (30 sites each subbasin) to inside/outside UGA boundaries (50 sites each inside/outside UGA)
- Substantial progress on stream gaging network analyses and recommendations for flow monitoring
- Decision to do WQI at only 30 each inside/outside UGA and to add PAHs and metals
- Considering recommendation to measure relative stage at each monthly monitoring visit
- Considering recommendations for data analyses and reporting
- Ramp-up nearly complete: QAPP written, sites confirmed, implementation team formed, contracting underway

Planned for small, wadeable streams monitoring

- 95 sites (48 inside UGAs, 47 outside UGAs) confirmed for 2015 monitoring
- Write QAPP addendum to define data analyses and reporting: focus on timely report out to key audiences as this cycle of monitoring is completed
- Complete recommendations for flow monitoring
- Identify extent to which our questions can be answered by other monitoring efforts
- Make recommendations for the second round of sampling: sites, parameters, analyses

Priority gaps/needs for wadeable streams monitoring

- Define process for making recommendations for next round of status and trends monitoring: report and public workshops in 2017?

- Identify (and meet) timing needed for various (*i.e.*, level of effort and priorities for next round versus SWMP elements) permit-specific recommendations
- Identify the type of report out and specific product for each of our key audiences: stormwater managers, local gov't council members, state policy makers, salmon managers
- Work with PSEMP to define our role moving forward and to help with cross-topic information sharing and priority-setting. For example:
 - Lakes are not being addressed; this is a crossover topic with Freshwater Workgroup
 - Salmonid Workgroup will be a key audience for our findings. What about fish counts? Do they know that there is a low-cost opportunity to collect additional information?

Accomplished for marine nearshore monitoring

- Draft QAPPs written, candidate sites identified
- Decision not to conduct monthly bacteria monitoring

Planned for marine nearshore monitoring

- 30-40 sites each for sediment and caged mussel monitoring in 2015-2016
- Focus on timely report out to key audiences as this cycle of monitoring is completed
- Analysis of bacteria data collected by other entities

Priority gap/need for marine nearshore monitoring

- Identify the type of report out and specific product for each of our key audiences: stormwater managers, local government council members, state policy makers

Source Identification and Diagnostic Monitoring

Accomplished

- Literature review and scoping document
- Lots of progress on methods/approaches via GRSS grants (*i.e.*, Field Screening Manual)
- IDDE incident tracking form online for gathering results/findings data

Planned

- Look at IDDE incident data submitted with annual reports and see what it looks like (how easily can it be analyzed to robustly support regional recommendations)
- Identify priorities for methods/approaches developed next; more practical and targeted means of identifying and removing illicit discharges
 - Prioritize problems or activities
 - Improve coordination among jurisdictions working on similar problems
- Define a different approach for gathering results/findings data
- Define approaches to interpret results/findings data and synthesize other diffuse, available information on what has been effective
 - To improve the permits (what works, what's not needed, what conditions/situations)
 - To make regional policy recommendations to help local governments with common sources of problems
- Effectiveness study focused on business inspections

Priority gaps/needs

- In early second quarter of 2015 have a Sprint workshop to get folks together to brainstorm: What would help you? What has worked?
 - Put LSC folks at one station to focus on those topics. Maybe a bacteria table, different topics at others – any new parameters to focus on? Trash?
 - Let priorities emerge from this process.
- Identify the type of report out and specific product for each of our key audiences: stormwater managers, local government council members, state policy makers
- Document progress toward better control of sources; effectiveness recommendations

Effectiveness Studies

Accomplished

- Literature review; prioritization of topics; requests for, and evaluation and ranking of project proposals addressing priority topics; selection of initial round of studies

Planned

- Ten studies in the first round; four beginning in fall 2014
- Gap analysis to inform second round to begin ~2016

Priority gap/need for effectiveness studies

- Identify the type of report out and specific product for each of our key audiences: stormwater managers, local government council members, state policy makers

Research and Modeling

- Nothing done or planned

Creation of a Pooled Resources Funding Approach and Stakeholder Oversight

Accomplished

- Charter written
- PRO-Committee formed and getting budget/progress reports from Ecology

Planned

- Continue to get budget/progress reports and give direction
- Eventually (2017?) review the administrative entity decision

Communication

- Identify what timing and process is needed for various permit-specific recommendations.
 - What are various audiences' expectations for each of the three monitoring components?
- Make sure we have funding for regional workshops and other key means of sharing our findings.
 - Use communication team at PSP to help form our messages and venues.
 - Add to Encyclopedia of PS?