

STORMWATER WORK GROUP

Wednesday, March 21, 2012 9:05 AM – 12:40 PM
Tacoma CTP Visitor Center, 2201 Portland Avenue, Tacoma WA, 98421

Revised Draft Summary

OF THE MEETING'S KEY DISCUSSIONS, DECISIONS AND AGREEMENTS

ATTENDEES:

Work Group Members and Alternates, and the Organizations or Groups and Caucuses they Represent:

Neil Aaland (Assn. of WA Cities and WA Assn. of Counties), Local Governments; **Jay Davis** (USFWS), Federal Agencies; **Dana De Leon** (Tacoma), Local Governments; **Dick Gersib** (WSDOT), State Agencies; **Heather Kibbey** (Everett), Local Governments; **Adam Lorio** (Samish Tribe), Tribes; **Bill Moore** (Ecology), State Agencies; **Tony Paulson** (USGS), Federal Agencies; **Tom Putnam** (Puget Soundkeeper Alliance), Environmental Groups; **Jim Simmonds** (King Co.), Local Governments and the Work Group's Chair; **Carol Smith** (WSCC), Agriculture; **Bruce Wulkan** (Puget Sound Partnership), State Agencies.

Others in attendance: **Kevin Buckley**, Seattle; **Mike Milne**, Brown and Caldwell.

Work Group Staff: **Karen Dinicola** (Ecology), Project Manager.

WORK GROUP APPROVES AGRICULTURAL RUNOFF PESTICIDE MONITORING RECOMMENDATIONS

The Agricultural Runoff Subgroup considered work group members' feedback provided via discussion at our last meeting and revised its recommendations. Discussion of the main points of revision included:

1. Background information and a detailed description of the existing monitoring program is available in the report at <http://agr.wa.gov/FP/Pubs/docs/302-SWM2006-2008Report.pdf>.
2. Specific revisions to the agricultural pesticide monitoring recommendations:
 - a. Articulation of the questions to be answered: Are pesticide levels in salmon-bearing surface waters within acceptable levels throughout the pesticide usage period in the Puget Sound region? Which chemicals are above acceptable levels? For any high level of detected pesticide, which crops are the likely contributors? "Acceptable levels" are previously defined for 160 chemicals and degradation compounds. See the report referenced in #1.
 - b. Timing of sampling and collection of additional data during peak flow events: Use the existing weekly data to develop a model to predict concentrations during peak flow events, and collect new data to confirm/reject the model. Collect additional data after growing season ends.
 - c. Presumption that Skagit County croplands are representative of Puget Sound conditions: Need to test this assumption. Consider a rotational sampling approach. It might take longer to get status and trends, and laboratory capacity might not be sufficient to support this sampling.
3. Other land uses are outside the subgroup's scope. However, they are willing to coordinate with other work groups or subgroups that are addressing specific pesticide issues in other land uses.

Work group members appreciate the subgroup's responsiveness to our questions and agreed by consensus to accept these revised recommendations. The subgroup will continue to develop recommendations for nutrient and bacteria monitoring and an overall implementation plan by this fall.

WORK GROUP APPROVES SOURCE IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION REPOSITORY MEMO

The work group approved, without modifications, the memo presented at our last meeting, establishing the scope of work and expectations for making progress on the Source Identification Information Repository (SIDIR) over the next 6-8 months. Specifically, the Washington Stormwater Center (under the SISIR Subgroup's direction) will

complete a literature review and staff interviews, and recommend specific next steps to create the repository. SIDIR has three components: information about strategies and actions, a database for housing key information associated with each strategy and action, and a peer network for sharing information among jurisdictions.

Related to SIDIR, work group members have heard concerns about addressing stormwater management program topics (Section S5 of the permits) rather than limiting our scope to monitoring requirements (Section S8 of the permits). Work group members agreed that the primary purpose of monitoring is to inform adaptive management of stormwater management programs, so the link to S5 requirements is appropriate and does not constitute “scope creep.”

EFFECTIVENESS LITERATURE DATABASE NOW AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC USE

Mike Milne of Brown and Caldwell presented the literature review database that was funded by PSP, Pierce County, and Everett, and also benefitted from a substantial in-kind contribution of WSDOT librarian services. The searchable Excel spreadsheet is available for download at the “References” subpage on the work group’s Ecology webpage and will soon be available on the “Reports” subpage as well. This is the first final deliverable produced as a result of the work group’s June and October 2010 recommendations.

The Effectiveness subgroup will propose recommendations about long-term maintenance of the database. The subgroup is in the process of reviewing the recommended list of study topics in light of the findings of the literature review. The subgroup will propose revisions to the list to the work group in May.

WORK GROUP DISCUSSES SWAMPPS IMPLEMENTATION WITH MULTIPLE FUNDING SOURCES

Work group members discussed how the 2010 Strategy is being implemented using various sources of funding, including the work proposed to be funded by municipal NPDES stormwater permittees. Work group members pointed out that current implementation also includes the ongoing programs that are being leveraged to implement the broader strategy. A link to the PowerPoint version of the summary will be highlighted on our webpage.

WORK GROUP DISCUSSES HEARS ABOUT LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS THAT MIGHT AFFECT SWAMPPS

Stormwater has been a topic of great interest during this legislative session. A number of bills have been proposed that would affect the implementation of the regional stormwater monitoring program. Some proposals would delay the effective date of the permits by an additional 1-5 years and others would require Ecology to publish draft permits that would be issued with changes made by the legislature during its next session. Interested work group members are advised to track SB6406, section 313.

Ecology is trying to maintain the integrity of the public process by which permits are issued. The public comment period ended on February 3. More than two thousand people submitted a total of more than 2600 pages of comments on these permits that the agency is still evaluating and considering.

WORK GROUP DIRECTS WORK PLAN SUBGROUP TO EVALUATE FOUR SWAMPPS EXPANSION TOPICS

At our last meeting we decided that we need to establish a process and criteria for deciding which SWAMPPS expansion topics will be pursued next. The Work Plan Subgroup discussed a wide range of ideas for criteria and proposed a set of considerations for evaluating possible expansion topics. Work group members discussed and accepted the subgroup’s proposal. The work group directed the subgroup to evaluate each of four possible expansion topics (roads and highways, industrial, lakes, and combined sewers) as to the following:

- Need: What is the relative need and importance to increase our understanding of this stormwater topic?
- Benefits: What are the projected benefits enhancing this area of stormwater monitoring?
- Timing: What is our best window of opportunity? When will applicable permits be developed for reissuance?

- Capacity: How difficult will it be to take this on? What are the projected costs and level of effort to develop monitoring recommendations for the topic? Are staff available to work on a new subgroup?
- Institutional hurdles: What are the anticipated obstacles to succeeding?
- Twofers: What efficiencies might we gain by taking this on and combining with other efforts?

Jim Simmonds will lead the subgroup. The work group will discuss the subgroup's findings at our next meeting.

WORK GROUP DIRECTS POOLED RESOURCES OVERSIGHT SUBGROUP TO REVISE CHARTER

Work group members discussed Seattle's comments on the oversight committee charter and revisited our lack of consensus as to whether the committee should report directly to Ecology or through the work group. Work group members agreed that Ecology should be given full authority to manage and implement the program through the agreements with local governments, and that the primary purpose of the oversight committee is to provide administrative transparency with a focus on scope, schedule, and budget. Our technical subgroups retain roles in ensuring quality of the results of the monitoring program.

Work group members directed the Pooled Resources Oversight Subgroup to revise the charter to make the roles and responsibilities clear, ensure any feedback for Ecology is given in a timely fashion, and provide appropriate flexibility to learn and adapt during the process of implementing the program. Members agreed by consensus that it is not necessary for the committee to formally report to Ecology via the work group to achieve the transparency function. A key product that work group members expect the subgroup to develop is a table showing roles and responsibilities, with administrative transparency and technical review clearly separated.

WORK GROUP AGREES ON MESSAGES FOR NEXT SWG REPORTER ISSUE

The next SWG Reporter will include updates on our progress and plans on effectiveness studies (literature review and process to select studies), source identification information repository scoping, status and trends, and agricultural runoff monitoring recommendations. The update should thank everyone for comments on permit monitoring requirements, the list of topics for effectiveness studies, and the oversight committee charter. Adam Lorio will help Karen Dinicola write this next issue.

WORK GROUP AGREES WEBSITE IMPROVEMENTS ARE NEEDED

The main webpage for the work group is <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/psmonitoring/swworkgroup.html>; and our "support page" is <http://sites.google.com/site/pugetsoundstormwaterworkgroup/>. Work group members tasked each subgroup with taking a critical look at pages at both websites related to their work and providing specific suggestions to Karen Dinicola for (1) cleaning up the site and removing documents that are no longer needed; (2) adding information that would be helpful to work group members and interested parties; and (3) improving the flow, clarity, and accessibility of the information.

WORK GROUP HEARS ABOUT PSEMP AND OTHER MONITORING ACTIVITIES

Many other work groups have been or are being formed by PSEMP. Of particular interest are: freshwater (currently being scoped), salmon (just beginning to discuss habitat monitoring in Puget Sound streams), marine waters, marine nearshore, and toxics. PSEMP work group staff met to discuss coordination, and propose sharing subgroups to increase coordination and efficiency. In particular, the SWG's status and trends subgroups for small streams and marine nearshore areas might expand to include members of other work groups, and we might have joint work group meetings to discuss these subgroups' recommendations. Ongoing work is needed to reduce redundancy, particularly for toxics discussions.

The Steering Committee has finalized guidance to work groups, and most of the other work groups will focus this year on completing an inventory.

UPCOMING WORK GROUP MEETINGS

The work group's upcoming meetings and expected discussion topics are:

- April 18 from 9-12: approve revisions to pooled resources oversight charter; hear findings of the stream gauging network analysis; consider SWAMPSS expansion topics; hear status of implementing our work plan; hear from PSEMP Steering Committee and about other monitoring activities, and in particular about status and plans of salmon recovery habitat monitoring and the scoping of a new freshwater work group.
- May 16 from 9-12: Hear how findings of the effectiveness literature review affect the list of study topics; discuss proposed process for requesting/selecting proposals for effectiveness studies; approve revised oversight committee charter; decide on priorities and timing for expanding SWAMPSS and commission new subgroup(s) as appropriate; determine messages and timing for next SWG Reporter; hear status of implementing our work plan; hear from PSEMP Steering Committee and about other monitoring activities, and in particular about the toxics work group.
- June 13 from 9-12; no meetings in July-August