

# STORMWATER WORK GROUP

Tuesday, October 27, 2009 9:00 AM – 3:00 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:*

**Neil Aaland** (Washington State Assn of Counties), Local Governments; **Jay Davis** (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service), Federal Agencies; **Dana de Leon** (Tacoma), Local Governments; **Mindy Fohn** (Kitsap Co.), Local Governments; **Jonathan Frodge** (Seattle), Local Governments; **Dick Gersib** (WA Dept of Transportation), State Agencies; **Kris Holm** (AWB/Boeing), Business Groups; **Heather Kibbey** (Everett), Local Governments; **DeeAnn Kirkpatrick** (NOAA Fisheries), Federal Agencies; **Bill Moore** (WA Dept of Ecology), State Agencies; **Kit Paulsen** (Bellevue), Local Governments; **Tom Putnam** (Puget Soundkeeper Alliance), Environmental Groups; **Jim Simmonds** (King Co.), Local Governments and the Work Group's chair; **Carol Smith** (WA Conservation Commission), Agriculture; **Heather Trim** (People for Puget Sound), Environmental Groups; and **Bruce Wulkan** (Puget Sound Partnership), State Agencies.

#### *Work Group Staff:*

**Karen Dinicola** (Ecology), Project Manager; and **Leska Fore** (Statistical Design), Facilitator and Communication Lead.

#### *Others in Attendance:*

**Fred Bergdolt**, WSDOT; and **Mark Biever**, Thurston County.

### ATTENDEES SHARE REASONS FOR PARTICIPATING

The work group opened the meeting with each individual sharing his/her reasons for participating in this effort. Here is a summary of what was said:

- I love Puget Sound (beaches, kayaking, biking, bird watching...). Save the species.
- We can't solve this problem alone; we need to work together. I want to be part of the solution.
- We need better science; move from myopic to holistic; decrease fear of data; increase meaningfulness of data; get better answers; mesh science with legal/regulatory framework. Good information will drive changes. Frustrated that we can't answer basic management questions about whether things are getting better or worse and why.
- I'm interested in how this effort will impact my work. Sensible permit requirements.
- Create a new business model; better approach. Be more efficient: leverage more, waste less. Combine/coordinate monitoring efforts on separate issues.
- We need to involve citizens and help people do the right thing; provide a better means for public conversations about stormwater problems.
- We need to involve business and industry in big picture solutions.
- We need to justify how all this money is being spent.

## **WORK GROUP DECIDES HOW TO PRODUCE NOVEMBER 4<sup>TH</sup> DRAFT FOR PUBLIC RELEASE**

The work group discussed the most recent version of the scientific framework document, dated October 21<sup>st</sup>. It will be challenging to release a document on November 4<sup>th</sup> as planned. There will be a lot of comments from work group members and many of them might contradict. There are a lot of gaps in the document, and many leaps of faith. What is the priority content and what is the best process (and logistics) to meet our deadline? What do members think is necessary to achieve in order for us to stick with our current timeline and release the document next week? Members agreed that there may be added value in releasing a document that is only 60-80% complete, because commenters may well feel that their input is more meaningful than if we had a very polished, 90-95% draft.

We need to make it clear that this is still a work in progress, that we've had a lot of input and buy off, but we are getting down to specifics and need more input to move forward. All were concerned about "jamming" folks to move forward in an open and transparent manner, and realizing our limited capacity to provide an ideal process for work group members to fully engage in the next revision to the document. We've been scrambling for a year and we're going to keep scrambling! Group members agreed to move forward with a disclaimer up front: the SWG has conflicting comments and we have not reviewed this as a group prior to its being sent out.

Group members agreed that we need a single person (ideally not one of the prior authors) to make the edits between now and November 4<sup>th</sup>. Project Manager Karen Dinicola was assigned lead authorship for the next version of the document: she will assign specific roles to the members of the writing team and compile and coordinate those tasks; and she will make decisions about what to include and what to leave out, with input from the writing team. Work group members agreed to provide their track-change comments by COB this Thursday to Karen, Jim Simmonds, and Leska Fore.

Key content issues from today's discussion to address/include in making the revisions:

- Add notes to readers asking for specific suggestions, particularly where we have gaps or where we struggled.
- Rewrite the executive summary, shorten it, explain what we propose and why.
- Explain the strategy and how it fits into the ecosystem monitoring program.
- Shorten the introduction and get to the "meat."
- Editorial suggestions: choose a voice, look for words like "monitoring framework" and "scientific framework" and "strategy" and "plan" and make their use consistent throughout.
- Add line numbers to the document.
- Add guides for reading the document and for the appendices.
- Clarify that this is volume 1 of 2 and explain what will be in implementation.
- Purpose and charge from our charter/work plan. PSP and Ecology: improve future stormwater management actions and future revisions to the action agenda. Figure out what belongs in purpose section that is now in Appendix B. Add other permits.
- Delete Table 1.
- Delete Section 1.4.
- Say where we are in adaptive management framework: #2, finding we need to go back to #1. We are collecting info that will be meaningful using theories and principles of AM. Use the discussion to frame our approach, and then set it aside.
- Use Table 2 to explain the leap to specifics: we could address all of these topics but this is what we are focusing on for a starting point, and why. Lay out the study design and then the hypotheses.
- Create a bridge between the hypotheses and the experimental design. The work group needs to own the hypotheses. Some editing and maybe other changes to the hypotheses; highlight that the hypotheses are not comprehensive. Explain that Appendix G provides

examples. Explain the “why” behind the sampling designs. How many studies will we need? How to nest them? How to compile and analyze multiple scales? Which are priorities and why? Do the studies we include make sense – are they consistent with the priorities we’ve stated in Table 2? Avoid shotgun approach.

- Put Source Identification in context: explain how to connect to individual studies, how can we use the data to improve Puget Sound? How do these studies get statistical power to provide a regional answer to fix a big problem? How to avoid separate programs for separate parameters and get better idea of how big the problem is Sound-wide? Use beneficial uses info to focus efforts.
- Add summary and next steps section.
- Include section on data needs for land use and land cover.
- Delete costs in appendices and save for implementation.
- In status and trends section, don’t restrict sites to public access: work with locals.
- In LID design, need SOP for “after a suitable period of time”

### **PEER REVIEW PANEL CONFIRMED**

The five members of the Peer Review Panel are: Rich Horner, Bob Pitt, Jean Spooner, Tom Schueler, and Steve Weisberg. Each member will submit an individual report with their comments and will participate in a conference call in early January to discuss any conflicting comments or other significant issues that arise during the public comment period. Once all five of the reviews are received, we will share them with the other members of the panel.

The work group discussed whether to have a formal peer review now or to delay it, and what to ask them if we have the peer review in November as scheduled. Work group members that a peer review now, concurrent with stakeholder input, will help us move forward. The peer review subgroup will help Jim Simmonds compile a list of specific questions to ask all of them to help us resolve. Jim will send the questions in a letter via email on November 4<sup>th</sup> with a link to the public release version of the document. Some questions brainstormed by the committee are:

- General comments on scientific basis of document. Are we on the correct pathway with a hypothesis-driven approach?
- Broad perspective on whether we’re capturing the burning needs to move stormwater management forward: Do we have the right buckets and are they characterized correctly? Do we have the right hypotheses in each bucket? Have them go through the list we have selected and tell us which they would set as priorities.
- Look at text boxes throughout the document.
- Identify critical elements for implementation: what makes a regional program work? How to connect to policy?

### **WORK GROUP MEMBERS WILL FACILITATE DISCUSSIONS AT SECOND PUBLIC WORKSHOP**

Group members reviewed a revised agenda for the November 10<sup>th</sup> meeting. Work group members agreed that at least half of the participants will not have read the document and discussed: what is the best way to get feedback on the strategy? The workshop will provide for a rollout of the document; help them understand what is in it, what isn’t in it, and why; get folks thinking about what it *should* say; and encourage them to provide more specific comments before the end of the month. Workshop facilitator Margaret Norton Arnold will produce another workshop summary but will provide more of a hybrid between the raw notes and summary themes. While group members agreed we want some connection to the May 19<sup>th</sup> workshop, the focus of this workshop should be on improving the document we have out for review and getting help starting on the document we will write next.

The morning session of the workshop will be focused on the scientific strategy, and lunch and the afternoon session on the implementation plan. David Dicks will open the workshop. Jim

Simmonds will describe the document, including the “aha” moments we’ve had (he needs more than 30 minutes to do this). Mindy Fohn, Tom Putnam, and Bruce Wulkan volunteered to join the workshop planning subgroup. The subgroup will meet on November 5<sup>th</sup> to finalize plans, agenda, and handouts for the workshop. Heather Trim will send regular updates from the registration site to the workshop planning subgroup. All work group members present agreed to participate in the workshop as discussion facilitators/note takers during the morning, lunch-time, and afternoon sessions. The workshop planning subgroup will finalize the handouts, working toward a smaller set of questions that apply more directly to the document/strategy, and meeting the revised primary goal of the workshop to rollout the scientific framework rather than get feedback on it.

For the implementation questions, use the essential characteristics and functions in the Surface Water and Aquatic Habitat Committee March 2007 report. This discussion should provide a clear description of the two areas of focus for implementation: mechanics such as standard data collection, reporting, and management methods; and coordination issues including roles and responsibilities, and connections to existing programs and data. Discussion questions should focus on “what could it look like?” and “what are the benefits?” and “what do I bring?”

Karen will send out a reminder to everyone today to register for the workshop; next week she will send out an email letting everyone know the document is available for download. After the workshop, she will send out an email thanking everyone for participating and reminding them to send in comments by the 30<sup>th</sup>. Then in December, we will thank everyone for their comments, tell them we got formal peer reviews (posted), explain the steps we will take to finalize the document, and ask them to participate in developing the implementation plan. We also need a clear statement that although the industrial stormwater NPDES permit was just issued, this workshop will not address that permit. All of our communications should be clear about the purpose: to get comments on the technical documents we are preparing.

Work group members will forward these emails to their caucus members and other email lists.

### **SCIENCE PANEL BRIEFING SCHEDULED FOR NOVEMBER 18<sup>TH</sup>**

PSP has tentatively scheduled a briefing for the Puget Sound Science Panel about our efforts at their meeting on November 18<sup>th</sup>. We need confirmation of the date and the amount of time we will have on their agenda in order to plan our briefing. If the briefing is confirmed, we will go over the presentation at our next meeting on the 17<sup>th</sup> – only the day prior to briefing. Group members agreed that Jim Simmonds and Karen Dinicola will give the briefing; Kit Paulsen will help them prepare the PowerPoint.

Group members also expressed a desire to have formal input and reactions from Ecology. There has been input from Ecology staff, but a stronger connection would be helpful. Should we brief the new director?

### **THE WORK GROUP’S NEXT MEETINGS/EVENTS**

- Our second regional public workshop is from 9-3 on Tuesday, November 10<sup>th</sup> at the Federal Way Aquatics Center
- All-day work group meeting on Tuesday, November 17<sup>th</sup> from 9-3 at the USGS Office in Tacoma
- All-day work group meeting on Tuesday, December 15<sup>th</sup> from 9-3 at the USGS Office in Tacoma

#### **ACTION ITEMS FROM TODAY'S MEETING:**

- **Karen Dinicola** will lead the writing team effort to revise the document prior to its release on November 4<sup>th</sup>. She will edit and streamline the document, add “dear reader” boxes, make it more internally consistent, and do her best to respond to input from today’s meeting and make the report read like it has a single author. She will send out an announcement to everyone once the document is posted.
- **Bruce Wulkan** will try to add the comment period for our technical document to the next PSP email, with the intent of giving folks enough information to decide whether to come to the workshop. In addition to the existing writing team’s upcoming contributions, Bruce will also help write the new source identification and purpose sections.
- **Jim Simmonds** will send an email to the peer review panel with specific questions.
- **Karen** will send out reminders to everyone that registration for the workshop is open until November 9<sup>th</sup>.
- **Jim** will prepare a PowerPoint presentation for the November 10<sup>th</sup> workshop.
- **Mindy Fohn, Tom Putnam, and Bruce** will join the workshop planning subgroup and participate in their November 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- **Heather Trim** will send regular updates from the registration site to the workshop planning subgroup.
- **Bruce and Karen** will confirm the scheduled briefing of the Science Panel with Tammy Owings.
- **Karen and Jim and Kit Paulsen** will prepare the PowerPoint presentation for the Science Panel.
- **Jocelyn Winz** will join the communication subgroup.
- **Everyone** will forward external communication emails to their caucus groups.
- **Everyone** will provide comments on the 10/21 version of the document by Thursday.