# Structural Stormwater Control

# Policy Advisory Committee

July 6, 2022

9:00-12:00 p.m.

## Meeting Notes

### Welcome – Jim Nelson (9:04)

* Tech check

#### Review PAC Purpose, Objectives, Agenda, Rules

* See Jim’s PowerPoint for reference.

#### Updates

* PAC Feedback on Project Types and Selection Criteria
  + Facilitation Team has developed an initial summary based on JamBoard comments from previous meeting.
  + **A copy will be supplied to PAC after today’s meeting.**
    - **PAC to submit their feedback in writing with any errors/corrections.**
    - **Submit comments directly to both Abbey and Jim via email.**
* Process for managing PAC feedback exercises
  + PAC expressed support for a shared/open document to submit feedback, rather than sending comments directly to Abbey/Jim
  + **Facilitation Team to work on a method/platform for facilitating a more open/visible feedback process.**

Multipliers/Point System – Discussion (9:32)

* See Doug Howie PPT[[1]](#footnote-1) for details – Summary Below
  + - * History (How We Got Here)
      * The Goal (Standardize Quantification of Qualifying Projects)
      * Qualifying Project Types
      * Formula/Process for Determining Level of Effort
      * Rationale Behind Multipliers (Expectation they would change over time)

**Blair**: The required calculations are “easy” for bigger projects that are large enough to warrant ECY funding, but it seems like a lot of work for very small projects. Is there a less rigorous model that could be used for very small projects (e.g. retrofitting ditches)?

**Doug:** We were envisioning projects requiring capital improvements/funding when developing the current system. We would be happy to consider adding a new category for smaller projects if that comes out of the PAC as a recommendation.

### BREAK (9:59)

* Return at 10:04

### Draft Recommendations – Breakout Rooms (10:05)

**Melissa (on behalf of Ingrid):**

* Point system should give more value to projects in flow control exempt waterways. For example, a 1-acre equivalent area bioretention project in a creek (that may already be meeting WQS) will get twice as many points as a 1-acre equivalent project draining to the Lower Duwamish Waterway (a Superfund site) due to the creek project being eligible for both flow control and water quality incentive points and the lower Duwamish Waterway project being eligible only for water quality incentive points. Method to do this to be developed.
* Point system should give more value to projects treating/managing roadway runoff in high AADT areas vs low AADT areas. For example, a 1-acre equivalent area bioretention project treating a rural roadway with low AADT will get twice as many points as a 1-acre equivalent project treating a highly urban major arterial with high AADT. Method to do this to be developed.

**Jenny:** Is that how Melissa’s examples would play out under the current system? If so, I agree this should be addressed.

**Doug:** Yes, Melissa’s examples are correct. Right now, the Duwamish wouldn’t get flow control credit. It would get treatment credit, but not both. We are open to addressing this in the future, but the current system doesn’t address it.

**Peter:** How can we design criteria that have flexibility for different types of Permittees (small and large Phase 2s, for example)?

**Bill:** How can we not provide skewed or unintentional incentives for collaborative initiatives when each municipality is individually responsible for certain projects/water bodies? Something to consider as we engage in the larger “points system” discussion.

### BREAK (11:01)

* Return at 11:06

### Draft Recommendations Cont. - Discussion ()

**Full Breakout Room notes will be sent to the PAC for review.**

#### Breakout Room Key Messages

##### 1 – Multi-Benefit Projects

* Needing an easier way to calculate points for multiple small projects in a permittee’s area.
  + Maybe each project receives a point. Points would just equal number of projects completed.
* How do you calculate for EJ? This needs to be done thoughtfully.
  + Perhaps ECY should create an ad-hoc group to study this problem.
* What about projects that reduce traffic count as a source control strategy (e.g., installing a bike lane)?

##### 2 – Changes to Better Support WQ

* Recommend listing everything (things to change or add to the SSC framework), then have PAC members rate for priority. Create smaller groups to work on the highest voted items.
* The basin planning process is large, unruly, and expensive. Is there a smaller, leaner process we can use to plan projects that will still get points?
  + Maybe have a minimum threshold for the project’s size?
* Preservation vs. Retrofit should be separate project categories.
* Buffer Requirements. Has ECY been coordinating with Dept. of Ag. regarding buffer requirements?
* Need a way to reflect high AADT in the point system.
* Should the overall number of points go up in the next permit cycle? Should all project types count?
* Need to make sure the points reflect LID/highest WQ benefit projects.
* Floodplain Reconnection: Should that be a project type? How should it be used?

##### 3 – Changes to Increase Flexibility

* Can we improve how and when the points are distributed?
  + Maybe allow carrying over or “banking” points to another permit cycle?
* How to deal with annexations? Particular concern for counties.
* What about when one Permittee pays for a project but another receives the benefit? How do points get awarded?
* How to avoid dis-incentivizing Watershed Scale Planning due to unbalanced distribution of costs vs. benefits?
* Perhaps more flexibility around Permittees being able to submit new qualifying projects or project types to ECY for review/approval, rather than waiting for new guidelines to come out.
* How to scale points required for large vs. small municipalities?
* How to account for projects that occur on a single property over a period of time?

#### Did the Breakout Room method work for PAC Members?

**Melissa:** Appreciated the small group conversation.

**Blair:** The experience of moving from room-to-room was a little clunky.

**Alyssa:** Appreciated the small group discussion. Was easier to exchange questions/feedback/responses and be more interactive, but it was also challenging not being able to contribute to all of the conversations.

### Public Comments – Jim Nelson (11:27)

* Open invitation for public comments was made.
* No public comments were offered.

### Next Steps and Close – Jim Nelson (11:28)

**Next Steps**

* **Get today’s Breakout Room notes to everyone.**
* **Receive PAC comments on Project Type Jamboard summary.**
* **Get help from PAC members to craft recommendations for PAC consideration.**
  + **As a first step, form a small group to prioritize the broad feedback into focused recommendations.**
  + **Send Jim an email if you are willing to participate in crafting recommendations for the PAC to consider.**
* **Note-takers for groups should email their notes to both Jim and Abbey.**

**Blair:** After recommendations are refined and presented to PAC, how does PAC engage to improve those recommendations?

**Jim:** Full group will need to offer feedback. Specific process not set at this point.

**Jenny:** What if we have PAC members who suggested specific changes serve on the groups to help refine those suggestions into recommendations?

**Jim:** I like that idea a lot. Looking to get help refining language from current feedback into something formal that can be accepted by the PAC.

**Bill:** Do we want to use the “statement crafting” method I mentioned in our first meeting as a way to approach these recommendations?

**Jim:** It is a good idea. We still need to invest energy to make those statements. Interested in having a conversation with you and perhaps a few others about how to craft these statements.

**Melissa:** After we did the statement voting in a previous committee, there was follow up discussion about the meaning of each statement and why people voted the way they did.

**Bill:** Totally agree that the follow-up discussion was vital. We discovered that statements we thought were unambiguous conveyed different meanings for different members.

PAC expresses general support for this approach. Plan to move forward.

#### Final Comments

**Sheena:** There hasn’t been a lot of time to craft recommendations within our full meetings. Is the idea that we meet in smaller groups to develop these recommendations?

**Jim:** Yes, we are hoping to engage smaller groups in Bill’s exercise/method to create those recommendations.

**Abbey:** What about the idea of having Breakout Rooms in meetings, hearing a report out, then going back into small groups for language crafting based on what we hear in the report outs?

Also, should we begin to consolidate Breakout Room notes and identify themes, in addition to sending out the raw notes to the PAC?

**Jim:** Yes, that’s a good idea. A good task for someone on the Facilitation Team to take on.

**Larry:** Struggling with the idea of recommendations for a Phase I framework vs. a Phase II framework. They are so different.

**Jim:** Yes, Phase I vs. Phase II is one of the main topics for our next meeting. This aspect still needs to be fleshed out/discussed.

**Larry:** Should the initial recommendations be articulated as applying to Phase I, Phase II, or both, or just start crafting then go from there?

**Abbey:** As we see the recommendations, it may be appropriate to call out Phase I vs. Phase II, and it would be good to start that conversation earlier rather than later. It would be helpful to hear from Phase II permittees about differences they see in application as the recommendations come along.

### Adjourn (11:53)

1. https://www.ezview.wa.gov/Portals/\_1962/Documents/StructuralStormwaterControls/Point%20System%20Description-Doug%20Howie.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-1)