Update: Process to Develop Voluntary Clean Water Guidance for Nonpoint Sources
What have we done to get input

- Interviews
- Online survey
- Researched other states
- Meetings
- Webinar
Timeline

Finish Interviews and Close Survey

Webinar-Present on what we have heard and what it means to process design

Draft Process

Solicit Feedback on Draft

Process Design Completed April 2017

Start Process to Develop Guidance 2017

January-February, 2017
Draft Process
Produce Voluntary Clean Water Guidance for Agriculture.
Changing our Approach:

- Work with an **Advisory Group**.
- Organize guidance around **practices**.
- Focus on evaluating **effectiveness and implementation considerations**.
Goal is to have a group with diverse perspectives.
Balanced representation.
- Identifying Participants-Group participants will be identified through a solicitation process.
- Approximately 10-20 members.
- **Step One-** Work with advisory group to compile the list of practices to evaluate.

- Cast a wide net.

- Include, but not be limited to, NRCS practices.
- Implementation Evaluation
- Effectiveness Evaluation
Compile, review, and synthesize information on implementation considerations:

- Capital cost
- Operation and maintenance requirements and costs
- Technical requirements
- Lifespan, land area requirements
- Barriers to implementation
 Compile information and data on the effectiveness of the identified practices.
 Review, and synthesize information and data to develop effectiveness estimates for each practice.
- Combine information from implementation and effectiveness subgroups into one document.
- Public comment.
- Annual cycle.
- The process should promote collaboration, transparency and common understanding.
- Effective practices support compliance with the water quality standards.
Water quality protection is most likely achieved through using a combination of practices together at a site.

Implementation support for voluntary clean water practices will be important.
Comments
• Reviewing comments and completing responsiveness summary.
• Eighteen comments were received.
• Mix of stakeholders and perspectives.
- Structure of the Advisory Group.
- Timing.
- Decision Making.
- Better Define What Effectiveness Means
Key Themes from Comments

- Clarification on Which Pollutants are Covered.
- Role of NRCS Standards.
- Suites of Practices.
- Other.
Keep the basic structure but provide more detail to clarify:

- The structure of the advisory group;
- The qualifications for serving on the effectiveness subgroup;
- How we will carry out the work of collecting literature and synthesize it;
- The roles and purpose of each of the workgroups;
- Ground rules.
 Build in more opportunities for the two subgroups to share information.
 Include a more detailed schedule-look for ways that we can expedite the process (while not sacrificing quality).
 Better define what we mean by “effectiveness” (i.e. pollutant removal and prevention).
- Considering limiting the advisory group to a smaller number of people (10-12).
- Clarify that we will be providing guidance for all water quality pollutants/parameters.
- More information on suites of practices and their effectiveness.
Questions and Discussion

Contact:
Ben Rau
Ben.Rau@ecy.wa.gov
360-407-6551