

From: [Cook, Joseph H.](#)
To: [Lubliner, Brandi \(ECY\)](#); [Song, Keunyea \(ECY\)](#)
Cc: [Aimee S. Navickis-Brasch, PhD, PE](#); [Larson-Pugh, Laurie J](#); [Jayakaran, Ani](#)
Subject: RE: Round 3 SAM Study Selection - Full proposal reviews
Date: Friday, July 31, 2020 4:36:08 PM

THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED FROM OUTSIDE THE WASHINGTON STATE EMAIL SYSTEM - Take caution not to open attachments or links unless you know the sender AND were expecting the attachment or the link

Dear Brandi and Keunyea,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the feedback from reviewers on our proposal (FP2 “Addressing challenges through behavior change and incentives, and permittee guidance for evaluating the effectiveness”). Here are the notes we were asked to respond to; we will reference each below as we respond to them.

6/30/2020 - S4 Meeting Notes:

- C1. Collaborate/communicate with STORM to limit duplicative efforts, try to leverage both projects well
- C2. Reviewers are willing to have a meeting with proponent to provide more clear feedback
- C3. There are many literature review, summary reports style studies. Emphasize more on 1) connecting behavior E&O to WQ, or 2) E&O selection tool development. Or reduce the budget if focus is the simple lit review
- C4. Task2 unnecessary. Lit review linking stormwater pollutant to WQ issues-Budget too high for what we already know (key pollutants).

As you know, after receiving the feedback we had two productive conversations: one with Alison Schweitzer and Mary Eidmann at STORM (**C1**), and a second with you, Eli Mackiewicz, Betsy Adams, and Alison (again) (**C2**).

We see two main concerns about our proposal. The first was that our Task 2 – a literature review of the science linking behaviors to water quality – was either unnecessary (“we already know this”, **C4**) or was duplicative of a similar project STORM is pursuing (**C1**). The second was that we should emphasize either “1) connecting behavior E&O to WQ, or 2) E&O selection tool development” (**C3**). We address each in turn below.

As the proposal discusses, we envisioned the first literature review (Task 2) as focusing on the scientific evidence linking behaviors to water quality. In other words, for a jurisdiction using E&O to meet the letter and spirit of their permit, what does the science tell you about which pollutant to focus on? How should you choose? The science for some of those pollutants may be clear, but they may be linked to behavior in ways that are difficult to address with E&O. For example, although copper’s toxicity is well-known scientifically, its link to behavior is through driving (brake pads), which is an ambitious behavior change goal for an E&O program. A toxic chemical found in dry-cleaning, however, might have both clear scientific evidence of its harm as well as be a good candidate for an E&O program. As Eli pointed out, in some cases the pollutant to focus on may be

clear based on a TMDL. Nevertheless, we feel including this task is important in informing the design of a decision-support tool where jurisdictions either don't have a TMDL, or where the TMDL lists multiple pollutants and E&O staff must decide which to focus on (C4).

We note that the scope of this review was also a relatively small part of our overall budget in part because we believe there is a reasonable amount of review evidence already available, though much of it correlates water quality with land use patterns rather than specific behaviors. The lion's share of our budget is on the next stage in the planning process: given that you plan to focus on dry cleaners, for example, what is the most effective E&O program to pursue? What is the quality of evidence that E&O programs can work in this case (compared to, for example, increased enforcement)? How do you carry out high-quality monitoring and evaluation efforts of your own program?

We also discussed this the potential STORM overlap with Mary and Alison (C1). We plan to coordinate with them to ensure that our work is complimentary to their work. We understand that they are still deciding on the specific focus on their research. As such, it is not possible at this time to determine if what we have outlined in the proposal will overlap with STORM's research. We will continue to coordinate with them and if there is overlap between the two projects, particularly if we are able to use their literature review of the science to inform our original Task 2, we stand ready to adjust our proposal accordingly. Ani has spoken with Alison separately and has offered to help STORM with their efforts in order to ensure the two studies are cross-pollinated.

The second concern (C3) was that we should focus either on connecting behavior E&O to water quality or the tool development, but not both. As discussed above, we do not plan a substantial effort to generate new knowledge linking behaviors to water quality, but rather a limited literature review and survey of jurisdictions to understand how they currently choose which behavior to focus on. We see our proposal as much more focused on the tool development, developing a research database of E&O effectiveness, and guidance for monitoring and evaluation of E&O programs.

Finally, we were also advised to "look for more Phase II cities for TAC". Even before receiving this feedback, Laurie Larson-Pugh had already identified and reached out to more Phase II cities. We anticipate adding more to our TAC.

Best wishes,
Joe Cook

From: Lubliner, Brandi (ECY) <BRWA461@ECY.WA.GOV>

Sent: Monday, July 6, 2020 4:55 PM

To: Pickering, Nigel Bruce <nigel.pickering@wsu.edu>; Larson-Pugh, Laurie J <laurie.larson-pugh@wsu.edu>; Aimee S. Navickis-Brasch, PhD, PE <aimeen@osbornconsulting.com>; Cook, Joseph H. <joe.cook@wsu.edu>; Jayakaran, Ani <anand.jayakaran@wsu.edu>; Hunsdorfer, Todd <thunsdorfer@kingcounty.gov>; DMcQuilliams <DMcQuilliams@bellevuewa.gov>; Jennifer Saltonstall <Jsaltonstall@aesgeo.com>; Rebecca B Neumann <rbneum@uw.edu>

Cc: Dinicola, Karen (ECY) <KDIN461@ECY.WA.GOV>; Song, Keunyea (ECY) <kson461@ECY.WA.GOV>

Subject: Round 3 SAM Study Selection - Full proposal reviews

Good Afternoon SAM Study Idea Leads

I would like to start by thanking you for the time you've spent preparing your study idea for SAM funding. Your proposal was numbered and reviewed by the SAM study selection subgroup (S⁴), on average each proposal had 6 reviewers. The review form attached for your reference (pdf). Also attached is a spreadsheet with the number key and the review responses. Because there are sometimes numerous and competing responses the S⁴ held a meeting June 30, 2020. Our meeting goal was to highlight or clarify which are the most important comments for you – as the study proponent - to consider as you prepare for your project presentation at the Sept 16th SAM study selection workshop.

At this meeting the S⁴ recommended each proponent send a written response to comments to the SAM coordinator, and the three lowest scoring projects are asked to revise their proposal based on the review comments. This spreadsheet has a tab for each proposal with notes from that meeting in blue italicized text, and the final summary tab has the S⁴ recommendations on the next steps for your project proposal. I anticipate summery flying by quickly and would like to suggest late July timeframe for your responses.

We also decided that I, the SAM Coordinator should offer to set up a call with you and the reviewers to go over the review comments and your responses. A call/meeting is not required for SAM funding, rather intended to give you any additional clarity on the comments prior to the September workshop. It might be best to time this call, if you want one, after you prepare some draft responses for the review team to read. Feel free to reach out to me about timing.

I want to thank you again for pitching these study ideas and bringing people together to investigate and gain insights on how to improve stormwater treatment and management approaches. I'm looking forward to working with you to get ready for the September 16th SAM study selection workshop.

Best

Brandi Lubliner, PE

Stormwater Action Monitoring | SAM Coordinator | [SAM Website](#)
brandi.lubliner@ecy.wa.gov | d: 360.407.7140