

# MEETING NOTES

TOPIC: SSC SCIENCE REVIEW AND SYNTHESIS PROJECT  
KICK-OFF TAC MEETING #1

DATE & TIME: MAY 19; 1:00PM-3:00PM

LOCATION: [MICROSOFT TEAMS WEBLINK](#)

**TAC REPRESENTATIVES**

ABBY BARNES, DNR  
MICHELLE CHOW, WEC  
JANA CRAWFORD, WSDOT  
JENNY GAUS, CITY OF KIRKLAND  
DOUG HOWIE, ECY  
JOHN HERMANN, SNOHOMISH COUNTY  
MIEKE HOPPIN, CITY OF TACOMA  
DON MCQUILLIAMS, CITY OF BELLEVUE  
LARRY SCHAFFNER, THURSTON CO  
BLAIR SCOTT, KING COUNTY  
EMMA TREWHITT, ECY  
INGRID WERTZ, CITY OF SEATTLE

INVITED:

**TAC ALTERNATES**

AARON CLARK, STEWARDSHIP  
PARTNERS  
ALAN CHAPMAN, LUMMI  
KAREN DINICOLA, ECY  
ARTHUR LEE, SNOHOMISH COUNTY  
KEUNYEA SONG, ECY  
MERITA TROHIMOVICH, CITY OF  
TACOMA

**OTHER**

JEFF KILLELEA, ECY  
ABBEY STOCKWELL, ECY  
AIMEE NAVICKIS-BRASCH, OCI  
PAUL FENDT, PARAMETRIX  
CHRISTIAN NILSEN, GEOSYNTEC  
JAMES PACKMAN, ASPECT  
MARIA PERAKI, OCI  
TAYLOR HOFFMAN-BALLARD, OCI  
ANGELA GALLARDO, CITY OF TACOMA  
BRANDI LUBLINER, ECY

MEETING LEAD/FACILITATOR: AIMEE NAVICKIS-BRASCH, CONSULTANT PROJECT MANAGER

MEETING DOCUMENTS:

MEETING REFERENCE DOCUMENTS ([WEBLINK TO MEETING DOCUMENTS](#))

1. Communication Protocol
2. SSC Project TAC Meeting #1 Power Point Presentation
3. Project Team & Roles
4. TAC Comment Form
5. Project key terms & definitions
6. List of Potential Data Sources
7. Draft Interview Questions

## DISCUSSION TOPICS

- Consultant Project Manager Reviewed **Communication Protocol** ([Reference Document #1](#)) and **Meeting Agenda** ([Reference Document #0](#))
- **Introductions:** each TAC representative, alternative, and other (except consultants) provided their name & association as well as their respond to the following questions

([Reference Document #2](#) Slides 6-7). Responses to questions are organized by common themes/categories and are summarized below.

- Describe your vision for a successful process for this project
  - Review Process:
    - Provide the TAC with plenty of time to review documents before TAC meetings to allow TAC to be well prepared
    - Provide exact timelines for TAC reviews
    - Openness, transparency, and good communication
  - Meeting Discussions:
    - Have the TAC provide input when it makes sense to have input
    - Genuine engagement with all TAC members; TAC members should feel their voices are heard (all voices are important)
    - Listen to different voices/opinions during discussions, try to understand different opinions, and seek clarity when the consultants do not understand what is being communicated
    - Openness, transparency, and good communication
  - Final Products/Deliverables:
    - TAC members should feel that their voices are represented in the final product; as many TAC members as possible “buy off” on final products
    - Integrate TAC comments/feedback into deliverables
  - Consultant Expectation:
    - Expect heavy lifting for this project to be provided by the consultants because the TAC has limited availability
- Describe your vision for a successful outcome for this project
  - Consideration of Jurisdictional Conditions:
    - Be cognitive of the differences in the geographic scope of Phase I Permittees and Phase II cities vs Phase II counties; make sure that future policy considers the differences in jurisdictional conditions
    - Find solutions that work across the board including beyond regulated areas
    - Understand scientific background for where to locate retrofits
    - Interested in retrofitting in urban areas
  - Data Sources:
    - The quality of outcomes depends on the quality of the information; search for reliable sources and incorporate as many as possible
    - Learn about what other permittees in the country are doing to meet similar retrofitting requirements
  - Scientific Foundation:
    - Would like a scientific foundation of information that we can trust/rely on for decision making going forward
    - Understand origin of science behind current requirements and how the metrics were developed; there appears to be gaps in knowledge here
    - Develop a set of scientific based and defensible tools to use to evaluate benefits

- Comparison Between SSC Project Types:
  - Be able to compare and understand how to compare retrofit benefits between SSC project types
  - Develop scientifically based tools for comparison between different project types
- Project Outcome:
  - Looking for information that we can apply to our process that is easy, straightforward, and useful for permittees
  - Set up a solid foundation of information in the eyes of Ecology and TAC for future permit discussions and to launch next phase of permit
  - Understand how the information allows proper evaluation of choices
  - Focus on benefits we are trying to accomplish and understand how BMPs provide those benefits
  - Develop a good toolbox that clearly demonstrates benefit (both fiscal and environmental) and is defensible to leadership
  - Hope for policy makers to understand consequences of actions
- **Consultant Team Introduced themselves**
- Consultant Project Manager Provided **Overview of Scope of Work and TAC Coordination Plan** ([Reference Document #2](#), Slides 9-13). A summary of the discussion is provided below.
  - Provided overview of tasks and deliverables with a focus on Tasks 3 and 4 (Slide 12)
  - Explained that the scope of work is structured in a logical way to facilitate the project process and allow flexibility for TAC input to direct the project
  - For each task, the work will be divided up between the consultants in a way that takes advantage of the specific skills of the team members
  - The consultant team will provide the task plan to the TAC before starting the task to get their input on key items
  - No questions from the group after initial overview of tasks/deliverables
- Consultant Project Manager **Reviewed Project Key Terms & Definitions** ([Reference Document #5](#) and [Reference Document #2](#) Slide 16). A summary of the discussion is provided below.
  - There are many terms in the RFP and scope of work that need to be defined to support consistency in the work completed and expectations for project deliverables
  - A critical part of this project will be to define the terminology before the consultants begin work because it is likely that there are different ideas on definition/meaning for each term.
  - Some of the key terms that need to be defined are shown on [Reference Document #5](#) which includes proposed definitions from the RFP and/or the consultant team. Most of the comments in this document originated from a TAC member and they were included in the document for the TAC to preserve them for discussion. The consultant team would like feedback from the group on the definitions as the project progresses. The consultants will provide the TAC with proposed definitions for terminology relevant to upcoming tasks and get their input before finalizing terms and starting work on these tasks.

- Discussions regarding specific definitions during the meeting focused on the proposed definition for Stormwater-Related Environmental Benefit. Per RFP this term is defined as follows: *For this project, “stormwater-related environmental benefit” is intended to focus on water quality and hydrology improvements.* Key discussion points regarding this term from those attending the meeting included:
  - Should “hydrology” be replaced with “hydraulic” because it is confusing in terms of managing flows
  - Hydrology is from the permit and receiving water oriented whereas hydraulics is BMP oriented. Considering that it was suggested that “hydrology” could be replaced with “flow control”
  - There was discussion about benefits related to metrics: are benefits measured by metrics? Could there be multiple metrics associated with one environmental benefit? Benefits are what they are and not how they are measured. Metrics are how benefits are measured.
  - Consider replacing “improvements” with “beneficial uses of receiving water bodies” or leave “improvements” and add “to support beneficial uses of receiving water bodies”. It is important to bring definition back to beneficial uses. Hydrology is for example important for aquatic organisms.
  - Aquatic organisms are covered by habitat improvements and per the permit stormwater actions are helping to improve and protect habitat.
  - For consistency with the water quality standards, it was suggested that “designated” should be used in place of “beneficial” because the standards require attainment of designated uses of the waterbody.
  - Are some of the suggestions for defining this term going beyond the what the permit is requiring? Are we complicating this definition more than is needed?
  - It was noted that there is no definition for stormwater benefit and that through work there is a desire to provide more information on this definition
  - **Following the discuss the potential revision to definition** was as follows: *Per RFP - For this project, “stormwater-related environmental benefit” is intended to focus on water quality and hydrology ~~improvements~~ to support designated (or) beneficial uses of receiving water bodies.*
  - **The decision was made to move forward with the potential revisions identified and reevaluate the definition at the next meeting.** At that time there will likely be more context for the definitions and how it relates to this project, then we can determine whether the revisions are important. It was also suggested that we consider defining what the term is not rather than what it is.
  - A TAC member requested the consultant team create a diagram that illustrates the connection between key terms (e.g. performance indicator, weight factor, etc.) and tasks/deliverables. A diagram showing how each task leads to the next would be very helpful in understanding how the pieces fit together. The consultant agreed to prepare this for the next TAC meeting.
- Consultant Project Manager presented an **Overview of Project Schedule** ([Reference Document #2](#) Slide 15) and **Discussed Logistics for TAC Coordination** which included:
  - Detailed Project Schedule – A detailed project schedule will be developed by the consultant team once their contract is executed with the City of Tacoma. This schedule will be shared with the TAC.

- Scheduling TAC Meetings - Doodle Polls will be sent out shortly after TAC meetings to schedule the next meeting so there is plenty of time to plan for the next meeting.
- Deliverable Review Periods – Email invites will be sent out for when the TAC can expect deliverables for review. This occur right after TAC meetings are scheduled.
- Collect TAC Information - Survey Monkey may be used to collect information from the TAC including feedback on this meeting. The group indicated that their jurisdiction did not have any restrictions on staff using Survey Monkey.
- Document Sharing – A OneDrive site will be setup for sharing documents for the TAC rather than email each document to the TAC.
- Consultant Project Manager **Requested TAC recommendations for sources of information** that the consultant team should use for this project ([Reference Document #6](#)). A summary of the discussion is as follows:
  - The RFP suggested data sources have been collected and inventoried into a spreadsheet ([Reference Document #6](#)). The consultant team needs help from the TAC regarding the sources in the spreadsheet and missing information. The follow provides a summary of the discussion. *Note: At the request of the TAC, additional details are included herein beyond what was discussed at the meeting to provide clarity regarding specifically what is needed from the TAC.*
    - Please review meeting [Reference Document #6](#)
      - Are the documents listed (and weblinks) the correct document? If not please update the spreadsheet with the correct information
      - If the status of the document is “Request Additional Information”, the information needed from the document was not found. Reference the notes column regarding the information missing. For example, the consultant team reviewed the Phase I annual reports, most did not include an appendices and none provided specifics regarding the BMP that was used for each SSC Type (e.g., bioretention, detention ponds, etc.). This information is needed for the Task 3.
      - If you have suggestions for additional sources, please add them to the spreadsheet including a weblink to the document
      - For data sources that cannot be located with a weblink, please upload the file to the project OneDrive [Data Sources](#) folder and indicate in the notes column of the spreadsheet that the document was uploaded to this folder.
      - In the column titled “Suggested Data Source Application” indicate your recommendations for how the source should be applied: to answer benefit questions, application questions, or both; or to summarize requirements relevant to this project
  - A summary of TAC discussion follows:
    - Not all jurisdictions report in the annual reports
    - Technical documentation from Phase II program would be beneficial if they contain information about the SSC that have been used (or plan to be used).
    - Information is needed from all the Phase I’s and all the Phase II’s that will be interviewed.
    - Consider reviewing the information from different cities and jurisdictions.
    - Add an option for “relevant requirements” to the option for the column titled “type of research question” (*note: this column name was changed to “Suggested Data Source Application”*)

- A request was made by the TAC to clarify what is needed from the TAC regarding their review of Reference Document #6. The consultant team agreed to send this out with the meeting notes.
- Consultant Project Manager **requested TAC suggestions for Ecology and Permittee staff to interview**. The following table provides an overview of the topics that will be addressed during the interviews. Following the table is a summary of the discussions during the meeting.

#	Subtask Description	Ecology	All Phase I	Six Phase II
2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify project goals/vision for successful results</li> <li>• Gather responses to RFP Research Questions for each eligible SSC project/activity types</li> <li>• Recommendations for information/data sources</li> <li>• Request watershed plans (Phase I counties)</li> </ul>	X	X	X
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gather further explanation/reasoning behind relevant permit language</li> </ul>	X		
3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify SSC project/activity types (used/planned)</li> </ul>		X	X
3.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify metric types used or are familiar with</li> </ul>		X	X
3.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify range of jurisdictional conditions</li> </ul>		X	X

- Number of Staff to Interview – Questions were asked by the TAC about whether interviews would be with an individual or multiple people. Several members of the TAC indicated that they would prefer multiple people from the jurisdiction attend the interview. The Consultant Project Manager indicated that the plan was to interview individuals via web meetings. Interview questions will be distributed ahead of the interviews which will allow the main contact from the jurisdiction to evaluate if additional people are needed to answer questions during the interview.
- Identify Ecology Staff to Interview - Ecology requested the following Ecology staff be included for their interview and they would like to all be interviewed at the same time:
  - Emma Trehitt
  - Doug Howie
  - Abbey Stockwell
  - Karen Dinicola
  - Jeff Killelea
  - Rachel
- Phase I Interviews – All Phase I jurisdictions will be interviewed. Phase I jurisdictions missing from the TAC include Pierce and Clark County. Suggested contacts for these jurisdictions are as follows:
  - Pierce County – Tim Hagan or Maureen Meehan
  - Clark County – Rod Swanson
- Clarify Jurisdictional Conditions - Clarification was requested by a TAC representative regarding the subtask 3.6 description for “Identify range of jurisdictional conditions” (from table above). The Consultant Project Manager explained that jurisdictional conditions are conditions specific to that jurisdiction that could influence the performance of an SSC project/activity type and ultimately affect the benefit. During the interviews, the jurisdiction will be asked questions about their

- jurisdiction's conditions and then the consultant team will focus on the areas identified during the literature search (subtask 3.6).
- Suggestions for Phase II Jurisdiction Interviews – followed by comments regarding made during the meeting about selecting the jurisdiction.
    - **City of Redmond** – they have done a lot of retrofitting including a paired monitoring study to assess the benefits of retrofits (and understanding basin wide benefits) so they might be valuable resource.
    - **City of Kirkland** – TAC representative from Kirkland is okay to participate in the interviews and okay if another jurisdiction is selected instead
    - **City of Bellevue** – TAC representative from Bellevue confirmed they are willing to be interviewed
    - **Thurston County** - TAC representative from Thurston confirmed they are willing to be interviewed. The county has conducted retrofit monitoring.
    - **City of Vancouver or Cowlitz County** – consider jurisdictions outside the Puget Sound such as these two jurisdictions
    - **Whatcom County**
    - **WSDOT** – while they are not a Phase II jurisdiction, they may provide insight into transportation retrofits
    - **Kitsap County** – the county had a robust retrofit program however they do not have anyone on the retrofit side right now.
    - **City of Lakewood**
    - **City of Federal Way**
    - **City of Duvall** – smaller community
    - **City of Snoqualmie** – smaller community
    - **City of Bellingham**
    - **Skagit County**
    - **SeaTac Airport** – could be a good source of information because of the number of retrofits they have completed, and they have been monitoring
    - **Comments regarding the selection and prioritization of Phase II jurisdictions** for interviews:
      - Consider jurisdictions with staff that are knowledgeable on the SSC requirements as some jurisdictions have new staff or the jurisdiction may use a consultant to support retrofit work. Consider emailing the suggested Phase II jurisdictions to find out if they have this before selecting them.
      - Consider selecting jurisdictions with diverse conditions such as: geography, large/small communities in terms of size and economy, age of development (e.g., unincorporated portion of a county annexed into a city), a balance of cities/counties, receiving water body types, urban/rural, etc.
      - Consider selecting a jurisdiction(s) that have been monitoring retrofits. For example, jurisdictions that have constructed retrofits and been monitoring to demonstrate the benefit.
      - Consider selecting jurisdictions that are not part of the TAC
      - The Consultant Project Manager will compare the suggested list of Phase II jurisdictions to the considerations for selecting jurisdictions and email them candidates as well as schedule interviews for early June.
  - **General comments regarding interviews:**

- How will “other benefits” that result from retrofits be captured? Will these benefits be used to prioritize the select of jurisdictions to interview? This information may be helpful in making decisions about selecting projects for retrofits. The consultant project manager indicated that they are captured as part of subtask 3.2.
  - With regard to “other benefits” there were also comments from TAC members about not getting in the way of how other jurisdictions assess/select projects. Consider including them under opportunity or multiple projects without identifying what they are.
  - Situational awareness is important
  - Consider capturing what triggers retrofits (opportunities): reasons and motivations for retrofit decisions as they may happen more often because of other reasons besides the SSC requirements. For example, park improvement, flood reduction, etc.
  - Request watershed plans and program data from Phase II jurisdictions as they may should have retrofit information
- Consultant Project Manager **Discussed Task 2 & 3 Deliverables** intended for discussion at TAC Meeting #1
    - The draft Interview questions will be emailed to the TAC for review/comment
  - Consultant Project Manager **Reviewed TAC Meeting #2 Goals** ([Reference Document #2](#) slide 20). This is expected to include:
    - Discuss/confirm any recommendations to modify RFP research questions
    - Discuss TAC comments on Task 2 Technical Memorandum
    - Collect TAC feedback on Task 3 items including:
      - Matrices Version 1 which will include:
        - List of Eligible SSC Project/Activity Types
          - SSC Permit related definition
          - Recommended Performance Indicators
          - List of Impact Factors (Phase I/II interviews re: jurisdictional conditions)
          - Consultant recommendations for priority SSCs
        - TAC to confirm priority SSCs as well as:
          - Note any important SSCs missing
          - Remove SSCs rarely implemented
          - Identify highest priority
        - Discuss plan for collecting data to answer benefit research questions
        - Consensus on Task 3 key term definitions
          - Performance Indicators and Impact Factors
          - Modeling vs metrics
          - Define “best” in the context of metrics
  - Consultant Project Manager Reviewed Action Items which are summarized in the following table.



## ACTION ITEMS

#	Action Item/Resolution	Responsible Party	Expected Timeframe	Status
1	Select and email potential permittees for interviews	Consultants	First week of June	
2	Submit draft interview questions for TAC review	Consultants	After consultant contract is executed	
3	Post Detailed Project Schedule on One Drive	Consultants	After consultant contract is executed	
4	Send email with specific information needed from Phase I jurisdictions regarding data sources. Phase II jurisdictions selected for interviews will also be requested to provide information.	Consultants	With TAC Meeting Notes	
5	Create a diagram that illustrates the connection between key terms (e.g. performance indicator, weight factor, etc.) and tasks.	Consultant	w/ review documents for next TAC meeting	
6	Comment on the TAC Meeting Reference Document #6 <u>List of Potential Data Sources</u> spreadsheet	TAC	June 5, 2020	
7	Confirm names and other information in the TAC Meeting Reference Document #3 <u>Project Team and Roles</u>	TAC	June 5, 2020	
8	Review/comment on the draft interview questions	TAC	TBD – first week or two of June	
9	Review TAC Meeting #1 Notes (this document) and let the Consultant Project Manager know if any corrections/revisions are needed.	TAC	June 5, 2020	