

**WRIA 9 Retrofit Project Management Team  
March 22, 2012**

**King & Chinook Conf. Rooms, 6<sup>th</sup> floor King Street Center**

PMT Notes

Chris Thorn, Auburn	Curtis DeGasperi, King County	Larry Jones, King County
Ben Parrish, Covington	Dan Smith, King County	Erkan Istanbulouglu, UW
Don Robinett, SeaTac	Dave Funke, King County	Olivia Mary Wright, UW
Ed O'Brien, Ecology	David Batts, King County	Rich Horner, UW
Mindy Roberts, Ecology	Doug Navetski, King County	Chris Knutson, King County
Dino Marshalonis, EPA	Mark Wilgus, King County	Brendan Grant, King County
	Giles Pettifor, King County	
Tamie Kellogg, Kellogg Consulting	Dave Batts, King County	
	Jim Simmonds, King County	

1. Intros & Miscellaneous Updates
  - a. UW GIS Class project, description by Jim
    - i. digitizing impervious area cover breakdowns
    - ii. help to refine into categories of impervious cover
    - iii. comments to Jim by Thurs 28<sup>th</sup>
2. Workshop Follow Up
  - a. Rich appreciated feedback from on potential frequency of exceeding targets and thus not meeting goal
    - i. if this number is high perhaps we should rethink the target
  - b. Feedback about BMPs on Enumclaw plateau to the effect that Ag BMPs are not suitable for the ag areas in this area & we should look at wetland restoration instead
    - i. wetlands as a land use category
    - ii. wetlands recovery as a goal
    - iii. we need to figure out how to handle this in the model and project
  - c. lots of skepticism about about rain barrels in the feedback
    - i. how to manage in the model?
    - ii. are they worth modeling?
    - iii. water retention such as cistern is a good thing
  - d. How are we going to breakdown land use was frequent question
  - e. Feedback asked to try green roofs everywhere

- f. Feedback asked to try porous pavement everywhere
  - g. Many wanting broader palette of BMPs per land use types
3. SUSTAIN Update – Curtis DeGasperi
    - a. Continuing with weekly SUSTAIN model conference calls with Tetrattech
    - b. SUSTAIN version 1.2 coming out soon, Curtis already has it
    - c. Many project team members will attending a 2-day workshop April 12&13th w/ Tetrattech to make model more functional and review possible solutions to ongoing SUSTAIN problems
    - d. Post workshop we will have better idea of next steps and where we will be able to go with the model by Mid April or early May
  4. EPA Update on SUSTAIN Dino Marshalonis
    - a. SUSTAIN updates will stop by September, however, internal EPA work on SUSTAIN will continue in
    - b. SPU not moving forward with SUSTAIN for its Pipers Creek Project, will be using SWIM and lots of iterative runs of model,
    - c. Bremerton will continue to get data
    - d. EPA will keep the good parts of SUSTAIN and the bad parts will be deleted
    - e. the good parts what is left of SUSTAIN may be put into a new model or as add-on to other model like SWIM or made into new model
  5. Rich Horner’s Target Application Procedure Document
    - a. Begin by reviewing Rich’s proposed uncertainty (confidence levels) proposals
      - i. BIBI to flow (high levels of the indicator of high pulse count are detrimental to BIBI scores) of 80% - which means determining what is the high pulse count we would have to have to get a specific BIBI score 80% of the time
      - ii. if we were to pick a higher confidence level (like 90%), it would reduce the high pulse count but the requisite cost to control flow to that level would be higher perhaps exceedingly high
    - b. PMT agrees to proposed confidence levels
      - i. for the application of BIBI –flow indicators at the 80% proposal and
      - ii. at the 95% for the water quality indicators
    - c. Stream Reaches where goals will be evaluated
      - i. Rich’s ideas for focus
        1. spots with good flow and BIBI scores
        2. spots with good BIBI scores and we model the flow
        3. spots pointed out by stewards with good habitats and fish
      - ii. of the three above Rich asked do we do all three? pick combo?
        1. Definitely do 1 and add 2 & 3?
      - iii. PMT agrees doing combination of them
      - iv. add Spring and Joe’s streams

- d. status of locations of BIBI WQ and hydrology
    - i. Rob to help get data from Port of Seattle
  - e. Goals
    - i. review goals for debate
    - ii. Jim adds question of is there a temporal element change?
      - 1. In other words should the goals change over time, become more strict
        - a. 50 to 100 year horizons?
    - iii. Goals on page 3 of report:
      - 1. 1-3 are preservation of existing conditions in streams
      - 2. 4-7 are restoration or improvement of conditions
    - iv. it is recommended that we pick a central measure and ignore the maximums as cost will go way up to pursue these maximums of protectiveness for marginal improvements
    - v. we should align the language for restoration with the language from PSP's Near Term Action Agenda
    - vi. Ed O'Brien "Lorax for the State" reminds PMT that we can't have a goal where streams with fish would lose fish, streams with poor measures have to move toward attaining beneficial uses
  - f. What is needed to get to goals?
    - i. See the tables in Rich's report and use the stream breakdown to get the HPC and HPR #'s then the tables at the back of the report to see how to get to the goals
  - g. Metals - Mindy Roberts makes point about couching how metals #'s and reductions and goals are stated
  - h. Reports –
    - i. Rich's report approved by PMT
      - 1. He will be including received new data and calling it good – PMT says yes
      - 2. Dan Smith of Federal Way has data for other creeks
6. Updates:
- a. Independent Assessments Update – Olivia Wright
    - i. She reviewed paper demonstrating work progress and procedures for her calculations on
      - 1. land use rainfall assessment progress
      - 2. bioretention model
  - b. Ecology Updates – Mindy Roberts

- i. Related to Ecology's small scale SUSTAIN applicability test project
  - 1. Hererra is done with project QAPP
  - 2. They are using SWIM instead of HSPF
  - 3. They're looking at ROW and some private land for BMP locations
  - 4. draft report in May will be forwarded to Giles
  - 5. lessons learned workshop to be held to review the project achievements in late summer likely
  
- c. Juanita Creek Retrofit Project Update– Mark Wilgus
  - i. in the review and editing stage
  - ii. final submitted in 3rd week of April to Ecology
  - iii. 68% TIA is 7 square miles
  - iv. 8% standard used
  - v. LID and detention ponds used and a BIBI of 35
  - vi. Cost of \$200 million/square mile