

**THURSTON COUNTY
STORM AND SURFACE WATER ADVISORY BOARD MEETING**

**January 18th, 2024
Meeting Summary**

Representative	Representing	Present (P) Not Present (NP) Excused (E)
Britt Nederhood (Chair)	District 3	P
David Hartley (Vice Chair)	District 1	P
Edward O'Brien	At Large	P
Nancy Winters	At Large	P
Zahid Chaudhry	District 3	NP
Phyllis Farrell	District 5	P
Daniel Vlad	District 2	P

Staff:

Larry Schaffner, Nicole Ross, Miriam Villacian, Tim Wilson, Andrew Deffobis, Ashley Arai

Guest:

Tris Carlson

Introductions/Process/Correspondence (Brett Nederhood, Chair)

Introductions made. No correspondence.

Public Comment

None.

Amendments to the Agenda

None.

Meeting Summary

David mentions a reference in the summary to Jake Wager and asks if Jake had resigned before that meeting. Larry confirms Jake's resignation occurred after the meeting, making the reference in the summary appropriate.

No edits made.

Britt motions for approval of the meeting summary. Daniel seconds the motion. Motion passes.

Proposed Direction and Role (*Ashley Arai*)

Ashley begins by noting that she encourages and appreciates the feedback that SSWAB gave regarding the BoCC's discussion about the continuation of SSWAB.

Based on previous feedback and on recent changes in Surface and Stormwater and Water Resources, one recommendation involves expanding the scope of SSWAB to focus not just on surface and stormwater but on water resources more broadly, including emerging topic areas like the Shoreline Master Program, water banking, water-related climate resiliency, and stormwater policy development. A benefit of a newly organized advisory body would, in addition to SSWAB's current role, also advise on areas that have a lot of community concern but have not received a lot of attention or research. The reorganized advisory board would be renamed Water Resources Advisory Board (WRAB).

One concern is that the new recommendation does not include water and water body health overall, which is a concern of SSWAB's. Another concern involves the risk of diluting the expertise of stormwater currently on SSWAB.

Members discussed potential implications to SSWAB's current workload. David suggests that the SSWAB cannot substitute for the County hiring consultants. Ashley clarifies that the work involved would be similar to what SSWAB currently does but for other water resource topics.

Nancy brings up that some current SSWAB members may not have the necessary expertise for the expanded purview. Ed mentions that SSWAB will naturally lose depth in the expertise they cover. Ashley notes that would be expected and suggests seeking greater diverse representation overall in recognition that few people have the expertise to cover everything that involves water resources. Different ways to organize WRAB can exist, such as having subcommittees or ad hoc groups as well.

David asks how WRAB would look in relation to working with BoCC. Ashley and Andy draw a comparison with the proposed duties of Shoreline Master Program's Board, suggesting the WRAB would track permit activity and see what would change on shorelines and other waterways – but this suggestion is adjustable depending on the WRAB member's capabilities.

Nancy discusses the potential cost of adding more onto SSWAB's docket, considering the different kinds of monitoring beyond just lake nutrients. Doing additional monitoring would be very expensive. Ashley agrees with her point and provides some recommendations of alternative ways to handle monitoring.

Ideally, SSWAB members would like to cap the number of WRAB members to 9 or 10 rather than have a larger advisory board.

Tris Carlson provides examples of a committee for the State that he worked on that handled a similarly large scope and described how they managed that amongst committee members, suggesting that WRAB could take on the scope of the new configuration in the face of changing workloads.

Ashley notes that the BoCC wants to revisit this change in March. Any further comments or recommendations should be forwarded to Larry.

David asks if Larry would still be the primary staff member working with WRAB. Larry clarified that the appropriate staff would engage with WRAB depending on the topic at hand, so Larry would still work with WRAB on water resources topics. However, Andy would assume the role as the primary staff contact.

Further discussion on how WRAB would communicate with BoCC, whether it would work with staff to relay recommendations or report to the BoCC directly. Ashley makes the comparison to Ag Committee, which does not have a staff-directed work plan that leads to some conflicted messages in recommendations, whereas Planning Commission is directed by the BoCC and has specific topics assigned to work on. Larry says that SSWAB's workplan has been more independent, whereas the proposed WRAB approach would be BoCC-directed.

SSWAB Recommendation Development Process (David Hartley)

David and Ed were working on the CIP recommendation. David suggests a process for developing recommendations for SSWAB. He suggests the subcommittees work on the initial recommendations, bring them to SSWAB, then SSWAB engages with the appropriate staff members who might have insight on those recommendations. After that, SSWAB will review and finalize or drop the recommendation, then finally go to the BoCC.

Nancy asks how long David anticipates this process to take. David believes it can be done within a couple SSWAB meetings, or at least before the July briefing of BoCC. Concern expressed that this timetable is too ambitious, but David suggests they can brief the BoCC later if needed.

Ed asks how we would determine which staff members would be appropriate to reach out to with recommendations. Larry could assist in identifying staff based on the recommendation.

Sub-Committee Reports (Subcommittees)

Ed begins with recommendations for the Capital Improvement Projects (CIPs). The potential recommendations involve: 1) prioritizing CIPs in SMAP-selected high priority basins (i.e., Green Cove Creek Basin) in accordance with the NPDES permit direction; 2) increasing staffing and funding for CIPs so that they may provide timely pre-designs of projects and make reasonable progress addressing habitat impacts; 3) developing and implementing a CIP monitoring program that assesses the effectiveness and deficiencies of projects; and 4) creating a strategy/mechanism to plan and construct water quality treatments to mitigate impacts of nearby legacy developments.

Phyllis presents the Stormwater Planning recommendations. These include: 1) expanding the performance measures for tracking progress of the stormwater program using current parameters that could be tracked by staff; 2) proposing a stormwater monitoring plan to assess concentrations of various water pollutants; and 3) increasing the number of treated outfalls by 10% annually.

Daniel covers the recommendations for Public Outreach and Education. Their recommendations include: 1) increasing participation with regional partners (e.g., WSDOT, DOH, Ecology, etc.); 2) educating and providing materials to SSWAB liaisons to better serve homeowner associations (HOAs) and other constituents who are dealing with stormwater-related issues; 3) creating an online link to contact SSWAB members that can provide an opportunity for feedback to reach SSWAB; and 4) using local publications to regularly publish stormwater/water quality stories written by SSWAB.

SSWAB set a deadline to finalize subcommittee proposals by the next meeting.

Time-Sensitive Communication Pathways (Co-Chairs)

Insufficient time to cover this item.

SSWAB General Discussion (SSWAB Members)

None.

Adjourn

Britt motions to adjourn. Nancy seconds. Motion to adjourn passed.

Next meet is on March 21st, 2024.