

NMSA ANNUAL MEMBERS MEETING

Meeting Minutes

WEFTEC, Chicago II
Room S104b, McCormick Place South Building - Level 1
October 4, 2017
8:00 am to 10:00 am

- I. Welcome and Introductions (Taylor) (8:05am)
Introductions were made around the room and on the phone. See the attached sign-in sheet.
- II. 2018 Project Planning (Taylor) (8:50am)
 - a. MS4 Database
 - i. Discussion on how this would work
 1. Scott suggested it would be piloted in VA and perhaps a few other states
 2. Would focus on post-construction MS4 permits and point of contact information of Stormwater program manager
 - a. The contacts and permits would be housed differently
 - b. Need to find the “right” points of contact (not just the one who signs the Permit)
 - ii. Pat S. – reminder that some states, like Iowa, there is no general permit – so Iowa has 47 separate Phase II permits.
 - iii. Randy – perhaps we need to phase this – go through all the states first to find out how the permits are administered, organized, etc.
 - iv. Scott asked for commitments to support – Randy N. volunteered to assist.
 - b. Policy engagement/comment letters
 - i. Letters
 1. Want to stay ahead of issues and be proactive via letters
 2. Letters will be sent at least two weeks prior to the due date for review. Silence is considered to be a “yes”, with no objection to the letter as written, so you are encouraged to respond.
 3. Not controversial positions/issues likely in comment letters.
 4. Joint letters are likely with other non-profits such as APWA, NACWA, NAHB etc.
 5. WOTUS is likely to be the next NMSA comment letter.
 6. Randy Bartlett expressed potential concern that people/organizations who are affiliated with multiple organizations may be associated with

letters that differ, so asked that there be a highlight of differences and justification for differences between various organizations/letters in order to coordinate on these differences.

- ii. EPA and other organization engagement
 1. Seth has been leading this communication as directed by NMSA leadership
 2. Met with several other organizations in DC during Water Week such as NAFSMA, NACE, NACO, APWA, ASLA, NPRA.
 3. WOTUS - Neprash
 - a. Will work to get the exclusion MS4 information included in the new WOTUS language (whenever comments are requested by EPA)
 - b. Randy met with Dennis Lee Forsgren, who is the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Water at EPA and Jim Gooden to discuss WOTUS issue – Mr. Forsgren listened carefully during the meeting. He feels that the proposed exclusion is reasonable. The inclusionary WOTUS definition may be sufficiently narrow that the exclusion may be rendered irrelevant. He felt that our approach of submitting a comment letter and reaching out to other organizations to support the exclusion is sound.
 - c. Pat S. asked about timeline – Gooden suggested that comments were due in late November, so there will be a need to move quickly
 - i. Chris Pomeroy with Aqualaw provided some email clarification during the meeting on the WOTUS timeline:
 1. There are multiple deadlines / opportunities.
 2. The first was September 27, 2017. But that was just on the proposal to rescind the new rule (which was stayed anyway) and reinstate the old rule, so was not worth commenting on.
 3. The second comment deadline is November 28, 2017. That is a request for “recommendations” for the upcoming rulemaking.
 4. Thereafter the action’s going to be on the step, when (if?) EPA proposes a replacement WOTUS rule. Comment then on proposed rule.
- c. Source Control Initiative
 - i. The new amendment of TSCA creates an opportunity to engage w EPA on this topic
 - ii. CASQA met with EPA 3-4 years ago on this subject (source control)
 - iii. We may want to place information on this on NMSA website.
 - iv. Bartlett – concern that “source control” may be seen by EPA as “green infrastructure”, so we should clearly define the terms
 1. We should use examples to clarify (brake linings, etc.)

2. Maybe define it as “pollutant source control” (as opposed to “hydrologic source control”)
 3. Perhaps include this clarification on the website
 - v. Neprash – maybe we can work w WEF on their “messaging campaign” to clarify source control and its importance to Stormwater.
- d. National Public Education Program
- i. Everyone does their own public education program now, so we want to see this as a focus – collaborative region wide and statewide programs and ultimately a national program.
 - ii. EPA Region 9 – municipal stormwater evolution workshop is occurring – Geoff B., Randy N. and Scott T. has been invited to this, may be an opportunity to move this topic forward at this workshop.
 - iii. Pat S. – we have a state-wide program and are very interested in a national program – we are providing messaging information across the state to regulated and non-regulated entities over the last 12 years – would love to be part of this effort
 - iv. Neprash stated that Chris Kloss has been moving forward on this topic via EPA HQ in the MN area – will push forward with sharing Pat S. information w EPA as well (Pat was appreciative of this)
 - v. Lori stated that there are often EPA publications on this topic aren’t implemented, so maybe we can look at doing a “how to” using some of this information
 - vi. Scott – would want to do something to get coverage via permit through engagement with a national campaign
 - vii. Geoff – good to compile state and local examples
 - viii. C. French – look at White River example where there was a “pay to play” effort in region
 1. Bartlett – could this be tied into the WEF SWI and coordinated with NMSA?
 - a. French – yes potentially, it could be one way to standardize messaging
 2. Neprash – in MN, we have Watershed Districts with a repository of educational information that can be tailored for local use – they have had to give up the effort to update and store these, so MCSC has been asked to be the hub for this – Stantec consulting firm is now hosting this information via FTP with “light” branding included for Stantec – the point is that once this is set up for MN, we may be able to provide access at the national level. Randy requested and received informal “approval” for moving ahead with this concept.
 3. Bartlett – we need to make sure the flooding element is not lost if going nationally, especially if EPA is involved with this, as they are only concerned with water quality

- a. Perhaps we can work on engaging with FEMA, ASFPM, etc. to ensure flooding is included
 - b. Some NMSA members are associated with ASFPM, so can leverage these relationships, perhaps, etc.
 - 4. Pat S. – we have a similar portal set up via FTP, so will follow up w Neprash on this point
 - e. NMSA Website
 - i. New/expanded website NMSA has been launched – please visit and provide feedback. It includes:
 - 1. Member formation documents
 - 2. Newsletter
 - 3. Stormwater Report Card
 - a. Include Orange County information, link
 - b. Should be aligned w ASCE Infrastructure Report card
- III. Scott mentioned that Eva Birk with NAHB will be presenting information from a new report on stormwater at the public meeting at 10am - they published this report recently
 - a. Scott invited people to check out the report at the NAHB website
 - b. Randy Neprash noted that this report included a view that the developers wished to be invited into a conversation locally on stormwater when regulations change, but they should really push this and demand to be included. NMSA should pursue this idea and work on ways that our member organizations may be able to work with their state NAHB chapters to approach the regulators jointly to promote the creation of robust stakeholder processes in more states.
 - i. We can use the website to make sure provide information on how to become engaged
 - c. Bartlett highlighted examples:
 - i. Accotink Creek TMDL situation and the integration of developers in public engagement
 - ii. State-level stormwater crediting
 - iii. Engagement with local developers and environmentalists together – got past some issues and found some areas of opportunities
 - iv. It's very good to engage with the developers – that way we can talk upfront rather than on the back end
 - v. Have a Powerpoint presentation developed for NACWA recently that can be shared and posted on the website
- IV. USEPA Engagement Plan (9:20am) – see notes above
 - a. January 2018 Meeting
 - b. Anticipated meetings
 - c. Calls
- V. Membership and Treasurer's Report (9:40am)
 - a. Fundraising

- i. Review of the budget (no questions – see attached budget spreadsheet)
 - b. New member identification and engagement
 - i. Washington State
 - ii. Utah Stormwater Advisory Council (USWAC)
 - iii. Alabama is interested in forming a statewide MS4 organization
 - iv. Hawaii is interested in forming a statewide MS4 organization
 - v. Oklahoma group may be forming (Geoff)
 - c. Discussion on creating a new revenue option for Affiliate Members who want to join both the SWI and NMSA that would reduce membership fees
 - i. NMSA could reduce fees for Affiliate Membership to \$500
 - ii. This would be an ongoing reduction
 - iii. A vote taken with unanimous (6) yes votes, one abstained (French), no “no” votes
- VI. Public Meeting (10:00am)
 - a. Review agenda
 - i. Question regarding on the timing the MS4 survey and how that can coincide with the Region 9 workshop (not likely to coincide)

NMSA Budget			
Revenue	Actual 2016 Budget	Actual 2017 Budget (as of 8/31)	Proposed 2018 Budget
Regular Dues	\$ -	\$ 3,250	\$ 5,750
Affiliate		\$ 1,000	\$ 4,000
Contributions			
<i>Individual</i>	\$ 1,830	\$ 6,028	\$ 2,000
<i>Corporate</i>	\$ 5,525	\$ -	\$ 2,500
Program Fees	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Grassroots Lobbying	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Lobbying	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Program/Event Sponsorships	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Event	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Grants	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Revenue	\$ 7,355	\$ 10,278	\$ 14,250
Expenses	Actual 2016 Budget	Actual 2017 Budget (as of 8/31)	Proposed 2018 Budget
Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Management	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,600
Business Fees & Licenses	\$ 1,086	\$ 203	\$ 400
Directors & Officers Liability	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500
Gen. Liability	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500
Website Support	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000
Printing	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Books & Research	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Telephone/communications	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Postage	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50
Office Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50
Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50
Membership Dues	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Professional Services			
<i>Legal</i>	\$ 1,830	\$ -	\$ 500
<i>Accounting</i>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500
Consulting	\$ 1,843	\$ -	\$ -
Program	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Rental (PO Box Rental)	\$ 200	\$ 279	\$ 300
Lobbying	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Grassroots lobbying	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Event	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Misc.	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,000
Banking Fees	\$ 14	\$ -	\$ 100
Total Expenses	\$ 4,959.00	\$ 482.00	\$ 9,450.00
(Revenue - Expense)	\$ 2,396.00	\$ 9,796.00	\$ 4,800.00



National Municipal Stormwater Alliance

Member Meeting – WEFTEC, Chicago October 4, 2017

8:00 am to 10:00 am

Name	Affiliation	Email Address
1. Scott Taylor	CASQA/Michael Baker	staylor@mbakerintl.com
2. Lori Gates	INAFSM/Christopher Burke Engineering	Lgates@cbbel-in.com
3. Randy Borold	VA Virginia Stormwater	Randy.Borold@fordocounty.gov
4. Seth Brown	Stormwater Solutions/WEF	seth.brown@stormwater.com
5. Daniel Apt	Olaunu/CASQA	dapt@olaunu.com
6. Chris French	WEF	cfrench@wef.org
7.		
8. Randy Neptash	MCSC	randy.neptash@stantec.com
9. Geoff Brousseau	CASQA	geoff@brousseau.us
10. Ryan Baran	Best Best + Krieger/CASQA	ryanbaran@bbklaw.com
11. Michael Trapp	MBI/CASQA	Michael.trapp@mbakerintl.com
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		
16.		
17.		
18.		