PUGET SOUND ECOSYSTEM MONITORING PROGRAM

STORMWATER WORK GROUP
http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/psmonitoring/swworkgroup.html

Pooled Resources Oversight Committee

DRAFT AGENDA

Thursday, May 5, 2016 from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
USGS 3rd floor Columbia Conference Room, 934 Broadway, Tacoma 98402

Permittee representatives:
__ Ben Parrish, Chair
__ Jim Simmonds
__ Theresa Thurlow
__ Kelly Uhacz

Permittee alternates:
__ Kit Paulsen
__ Bill Reilly
__ Carla Vincent
__ *vacant*

RSMP Coordinator:
__ Brandi Lubliner

Other stakeholder representatives:
__ Abby Barnes
__ Leska Fore
__ Chris Konrad, Vice Chair

Other stakeholder alternates:
__ Jay Davis
__ Katelyn Kinn
__ Tom Putnam

SWG Staff:
__ Karen Dinicola

THE COMMITTEE'S PURPOSE:

The purpose of the Committee is to provide transparency, efficiency, and accountability of the expenditure of the Pooled Fund for the Regional Stormwater Monitoring Program (RSMP). The Committee will provide feedback to Ecology through the Stormwater Work Group (SWG) regarding the schedule, scope, budget, and quality of the program's deliverables and verify that contracts are implemented.

THE MEETING'S GOALS:

1. Discuss annual report – *provide feedback on format and content to RSMP Coordinator for next year's report*
2. Discuss communication proposal from AWC – *provide feedback on budget and tasks to AWC and RSMP Coordinator*
   - At our last meeting the PRO-C asked Karen to approach AWC to get a proposal for RSMP communication support for $100K-$150K over the next few years. Andy Myer and Alicia Seegers Martinelli are joining us to present AWC's proposal and hear PRO-C feedback.
   - Discuss what Ecology is doing as administrator, and if there additional outreach needs.
3. Ecology performance as RSMP Administrator – *discussion/decision/action items*
   - At our last meeting in 2015 we agreed on an approach for this committee's assignment to review Ecology's performance as RSMP Administrator. Karen compiled a draft report card for the PRO-C to use as the basis of their review and at our January meeting Karen handed it over to Ben to complete.
   - The draft report card focuses on Ecology's performance per the PRO-C charter in serving the needs and intent of the stakeholders involved in the program and also in implementation of lessons learned. It is structured according to the roles and responsibilities outlined in the charter.
   - The report card also includes an assessment of the PRO-C itself per the roles and responsibilities outlined in the charter.
   - The report card is intended as an attachment to a letter to the SWG and permittees from the PRO-C describing Ecology's performance in the role as RSMP administrator.
   - What are next steps for completing this assignment? How should the draft report card be presented to the SWG at the June 1 meeting?
4. Hear budget report – *brief overall update before going into details below*
   - Status and Trends to date - $75K (2%) unobligated
   - Effectiveness Studies to date – $1.3M (22%) unobligated
   - SIDIR to date – $525K (83%) unobligated

- Communication - $ Funding for AWC needs to come from one or more of the three above
- Admin charges to date – still under-charging, agency has wanted to be conservative

5. Oversee RSMP Status and Trends monitoring – *update and discussion of overall budget and contracting status*
   - Small Streams Water Quality, Sediment Chemistry, and Watershed Health Monitoring:
     - Water, sediment, and habitat data in EIM-search from correct location, stream benthos data expected from lab in May
     - Stream sediment samples run at a low resolution for PAH (higher detection limit). RSMP Coordinator asked that 10 samples be kept frozen at lab. Because of non-detects, should these be run for higher resolution (lower detection limit), just to see where the detection threshold is for future work ($6000)? Nearshore will be run at the better (lower detection limit).
     - Data analysis and reporting contracts with USGS and King County are let, work underway, & deliverables to be posted at http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/stormwater/municipal/rsmp/status.html
       - Optional analysis included in contracts.
   - Mussel Contaminant Monitoring – *update only*
   - Marine Nearshore Sediment Chemistry Monitoring – *update on contracting status/labs/protocols*
   - Marine Shoreline Bacteria Analysis and Interpretation – *update only*
6. Oversee RSMP Effectiveness Studies – *updates only*
   - SWG approved process to select second round of studies can begin this month. Needed final SOW and budgets for two King Co projects, the last 2 of the original round. Expected funding available: $1.3M.
   - Current studies underway:
     - USFWS bioretention toxicity reduction study: just about done, waiting for final invoice
     - Redmond paired basin retrofit study: monitoring underway, behind on 2015 year end deliverables
     - Bellingham bioretention hydrologic performance study: monitoring postponed to fall 2016
     - Lakewood business inspection source control study: poor survey return rate 20%, extend timeframe?
     - King County highway retrofits along Echo Lake: SOW revision won't affect costs in agreement
     - King County/Federal Way bioretention retrofit at Hylebos: monitoring underway
     - Puyallup rain garden study: forming TAC, first deliverable anticipated in June
     - USFWS plants and fungi effects on stormwater water treatment and toxicity: QAPP is first deliverable, anticipated in May
     - King Co PCB Cycling interruption by bioretention soils: about to send SOW to PRO-C
     - King Co catch basin study: SOW voting, some questions on cost
   - Liaison assignments are needed for PCB cycling study by King County.
7. Oversee Source Identification Information Repository (SIDIR) – *update only*
   - Lakewood IDDE data compilation and analysis: Contractor and Ecology intern working on data entry.
8. SWG discussion of improvements and priorities for future RSMP implementation - *update and discussion*
   - At the SWG meeting on March 16, the stakeholders continued to discuss recommendations for Special Condition S8. Monitoring and Assessment in the next municipal stormwater permit cycle.
     - The focus of these discussions is to improve future RSMP implementation. The SWG will vote on a final set of recommendations at the June 1 meeting.
   - Currently, the SWG has consensus regarding the PRO-C recommendation to increase the RSMP administration funding in the next permit cycle to 1.25 FTE as a line item. The SWG current majority position is to maintain the RSMP funding levels at the amounts in the current permit.
9. Hear any concerns or suggestions related to our work
10. Review decisions, recommendations, and action items coming out of this meeting

Pooled Resources Oversight Committee

MEETING SUMMARY

Thursday, May 5, 2016 from 9:10 a.m. to 12:20 p.m.

USGS 3rd floor Okanogan Conference Room, 934 Broadway, Tacoma 98402

Permittee representatives:
_x_ Ben Parrish, Chair
_x_ Jim Simmonds
_x_ Theresa Thurlow
_x_ Kelly Uhacz

Other stakeholder representatives:
_x_ Abby Barnes
__ Leska Fore
_x_ Chris Konrad, Vice Chair

Permittee alternates:
__ Kit Paulsen
_x_ Carla Vincent
__ *vacant*
__ *vacant*

Other stakeholder alternates:
_x_ Jay Davis
__ Katelyn Kinn
__ Tom Putnam

RSMP Coordinator:
_x_ Brandi Lubliner

SWG Project Manager:
_x_ Karen Dinicola

1. The first RSMP Annual Report (AR) from Ecology as the RSMP Coordinator was sent out broadly last month. Quarterly reports are focused on cash flow and contracting actions. The intent of the AR was to capture the first year of implementation in earnest, describe the program at a high level, provide context for longer term planning, and let folks know where to get more information. The PRO-C appreciated the format and content of the AR. Future reports should keep to the four page format. It was easy for folks to read.

2. RSMP Communication Support: Andy Myer, Michelle Harvey, and Alicia Seegers Martinelli presented AWC's proposed scope of work (SOW) and heard feedback from committee members. The key elements/goals of their proposal are, over the next 18 months, to: help address branding and identity issues (make the SWG/RSMP distinct from Ecology and highlight the number of partners in the project); understand whether communication efforts are hitting the mark; develop initial communication products and templates; and plan the first of what is expected to be an annual workshop where RSMP findings are shared.

   AWC staff want to get a clear understanding of what the PRO-C wants in order to minimize iterations. The first phase of their proposal is up front work to identify needs and goals for various audiences, then the work plan can be set for the second project phase developing targeted materials. Expected products include a 3-5 minute video, PowerPoint template, 1-page flier, articles with succinct messages, and story maps. The video and first articles would be less technical for the broadest audience.

   The AWC proposal adds to the current SWG Reporter and RSMP quarterly and annual reports, as well as the RFMP requirement for individual project authors to draft fact sheets about their findings. We might reissue/repurpose Ecology's AR as an SWG/RSMP product. Some of the information can be repackaged and used for other audiences. AWC's City View magazine reaches more than 5,000 people per issue. For the overall communication project AWC should reach out to STORM and the Washington Stormwater Center, and connect to other communication efforts including the APWA Reporter (more technical audience) and WSAC Insider (closest county counterpart to City View). The primary audience for RSMP findings is stormwater managers; the secondary audience is public works directors and elected officials; the public and other stakeholders are a third audience.

   Clarification of roles and responsibilities, and who will make decisions about the deliverables of this project:
   The PRO-C asked for this proposal to fill a strategic need for RSMP communication. A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) will be formed for this RSMP project just like any other project. The PRO-C will review the scope of work, budget, and schedule and will hear from the RSMP Coordinator and TAC about technical deliverables (summaries of project findings). The two most active members of the SWG Communication Subgroup are also on the PRO-C. The TAC will draw from the broader SWG Communication Subgroup and include other target audience representatives

knowledgeable about the RSMP to provide helpful diversity. The TAC will provide input on the logo, key messages, templates, and overall package of communication approaches. Brandi and Karen will help interface between primary authors and AWC staff for developing summaries of RSMP technical findings. The SWG should get a chance to weigh in on the logo/branding; this could be done by email over the summer rather than waiting until the SWG meeting on September 14. We will ask the SWG about their preference on this at their meeting on June 1.

Clarification of goals of workshop: Brandi and Karen were to follow up to distinguish between the need/purpose and timing of an effectiveness workshop and the need/purpose and timing of an overall RSMP workshop. The former is one-time this year to select the next round of studies, and the latter is a "roll-out" to then annually share RSMP findings and tee up discussions about projects in the works. The latter can be delayed until early 2017.

The TAC will be formed soon. Meanwhile, AWC staff will revise the SOW and the communication subgroup can review it via email prior to it going back out to the PRO-C for final review. The project cost estimate will increase due to the clarification of scope and expectations coming out of today's meeting. Brandi will work on getting the contract ready for execution the first of July. (AWC staff are unavailable the month of June.)

3. Report card on Ecology's performance as RSMP Administrator: Ben and Abby presented the draft report card template that they structured according to the roles and responsibilities outlined in the charter. The PRO-C decided that each line should be rated as "needs improvement, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations" with comments included, and will add the following lines to the draft report card:
   - "Funds are being used for the intended purpose"
   - "Funds are being used in a timely manner"
   - "Cash flow is being managed appropriately"

   Abby asked members to send other ideas for lines to add to the report card as soon as possible. Jim expressed ongoing concern about the inability of the RSMP Coordinator to control the state budget process and asked that the report card note that one study was delayed last year due to the Legislature not passing a budget on time.

   PRO-C members are asked to fill in the template with their assessments and send them to Abby and Ben. PRO-C members should capture the concerns they've heard, call out what has worked particularly well, and acknowledge Ecology's commitment to ensure the RSMP is successful. This first report card should highlight what the ramp-up effort took; for instance, Brandi and Karen will think about how to transparently convey the internal work at Ecology to get spending authority and create the invoicing system.

   The filled out assessment will be discussed at the next PRO-C meeting and the final will be sent to the SWG and permittees with a cover letter from Ben as PRO-C chair. The revised *blank* draft report card will be sent to the SWG with the June 1 meeting agenda and materials, and Ben will present the PRO-C's plans for completing the evaluation.

   The last draft of the report card also included an assessment of the PRO-C itself per the roles and responsibilities outlined in the charter. PRO-C members asked Brandi and Karen to move forward with that evaluation.

   All PRO-C members should be thinking about recommended changes to the PRO-C charter.

4. Budget report and discussion: Budget is in good shape. Topics and details not included in today's agenda:
   - How should the AWC communication project be funded? PRO-C prefers one third from each RSMP component or proportional funding draw from each component. (Jim suggested funding it all from the SIDIR account.) Brandi will look into identifying a project code to draw from the three accounts as the RSMP administration charges do.
   - Fully funding Ecology's RSMP administration expenses: The 1.25 FTE previously recommended by the PRO-C still seems like the right target. So far, only Brandi's time has been charged to RSMP administration. Beginning this month, more Ecology staff who have been preparing invoices, developing the webpage, helping move contracts through the system will begin charging their time, so the line item in the quarterly report will increase to reflect actual expenditures in the future. Jim requested a breakdown of the types of administrative expenses expected to be included in the 1.25 FTE.

5. Status and Trends Monitoring: Brandi will send PRO-C members an email to request a decision on spending $6K to get lower reporting level PAH analyses run on ten stream sediment samples to inform recommendations for the next

round of RSMP stream sampling and for comparison with nearshore samples. Committee members asked if the lower levels are needed for comparison with sediment quality standards.

6. Effectiveness Studies: The business inspection source control PRO-C recommends extending the timeline and sending another request for permittees via a different means (most likely the North and South Sound permit groups' coordinators) to return the surveys.

   The last two new studies are getting going. One lesson learned from the first round is that the cost of many of the studies increased with expanded scopes in response to comments at the workshops, changes in availability of contributed staff, and general cost increases since the proposals were prepared. The catch basin study budget also reflects lessons learned from the business inspection source control study on the real effort to gather and enter data to support analyses.

   About $1.3M is available for the next round of studies. The call for letters of interest will go out soon.

7. Next PRO-C meeting will be at the end of June or beginning of July. Karen will send out a Doodle poll.