



Pooled Resources Oversight Committee

Tuesday, January 26, 2016 from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

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

BUDGET REPORT AND DISCUSSION:

1. PRO-C members discussed Brandi's updated spreadsheet. Overall, PRO-C members agree that the contingency should be used to enhance communication products (see last item under "**CONTRACTING DECISIONS**" below). PRO-C members want to be certain that 2-page fact sheets are included in all RSMP projects.
 - Remaining budget and contingency for status and trends monitoring: these budget numbers are closer to final/actual, particularly for streams now that data collection is completed. Committee members want to be certain that the nearshore sediment and mussel monitoring budgets include contingency.
 - PRO-C members committed to adding the optional tasks (previously identified) to the streams data analysis project.
 - Brandi told the committee about EAP's proposal to charge a \$42,530 fee which is being allocated per site across all projects and will be used for improving the watershed health data management tool. This per-site charge is also being assessed separately to the opt-outs. This charge would be within the initial estimated budget for data management but for which EAP indicated a decreased amount at the beginning of RSMP stream data collection. Committee members did not approve this charge and asked Brandi to bring them more information about its purpose and allocation, and how the RSMP will benefit. Brandi will forward more information from EAP.
 - Remaining budget for effectiveness studies: we will have no problem encumbering all of these funds. Could spend it all on the Redmond urban watershed retrofit study, but will fund another couple of new projects that will be identified through the RFP that should go out in early spring.
 - Remaining budget for Source Identification Information Repository (SIDIR): After the current data compilation and analysis project is completed, the SIDIR subgroup will recommend next steps based on the findings. Two paths will be under consideration: new methods or effectiveness studies, and a means to report results and findings that satisfies all permit requirements as well as providing an easy means of annual data assessment.
2. End of permit and permit reissuance budget questions: Karen explained that if the permit is administratively extended then permittees must still submit RSMP payments in August 2018, so effectiveness studies should be able to continue, as should the next round of status and trends monitoring. If the amounts change in the next permit cycle, then it will be easiest to change the amounts due in the second year of the new permit because permittees will need to plan for the adjustments in their individual budgeting processes. The few new permittees that were added this permit cycle should also begin contributing in the second year of the new permit at the same population-based rate.
3. Annual report: committee members agreed that the charter-specified topics for this report are a minimum, and that more information about findings would be welcome. Brandi and Karen will share a draft at the next meeting.



CONTRACTING DECISIONS:

4. Status and Trends
 - The committee reviewed the SOW for marine nearshore sediment chemistry monitoring. It does include contingency, but might not include a 2-page fact sheet. Brandi will confirm.
 - Brandi will ensure that the budget for the second round of mussel monitoring also includes enough contingency (it does include some) and a 2-page fact sheet.
5. Effectiveness Studies
 - PRO-C agrees that any remaining funds should be encumbered for the Redmond paired urban watershed retrofit study. The SWG approved this as a ten-year project and there should be no interruption in the project due to permit reissuance.
 - New studies in contracting process. Liaison assignments are needed for three new studies:
 - Puyallup rain garden study – an effectiveness monitoring protocol development project with a social science questions. Will test out the protocol on rain gardens and bioretention using trained volunteers.
 - King Co catch basin cleaning study – SOW under development.
 - USFWS: New bioretention columns will be used to evaluate effects of plants and fungi on stormwater water treatment and toxicity.
 - Will use Ecology specified 60/40 mix.
 - PCB samples to be collected by WSU as part of this field effort for King Co PCB cycling study.
 - King Co PCB cycling interruption by bioretention soils – SOW under development; will use USFWS sites and limited staff time for field sampling. King Co will coordinate lab, QC, data analysis and report writing.
6. SIDIR
 - Next contract task was approved by SWG SIDIR Subgroup and is underway.
7. Karen will work with Andy Meyer at the Association of Washington Cities (AWC) to initiate a new overall communication project. AWC would be expected to work with the Washington Association of Counties (WSAC). The budget for this work would be around \$100K-\$150K. The project would address communication of all RSMP findings to stormwater managers and other interested parties.

PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF ECOLOGY AS RSMP ADMINISTRATOR AND OF THIS COMMITTEE:

8. Karen sent a draft “report card” built from the requirements established in the committee charter. The charter specifies a review not only of Ecology’s performance as RSMP administrator, but also of the PRO-C performance in the oversight role, so Karen’s draft addresses both as a starting point for committee members to use and complete. PRO-C members have not had time to thoroughly review Karen’s draft document. Ben as PRO-C Chair will take on the task of completing the document. PRO-C members are asked to send comments and suggested edits directly to Ben between now and the next SWG meeting. Ben will bring an updated version of the document to the next PRO-C meeting for further discussion. The next version should include grades assigned to each item: i.e., meets, exceeds, or does not meet expectations.
9. PRO-C members will also consider recommending revisions/updates to the charter for consideration by the SWG.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE NEXT PERMIT:

10. The SWG should discuss including an adjustment for inflation to maintain the “current level of funding.” If the budget does not include this adjustment, then the overall effort will actually shrink over time rather than remaining level.
11. PRO-C members recommend a line item in the RSMP budget to ensure the budget covers Ecology’s actual RSMP administration costs. The PRO-C recommends that Ecology’s administrative costs be included in each RSMP program component budgets as follows: 0.5 FTE from status and trends, 0.5 FTE from effectiveness studies, and 0.25 FTE from SIDIR – for a total of 1.25 FTE rather than a percentage of the total overall budget. Ecology would not need to track administrative expenses to each specific RSMP component, but rather use the three partial FTEs together as a pool.

NEXT MEETING:

12. The next PRO-C meeting will be held between the next two SWG meetings which are March 16 and June 1. Karen will send out a doodle poll.