



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:

Ben Parrish, Chair
 Jim Simmonds
 Theresa Thurlow
 Kelly Uhacz

Permittee alternates:

Kit Paulsen
 Carla Vincent
 vacant
 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 Project Manager:

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



STORMWATER WORK GROUP

<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/psmonitoring/swworkgroup.html>

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.