



Pooled Resources Oversight Committee

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Thursday, October 15, 2015 from 10:10 a.m. to 12:05 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

TOPICS DISCUSSED AND DECISIONS MADE:

1. Budget report and RSMP project oversight. Brandi shared an updated spreadsheet of actual expenditures, encumbrances, and budget set-asides. Overall need to support communication: template for the 2-pager so that folks know what we're asking for, to help folks with skills to finalize fact sheets for publication.
 - Got 87 small stream sites (49 inside UGAs, 37 outside). The field crews went to 220 sites and visited some of these multiple times to get this number. Big effort.
 - Awaiting final scopes of work (SOW) for streams data analysis. This is expected to be over original budget but well within buffer, especially considering that we had \$70K set aside for a specific stream gaging analysis that can go to overall analysis budget. What is right amount for budget for data analysis? This is about 20%. PRO-C will see final SOWs before interagency agreements are finalized.
 - Includes project management, primarily by King Co.
 - Leska helping with coordination and communication. Includes two-pagers with most relevant information. Concern that more time may be needed to iterate with the technical folks. Brandi and Leska will review and clarify these hours and deliverables with the scientists.
 - Technical reports are intended to focus on results and recommendations, and to cite (but not go into detail) on methods to the greatest extent possible. Concern that more time may be needed for recommendations. Will take into account both City of Redmond and Lower Columbia study design work.
 - Hoped to have a SOW for sediment chemistry today. Made a decision on field leads: mostly WDNR and USGS; King County will do their sites. PAH analysis will be done by PSAMP method and subset (King Co sites) will be analyzed by both that method and the method used for the small stream chemistry.
 - Second round of mussel sampling will be approximately the same price.
 - WDFW map shows sites and funding sources. About 30 sites sponsored by others.
 - The draft scope of work and budget for the bacteria data compilation and analysis was sent with the agenda for this meeting.
 - Needs to include a 2-pager, add to the last task.
 - Should presentation should be earlier in the project? Interim step of what data are available. SWG weighs in between tasks 2 and 3.
 - Also awaiting SOWs for four effectiveness studies. Putting together estimates so that we have a better idea of what is available for the second round of studies. Anticipated to have about \$1.5M.
 - Subgroup-proposed process to select second round of studies is more streamlined, supports well-informed permittee voting, and includes technical review in advance of the workshop.
 - Liaison process is working well, will be explicit and up-front for future studies.



- We are fully committed to the City of Redmond study, expect water quality monitoring to cost between \$500K and \$1M. Herrera finished study design – analysis of what metrics will show change.
 - Three rain garden studies. Brandi and Karen working to coordinate the sites, etc. among them.
 - WSU rain garden fungi study budget estimate update just came in. Will take place at WSDOT sites. Building columns to bring to sites of their choosing.
 - Stewardship partners has been working on a contract scope of work for a while. Leska is liaison.
 - King Co PCB will start on SOW soon.
 - Holding project estimate for Bellingham’s Phase II. Need a liaison keeping track of this study. Ben will either serve or find an appropriate person and tell Brandi.
 - Catch basin study – no update, but expected sometime this fall – not included in overall RSMP expenditure estimate.
 - Echo Lake retrofit study – slim percentage of the lake watershed, getting baseline background info.
 - No update on Hylebos study – one of the facilities was failing and they were rebuilding it.
 - USFWS had a big media event last week that went great! Picked up by lots of local and national press.
 - Lakewood business inspection source control – first TAC meeting very well attended by permittees. Questionnaire and study design will be more logical and reflect permit requirements. What improves compliance rate?
 - Local source control program data will also be considered.
 - Lakewood: IDDE data compilation underway; SWG SIDIR subgroup to review initial findings November 16
2. PRO-C review of Ecology performance as RSMP Administrator
- What details should be reviewed? What findings will people want to consider? Identify lessons learned and acknowledge and highlight how well it’s going (as well as or better than expected). Perhaps question is not whether to change administrators but how to ensure sufficient capacity. Look to see how we can improve current situation.
 - Build on earlier lessons learned document – continuing to learn (i.e., communication)
 - Quarterly reports are great
 - Ideas:
 - Report card based on expectations set out in PRO-C charter
 - Survey monkey of permit managers: how is it going?
 - Letter to Stormwater Work Group from PRO-C may weigh more than survey. PRO-C knows what is going on and how administration is going.
 - Include 2-pagers – results and findings of program (what folks are getting) and what’s coming. Distinguish between what RSMP is finding and how program is being run.
 - Highlight how many folks are opting in.
 - Address concern about full compensation for Ecology, and whether we need to add capacity. For overhead – we’ve only tracked one year, would be better to see more.
 - Timeline: do this summer of 2016 to go along with recommendations for the next permits.
 - Action item: Karen and Brandi take PRO-C charter and turn it into a report card for PRO-C to consider turning into a monkey survey: what is folks’ perception of how well things have gone.
 - Local jurisdictions want summary statements of others kicking in money to enhance RSMP – monitoring activities/funding, not just participation in committees.