



# Pooled Resources Oversight Committee

## DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Wednesday, July 23, 2014 from 9:00 a.m. to 12:20 p.m.

USGS, 934 Broadway, Tacoma 98402

### Permittee representatives:

Will Appleton, Chair  
 Ben Parrish  
 Jim Simmonds  
 Kelly Uhacz

### Other stakeholder representatives:

Chris Konrad, Vice Chair  
 Tom Putnam  
 Bruce Wulkan

### Permittee alternates:

Heather Kibbey  
 Kit Paulsen  
 Bill Reilly  
 Carla Vincent

### Other stakeholder alternates:

Abby Barnes  
 Jay Davis  
 Katelyn Kinn

### RSMP Coordinator:

Brandi Lubliner

### SWG Staff:

Karen Dinicola

### Others in attendance:

Derek Day, Ecology's LID grants coordinator

### Committee Chair and Vice Chair

- *The Committee selected Will Appleton as Chair and Chris Konrad as Vice Chair, and thanked both of them for their willingness to serve. Karen Dinicola will share a draft agenda with the Chair and Vice Chair for their review and input approximately 9-10 days in advance of each meeting. Chris will report on the PRO-Committee at SWG meetings.*

### Budget reporting to this Committee and to the Permittees and Other Interested Parties

- The Committee reviewed the charter description of the quarterly and annual reports Ecology is expected to provide, and made the following edits (additions). "Task" is understood to mean "RSMP program component." The quarterly reports from Ecology shall include the following information:
  - A summary of accomplishments, key decisions, and budget expended by task and contractor for the previous quarter,
  - A summary of planned accomplishments, key decisions, **revenue available**, and budget expenditures by task and contractor for the next quarter,
  - A description of contracts and agreements awarded in the previous quarter,
  - A description of contracts and agreements planned to be awarded in the next quarter,
  - A description of deliverables received as part of the RSMP in the previous quarter,
  - A description of outstanding issues to be resolved, and Ecology's plan for resolving the issues,
  - A description of topics for which input and advice from the SWG and/or the Committee is desired.

*The annual reports from Ecology shall include the following information:*

- A summary of annual revenues and expenditures for the RSMP by task
- A summary of annual expenditures by Ecology and its contractors
- **Anticipated revenues for the next year by task**
- A work plan for the next year by task
- Any fiscal or material issues raised by the most recent quality control review, or peer review, or by any inquiry or investigation, and any steps taken to deal with any such issues, for all of the contracted work.



<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/psmonitoring/swworkgroup.html>; <https://sites.google.com/site/pugetsoundstormwaterworkgroup/home>

- Brandi Lubliner and Karen will develop a template for a quarterly report handout and distribute it to Committee members for review. The handout should be brief (2 pp) and serve to inform people outside the Committee.
- Ecology's spreadsheet reporting cumulative income and expenditures by program component will be included as an attachment for Committee members but is not anticipated to be distributed with the reports.
- The annual report should be structured to fit into a larger annual report that summarizes RSMP findings. Early annual reports will be shorter (2 pp) than reports later on that include RSMP findings (up to 4 pp).
- The quarterly reports will be for calendar year quarters and the annual reports will be for State fiscal years (July-June). A quarterly report is expected for the second calendar year quarter (April-June) sooner than and in addition to the annual report for that year. Annual reports will be ready to share at September SWG meetings.

### RSMP Status and Trends Monitoring in Small Streams

- The USGS recently delivered to Ecology lists of stream sites. There is at least one site in every county except Island. Brandi is confirming the permittees (counties) that have expressed interest in conducting the sampling. Each county will provide budget estimates to conduct the sampling and the USGS will provide a cost estimate for sampling the RSMP sites not taken on by the permittees. The Committee requested that a cost estimate from USGS be provided for doing all of the sampling, for comparison purposes.
- The Committee agrees that Ecology will minimize the number of labs used for the RSMP sampling to the greatest extent possible to decrease variability in the data. Only parameters with short holding times (bacteria and ortho-phosphate) will be sent to multiple labs.
- WSDOT will contribute \$27K/year to the Pooled Resources Account for status and trends monitoring. The Committee recommended that this money be spent adding roadside use pesticides to the stream sediment chemistry.
- The Committee reviewed the updated budget for the streams monitoring and agreed that the RSMP should sample periphyton (which provides a biotic indicator of metals) at all 100 RSMP sites, not just 30. We will learn from this effort and then decide how and whether to continue it in future sampling rounds.
- Some sites may need additional approaches for measuring/estimating high wet season streamflows. Sites should not be disqualified because of difficulty measuring high flows in winter months.
- The contracting process for the streams monitoring will continue over the weeks ahead. Contracting needs for conducting this work include 4-5 interagency agreements (IAAs) with Counties, a joint funding agreement (JFA) with USGS, and at least 3 contracts with labs. What additional information or review do Committee members need in advance of Ecology proceeding with these RSMP contracts?

### RSMP Effectiveness Studies

- The Committee learned about the deliverables-based (as opposed to time-and-materials-based) approach Ecology will use for the RSMP contracts. Each deliverable will have a "not to exceed" associated cost, and project proponents may move small amounts of funding among tasks without amending the contract. The approach works best if project proponents can cover costs until the deliverable is ready for submission, or alternately if appropriate interim deliverables are identified for the end of each billing cycle.
- Brandi will review and approve deliverables unless the Committee specifies that additional review is needed for a specific task. The Committee's role at this point is to review scope, schedule, budget, and also help resolve any issues that may persist between Ecology and project proponents in responding to technical reviews.
- The Committee discussed each of the first four study proposals. Scopes of work were distributed for the first three.
  - USFWS proposal: Coho toxicity of treated (filtered) runoff. The scope of work for this project is nearly ready to go, USFWS is responding to comments on minor details. They have added metals to their analyses to complement the RSMP suite and will consider adding a metals analysis of the compost material prior to construction of the treatment cells.
  - King County proposal: Echo Lake highway retrofit. Staff is responding to comments by Ecology engineers. Most will be addressed in the QAPP. The Committee recommended that toxicity sampling be retained and also be added for influent to the treatment system. Receiving water monitoring (and analysis



<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/psmonitoring/swworkgroup.html>; <https://sites.google.com/site/pugetsoundstormwaterworkgroup/home>

of prior data) should be focused on the vicinity of the outfall and avoid turnover periods. The QAPP will describe how the lake sampling will be targeted to best answer the question of whether water quality in the lake improves as a result of the retrofits.

- King County proposal: Hylebos treatment pond in Federal Way. Staff is responding to comments by Ecology engineers. Most will be addressed in the QAPP. The Committee recommended that toxicity sampling be retained. King Co will scope an “as needed” deliverable for additional sampling of the treatment pond effluent discharged at other times besides during storm events. The QAPP will verify where receiving water monitoring will take place (above or below the wetland, or both? – likely not both because the project is already quite expensive). The receiving water is mostly effluent at the headwaters. There is an RSMP site located downstream. Funding for attendance at a national conference will be removed from the budget. Presentations will be focused on this region.
- Redmond proposal: paired watershed study of retrofits. The committee recommended, that for this unique, large, expensive, and complicated study, the first contract should be to write a QAPP. This first stage of the project will define the deliverables for the ensuing, second stage project contract. Redmond and Ecology will work out a scope of work for the first stage and distribute it to the Committee for review and comment. This review will mostly be focused on budget, but also look at scope and schedule.
- The contracting process for the first three of the four effectiveness studies listed above will continue over the weeks ahead, addressing the items discussed above. The Committee will review and discuss the scope, schedule, and budget for the first phase of the Redmond project via email and, if needed, at the next Committee meeting.
- The Committee recommended that project proponents should own equipment purchased for the studies. Project proponents will understand, and agree in good faith, that all such equipment will be put on a list for future loan to other RSMP projects as requested.

### Source Identification Information Repository (SIDIR)

- No Committee discussion today, just this update: the SWG SIDIR subgroup will convene in early fall to address improvements to the illicit discharge event results database and collection method, the approach to data analysis and reporting, and needs for a methods library.

### Recap of today's meeting

- Decisions:
  - WSDOT funds will contribute to pesticide analyses in small stream sediment samples.
  - Ecology will recommend a single lab for most of the analyses of each parameter, except those with short holding times.
  - The Committee will review cost estimates and contract scopes of work for the streams monitoring.
  - USFWS and two King County effectiveness studies can move forward to contracting by Ecology per today's discussion. Any unexpected changes in scope or budget need to be brought back to the Committee.
  - The Committee will review the scope of work for the first-stage of a Redmond project.
- Action items:
  - Brandi and Karen: develop a draft quarterly report template.
  - Brandi: compile stream monitoring cost estimates and recommend labs to use.
  - Karen: send out map of stream monitoring sites.
  - Derek: help finalize scopes of work for all effectiveness studies and move three through contracting process.
- Next steps: Karen will send out a doodle poll to schedule another Committee meeting in early September (before the next SWG meeting September 17). The meeting will focus on the streams monitoring contracts and review of the initial annual report. The annual report will not have a lot of information but is desired for transparency. Committee members should look for meeting materials (cost estimates and contract scopes of work) a week in advance of the meeting.