

EPO Working Group

Charge from Groundwater Management Area Advisory Committee

Review EPO budget proposals. Submit budget revisions for GWAC review and consideration.

Working Group Members

Andres Cervantes (GWAC-DOH), Jean Mendoza (GWAC-Friends of Toppenish Creek), Tom Tebb (GWAC-Ecology), Elizabeth Torres (Citizen), Gretchen Stewart (EPA), Nieves Negrete (Citizen), Patricia Newhouse (GWAC-Citizen Rep Position #2), Tom Eaton (GWAC-EPA), Dean Effler (Citizen), Joye Redfield-Wilder (Ecology), Stuart Turner (GWAC-Turner & Co), Ignacio Marquez (AGR)

Meetings/Calls Dates

Meeting: Wednesday, September 03, 2014 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Participants

Lisa Freund (EPO Chair -Yakima County), Jim Davenport (Yakima County), Jean Mendoza (GWAC-FOTC), Andres Cervantes (GWAC-DOH), Elizabeth Torres (Citizen), Nieves Negrete (Citizen), *Gretchen Stewart (EPA), Patricia Newhouse, (GWAC-Citizen Rep Position #2), Lee Murdock (Yakima County), Mary Wurtz (Yakima County support staff)

*via phone

Key Discussion Points

Welcome & Meeting Overview: Lisa Freund welcomed the group and reviewed the meeting agenda, noting that the GWAC had ranked all working group budget proposals at its August 21 meeting, including EPO's seven proposals. Collectively, the proposals exceeded the available funding. As a result, the working groups have been tasked with reviewing their respective proposals and determining whether to retain, revise or eliminate proposals, and resubmit their proposals to the GWAC.

It was brought up that we do not know what EPO will look like in the future. Do we have long range plans? Will we integrate or coordinate with other groups? Will the money still be there if all is not implemented? It was stated that this is a two year budget and the county has all the money available now. It was suggested that we draft a program, publish it, and discuss long term implementation later.

EPO Budget Proposals and Next Steps -

1. **Educational Outreach Campaign. GWAC ranking: high 6, medium 5, low 6.**

Original budget: \$54,000

Decision: Retain the proposal

2. **Community Outreach Surveys. GWAC ranking: High 0, Medium 9, Low 10**

Original budget: \$40,000 (five surveys to be conducted over two years)

Decision: reduce the number of surveys to two, and reduce the budget amount to \$16,000.

3. **RCIM Resource Hotline (Pilot Program) and RCIM Resource Hotline (Full Resource Project. GWAC ranking: High 0, Medium 2, Low 17.**

Original budget: \$50,000

Decision: based on RCIM's recommendation, remove the proposal from the current list. Defer project until funding is available. Eliminate the budget line item.

4. **Abandoned Wells and Septic System Maintenance Outreach. GWAC ranking: High 11, Medium 6, Low 3**

Lisa noted that the RCIM working group will recommend transferring its first year budget allocation (\$50,000) to the EPO. The EPO will be tasked with conducting outreach and surveys to identify the location of abandoned wells, and to provide septic system education on behalf of RCIM. It was suggested that the most effective means of locating the wells and septic systems would be to hire a bilingual person to conduct research and to go door-to-door to gather information. This proposal could be combined with the Wellhead Risk Assessment Surveys – Phase 2.

Decision: Accept RCIM's request to conduct the outreach and surveying. Transfer the \$50,000 line item from RCIM to this proposal.

5. **Redesign and Maintain GWMA Website. GWAC Ranking: High 5, Medium 10, Low 3**

Original budget: \$10,500.

Decision: Retain the proposal.

6. **Wellhead Risk Assessment Surveys – Phase 2. GWAC Ranking: High 6, Medium 10, Low 2**

Original budget: \$150,000

Decision: Reduce the budget to \$100,000. Combine this task with the Abandoned Wells and Septic System Maintenance Outreach.

7. Bilingual Outreach Worker (working title) Position (Pilot) GWAC Ranking: High 3, Medium 7, Low 10

Although the proposal received a low GWAC ranking, the group discussed the importance of the position in carrying out proposals 1-6.

Decision: Retain the proposal. Group EPO proposals 2, 4, and 6 under this item. Revise total budget accordingly. [9/11/14 Editorial Note-based on subsequent responses to emails between those present at this meeting, it was decided to drop this proposal and adopt a third-party contractor fallback position that the GWAC would more likely to support. LF]

		Original Budget	Revision #1	Recommendation to GWAC
EPO 1	Educational Outreach Program	\$54,000	*\$54,000 (subject to revision)	Retain the proposal
EPO 3	RCIM Hotline (Pilot Program)	\$10,000	\$0	Delete the proposal
EPO 5	Redesign and Maintain GWMA Website	\$10,500	\$10,500	Retain the proposal
EPO 7 Bilingual Outreach Position (budget to be determined)				Retain the proposal
Essential Duties:				
EPO 2	Community Outreach Surveys	\$40,000	*\$16,000	
EPO 4	Abandoned Wells and Septic system Maintenance Outreach	\$5,000	*\$50,000 from RCIM	
EPO 6	Wellhead Risk Assessment Surveys (Part 2)	\$150,000	*\$100,000	
EPO 7	Bilingual Outreach Worker Position	\$89,151	*\$89,151	

- *Placeholders only. To be revised as needed.*

Due to lack of time, the New Mom Flyer distribution status and identifying additional distribution locations were not discussed.

Recommendations for GWAC

Adopt revised proposals and budget

Proposed Next Steps

- Lisa will revise the budget based on today's discussion. An *ad hoc* meeting will be scheduled the week of September 8 to review and finalize the revised EPO budget.
- Submit revised EPO budget to Vern no later than Thursday, September 11.

Next meeting Wednesday, October 1, 2014 at 1:30 p.m. Yakima County Courthouse, Room 419
(phone: 506-574-2353 [PIN# 2353#])