RHODE ISLAND BAYS, RIVERS, & WATERSHEDS COORDINATION TEAM

Meeting of July 25, 2012

Conference Room A
2:00-4:00 pm
The Department of Environmental Management
235 Promenade Street
Providence, RI

FINAL Minutes

Coordination Team Members in Attendance: Sue Kiernan, Jeff Willis, Tom Uva, Nancy Hess, Guy Lefebvre

BRWCT Staff: Ames Colt, Melissa Deciantis

Meeting called to order at 2:00 PM and minutes of the May 23rd BRWCT meeting were approved without amendment.

I. CALL TO ORDER & ADMINISTRATION

BRWCT FY 12 Budget

Colt opened the meeting requesting that the BRWCT review and discuss the distributed "Summary of Income and Expenses" for the BRWCT in FY 12. (Copy attached.)

The Office of the Chair costs entailed for the most part personnel costs for Colt and Deciantis. With regard to funded projects, only those project expenses incurred in FY12 are listed. Expenditures for other projects already committed to by the BRWCT but that have yet to seek reimbursement will post in FY13.

Colt summarized overall cash flow in FY 12. Nearly $500,000 (net to BRWCT) was generated from the septage fee in FY12, $80,000 greater than the previous highest total received from this fee in a single year. FY12 revenues combined with the FY11 rollover generated total income of $856,000 for FY12. Given total expenditures of about $400,000, rollover to FY13 will equal about $455,000.

The BRWCT's FY 12 OSPAR allocation for economic and environmental monitoring was fully expended, primarily on the state's stream gage network, large river monitoring, and other water flow and quality projects that the BRWCT has been supporting for several years now. (Colt noted that the BRWCT now funds thirteen stream gauges (nearly half of all currently

operational in RI), nineteen observation wells, and six water quality stations.) The BRWCT and the RI Environmental Monitoring Collaborative should continue to work to find alternative sources of support for baseline line environmental monitoring.

BRWCT FY13 Draft Budget

Colt turned next to review of a proposed FY13 draft budget (copy attached).

Office of Chair Costs
For FY 13, DEM managed to provide some funding for Deciantis's position, about $22,000. Other Office of Chair costs are minimal, with most travel expenses are NROC-related. DEM continues to underwrite all office costs other than computer equipment and software and basic office supplies. They do not charge an overhead fee for fixed costs to the BRWCT.

Discretionary Projects- Proposed Project Fund and RfP
The biggest innovation in the FY 13 budget is a proposal to create a pool of funding totaling at least $130,000 and run a competition for agencies and partners to submit proposals for review. This new approach to distributing funds was discussed and requested at the May 2012 BRWCT meeting. Hess strongly endorsed the need for such a fund and request for proposals.

The FY 13 draft budget also proposes creation of a modest project development fund of about $10,000, and allocating a total of about $7,000 for support of the BRWCT standing committees. That would establish a total project grants program of $148,000.

Previously Funded Projects
The draft FY13 budget lists the projects the BRWCT has already agreed to fund, but for which funds have not actually been spent. If the BRWCT also agreed to fund the two projects reviewed at this meeting (see below), total project costs in FY13 would equal about $369,000.

Revenue Account Cash Flow
Rollover from FY12 and FY13 is about $455,000. Again, that is high because projects the BRWCT has agreed to fund have not been drawing down the funds. That will definitely occur in FY13. The FY13 budget projects septage fee revenues totalling $415,000 (based on the running four-year average of $417,000.).

Importantly, CRMC has promulgated successfully the Trans-Atlantic Submarine Cable Fee (applied to all such cables making landfall in Rhode Island) after negotiations this year with the cable owner AT&T. This will entail a a one-time payment of $7,5000 for three inactive cables and an annual fee for AT&T's single active cable of $40,000 annually. This will provide for the BRWCT total income of about $870,000 for FY13, not including OSPAR.

Colt asked the BRWCT for guidance on the maximum annual rollover between fiscal years the BRWCT should ensure; he suggested $100,000. Willis asked what has been the annual rollover on average. Colt noted that it has been as high as $215,000 in FY09.

Kiernan said that if the Septage fees are collected on a quarterly basis, the BRWCT should not try to commit 100% of its available funds annual. She stated that she felt a $100,000 was too high for a targeted rollover amount. She recommended that they commit to rolling over about $50,000. Hess agreed that the annual rollover should be between $50,000 and $75,000.

Kiernan also recommended that the BRWCT provide BRWCT standing committees $15,000 in FY13, and increase the allotment for project funds to $15,000. Kiernan added that there have been a lot of ideas generated recently to enhance environmental monitoring data collection and communications, such as compiling a map of all the stations we tried that process where we had a different process for finishing the monitoring collaborative report. She suggested that if additional funding was made available to the standing committees, they might be able to bring in seasonal interns to provide staff support for the committees.

Colt replied that he would adjust the draft budget to reduce the projected rollover to $65,000 by increasing available funds for the project RfP, the project development fund, and support for the standing committees.

II. BAYS, RIVERS, AND WATERSHEDS SYSTEMS-LEVEL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Copies of the following three spending proposals are appended to these minutes.

RI DEM and Conservation Law Foundation: CLF Proposal to conduct legal analysis of stormwater utility districts as part of BRWCT's Municipal stormwater partnership program

Colt reviewed how DEM's Elizabeth Scott has assessing Stormwater Utility District (SUD) design and implementation in light of Rhode Island's enabling legislation for SUD's. In the course of her discussions of the issue with the Rhode Island chapter of the Conservation Law Foundation (CLF), CLF proposed to go forward with an in-depth legal analysis of the state's enabling legislation utilizing a budget that would rely upon a variety of funding sources. DEM has also been seeking guidance from the Office of Legal Service and the Department of Administration's attorneys and have received some basic analyses on the intent and provisions of the state's enabling legislation. Scott feels that CLF's analysis of SUD design and implementation would be well-worth the modest funding amount requested, $2,500. CLF has also acquired commitments from other sources to provide an additional $5,000 in funds.

Uva said he was under the impression that Middletown was going to look at the ramifications of SUD design and implementation. Colt said it is, but that would be from Middletown's perspective. This work would be from a statewide perspective.

Hess asked if they will get a better state statute as an end product of this, or will they just get a report saying what is wrong with it without a recommended bill to be filed. She would like to see CLF provide some recommendations for amending the enabling statute as necessary. Colt agreed that CLF should seek to provide such recommendations.

Uva said he was under the impression that what was to be developed regarding SUD design in the Middletown Partnership Project would be applicable to any community in the state. Colt replied that the Middletown project would definitely provide lessons and insights that other RI municipalities could utilize, but the Middletown project will focus on SUD design and development for just Middletown. It will not be seeking to provide the in-depth analysis of the consequences of RI's SUD enabling legislation that CLF proposes to conduct.

Kiernan agreed that to date DEM and DoA have provided a preliminary legal opinion on the provisions of the state's SUD enabling legislation but that it was not particularly thorough.

Willis made a motion to approve the funding request from CLF and Lefebvre seconded it.

Hess asked if they could get something more out of this than just analysis. If they think the statute has problems then what are the solutions to fix it? Colt agreed that CLF should be asked to provide recommendations for amending the enabling legislation. Willis said he would be happy to amend his motion to include a requriement.

Four members voted in favor of the motion as amended. Kiernan abstained.

CRMC and URI: Proposal for seed funding for a new "Beach" SAMP

Willis characterized this funding request to the BRWCT as the start of a larger effort to develop what is termed the "Beach SAMP" to address shoreline erosion management in Rhode Island. CRMC is asking the BRWCT to help it start planning process by helping to develop a communication strategy through a cooperative agreement with the University of Rhode Island (URI). A team of faculty at URI has submitted a formal proposal to CRMC entailing over one million dollars in research, planning, and outreach.

Much attention has been devoted lately to the Matunuck erosion risks whereby a roadway and water utility infrastructure serving about 250+ homes is already threatened by erosion and storm damages. The town of Charlestown has been working closely with CRMC to devise acceptable means to protect the roadway from storm damage and to try to check shoreline erosion in this area. There are also shoreline erosion risks emerging for Misquamicut and Block Island. CRMC seeks the opportunity via a new SAMP effort to address shoreline erosion vulnerabilities along the Rhode Island coast and to develop comprehensive management strategies.

CRMC would utilize initial BRWCT funding to engage a diverse set of stakeholders through facilitated outreach that will brief participants on shoreline erosion risks and vulnerabilities that we face on the Rhode Island coast, and then work to keep stakeholders engaged throughout the two-year planning process.

CRMC is already starting to draft items for a Shoreline Special Area Management Plan (SAMP). Two shorelines areas near Matunuck are being designated as areas for piloting erosion control strategies and technologies such as. They are also drafting regulations that will detail how CRMC will manage such erosion control experiments.

CRMC also needs to conduct the research and monitoring needed to construct a sediment budget for key Rhode Island shorelines, particularly the delineation of "closure depths", the depth beyond which sand deposits cannot return via natural physical processes to the shoreline.

CRMC will actively seek out other funding sources for the Shoreline SAMP. The seed funding from the BRWCT will be an important aid for fund raising as it demonstrates strong state commitment to the effort.

Uva noted that Willis hadn't spelled out fully how the $50,000 would be spent. Could he provide more information on this? Willis referred the Team members to the details contained in

the funding request. The $50,000 would be used to start the public outreach and education process.

Lefebvre asked if the SAMP itself would be produced by CRMC. Willis answered yes, URI is proposing to conduct the technical analyses, and outreach efforts that in turn would be utilized by CRMC to develop the Shoreline SAMP.

Hess added that this SAMP development approach enables CRMC to tap into resources at RI Sea Grant and URI's Coastal Resources Center. It looks to her as if CRMC will follow the same strategy and partnership arrangements they utilized to produce the Ocean SAMP.
Willis said that is usually the review process.

Uva asked Willis if the $50,000 would be the life of the project. Willis said he didn't think so because the life of the project is presently two years, but will probably end up being closer to three. The education and outreach effort is continuous over that whole lifespan; the $50,000 request is just to start the outreach process.

Kiernan said it seems that what they would get out of the initial $50,000 investment is a concentrated effort to go out and access and collect information on what the issues are from the perspective of local stakeholders and communities. The goal is to engage stakeholders, identify the key players, and articulate the issues at a community level. If that work can be summarized well in a report on how the initial $50,000 will be spent, that's still a worthwhile output regardless of how development of the Shoreline SAMP unfolds. Even if the research components of the proposed SAMP process are not funded immediately, CRMC and Rhode Island will nevertheless be confronted with public views and strong concerns regarding how deal with the impacts of an eroding shoreline. Hence, Kiernan supported funding the proposal, as long as it provides strong documentation on stakeholders' perceptions of risks and preferable risk mitigation strategies.

Kiernan also noted how there are many folks in government and academia that possess important, specialized knowledge regarding shoreline erosion in Rhode Island. It will be important to go beyond basic public education of the issues. CRMC should also work to engage with experts and stakeholders already working on projects relevant to a Shoreline SAMP.

Uva agreed with Keirnan, saying that it's good to engage the stakeholders. But are we engaging stakeholders in these couple of areas where we have issues or should it be statewide? Willis replied that the planning process would be divided into three phases as specified in the proposal.

Kiernan moved to approve the proposal subject to Colt and Willis clarifying the specific tasks to undertaken with particular attention paid to ensuring that it not duplicate related work already underway.

With Willis of RI CRMC abstaining, the other six members of the BRWCT approved this funding request and requested that Willis and Colt work out the details of a cooperative agreement.

RI DEM and RI WRB: Proposal to continue funding stream gages and large river monitoring program

Kiernan and Crawley requested that the BRWCT commit $110,000 - $200,000 from the FY13 OSPAR allocation to pay for USGS-operated stream gages in FY13. While they plan to provide the BRWCT a full proposal for review at the September BRWCT meeting, they presented for the BRWCT's consideration an initial funding request that would ensure coverage of these costs through September 2013. This initial request entails utilizing the FY13 OSPAR allocation to provide about $51,500 to cover the USGS contracts for the period of April-September, 2012. The remaining balance in the OSPAR FY13 allocation would be about $147,000.

In FY12, the BRWCT endorsed covering the costs of the USGS contracts, but DEM and WRB are seeking confirmation that these contracts would be covered through the last quarter of FY12 utilizing FY13 funds (USGS invoices do not arrive in time to pay them in the correct fiscal year. They also seek approval to pay for the USGS contracts for the first quarter of FY13.
In discussions with USGS, Crawley noted that she was told that their stream gage system operating costs were going to increase. There are differences between the level of support and match USGS provides to the Water Resources Board and DEM. Kiernan and Crawley are committed to ensuring that in the future both agencies receive the same funding arrangement from USGS; this is another reason to continue to pursue development of a single agreement with USGS for the State of Rhode Island, with a single list of gauges and one list of where the work is getting done from a water quality viewpoint. These issues will be addressed in relation to their full proposal to be presented at the September BRWCT meeting.
ratio has been different because of their available funding.

Uva asked if DEM had submitted any funding request to pay for the stream gage network to the Governor's office. Kiernan replied that they tried to have the funding restored, but were unsuccessful. This year they have talked with Colt about doing a lot more leg work. She is not anticipating the budget process for state government to include a request for new additions or new funding. However, they have to push this in August when the initial part of the budget process starts so they get some feedback. Uva asked for details on the budget process state agencies such as DEM must follow. Kiernan explained that the Department of Administration budget office issues budget instructions to all agencies and they will direct you what to give them. Draft agency budgets are submitted to the Department of Administration by October 1st. There is some back and forth between the DOA budget office and the agencies on what they can and cannot do during the August to September periods.

Hess pointed out that the DoA budgeting instructions have recently been focused on cutting agency budgets. Agency directors and chiefs frequently must lobby DoA concertedly to prevent additional program cuts by DoA.

Uva asked if the Water Resources Board is now part of DoA. Hess stated that they now part of the Division of Planning, but their funding sources remain distincvt. WRB is entirely state-funded, while Planning's funding sources include Federal Highway, Federal Transit , and Economic Development (Economic Development Administration), as well as state funding.

Uva said the stream flow gauges clearly tie into economic development, but we have to know our water resources so we can encourage businesses to come into the state. Hess agreed, but the

funding they get from EDA is very specific for planning purposes, which they are no longer going to have that grant after this fiscal year.

Kiernan felt that DEM and WRB should write a comprehensive memo detailing the history of stream gage funding. Once DEM ran out of options to cut costs through personnel reductions, their funding for contractual services were cut, including funding for the stream gages that the BRWCT has subsequently filed in.

Colt said that part of the challenging to restore funds to agency budgets is persuading the Governor's policy staff to put greater emphasis on these needs. Kiernan said her intent at this point would not be to just ask for extra money, but to get the level of commitment they have had in the past and ensure that such a commitment would be long-term.

Colt suggested that the BRWCT reach out to RIEMA, and probably others in the state executive branch or in the municipalities. They could put together a request and pursue it with DoA and the Governor's Office in the coming months.

Uva made a motion to approve the funding request as requested on the condition that the DEM and WRB formulate a memo within the next month or two on the history of stream gage funding in Rhode Island.

With Kiernan of RIDEM abstaining, the other six members of the BRWCT approved this funding request.

FY 2013 BRWCT Draft Budget and Work Plan

Colt distributed a draft outline of BRWCT priorities and the projects it had funded to advance those priorities as a basis for discussing what BRWCT's overall priorities should be for FY13. He noted that a complete draft FY 13 work plan would be distributed in early September.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00.

RI BRWCT
Summary of FY 2012 Income & Expenses

(7/25/2012)

Office of the Chair

	Direct Cost	DEM Match
Personnel	$ 230,256	
Operations		
Office Space		$ 31,300
Seminars & Conferences	$ 195	
Computer Supplies, Software, Equipment	$ 943	
Transportation	$ 518	
Total Operations	**$ 1,657**	**$ 31,300**
TOTAL	**$ 231,913**	**$ 31,300**

Funded Projects

Environmental Monitoring	**Cost**
USGS collection and publishing of data from 10 Stream Gages, 19 Observation Wells, and 6 WQ Monitoring Stations for period of 7/1/2010 9/30/2010	$ 40,185
USGS collection and publishing of data from 10 Stream Gages and 19 Observation Wells for period of 10/1/2010 to 3/1/2011	$ 112,080
Regional Ventless Lobster Trap Survey	$ 2,761
Other	
Municipal SUD Feasibility Assessment (K. England)	$ 12,694
DO Field Survey Intern (CHRP)	$ 153
June 2011 Sustainable Seafood Initiative Conference Sponsorship	$ 1,000
Total Funded Projects	**$ 168,872**

FY 2012 Income & Expenses

Income

FY 2011 Rollover	$ 359,864
FY 12 Revenues	$ 496,894
Total Income	**$ 856,758**

Expenses

Office of the Chair	$ 231,913
Projects	$ 168,872
Total Costs	**$ 400,785**
Rollover to FY 13	**$ 455,973**

BRWCT Revenue Account: Cash Flow FY08-FY12

FY	Costs	Revenues	Net	Cash Balance
2008	$ 195,631	$ -	$ (195,631)	$ (195,631)
2009	$ 200,087	$ 415,659	$ 215,572	$ 19,941
2010	$ 191,516	$ 379,973	$ 188,458	$ 208,399
2011	$ 226,120	$ 377,585	$ 151,465	$ 359,864
2012	$ 400,785	$ 496,894	$ 96,109	$ 455,973

FY12 OSPAR Allocation for BRWCT
Environmental & Economic Monitoring

Project	$ 250,000
USGS Contract: 10 Stream Gages, 19 Observation Wells, and 6 WQ Monitoring Stations 7/1/2010 9/30/2010	$ 11,279
USGS Contract: 10 GAGING STATIONS, 19 OBSERVATION WELL AND 6 WQ MONITORING STATIONs. 4/1/11 THRU 6/30/11	$ 64,882
USGS Contract: 10 GAGING STATIONS, 19 OBSERVATION WELL AND 6 WQ MONITORING STATIONS. 7/1/11 to 9/30/11	$ 64,882
USGS Contract: 13 GAGING STATIONS, 19 OBSERVATION WELLS, AND 6 WQ MONITORING STATIONS 1/1/12 TO 3/31/12	$ 51,275
USGS Contract: 13 GAGING STATIONS, 19 OBSERVATION WELLS, AND 6 WQ MONITORING STATIONS 10/1/11 TO 12/31/11	$ 51,257
NBC Equipment Grant	$ 6,424
Total	**$ 250,000**

RI BRWCT FY 2013 Draft Budget

(7/25/2012)

Office of the Chair

	Direct Cost	DEM Match	
Total Personnel	$ 214,507	$ 22,501	(DEM support for Deciantis)
Operations			
Office Space, etc.		$ 31,300	
Supplies, Software, Equipment	$ 500		
Travel	$ 1,200		
Other	$ 1,000		
Total Operations	$ 2,700	$ 31,300	
Grants			
FY 2013 Request for Proposals	$ 130,000		
Project Development Funds	$ 10,000		
Sponsorships	$ 1,500		
BRWCT Standing Committees	$ 7,000		(SAC and Env MC)
Total Grants	$ 148,500		
TOTAL	**$ 365,707**	**$ 31,300**	

Funded Projects

	Cost
Coastal Hypoxia Research Program	
Intern for spatial surveys	$ 10,000
CHRP Grant (Ullman- numerical modelling)	$ 15,000
Other Projects	
EDC Large Marine Event Benefit Assessment	$ 100,000
DEM/Planning IC GIS Data Layer Update	$ 54,000
DEM WWTF Climate Vulnerability Analysis	$ 59,000
DEM/Middletown SUD Partnership Project	$ 35,000
SUD Feasibility Assessment	$ 468
DEM Lobster Ventless Trap Reg. Survey	$ 43,839
Proposed Projects	
CRMC Beach SAMP	*$ 50,000*
CLF Stormwater Util. District Analysis	*$ 2,500*
Total Projects	**$ 369,807**

FY 2013 Cash Flow Projection

Income

FY 2012 Rollover	$ 455,973	
Septage Fee Revenues (projected)	$ 415,000	(2009-2012 average: ~$417,000)
Cable Fee Revenues (projected)	$ 47,500	
Total Income	**$ 870,973**	

Expenses

Personnel & Office	$ 217,207	
CT Grants	$ 148,500	
Funded Projects	$ 369,807	
Total Expenses	$ 735,514	
Rollover to FY 14	**$ 135,459**	(What should we rollover annually?)

FY13 OSPAR Allocation:
Environmental & Economic
Monitoring

Available	$	250,000
USGS Contracts April - June 2012	*$*	*51,257*
USGS Contracts July-Sept 2012	$	51,257
Total	***$***	***147,486***

Conservation Law Foundation Proposal to Assess RI Stormwater Utility District Enabling Legislation

RHODE ISLAND BAYS, RIVERS, & WATERSHEDS COORDINATION TEAM

Discretionary Project Funding Application Cover Sheet

I. APPLICANT INFORMATION

Organization	Conservation Law Foundation			Date	7-2-2012
Street Address	55 Dorrance Street – Suite 202				
City	Providence	State	RI	ZIP	02903
Phone	401-351-1102	E-mail Address	akullenberg@clf.org		
Project Lead Contact & Title	Amy Kullenberg, Staff Attorney				
Project Start Date	July 1st 2012	Project End Date	September 1st 2012		
Project Title	Rhode Island Stormwater Utility District Feasibility Research				

II. PROJECT SUMMARY

CLF will perform an assessment of Rhode Island's "Stormwater Management and Utility District Act of 2002," R.I.G.L. 46-61-1 et seq. Drawing on its experience working with stormwater management initiatives throughout New England, CLF will evaluate Rhode Island's stormwater management statute to determine: (a) whether / where the statute might be vulnerable to legal challenge; (b) how a Rhode Island court of first impression might interpret this statute in light of how other municipal governance statutes have been interpreted by Rhode Island and New England courts; (c) whether / how stormwater utility district statutes have been challenged and interpreted in other New England states; and (d) how a fee structure could be established to assure economic fairness and effectiveness in reducing and managing stormwater runoff.

III. RI BAYS, RIVERS & WATERSHEDS SYSTEMS-LEVEL PLAN PRIORITIES TO BE ADDRESSED

Goal III, Policy III.5: Minimize impervious cover to prevent stormwater runoff from impairing water quality and habitat.

Goal X, Policy X.2: Promote and practice integrated (regional, state, and local) water management

Goal XIII, Policy XIII.7: Significantly enhance stormwater control and management state-wide.

IV. PROJECT COST

TOTAL PROJECT COST	$7,500.00
BRWCT FUNDS REQUESTED	$2,500.00

See following page for instructions.

CLF'S PROJECT PROPOSAL FOR A RHODE ISLAND STORMWATER UTILITY DISTRICT FEASIBILITY RESEARCH PROJECT [1]

As the negative consequences of storm-water pollution become more well-known, many states are examining the possibility of establishing Stormwater Utility Districts to provide funding for the costs associated with effective stormwater management. [2]

Approximately 1,200 stormwater utility programs have been established nation-wide,[3] including programs in Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont. Although the Rhode Island General Assembly enacted the *Rhode Island Stormwater Management and Utility District Act of 2002* (R.I.G.L. §45-61-1 *et seq.*), no Rhode Island city or town has yet attempted to establish a stormwater utility district.

CLF has been very involved in the creation of stormwater utility programs in Vermont and Massachusetts; CLF is able to draw upon this past work to aid in implementing effective stormwater management programs in Rhode Island.

CLF will evaluate the statutory scheme outlined in R.I.G.L. §45-61-1 *et seq.* to determine: (a) whether / where the statute might be vulnerable to legal challenge; (b) how a Rhode Island court of first impression might interpret this statute in light of how other municipal governance statutes have been interpreted by Rhode Island and New England courts; (c) whether / how stormwater utility district statutes have been challenged and interpreted in other New England states; and (d) how a fee structure

---

[1] CLF has structured this project as a baseline research project which can be used as the foundation for developing sound policy in the implementation of Rhode Island's stormwater management statute. By engaging in this research project, CLF does not intend to create an attorney-client relationship with the BRWCT, or to be providing formal legal advice to the BRWCT or its affiliates within Rhode Island state government. Also, by virtue of performing this research with support from BRWCT, CLF does not waive any right to engage in future enforcement of any applicable local, state, or federal law.

[2] Negative consequences of stormwater runoff in Rhode Island include: street flooding, property damage, beach closures, closed shellfishing waters, and impaired water quality. See http://www.uri.edu/ce/wq/NEMO/Workshops-Support/PDFs/StormwaterUtilityDistricts/SeriesFlyer_101311.pdf

[3] See http://des.nh.gov/organization/divisions/water/stormwater/utilities.htm#example

could be established to assure economic fairness and effectiveness in reducing and managing stormwater runoff.

CLF has designed this project to: (a) take place over the Summer of 2012; and (b) conclude in the Fall of 2012. At the conclusion of the project, CLF-RI will produce a report of its research. CLF estimates a target date for release of its report as September 1, 2012.

CLF has estimated the cost for this research project to be $7,500.00. In addition to the funds CLF is seeking from the Rhode Island Bays, Rivers, and Watersheds Coordination Team ($2,500.00), CLF has also secured $5,000 in other funding to support this project.

Stormwater runoff pollution has been a negative news story in Rhode Island on a steady basis for the past two years. Beach closures and shell-fishing bans have been well-documented in the news. Because Rhode Island has such a geographically condensed combination of pristine areas, sensitive habitats, and industrial and heavily populated urban areas, stormwater runoff has the capacity to wreak havoc in the treasured Narragansett Bay, as well as in poorer communities throughout the state.

CLF believes, along with XII.7.v of the Rhode Island Bays, Rivers, and Watershed Coordination Team's 2009-2013 Strategy Tables, that it is important to "help local governments establish utility districts to provide a stable source of funding for stormwater management, including needed retrofits of existing systems." CLF believes this research project would be an important first step in the creation of these utility districts.

The initial beneficiaries of this project would be state and local planning personnel, as well as watershed groups and other stakeholders who may become engaged in the development of stormwater utility districts. Ultimately, when stormwater utility districts are successfully implemented in Rhode Island, the state's citizens – and visitors to the *Ocean State* – will benefit, as well.

BUDGET FORM: FY 2012-FY 2013

GRANT RECEPIENT: Conservation Law Foundation, Rhode Island			STATE FISCAL YEAR:	
PROJECT LEAD:			DURATION (months) : July 2012-August 2012	
SALARIES AND WAGES:	person-months		BRWCT Funds	Other Funds
	No. of People	Amount of Effort		
1. Senior Personnel				
a. Amy Kullenberg	1	0.37 FTE		
b.				
Sub Total:				
2. Other Personnel				
Total Salaries and Wages:			$1780	$3561
B. FRINGE BENEFITS:				
Total Personnel (A and B):			$356	$712
C. PERMANENT EQUIPMENT:				
D. EXPENDABLE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT:				
F. PUBLICATION AND DOCUMENTATION COSTS:				
G. OTHER COSTS:				
1. Office Supplies			$35	$69
2. Library and Research			$42	$85
3. Utilities			$33	$67
4. Telecom			$83	$166
5. Facilities			$112	$223
6. Insurance			$59	$117
Total Other Costs:				
TOTAL DIRECT COST (A through G):			$2500	$5000
INDIRECT COST:				
TOTAL COSTS:			$2500	$5000

CRMC: Proposal for seed funding for a new "Beach" SAMP

Discretionary Project Funding Application Cover Sheet

I. APPLICANT INFORMATION			
Organization: Coastal Resources Management Council			Date: 07-19-2012
Street Address: Stedman Government Center; 4808 Tower Hill Road			
City: Wakefield	State: RI	ZIP: 02879	
Phone: 401-783-3370	E-mail Address: jwillis@crmc.ri.gov		
Project Lead Contact & Title: Jeffrey M. Willis, Deputy Director			
Project Start Date: Immediate	Project End Date: Immediate + two years		
Project Title			

II. PROJECT SUMMARY
See Attached.

III. RI BAYS, RIVERS & WATERSHEDS SYSTEMS-LEVEL PLAN PRIORITIES TO BE ADDRESSED
Goal 1X Policies 1X.1 through 5

IV. PROJECT COST	
TOTAL PROJECT COST	$1 million
BRWCT FUNDS REQUESTED	$50,000

Applicant: Coastal Resources Management Council

Proposal: The Beach SAMP

Project Summary

As has been highlighted of late, erosion along the Matunuck (SK) shoreline may well represent the proverbial tip of the iceberg; the Rhode Island shoreline is facing significant erosion issues and more needs to be done in analyzing the issue, communicating the issue, and proposing management measures to deal with the growing dilemma. Two projects represent this statement. The road at Matunuck is already in a compromised state as the coastal feature is within six (6) feet of the shoulder. One good coastal storm could significantly damage the road and immediately interrupt the sole access to approximately 250 homes and the water supply system for over 1600 homes in the area, which also feeds the area's fire suppression system. Additionally, Corn Neck Road on Block Island is protected by a small revetment and is exposed to the forces of Block Island Sound. If the road breaks through in a storm, it will segment the island.

Because there is a clear public health and safety purpose to protecting certain shoreline segments, the CRMC has therefore proposed a comprehensive approach to addressing erosion issues along the entire Rhode Island shoreline (via the development of a new "Beach" SAMP) that first begins with a look at more "at-risk" shoreline segments (via regulatory amendments to the existing Salt Ponds Region SAMP).

Therefore in the short-term, the CRMC has begun the development of policies and regulations for addressing erosion-related issues at two "experimental areas" within its Salt Ponds Region SAMP: one being Matunuck; the other Misquamicut (Westerly). Envisioned would be attendant regulations outlining what would be allowed as "experimental" measures that includes monitoring guidelines and bonding for removal. This would allow the CRMC to try some techniques such as geo-mattresses that slow or abate the erosion but do not have the damaging impacts that full-out sea walls have. The agency staff has monitored a number of these systems throughout the world and is familiar with many of the suggested techniques that current property owners have recently proposed to the agency. Unfortunately, it is recognized that in reflective headlands with little sediment load for collection (ie: Matunuck) some of these solutions may fail. This does not mean, however that there aren't some systems worth trying, specifically geo-mattresses, which show a promise in this regard. The Misquamicut area is suggested because it represents another area that is similarly problematic regarding erosion but has characteristic beach faces with lower profiles that may need different solutions. An experimental designation for these two shoreline segments will allow for different approaches that, if determined to be successful, are envisioned to become transferrable to other shoreline types in the state. This short-term effort is underway.

For the long term, the CRMC is proposing to perform an analysis and develop a strategy that will address the erosion issue for the entire shoreline of the state. This will require a SAMP approach much like the Ocean SAMP. We anticipate a process that involves a research component, a stakeholder's component, a legal component, and an aggressive public education and outreach component. The CRMC is suggesting a phased planning approach for this effort where the south shore of Rhode Island and Block Island is looked at first and then the rest of the state's shoreline systems. The new SAMP will need the scientific resources of URI, the various municipal governments' commitment and backing, as well as the participation of NGO's, trade groups, and the public.

This proposal to the Coordination Team is made towards realizing "start-up" funds of this longer-term effort.

Project Goal, Methods and Outcomes of a "Beach" SAMP

The objective of a "Beach" SAMP is to understand how coastal processes, specifically frontal erosion and inundation by storm surge and sea level rise, affect the shoreline and adjacent areas for the entire state of Rhode Island. These processes, coupled with a 'line in the sand' mentality induced by the presence of infrastructure and properties along the coast, present unique and challenging management problems in the nea future. With continued (perhaps increased) storminess and the potential for accelerated sea level rise, planning needs to begin now to address future impacts to public and private properties, infrastructure and public access along the shoreline. The SAMP process, using the best available science and stakeholder involvement will provide a holistic approach to evaluating future planning and development of the Rhode Island shoreline.

Areas of critical concern, where public and private properties and infrastructure are at risk, based on historic shoreline change rates and inundation models creating using 2011 LiDAR digital elevation models will be identified. The role of shoreface depositional platform will be examined in concert with observed shoreline change, to better understand the available sediment budget along the shoreline.

A communication strategy that responds to the needs and issues of the stakeholders will be developed. It is likely that periodic stakeholder meetings, library lecture series, site visits with stakeholders to key shore sites, and presentations at local civic events will take place to share existing research as well as encourage discussio of some of the priority issues. Communication/outreach products including a fact sheet and web page will be developed.

Additionally, development of a legal analysis on related south shore issues, including an inventory and analysi of existing statutes and regulations. This will involve engaging the Rhode Island Sea Grant Law Program located at Roger Williams University to complete this effort.

This project will consist of three phases, beginning with the Rhode Island South Shore (Napatree Point to Poi Judith and Block Island) in year 1. Subject to refinement, Phase 2 will focus on the east facing shoreline of Narragansett and south facing shorelines of Aquidneck Island and Little Compton. Phase 3 will focus on areas of Narragansett Bay, where the elevation and materials comprising the shoreline cause them to be susceptible to frontal erosion and inundation. Each phase will consist of both a technical and a public outreach component

At the end of year one, organize a public event that presents the research developed to date, summarize the legal findings, and identify additional research needs and next steps for the SAMP.

A preliminary proposal and budget has been prepared by URI's Geology Department and the CRC/Sea Grant program to assist the agency in this endeavor and represents the objectives, deliverables and a budget for Phas l of this effort. It is available under separate cover. Upon review of this initial preliminary proposal, the CRMC believes that the total cost for such a comprehensive effort will reach $1 million and has asked the University to refine the proposal to reflect that effort.

Audiences, Beneficiaries, Project Partners and Outcomes

The Stakeholders are envisioned to include federal and state government agencies, municipalities, local environmental organizations, historical societies, and chambers of commerce. Meetings with such will help

identify their issues of concern and opportunity, determine their preferred mechanisms for involvement, and gauge their level of understanding of the issues to serve as foundations for the outreach strategy. Likewise the beneficiaries are the same as well as the area property owners, state and municipal comprehensive planning efforts, economic development concerns, and of course the public as a whole. The primary state project partners would be the CRMC and the University of Rhode Island with significant input from Statewide Planning, DEM, EDC, State Building Commissioner, RIEMA, and the Sea Grant Law Program at a minimum.

Project Budget

The CRMC is seeking $50,000 from the Coordination Team which will be earmarked for a Cooperative Agreement with URI and purposed for initial SAMP stakeholder meeting and involvement coordination, as well as to begin the education and outreach effort and strategy needed to make the project successful.

See attached initial preliminary URI proposal for task specific details, as well as for contextual purposes, as the proposal will be revised to reflect the larger monetary effort expected to be needed.

The total project costs are expected to be $1 million (estimated). The CRMC is seeking funding for such from the Governor's office, the state's coastal communities, NOAA, the Rhode Island Foundation and other similar funding sources.

BUDGET FORM: FY 2012-FY 2013

GRANT RECEPIENT: CRMC			STATE FISCAL YEAR: FY13	
PROJECT LEAD: Jeff Willis			DURATION (months) : 24-36	
SALARIES AND WAGES:	person-months		**BRWCT Funds**	**Other Funds**
1. Senior Personnel	**No. of People**	**Amount of Effort**		
a.				
b.				
Sub Total:				
2. Other Personnel				
Total Salaries and Wages:				
B. FRINGE BENEFITS:				
Total Personnel (A and B):				
C. PERMANENT EQUIPMENT:				
D. EXPENDABLE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT:				
F. PUBLICATION AND DOCUMENTATION COSTS:				
G. OTHER COSTS:				
1. Contractual			50,000	950,000
2. – cooperative agreement with URI Dept of Geology &				
3. Sea Grant Program				
4.				
5.				
Etc.				
Total Other Costs:				
TOTAL DIRECT COST (A through G):			50,000	950,000
INDIRECT COST:				
TOTAL COSTS:			50,000	950,000

RI DEM and RI WRB: Proposal to continue funding stream gages and large river monitoring program
7/25/12

Authorization for Period July- September 2012
The FY12 budget for the RI Bays, Rivers and Watersheds Coordination Team (BRWCT) included funding from the CT OSPAR allocation to support the extension of the agreement between the State of Rhode Island (DEM) and the United States Geological Survey (USGS) for water related monitoring. The resulting agreement, which constituted a consolidation of three prior agreements, included: six water quality monitoring stations on large rivers, 13 continuous streamflow gage stations and 19 groundwater level observation stations. The resulting agreement totaling $355,924 consists of $150,895 provided by USGS and $205,029 provided by RI (DEM) and covers the federal fiscal year period of October 2011 through September 2012. The agreement involves quarterly payments. Consistent with the CT budget RIDEM has paid out on this agreement for work through March 2012. The remainder of the contract ($102,514.50) is planned to be paid from the FY13 OSPAR allocation (as forecast in the CT estimated budget). Consistent with this, RIDEM is seeking to confirm permission to make payments for the work through September 2012.

Continuation of USGS Monitoring – October 2012 – September 2013
Over the next two months, the RIDEM agreement will need to be negotiated and renewed with USGS to allow continuation of the monitoring programs reflected in the current agreement. A new agreement would be expected to start in October. A request to seek authorization to use an additional amount of FY13 CT OSPAR funds for this purpose, as forecast in prior estimated CT FY13 budget estimates, is expected to be placed before the team at its September 2012 meeting.

Information relevant to the negotiation has recently emerged from the Water Resources Board. The WRB also maintains a funding agreement with USGS that is tied to the state fiscal year. In developing its agreement, the WRB has identified it will need about $12,000 in additional state funding to sustain its monitoring agreement due to increased pricing from USGS. RIDEM and WRB both believe responding to this issue should be done within the context of the overall program of collaborative USGS monitoring programs. Toward that end, RIDEM and WRB believe it would be beneficial to work toward a single joint funding agreement with USGS for the State of RI. The agencies plan to explore the feasibility of doing so as part of the upcoming agreement renewal and will jointly develop recommendations for proceeding. This may include consolidation into a single agreement, adjustments in the level of work being performed to align with available resources and consideration of additional partnering opportunities. A plan for FY13, jointly developed by RIDEM and WRB, will be presented in September outlining options as needed for the CT to consider.