



HERRERA

Meeting Notes

Regional Spill Hotline Feasibility Study

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

Date: Apr. 30, 2020 **Location:** Skype
Project Number 18-06919-000

Attendees

Anne Dettelbach (City of Redmond)	Todd Hunsdorfer (King County)
Laura Haren (City of Kent)	Rebecca Dugopolski (Herrera)
Eric Autry (Seattle Public Utilities)	Jennifer Schmidt (Herrera)
Jason Quigley (Skagit County)	Katie Wingrove (Herrera)
Brandi Lubliner (Ecology)	

Meeting Objectives

- Review and provide feedback on the draft Options Matrix
- Review changes to final Interview Summary Report (focuses on Executive Summary)
- Outline action items and next steps

Meeting Agenda

Item	Lead	Approximate Duration (minutes)
Introductions	All	5
Update on project status	Rebecca	5
System research discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview • Review draft Options Matrix and discuss the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposed evaluation criteria – anything missing? ○ Proposed systems – anything missing? ○ Format – any changes needed? ○ Level of detail – any changes needed? ○ Optional vs. required features ○ Prioritizing features ○ Relevance to final report and recommendations 	Jenn	60
Final Interview Summary Report discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on executive summary 	Rebecca	15
Action items and next steps	Rebecca and Todd	5
	Total	90

Our next TAC meeting is anticipated to be scheduled in July 2020 and most likely will be combined with a Source ID Subgroup meeting.

Meeting Notes

Update on Project Status

- Still on track to wrap things up by the end of the year (per grant timeline)

System Research Discussion – Overview

- A narrative will be provided with the full draft Options Matrix
- Herrera provided an overview of the proposed process
- Consider how to summarize the complexity of a system (include this in the system writeups)

System Research Discussion – Questions/Recommended Revisions to Options Matrix

- Column G – Forms are customizable to include dropdown menus
 - ERTS is not customizable for local jurisdictions, and limited customization is available to Ecology
 - Consider changing to “Partial”
 - Clarify meaning of “customizable”; consider separating dropdown menu functionality from customization functionality or otherwise clarifying
 - Consider splitting “customizable to include dropdown menus” to be specific to receiving (internal) and reporting (external)
- Column J – Notifications can be received by spill responders in multiple formats
 - ERTS notifications go to Ecology spill responders via mobile phones, pagers, etc.
 - ERTS notifications are sent to jurisdictions generally via e-mail – this is not the intended focus of this feature category, which refers to internal communications for mobilizing spill response
 - Clarify who is doing the sending and who is doing the receiving (distinction for internal communication, communication with public, communication with other jurisdictions or agencies)
- Column K – Allows 2-way communication with external entity that submitted the report
 - Clarify who is doing the sending and who is doing the receiving
 - This item is intended for re-sending to the notifying party
- How does Column K relate to Column AE?
 - Clarify who is doing the sending and who is doing the receiving
 - Consider deleting column AE
- Column I – Alerting spill responders based on type of spill
 - Change to “High” priority because rapid alerts are critical; issue with ERTS is delay in notifications
 - Not necessarily a preference for automatic notification; dispatcher also works well for this function
- Column M – Integrate with Asset Management Systems
 - Would this be able to be linked to multiple types of asset management systems? Some jurisdictions may use Cartegraph, other may use Lucity, etc.
 - In narrative, clarify applicability for local implementation versus regional implementation; implementation issues are to be addressed for top three systems
- Consider adding the following to the summary memo that will accompany the matrix (or final report) – “Does it allow for alignment with local codes/policies?”
 - Example: Seattle requires that the City be notified of spills.
 - Will vary by jurisdiction

System Research Discussion – Questions/Recommended Revisions to Options Matrix (continued)

- Consider shifting Columns AB, AE, and AF to Reporting section
- Change “TBD” priority to “Client Preference” if it is up to the jurisdiction to select high/moderate/low
- Consider changing more attributes to “Partial” to be more discerning
- Formatting:
 - Horizontal format seemed to work for everyone – lots of scrolling in either format
 - Could create another version that could be filtered and sorted more easily without the supplemental text details filled in
 - Filter by priority within each category – high, moderate, low (default arrangement should be consistent)
 - Filter by features
 - Post-meeting note: Research team is leaning towards shifting matrix back to a vertical format to provide better sorting/filtering capabilities

Final Interview Summary Report Discussion

- Add clarification that report recommendations (as listed in Executive Summary) apply both to improving existing programs and/or regional applications
- Revise recommendation on public awareness and education; emphasis should be awareness of where and how to report spills (rather than accuracy of reporting)
- Otherwise, the TAC approved closing out the report.

Action Items

Action	Due Date	Assigned To
Submit final comments on Interview Summary Report	May 7	TAC
Submit final Interview Summary Report	May 14	Herrera
Update Options Matrix per group comments; fill in matrix for 10-12 systems & develop draft narrative (tech memo)	July 1	Herrera