

Regional Spill Hotline Feasibility Study

Final Report Outline

Executive Summary (~1 page)

Project Goal: Gather information and conduct an assessment on the feasibility and desire for a regional or statewide common “hotline” for citizens and municipal staff in Washington State to report spills and environmental incidents.

Per SAM outline: Briefly state the purpose of the study, principal results, and major conclusions

Acknowledgements (~1/2 page)

The regional spill hotline feasibility study is a Source Identification Information Repository (SIDIR) project that is being implemented through the Stormwater Action Monitoring (SAM) program with oversight from the Stormwater Group (SWG). A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was also formed to provide guidance and review deliverables for this study. The project team would like to acknowledge the following contributors to this study:

- SAM
- SWG
- Source ID Subgroup
- TAC
- King County and Consultant Team (Herrera, Hardwick Research)
- Survey, interview, and vendor participants (general acknowledgement, not specific names)

Introduction (~1/2 page)

Per SAM outline: Briefly review of current knowledge, purpose of project, aim to address SWG questions

Study Area

The study area for this feasibility study included the entire state of Washington

Information Gathering

- Survey
- Municipal Interviews
- State Agency Interviews
- Technical Interviews
- Targeted Vendor Interviews

Key Findings

Per SAM outline: 3-5 bullet points that convey the core findings.

Commented [RD1]: Note to reviewers: This is from the SAM outline. Are there any specific questions from the SWG that we should plan on addressing?

Commented [RD2]: Note to reviewers: Made this a subheading under the Introduction (was the fifth item in Ecology’s SAM report outline). Removed reference to “site selection” since that isn’t applicable to this project.

Commented [RD3]: Note to reviewers: We are planning on showing these pieces graphically feeding into the final report

Commented [RD4]: Note to reviewers: Moved this down slightly (was the third item in Ecology’s SAM report outline)

Results & Discussion (~3 pages)

Commented [RD5]: Note to reviewers: This section of the report is intended to be graphical. Bulleted text will most likely be conveyed via graphics and/or tables.

Is a regional spill hotline system **feasible**? **Yes** No

What specific formats of a regional spill hotline system are feasible?

- Software package systems exist- custom build is not necessary
- Technology allows for multi-jurisdictional access and data management
- Mobile application, web form, call center, e-mail components, etc.

Is a regional spill hotline system **preferred**? **Yes** **No**

What are the reasons that a regional spill hotline system is not preferred?

- Local jurisdictional system is satisfactory and specific to local jurisdictional needs
- ERTS is satisfactory for regional needs and is a requirement by Ecology

Why consider implementation of a regional spill hotline system?

- Ecology did not intend ERTS to serve as a regional spill hotline system
- ERTS has limited functionality for analytics and currently has manual follow up for spill response and 2-way communication with individual jurisdictions
- A regional spill hotline system can provide long-term tracking and analytic capabilities
- A regional spill hotline system can be automated and increase efficiency and data accessibility across multiple regions

What are the **benefits** of a regional spill hotline system?

- Bulk cost savings potential as a centralized spill hotline system
- Integration of ERTS as an automated workflow with a regional spill hotline system
- Management and access to data for reports submitted anywhere and automatically routed to a specific jurisdiction
- Ability to create a hybrid system at additional cost to maintain individual jurisdiction spill response and asset management systems

What about **ERTS**?

- How does ERTS get used alongside regional spills?
- Recommendation that ERTS and regional spill hotline system uses be clarified
- Ability for direct workflow integration of spill reporting and ERTS reporting

Recommendations (~5 pages)

Commented [RD6]: Note to reviewers: This section of the report is intended to be graphical. Bulleted text will most likely be conveyed via graphics and/or tables.

What are the **recommended core components** for a regional spill hotline system?

- Centralized host
- Central web form
- Central Call Center
- Central Cloud Data Storage
- No mobile application
- ERTS integration

How do the core components address **equity and accessibility**?

- Hotline number vs. digital solutions
- Incorporating multiple languages
- Widespread coverage

Who would **manage** a regional spill hotline system?

Options include:

- "Hosting" municipality
- State or other government agency
- Create a non-profit (or house with an existing non-profit)

What **vendor** is recommended for a regional spill hotline system?

Rock Solid OR SeeClickFix (must include supplemental call center)

- Both systems meet core components and desired features identified through interviews
- No specialized software or technology needed for implementation (cloud based)
- Trainings are provided by each system (comparable)
- What are the anonymous reporting workflows?
- **What would happen to local mobile applications, programs, and workflows?**
- What is the timeframe to set up these systems?
- Can formats be downloaded for local storage?

Commented [RD7]: Note to reviewers: Graphic (in progress) showing the workflow of a regional spill hotline system would be incorporated here

What would a **hybrid system** look like?

- Alternative hybrid recommended workflows, one for Rock Solid, one for SeeClickFix
- What hybrid system features are available with each system?
- Asset management hybrid system workflow differences
- What does the hybrid data system for capturing both regional spill and jurisdiction-specific CRM look like?
- How are notifications directed to non-participants in a regional spill hotline system under a hybrid system?

What are the **cost factors** for implementation?

- Payment/cost structures for core system
- Add ons/integrations for hybrid system

What are the **next steps**?

References

We may not need this section, but leaving it in as a placeholder per SAM outline for now

Appendices

- Appendix 1: Regional Spill Hotline Feasibility Study Interview Summary Report
- Appendix 2: Options Matrix Narrative for the Regional Spill Hotline Feasibility Study

Commented [RD8]: Note to reviewers: We are planning on including the full Interview Summary Report, minus the detailed Survey Monkey responses in Appendix 1.