

Watersheds and Embayments Work Group
WebEx Online Meeting
Wednesday, Feb. 10, 2021 – Meeting Summary



Attendees:

Casey Personius, NYSDEC	Mark Parker, CTDEEP	Heather Johnson, FOB
Victoria O’Neill, NYSDEC	Kathleen Knight, CTDEEP	Judy Preston, CTSG
Sue Van Patten, NYSDEC	Kelly Streich, CTDEEP	Peter Linderoth, STS
Anthony Caniano, SCDOH	Eric Swenson, HHPC	Cayla Sullivan, EPA
Dave Dickson, UConn	Jimena Perez-Viscasillas, NYSG	Leah O’Neill, EPA
George Hoffman, SHTF	Evelyn Powers, IEC	Nikki Tachiki, EPA

Welcome:

- The meeting started quickly, and introductions were skipped as participant names were available in the WebEx participant list.

Presentation: WW Enhancement Proposal Review

- The entire meeting was dedicated to reviewing LISS FY21 Clean Waters and Healthy Watersheds enhancement proposals. C.Personius began with a quick overview of the process for evaluating proposals.
 - Slideshow: Participants in today's meeting had self-assigned proposals to review and present to the group. Slides were completed before the meeting and each reviewer presented their slide(s) during the presentation.
 - Individual Proposal review: all WEWG members were welcome to provide a thorough review of any and all proposals. The assigned presenter for each proposal was explicitly responsible for completing a thorough review of the proposal by completing a survey with questions specifically requested by EPA LISO office.
 - Proposal Rankings: After each proposal was presented to the group, by the assigned reviewer, there was a short amount of time for questions and discussion. Before moving onto the next slide/proposal, participants were asked to rank the proposal on a scale of 1-10 (10 being most important / highest priority) and to identify if project is eligible for other funding sources.
 - After the meeting participants and all WEWG members had a week to provide additional comments or feedback on the proposals.
- All feedback was collected and synthesized to provide to the LISS Management Committee.

- Numeric proposal rankings were provided in the spreadsheet for transparency and to allow for easy comparisons.
 - Proposals were also assigned a relative priority ranking of Low, Med, or High, as requested. Of the proposals reviewed, the 5 lowest and highest scoring were assigned a rank of Low and High, respectively. The remaining 10 (representing the IQR) were assigned a ranking of Medium.
 - Funding Source: For the funding source questions in the survey, participants were asked to select all appropriate funding sources for the proposal. The options were Enhancement Grants, LIS Futures Fund, LIS Research Grant, and LIS Stewardship Fund. If most responses, identified LIS enhancement grant than it was considered an appropriate funding source. If two or more responses also identified an alternative funding source, such as the Research Grant, than this proposal was also listed as an option in the spreadsheet. If the majority or responses identified an alternative funding source it was not considered appropriate for the enhancement grants by the WEWG.
 - Comments from surveys as well as meeting discussion were included in the final review spreadsheet. All potentially contradictory comments were included, to fully represent views of all WEWG members, unless discussions reconciled the differences during the meeting.
 - Both questions and answers were kept in the spreadsheet for reference.
- Please see spreadsheet for full review.

Great job and huge thank you to all you helped in the review process!

Next Meeting:

**Wednesday, May 12th
10am-12pm**