



Working together, restoring the river

DRAFT AGENDA
ALLIANCE OF ROUGE COMMUNITIES

Wednesday, December 12, 2007

1:30 – 3:30 p.m.

Costick Center, 28600 11 Mile, Farmington Hills

James W. Ridgway, P.E.
 Executive Director

Allen Park
 Auburn Hills
 Beverly Hills
 Bingham Farms
 Birmingham
 Bloomfield Hills
 Bloomfield Twp.
 Canton Twp.
 Commerce Twp.
 Dearborn
 Dearborn Heights
 Farmington
 Farmington Hills
 Franklin
 Garden City
 Inkster
 Lathrup Village
 Livonia
 Melvindale
 Northville
 Northville Twp.
 Novi
 Oakland County
 Orchard Lake
 Plymouth
 Plymouth Twp.
 Pontiac
 Redford Twp.
 Rochester Hills
 Romulus
 Southfield
 Superior Twp.
 Troy
 Van Buren Twp.
 Walled Lake
 Washtenaw County
 Wayne
 Wayne County
 Wayne County Airport
 Authority
 West Bloomfield Twp.
 Westland
 Wixom
 Ypsilanti Twp.

1. **Welcome** – Kurt Giberson, Chair
 - a. Roll Call/Determination of Quorum
 - b. Approval of June 27, 2007 Meeting Summary *Action*
 - c. Additions or changes to the Draft Meeting Agenda

2. **Treasurers/Finance Committee Report** (T. Faas - Treasurer)
 - a. Status of Alliance Invoice Payments *Information*
 - b. 2007 Budget/Expenditures Status Report *Information*
 - c. 2007 Budget Amendments *Action*
 - d. 2008 Fiduciary Services *Action*
 - e. 2008 Extension to ECT service contract *Action*
 - f. 2008 Budget Recommendations *Action*

7. **Executive Director Report** (J. Ridgway) *Information*
 - a. TMDL and *E. coli* update
 - b. NPDES Phase II permit update

8. **Rouge Program Office Report** (K. Cave) *Information*

9. **Standing Committee Reports** (K. Giberson)
 - a. Organization Committee (K. Heise/D. Payne – Co-Chairs)
 - i. ARC – County In Kind Contributions Policy *Action*
 - ii. Draft ARC Strategic Plan *Information*
 - b. PIE Committee (J. Lawson, Chair)
 - i. Progress Report *Information*
 - c. Technical Committee (G. Zorza, Vice Chair)
 - i. Progress Report *Information*
 - d. Grants Committee (P. Sanzica, Chair)
 - i. Progress Report *Information*

10. Opportunity for Public Comment (K. Giberson)

11. Summary of Actions of Full Alliance (K. Giberson)

12. Upcoming Meeting Schedule (K. Giberson)

13. Adjourn



MEETING NOTES
ALLIANCE OF ROUGE COMMUNITIES

June 27, 2007
Novi Civic Center
45175 W. Ten Mile Rd.
Novi, Michigan

Working together, restoring the river

Allen Park
Auburn Hills
Beverly Hills
Bingham Farms
Birmingham
Bloomfield Hills
Bloomfield Twp.
Canton Twp.
Commerce Twp.
Dearborn
Dearborn Heights
Farmington
Farmington Hills
Franklin
Garden City
Inkster
Lathrup Village
Livonia
Melvindale
Northville
Northville Twp.
Novi
Oak Park
Oakland County
Orchard Lake Village
Plymouth
Plymouth Twp.
Pontiac
Redford Twp.
Rochester Hills
Romulus
Southfield
Superior Twp.
Troy
Van Buren Twp.
Walled Lake
Washtenaw County
Wayne
Wayne County
Wayne County Airport Authority
West Bloomfield Twp.
Westland
Wixom
Ypsilanti Twp.

1. Welcome – Kurt Giberson, ARC Chair

- a. **Roll Call /Determination of Quorum** - Roll call was taken. The 26 members listed below were in attendance and sufficient for a quorum.

The following were in attendance:

Birmingham	Lathrup Village	Redford Twp.	Wayne County
Bloomfield Twp.	Livonia	Rochester Hills	Wayne County Airport Authority
Canton Twp.	Northville Twp.	Southfield	West Bloomfield Twp.
Dearborn	Novi	Troy	Westland
Farmington	Oak Park	Van Buren Twp.	Ypsilanti Twp.
Farmington Hills	Oakland County	Walled Lake	Wayne
Garden City	Plymouth Twp.	Washtenaw County Drain Commissioner	Washtenaw County Road Commission

The following were not in attendance:

Allen Park	Dearborn Heights	Plymouth	Village of Beverly Hills
Auburn Hills	Inkster	Pontiac	Village of Franklin
Bingham Farms	Melvindale	Romulus	Village of Orchard Lake
Bloomfield Hills	Northville	Superior Twp.	Wixom
Commerce Twp.			

- b. **Approval of March 1, 2007 Meeting Minutes.** - A motion was made to approve the meeting minutes, it was seconded, and passed unanimously.

2. Rouge River TMDL

Christine Alexander, Kevin Goodwin and John Suppnick from the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality presented three powerpoint presentations regarding Rouge River E. coli, Rouge River biota and Johnson Creek dissolved oxygen Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL). A copy of the powerpoint presentations are attached to the minutes. Each speaker presented and then took questions at the end of their presentation. The following is a summary of the questions received from the audience along with the MDEQ response.

a. **Rouge River E. coli – Christine Alexander**

Question: Will the MDEQ issue a response to comments made during the public comment period?

Answer: Yes, a comment/response document or letter will be prepared by the MDEQ.

Question: What are the plans to continue monitoring?

Answer: Monitoring will be limited until water quality improvements are implemented and progress is made. Monitoring is on a rotating watershed 5-year schedule and 2010 will be the earliest timeframe for MDEQ monitoring again, but this depends on the MDEQ's budget.

Question: Will you do (monitor) all sites again?

Answer: There were a relatively large number of sites sampled to develop the TMDL. It is unlikely that this number of sites would be sampled again in the near future.

Question: Will you sample for E. coli or pathogens?

Answer: E. coli will remain the standard.

Question: In regards to slide six of the E. coli slide show. The MDEQ feels that their priority is to hold people under their permit. Jim Ridgway noted that there have been many lawsuits when the non-point sources component of the formula (LAs) were not addressed sufficiently.

$$LC = \Sigma WLA_s + \Sigma LA_s + MOS$$

WLA = Point source allocation loading;

LA = Nonpoint source allocation loading;

MOS = margin of safety

Jim Ridgway asked the MDEQ about the LA component. Specifically, there is a need to clarify who exactly is responsible for this number. The communities should not be held to a higher standard because the regulatory agencies fail to monitor and enforce against non-regulated discharges.

Answer: There are no numeric limits for the nonpoint source component at this time – it might happen some day – meaning *all of the reductions are expected to come from the point sources which includes the MS4 communities.*

Question: How will these TMDLs affect our current storm water permits?

Answer: The MDEQ does not have plans to put numerical limits in the storm water Phase II permits.

Overall Comments from MDEQ: It is clear that the E. coli levels are improving and that ongoing activities in the Rouge River Watershed have demonstrated an improvement. The goal should be to continue on a similar path of actions. Use dry weather data to help prioritize IDEP activities. New sampling plans should be prioritized based on existing data.

b. **Rouge River Biota TMDL – Kevin Goodwin**

Question: Regarding slide 19 of Rouge River Biota TMDL presentation, it shows 22% reduction, what if you don't have agriculture?

Answer: There are other breakdowns for counties. The report used SEMCOG data. It's not an issue from a nonpoint standard.

Question: Regarding slide 12 of the presentation, you used 2 reports that are over 10 years old. Did you look at other data like Wayne County or Friends of the Rouge volunteer monitoring?

Answer: Yes, and they were still comparable – where the other reports showed hot spots the volunteer samples showed hot spots. We also collect in-stream sediment data, runoff and other things we need to look at, maybe we can work together.

Question: Where can you get the draft TDML reports?

Answer: We will forward the link on the MDEQ's website to the ARC members.

Question: Have you collected in-stream sediment data and how does this compare to the Land Use and Event Mean Concentration loadings?

Answer: Loads were from the lands use data which was provided by Purdue University and is outdated. Loads were not from streambank erosion estimates.

Additional Comment: Studies have shown that streambank erosion can account for 40% of sediment load in a stream.

Question: If land use runoff was corrected, if flow can't be controlled, how can we meet the standards?

Answer: TSS needs to be addressed, mitigating how the water gets to the stream. Addressing flows is important. Loads were from land use.

Question: Do you have examples of TMDLs lowering numbers?

Answer: It is too early in the TMDL process to see big changes.

Question: With the 15% reduction, if a watershed is making progress – just have them continue on?

Answer: Yes, keep going.

Question: Do you consider discharge a pollutant?

Answer: Flow volume is not a pollutant according to the Clean Water Act. We need to address flow management BMPs. Vermont is working with the EPA on flow.

Additional Comment: Are the numbers included in the TMDL goals or permit limits? The ARC is concerned that communities that are doing the most work are being asked to do more than those that have chosen to ignore the regulations.

c. **Johnson Creek Dissolved Oxygen TMDL – John Suppnick**

Question: Regarding the Rouge as an AOC – to delist do you have to meet TMDL to be off the 303 list?

Answer: The Rouge cannot be delisted until the 303 are met. They are trying to work that out between the two programs and need to continue to get them to agree on standards of designated use.

Question: Regarding the original permit data, do these need to be reduced by 80%?

Answer: No.

Question: Where is the land use data from?

Answer: From a Purdue database dated 1998ish.

Question: When the model runs with 0 loads from everyone else do they meet the standard?

Answer: The headwaters need to be clean. Levels of loads are attributed to the contributing agency.

Question: Are permits available in TMDL?

Answer: Yes.

Question: How does this area affect the permittees? Are there specific reductions for those communities' storm water permits?

Answer: It is not expected to have permit limits, rely on BMPs. It is not targeted specifically, but by a watershed.

Question: There is low flow and suspended solids located in Salem Twp. Has the Department of Agriculture done anything in helping reach these goals?

Answer: No.

Question: Has the County Extension participated?

Answer: No

Audience Comment: There is low flow – the people want to pump out of the creek to water their lawn – they see the agriculture is doing the same thing. They should be responsible.

Question: Are the TMDLs driven by cold water fish? Would it be different in warm water?

Answer: Yes, but we can't change that.

Question: Is the designated use legitimate? Trout are present in lower reach, can you look at use attainability?

Answer: No, probably not. Is Johnson Creek appropriately designated a trout stream, fisheries said yes.

Question: Did you look at permitted non-point and non-permit to see how realistic an 80% would be attainable?

Answer: No, look at individual BMPs.

3. Permit Reapplication

J. Ridgway stated that the permit package is not available yet. SEMCOG has a coordinated response. From the discussions to date, the communities contend that the proposed permit is not a cost-effective way to improve water quality but rather it has degenerated into a bureaucratic check list. The existing permit deadlines won't match the availability of the next permit requirements.

4. Watershed Plan Updates

K. Karll stated that the plan updates are due October 1, 2007. There may be a lag time to comment before you apply and it may be a simple form by MDEQ. We are hoping to see the new permit within the next month to comment on. MDEQ is still drafting the new permit and permit application so the timing of the new permit may not coincide with the permit reapplication date, so the MDEQ is hoping to have permittees submit a simple form indicating their intent to apply for the new permit once it's made available.

The MDEQ made a decision on terminated permits and will make a list available. The ARC should stay with a permit that is flexible. A copy of the list of terminated permits is attached to these minutes.

The ARC sent a letter to the MDEQ on behalf of all the SWAGs indicating that none of the Rouge Watershed Plans will be updated at this time. The SWAGs are supportive of evaluating the use of some portion of the monitoring budget to update the watershed plans over the next year.

5. Rouge Round VIII Subgrant Awards

K. Cave reviewed the attached memo recommending projects to receive funding under the Rouge VIII Subgrant Program of the Rouge River National Wet Weather Demonstration Project. K. Cave stated that there were more projects than money available. K. Cave reminded everyone that this is a short amount of time to give out money. December 2008 is the end date, get those IAAs signed and get projects started. K. Cave stated that they are working with the EPA to get the date moved out.

K. Cave also informed the ARC that there should be funds available to support the ARC in 2008.

6. Standing Committee Reports

a. Organizational Committee (Kurt Giberson, Dearborn)

Progress Report - K. Giberson stated that the committee has drafted a policy regarding dues for counties. The draft will go to the Executive Committee for review and then to the full ARC. This will allow us to finalize the bylaws.

b. Public Involvement and Education Committee (PIE) (Chair Jennifer Lawson, Troy)

Progress Report – J. Lawson reported that the committee's next meeting will be in Beverly Hills on July 12, 2007. J. Lawson informed the ARC that the next round of Rouge posters for the Lower 1 and Lower 2 are close to being ready for review. J. Lawson also stated that Canton Township prepared a video regarding the ARC which all members will receive upon leaving the meeting.

7. Summary of Actions of Full Alliance

- a. Adoption of March 1, 2007 minutes

8. Adjourn

Alliance of Rouge Communities Status Report
2007 Fiscal Year
Updated 11/30/2007

Activity	Budget*	Paid	Remaining Balance
Monitoring Program			
- Baseline Sampling Program	\$281,884	\$174,488	\$107,396
- Rouge Data Dissemination	\$4,000	\$3,988	\$12
- Continuous Monitoring (USGS)	\$29,850	\$26,000	\$3,850
- Lab Services for SWPPI Monitoring	\$12,000	\$7,290	\$4,710
- IDEP Support	\$7,514	\$7,514	\$0
- 5 Year Monitoring Plan (2008-2012)	\$8,000	\$6,667	\$1,333
- Pursue Other Grant Funding Opportunities	\$15,000	\$554	\$14,446
- Evaluate Data Sharing Opportunities	\$1,000	\$970	\$30
Subwatershed Advisory Group Facilitation	\$6,047	\$3,863	\$2,184
Public Education/Involvement Activities			
- Long-Term Planning Efforts for ARC PIE	\$5,000	\$4,980	\$20
- Household Hazardous Waste Committee Facilitation	\$10,000	\$3,187	\$6,813
- "Measuring Our Success" Posters	\$36,000	\$25,831	\$10,169
- Information Packet for ARC Members/Local Officials	\$7,000	\$2,864	\$4,136
- Two Onsite Sewage Disposal System Workshops	\$5,000	\$4,944	\$56
- Research Financial Sustainability of PIE Programs	\$7,000	\$0	\$7,000
- Radio Ads Promoting Fertilizer Use Awareness	\$2,572	\$2,572	\$0
- Municipal Training Materials Printing	\$3,000	\$2,042	\$959
Staff Support to Alliance			
- ARC Staff Support	\$120,966	\$95,825	\$25,141
- ARC Insurance (David Chapman Agency)	\$4,100	\$4,100	\$0
- Public Education Committee Support	\$19,859	\$14,317	\$5,542
Total Budgeted	\$585,792	\$391,996	\$193,796
Contingency (Not Budgeted)	\$117,870		
Total Available Funds for 2007	\$703,662		

Amount Paid from Alliance Dues	\$198,048
Amount Paid from Federal Grant	\$193,948

Alliance Dues Received	\$353,881
Alliance Dues Available for Future Bills in FY07 Budget	\$155,833

* Including amendment to be approved by Full ARC on December 12, 2007.

Alliance of Rouge Communities Status Report
2007 Fiscal Year
Updated 11/30/2007

Community	Cost Allocation [7]	2007 Assessment Paid
Member Communities		
Allen Park	\$759	\$759
Auburn Hills	\$257	\$257
Beverly Hills	\$2,866	\$2,866
Bingham Farms	\$624	\$624
Birmingham	\$3,045	\$3,045
Bloomfield Hills	\$2,522	\$2,522
Bloomfield Twp.	\$16,006	\$16,006
Canton Twp.	\$25,432	\$25,432
Commerce Twp.	\$522	\$522
Dearborn	\$24,214	\$24,214
Dearborn Heights	\$8,912	\$8,912
Farmington	\$2,605	\$2,605
Farmington Hills	\$25,226	\$25,226
Franklin	\$1,453	\$1,453
Garden City	\$6,815	\$6,815
Inkster	\$6,468	\$6,468
Lathrup Village	\$1,220	\$1,220
Livonia	\$29,013	\$29,013
Melvindale	\$2,635	\$2,635
Northville	\$1,758	\$1,758
Northville Twp.	\$9,525	\$9,525
Novi	\$15,628	\$15,628
Oakland County	\$0	n/a
Orchard Lake	\$114	\$114
Plymouth	\$2,210	\$2,210
Plymouth Twp.	\$10,358	\$10,358
Pontiac	\$508	\$508
Redford Twp.	\$12,168	\$12,168
Rochester Hills	\$1,875	\$1,875
Romulus	\$2,075	\$2,075
Southfield	\$18,793	\$18,793
Superior Twp.	\$7,359	\$7,359
Troy	\$4,395	\$4,395
Van Buren Twp.	\$6,326	\$6,326
Walled Lake	\$737	\$737
Washtenaw County	\$0	n/a
Wayne	\$5,153	\$5,153
Wayne County	\$0	n/a
West Bloomfield Twp.	\$12,851	\$12,851
Westland	\$20,255	\$20,255
Wixom	\$528	\$528
Ypsilanti Twp.	\$1,054	\$1,054
Sub Totals	\$294,264	\$294,264
Percent Confirmed		100.0%

Other Items that Affect 2007 Dues		
	Cost Allocation	Balance to Date
Prevoius Years Unused Dues	\$57,351	\$57,351
WCAA	\$2,266	\$2,266
Other Items Total	\$59,617	\$59,617

Total (Assessment and Other Items)	\$353,881	\$353,881
---	------------------	------------------

Alliance of Rouge Communities Status Report
Payment Status Report
2007 Budget Year
Updated 11/30/2007

Vendor	Invoice #	Invoice Amount	Amount Paid	Date Paid	Total per Vendor
Activity: Baseline Sampling Program					
CDM (RPO)	51	\$47,252.98	\$47,252.98	05/25/07	
CDM (RPO)	53	\$14,469.16	\$14,469.16	06/26/07	
CDM (RPO)	54	\$10,587.75	\$10,587.75	7/27/2007	
ECT (Executive Director)	072640 (#4)	\$701.70	\$701.70	7/27/2007	
ECT (Executive Director)	070350 (#6)	\$1,322.62	\$1,322.62	8/27/2007	
CDM (RPO)	55	\$35,746.47	\$35,746.47	9/25/2007	
ECT (Executive Director)	073621 (#9)	\$432.59	\$432.59	9/25/2007	
ECT (Executive Director)	074092 (#12)	\$8,064.64	\$8,064.64	10/30/2007	
CDM (RPO)	56	\$55,910.01	\$55,910.01	11/27/2007	
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
Subtotal:					\$174,487.92
Activity: Rouge Data Dissemination					
CDM (RPO)	51	\$652.44	\$652.44	05/25/07	
CDM (RPO)	53	\$189.62	\$189.62	06/26/07	
CDM (RPO)	56	\$3,145.48	\$3,145.48	11/27/2007	
Subtotal: CDM (RPO)					\$3,987.54
Activity: Continuous Monitoring					
USGS	7-2445-00032 (#1)	\$2,900.00	\$2,900.00	4/23/2006	
USGS	7-2445-00044 (#2)	\$11,550.00	\$11,550.00	7/27/2007	
USGS	8-2445-00017 (#3)	\$11,550.00	\$11,550.00	10/30/2007	
USGS			\$0.00		
Subtotal: USGS					\$26,000.00
Activity: Lab Services for SWPPI Monitoring					
E-Lab Analytical	20-0705164-0 (#3)	\$72.00	\$72.00	05/25/07	
Paragon Laboratories, Inc	48776 (#33)	\$45.00	\$45.00	06/26/07	
Paragon Laboratories, Inc	48777 (#34)	\$2,119.50	\$2,119.50	06/26/07	
E-Lab Analytical	20-0705539-0 (#4)	\$72.00	\$72.00	06/26/07	
Paragon Laboratories, Inc	49166 (#36)	\$1,998.00	\$1,998.00	7/31/2007	
Paragon Laboratories, Inc	49514 (#37)	\$688.50	\$688.50	8/28/2007	
Paragon Laboratories, Inc	49517 (#38)	\$144.00	\$144.00	8/28/2007	
E-Lab Analytical	20-0708476-0 (#5)	\$72.00	\$72.00	9/22/2007	
E-Lab Analytical	20-0709312-0 (#19)	\$54.00	\$54.00	10/30/2007	
E-Lab Analytical	20-0709488-0 (#20)	\$18.00	\$18.00	10/30/2007	
E-Lab Analytical	20-0710080-0 (#21)	\$72.00	\$72.00	10/30/2007	
Paragon Laboratories, Inc	50722 (#42)	\$1,863.00	\$1,863.00	11/27/2007	
E-Lab Analytical	20-0710548-0 (#23)	\$72.00	\$72.00	11/27/2007	
Subtotal: Laboratories					\$7,290.00

Activity: IDEP Support					
CDM (RPO)	51	\$7,456.03	\$7,456.03	05/25/07	
CDM (RPO)	54	\$58.05	\$58.05	7/27/2007	
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
Subtotal: IDEP Support					\$7,514.08
Activity: 5 Year Monitoring Plan (2008-2012)					
ECT (Executive Director)	072640 (#4)	\$2,867.64	\$2,867.64	7/27/2007	
ECT (Executive Director)	070350 (#6)	\$140.34	\$140.34	8/27/2007	
CDM (RPO)	55	\$379.25	\$379.25	9/25/2007	
ECT (Executive Director)	073621 (#9)	\$1,279.26	\$1,279.26	9/25/2007	
ECT (Executive Director)	074092 (#12)	\$356.13	\$356.13	10/30/2007	
CDM (RPO)	56	\$1,644.57	\$1,644.57	11/27/2007	
Subtotal:					\$6,667.19
Activity: Pursue Other Grant Funding Opportunities					
ECT (Executive Director)	074092 (#12)	\$554.20	\$554.20	10/30/2007	
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
Subtotal: CDM (RPO)					\$554.20
Activity: Evaluate Data Sharing Opportunities					
ECT (Executive Director)	073621 (#9)	\$831.30	\$831.30	9/25/2007	
ECT (Executive Director)	074092 (#12)	\$138.55	\$138.55	10/30/2007	
			\$0.00		
Subtotal: Executive Director					\$969.85
Total: Monitoring Program					\$227,470.78
Activity: Subwatershed Facilitation					
CDM (RPO)	53	\$997.50	\$997.50	06/26/07	
ECT (Executive Director)	072639 (#3)	\$2,543.10	\$2,543.10	7/27/2007	
ECT (Executive Director)	070282 (#5)	\$322.78	\$322.78	8/27/2007	
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
Total: Subwatershed Facilitation					\$3,863.38
Activity: Long-Term Planning Efforts for ARC PIE					
ECT (Executive Director)	072260 (#2)	\$907.45	\$907.45	06/28/07	
ECT (Executive Director)	073533 (#8)	\$144.71	\$144.71	9/25/2007	
ECT (Executive Director)	074091 (#11)	\$3,246.21	\$3,246.21	10/30/2007	
ECT (Executive Director)	070289 (#13)	\$681.98	\$681.98	11/27/2007	
			\$0.00		
			\$0.00		
Subtotal (Executive Director)					\$4,980.35
Activity: Household Hazardous Waste Committee Facilitation					
CDM (RPO)	51	\$147.61	\$147.61	05/25/07	
CDM (RPO)	54	\$179.49	\$179.49	7/27/2007	
CDM (RPO)	55	\$1,764.91	\$1,764.91	9/25/2007	

CDM (RPO)	56	\$1,095.24	\$1,095.24	11/27/2007	
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
Subtotal (RPO)					\$3,187.25
Activity: "Measuring Our Success" Posters					
CDM (RPO)	51	\$2,424.24	\$2,424.24	05/25/07	
CDM (RPO)	53	\$3,855.41	\$3,855.41	06/26/07	
CDM (RPO)	54	\$3,810.61	\$3,810.61	7/27/2007	
CDM (RPO)	55	\$11,809.27	\$11,809.27	9/25/2007	
CDM (RPO)	56	\$3,931.02	\$3,931.02	11/27/2007	
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
Subtotal (RPO)					\$25,830.55
Activity: Information Packet for ARC Members/Local Officials					
Wayne County	2nd Quarter 2007	\$91.97	\$91.97	03/31/07	
CDM (RPO)	51	\$1,476.05	\$1,476.05	05/25/07	
CDM (RPO)	53	\$147.61	\$147.61	06/26/07	
Wayne County	3rd Quarter 2007	\$152.63	\$152.63	06/30/07	
CDM (RPO)	54	\$876.33	\$876.33	7/27/2007	
CDM (RPO)	55	\$119.66	\$119.66	9/25/2007	
Subtotal					\$2,864.25
Activity: Two Onsite Sewage Disposal System Workshops					
Wayne County	2nd Quarter 2007	\$228.95	\$228.95	03/31/07	
CDM (RPO)	51	\$1,927.20	\$1,927.20	05/25/07	
CDM (RPO)	53	\$1,007.49	\$1,007.49	06/26/07	
Wayne County	3rd Quarter 2007	\$475.00	\$475.00	06/30/07	
CDM (RPO)	54	\$1,305.66	\$1,305.66	7/27/2007	
Subtotal:					\$4,944.30
Activity: Research Financial Sustainability of PIE Programs					
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
Subtotal: CDM (RPO)					\$0.00
Activity: Radio Ads Promoting Fertilizer Use Awareness					
Wayne County	2nd Quarter 2007	\$76.32	\$76.32	03/31/07	
Wayne County	3rd Quarter 2007	\$2,495.23	\$2,495.23	06/30/07	
Subtotal: CDM (Wayne County)					\$2,571.55
Activity: Municipal Training Materials Printing					
Wayne County	2nd Quarter 2007	\$686.71	\$686.71	03/31/07	
Wayne County	3rd Quarter 2007	\$1,354.79	\$1,354.79	06/30/07	
Subtotal (Wayne County)					\$2,041.50

Total: Public Involvement & Education Committee Support					\$46,419.75
Activity: Staff Support					
CDM (RPO)	51	\$14,639.39	\$14,639.39	05/25/07	
CDM (RPO)	53	\$353.90	\$353.90	06/26/07	
ECT (Executive Director)	072271 (#1)	\$28,437.33	\$28,437.33	06/28/07	
ECT (Executive Director)	072639 (#3)	\$15,022.46	\$15,022.46	7/27/2007	
ECT (Executive Director)	070282 (#5)	\$11,310.50	\$11,310.50	8/27/2007	
ECT (Executive Director)	073620 (#7)	\$10,023.26	\$10,023.26	9/25/2007	
ECT (Executive Director)	074090 (#10)	\$16,038.30	\$16,038.30	10/30/2007	
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
CDM (RPO)			\$0.00		
Subtotal					\$95,825.14
Activity: ARC Insurance					
David Chapman Agency	203285	\$4,100.00	\$4,100.00	1/16/2007	
Subtotal Insurance					\$4,100.00
Activity: Public Education Committee Support					
CDM (RPO)	53	\$5,000.10	\$5,000.10	06/26/07	
ECT (Executive Director)	072639 (#3)	\$1,992.80	\$1,992.80	7/27/2007	
ECT (Executive Director)	070282 (#5)	\$1,224.04	\$1,224.04	8/27/2007	
ECT (Executive Director)	073620 (#7)	\$2,996.50	\$2,996.50	8/27/2007	
ECT (Executive Director)	074090 (#10)	\$3,103.52	\$3,103.52	10/30/2007	
Subtotal					\$14,316.96
Total: ARC Staff Support					\$114,242.10
TOTAL					\$391,996.01

NOTES:

- (1) Payments for services provided and costs incurred against the 2007 budget.
- (2) There are additional funds which have been expended against the 2007 budget which have not yet been billed/paid.
There is a delay of 30 to 60 days between expenditure and payment.



Working together, restoring the river

ALLIANCE OF ROUGE COMMUNITIES MEMORANDUM

TO: ARC Membership
FROM: Tim Faas, ARC Treasurer
DATE: December 3, 2007
SUBJECT: Recommendation on 2007 Budget Amendments

Allen Park
Auburn Hills
Beverly Hills
Bingham Farms
Birmingham
Bloomfield Hills
Bloomfield Twp.
Canton Twp.
Commerce Twp.
Dearborn
Dearborn Heights
Farmington
Farmington Hills
Franklin
Garden City
Inkster
Lathrup Village
Livonia
Melvindale
Northville
Northville Twp.
Novi
Orchard Lake
Plymouth
Plymouth Twp.
Pontiac
Redford Twp.
Rochester Hills
Romulus
Southfield
Superior Twp.
Troy
Van Buren Twp.
Walled Lake
Washtenaw County
Wayne
Wayne County
West Bloomfield
Twp.
Westland
Wixom
Ypsilanti Twp.

BACKGROUND:

Attached are two requests from the Technical Committee: 1) for payment to ECT for out-of-scope services provided to the ARC for the TMDL public Notice & Comments to the MDEQ; and 2) for carry-over of the IDEP activities to 2008 resulting in a budget reduction. In addition, the Finance Committee is recommending a number of other housekeeping amendments to the expenditures. All of the requests are summarized below.

- Increase OC1 by \$4,611 to cover ECT extra for the TMDL issue
- Decrease OC2a by \$40 to reflect actual costs for our insurance
- Increase PIE9 by \$72 to reflect actual costs for the radio ads
- Decrease TC4 by \$27,486 to reflect the carryover of the balance of the IDEP work into 2008
- Decrease TC7 by \$100,000 to reflect the fact that no other grant funding has been secured for 2007
- Decrease TC8 by \$4,000 to reflect actual costs for data sharing opportunities in 2007 and expectation this effort will continue as part of the sub-watershed management plan updates in 2008

Together these items represent a reduction of \$126,843 of which \$117,870 would roll over to 2008 (see attached spreadsheet).

ACTION REQUESTED:

I move to approve the requested budget amendments totaling (\$126,843) as presented by the Treasurer and as depicted on the attached spreadsheet for the 2007 Budget of the Alliance of Rouge Communities.

Motion made by: _____ ()
Seconded by: _____ ()



Working together, restoring the river

ALLIANCE OF ROUGE COMMUNITIES FINANCE COMMITTEE

2007 Budget Amendment

REQUEST DATE: October 22, 2007

LINE ITEM: TMDL Public Notice and Comment

COMMITTEE MAKING REQUEST: Technical Committee

BACKGROUND: The Executive Director was requested to provide a complete review of the MDEQ public notice technical documents and to prepare a thorough comment letter on behalf of the ARC. This task was not included as part of the original ED contract. The MDEQ submitted a public notice regarding the DRAFT Rouge River Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs). Although, the Executive Director, Jim Ridgway, generally provides advocacy and support services for various items throughout the year as part of the ED budget, this task required significant ECT staff time beyond the general advocacy and support services. ECT staff with specific TMDL technical expertise provided review and comment on the public notice documents.

DESCRIPTION OF ANTICIPATED ACTIVITIES:

The Executive Director and ECT staff were requested to provide a thorough review of all of the MDEQ public notice documents regarding the Rouge River DRAFT TMDLs. In addition, the Executive Director and staff prepared a response on behalf of the ARC regarding the DRAFT TMDLs.

RATIONALE (including why needed): The effects of the proposed TMDLs on community activities and potential storm water permit compliance could be significant. Without review of the documents and comment by the ARC, the MDEQ may impose these stringent standards.

BUDGET (including how the amount requested was established): The ECT expended budget for this task was \$4,610.61.

PERSON/AGENCY RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION: The Vice-Chair (Gary Zorza) of the Technical Committee oversaw coordination of this activity.



ALLIANCE OF ROUGE COMMUNITIES FINANCE COMMITTEE

REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT 2007 BUDGET

REQUEST DATE: August 31, 2007

LINE ITEM: IDEP

COMMITTEE MAKING REQUEST: Technical Committee

BACKGROUND: This task item was budgeted at \$35,000 in 2007. IDEP activities were completed at a cost of \$7,500. Technical Committee reserved approximately \$27,500 in the 2007 ARC budget to develop an SWPPI annual report template that could be used by communities reporting on their storm water permit activities. The MDEQ is currently in the process of revising the storm water permit language. The Technical Committee will oversee completion of the SWPPI Template in the 2008 budget year.

DESCRIPTION OF ANTICIPATED ACTIVITIES: Development of a SWPPI template that communities could use when reporting on MDEQ storm water permit activities.

RATIONALE: MDEQ is currently revising the storm water permit language so SWPPI template requirements have not been determined.

BUDGET: Reduce IDEP Budget item from \$35,000 to \$7,500.

PERSON/AGENCY RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION: The Chair of the Technical Committee, Gary Zorza, will oversee the task on behalf of the committee.

**Alliance of Rouge Communities
Proposed 2007 Budget Amendments
Recommended to Executive Committee : October 25, 2007**

Budget Available for 2007	
* 2007 Dues from Communities	\$ 296,530
** 2007 Rouge Project Grant	\$ 292,430
Future other Grants (Estimated)	\$ -
Rollover Budget from 2006 (3)	\$ 114,702
REVENUE TOTAL =	\$ 703,662

* Based on 2006 dues amounts

** Amount may be less if some of the costs associated with pursuing other funding sources is determined to be ineligible

Proposed 2007 Budget Items	Existing Budget	Recommended Amendment (3)	Amended Budget	Funding Source			"Provider" using Budget (6)
				ARC Dues	Rouge Grant	Other Source	
Organization Committee							
(10) OC1 Staff Support	\$ 116,355	\$ 4,611	\$ 120,966	\$ 60,483	\$ 60,483		Exe.Dir. Serv./RPO
(3) OC1.2 Public Education Committee Support	\$ 19,859	\$ -	\$ 19,859	\$ 9,930	\$ 9,930		Exe.Dir. Serv./RPO
(7)(1) OC2.a ARC Insurance	\$ 4,140	\$ (40)	\$ 4,100	\$ 4,100	\$ -		outside purchase
(4) OC2.b Fiduciary Services	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		Wayne County
OC3 Subwatershed Advisory Group Facilitation	\$ 6,047	\$ -	\$ 6,047	\$ 3,024	\$ 3,024		Exe.Dir. Serv./RPO
<i>Organization Committee Total</i>	\$ 146,401	\$ 4,571	\$ 150,972	\$ 77,536	\$ 73,436		
Public Education and Involvement Committee							
PIE2 Long-Term Planning Efforts for ARC PIE	\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500		Exe.Dir. Serv.
PIE3 Household Hazardous Waste Committee Facilitation	\$ 10,000	\$ -	\$ 10,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000		RPO
(5) PIE4 Measuring Our Success Posters	\$ 36,000	\$ -	\$ 36,000	\$ 18,000	\$ 18,000		RPO
PIE5 Fertilizer Education Pilot Program	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
PIE6 Information Packet for ARC Members/Local Officials	\$ 7,000	\$ -	\$ 7,000	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500		RPO/Wayne County
PIE7 Two Onsite Sewage Disposal System Workshops	\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500		RPO/Wayne County
PIE8 SWPPI Implementation	\$ 7,000	\$ -	\$ 7,000	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500		Exe.Dir. Serv.
(7) PIE9 Radio Ads Promoting Fertilizer Use Awareness	\$ 2,500	\$ 72	\$ 2,572	\$ 1,286	\$ 1,286		Wayne County /Radio Company
PIE10 Municipal Training Materials Printing	\$ 3,000	\$ -	\$ 3,000	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500		Wayne County
<i>PIE Committee Total</i>	\$ 75,500	\$ 72	\$ 75,572	\$ 37,786	\$ 37,786		
Technical Committee							
(5) TC1 Baseline Sampling Program	\$ 281,884	\$ -	\$ 281,884	\$ 140,942	\$ 140,942		RPO/Exe.Dir. Serv.
TC2 Rouge Data Dissemination	\$ 4,000	\$ -	\$ 4,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000		RPO
TC3 Lab Services	\$ 12,000	\$ -	\$ 12,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000		Paragon/Elab
(9) TC4 IDEP	\$ 35,000	\$ (27,486)	\$ 7,514	\$ 3,757	\$ 3,757		RPO
TC5 Continuous Monitoring	\$ 29,850	\$ -	\$ 29,850	\$ 14,925	\$ 14,925		USGS
TC6 5 Year Monitoring Plan (2008-2012)	\$ 8,000	\$ -	\$ 8,000	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000		Exe.Dir. Serv.
(2) TC7 Pursue Other Grant Funding Opportunities	\$ 115,000	\$ (100,000)	\$ 15,000	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ -	Exe.Dir. Serv.
(8) TC8 Evaluate Data Sharing Opportunities	\$ 5,000	\$ (4,000)	\$ 1,000	\$ 500	\$ 500		Exe.Dir. Serv.
<i>Technical Committee Total</i>	\$ 490,734	\$ (131,486)	\$ 359,248	\$ 179,624	\$ 179,624	\$ -	
Total Amount Requested by All Committees	\$ 712,635	\$ (126,843)	\$ 585,792	\$ 294,946	\$ 290,846	\$ -	
Available Budget	\$ 20,987	\$ 126,843	\$ 117,870	\$ 58,935	\$ 58,935	\$ -	

Notes

- (1) Not a Rouge grant eligible item; funded 100% from ARC dues
- (2) Eligibility of using Rouge Grant funds to prepare applications to other funding sources needs to be investigated
Original budget included Grant Writing is currently budgeted 50/50 (ARC/Rouge Grant), while the project is Budgeted 35/65 (ARC/New grant). This amendment reduced the grant writing budget to \$15,000 and removed the expected future grant and local match from 2007 budget.
- (3) Amendment include update of the rollover funds from 2006 budget
- (4) Wayne County will be providing this service. Wayne County cost is not included in ARC Budget.
- (5) Wayne County will be providing part of this service. Wayne County cost is not included in ARC Budget.
- (6) Officers & Committee Members provide assistance to implement most of the ARC tasks. Cost for this assistance is not included in ARC Budget.
- (7) Update budget per actual final expenditure.
- (8) Task will not be completed in 2007 per Executive Director. This task will be included as part of the WMP update 2008 budget.
- (9) Task will not incur any more cost in 2007, per Technical Committee.
- (10) Requested amendment by Executive Director to add budget for TMDL Public Notice and Comments to State.

TC8 after talking to Kelly Karll, we decided to remove the balance on this task out. They spent \$970. I Picked keeping \$1000 as the budget



Working together, restoring the river

ALLIANCE OF ROUGE COMMUNITIES MEMORANDUM

TO: ARC Membership
FROM: Tim Faas, ARC Treasurer
DATE: December 3, 2007
SUBJECT: Consider Amendment #4 to the Fiduciary Services Agreement with Wayne County

- Allen Park
Auburn Hills
Beverly Hills
Bingham Farms
Birmingham
Bloomfield Hills
Bloomfield Twp.
Canton Twp.
Commerce Twp.
Dearborn
Dearborn Heights
Farmington
Farmington Hills
Franklin
Garden City
Inkster
Lathrup Village
Livonia
Melvindale
Northville
Northville Twp.
Novi
Orchard Lake
Plymouth
Plymouth Twp.
Pontiac
Redford Twp.
Rochester Hills
Romulus
Southfield
Superior Twp.
Troy
Van Buren Twp.
Walled Lake
Washtenaw County
Wayne
Wayne County
West Bloomfield Twp.
Westland
Wixom
Ypsilanti Twp.

BACKGROUND:

Attached is a copy of the proposed amendment to the Fiduciary Services Agreement with Wayne County for 2008. This draft is the identical form of agreement used in the past three years. The document is scheduled for consideration by the Wayne County Board of Commissioners on December 6, 2007.

ACTION REQUESTED:

I move to approve Amendment #4 to the Fiduciary Services Agreement with Wayne County as presented and authorize the ARC Chairperson to sign the agreement on behalf of the ARC.

Motion made by: _____ ()
Seconded by: _____ ()

Revised 10/11/2007

**AMENDMENT #4
TO
FIDUCIARY AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF WAYNE AND THE ALLIANCE OF ROUGE
COMMUNITIES**

THIS AMENDMENT #4 to Fiduciary Agreement between the County of Wayne and the Alliance of Rouge Communities (formally known as "The Rouge River Local Management Assembly") is entered into this _____ day of _____, _____ ("the Effective Date of this Amendment"), between the County of Wayne, Michigan, a body corporate and Charter County ("County") and The Alliance of Rouge Communities (also known as "ARC"), a public entity formed under the provisions of Michigan Act No. 517, P.A. 2004 (collectively, the "Parties"). The Parties have previously entered into a certain Fiduciary Agreement dated December 4, 2003 ("Fiduciary Agreement"), Amendment #1 to the Fiduciary Agreement dated February 17, 2005 ("Amendment #1"), Amendment #2 to the Fiduciary Agreement dated January 6, 2006 ("Amendment #2") and Amendment #3 to the Fiduciary Agreement dated November 28, 2006 ("Amendment #3"), for the purpose of enabling the County to perform the fiduciary obligations on the behalf of the ARC and provide funds from the federal grants for the Rouge River National Wet Weather Demonstration Project to the ARC to perform their projects.

RECITALS

WHEREAS, the ARC represents the Rouge River watershed communities, and Wayne, Washtenaw and Oakland Counties ("the Communities"); and

WHEREAS, the ARC exists to facilitate the cooperative management of the Rouge River and to allow for mutual assistance in meeting the storm water permit requirements under the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality's watershed-based, general storm water discharge permit, and similar permits issued by other governmental agencies; and

WHEREAS, meeting the storm water permit requirements will further the goal of improving water quality and recreational use of the Rouge River, one of the goals of the federal grants received from the United States Environmental Protection Agency as part of the Rouge River National Wet Weather Demonstration Project ("Grant"); and

WHEREAS, the County has agreed to perform certain functions relating to the collection and expenditure of assessments paid by the Communities; and

WHEREAS, the assessments paid by the Communities will be used to support the ARC's activities, and to provide the required local matching funds for federal grant funds received from the United States Environmental Protection Agency as part of the Rouge River National Wet Weather Demonstration Project ("Grant Funds"); and

WHEREAS, the Amendment #3 dated the November 28, 2006, expires on December 31, 2007;

NOW THEREFORE, the Parties mutually agree to amend and modify the Fiduciary Agreement and Amendment #3 as follows:

Article 1.1 of the Fiduciary Agreement Amendment 2 is amended to add the following:

The Executive Committee of the ARC shall provide to Wayne County, on the Effective Date of this Agreement amendment and / or by February 1, 2008, a list of the communities or other entities who have agreed to participate in the ARC and the amount that each should be invoiced for budget year 2008.

Article 1.2 of the Fiduciary Agreement Amendment 3 is amended to add the following:

The Executive Committee of the ARC shall provide to Wayne County, on the Effective Date of this Agreement and / or by January 1, 2008, a copy of the ARC approved budget for 2008.

Article 1.6 of the Fiduciary Agreement Amendment 3 is amended to add the following:

The assessments shall be used only in the amounts and for the services identified in the ARC approved budget for 2008, and to provide the required local match for federal Grant Funds.

Article 1.8 of the Fiduciary Agreement is amended to add the following:

The total amount to be provided to the ARC from the Grant for 2008 activities shall not exceed \$300,000. The ARC shall provide a minimum match of \$300,000 for 2008 activities as indicated in the 2008 budget.

Article 1.10 of the Fiduciary Agreement Amendment 3 is amended to add the following:

The County shall be responsible for the procurement of certain services, identified in the ARC approved budget for 2008, from the appropriate contractor(s).

Article 3.1 of the Fiduciary Agreement Amendment 3 is deleted and replaced in its entirety by the following:

This Agreement shall terminate on December 31, 2008.

Article 10.1 of the Fiduciary Agreement Amendment 3 is deleted and replaced in its entirety by the following:

This Agreement becomes effective immediately upon signing by both parties and shall apply with respect to all assessments received and expenditures made pursuant to the ARC's Approved budget for 2008; and allocation as referenced in Article 1.1.

EFFECT, except as amended by this Amendment #4, the Fiduciary Agreement Between the County of Wayne and the Rouge River Watershed Local Management Assembly, as amended shall continue in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be executed as of the date and year first written above.

COUNTY OF WAYNE, MICHIGAN

ALLIANCE OF ROUGE COMMUNITIES

By: _____

By: _____

Robert A. Ficano
Its: Chief Executive Officer

Kurt Giberson
Its: Chairperson



Working together, restoring the river

ALLIANCE OF ROUGE COMMUNITIES MEMORANDUM

TO: ARC Membership

FROM: Tim Faas, ARC Treasurer

DATE: December 3, 2007

SUBJECT: Consider Approval of an Extension of the Contract with ECT for Executive Director Services in 2008

BACKGROUND:

In March 2007, the ARC entered into a nine (9) month long contract with ECT for the provision of Executive Director Services for an amount of \$173,746. With the blessing of the Executive Committee, and based on the performance of ECT to date, we have been negotiating an extension of that contract for 2008. The budget for 2008 has been prepared anticipating ECT will continue to provide a similar level of service as in 2007, however increase the scope to include the required updates to the watershed management plans.

The current contract has an "extension of term" provision enabling this to occur. Several meetings have been held with ECT to negotiate the scope of services and the hourly rates under the new agreement. The general counsel for Canton Township is currently reviewing the changes to the contract which appear relatively straight forward.

Should the Alliance approve the 2008 Budget as presented, the final scope (detailed in Table 1 attached) can be incorporated into the contract document and the final documents assembled for execution before January 1, 2008.

Allen Park
Auburn Hills
Beverly Hills
Bingham Farms
Birmingham
Bloomfield Hills
Bloomfield Twp.
Canton Twp.
Commerce Twp.
Dearborn
Dearborn Heights
Farmington
Farmington Hills
Franklin
Garden City
Inkster
Lathrup Village
Livonia
Melvindale
Northville
Northville Twp.
Novi
Orchard Lake
Plymouth
Plymouth Twp.
Pontiac
Redford Twp.
Rochester Hills
Romulus
Southfield
Superior Twp.
Troy
Van Buren Twp.
Walled Lake
Washtenaw County
Wayne
Wayne County
West Bloomfield
Twp.
Westland
Wixom
Ypsilanti Twp.

The total cost of the negotiated service for 2008 is shown below.

Meeting & facilitation	\$150,644
Advocacy & administration	\$51,660
Watershed management plan updates	\$196,483

TOTAL = \$398,788

ACTION REQUESTED:

I move to approve an extension of the service contract with ECT for the 2008 ARC fiscal year in an amount not-to-exceed \$398,788 as outlined on the attached Table 1, and further authorize the ARC Chairperson to sign the contract on behalf of the ARC.

Motion made by: _____ ()

Seconded by: _____ ()

11/30/2007



TABLE 1: 2008 ARC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BUDGET SUMMARY WITH WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE

Task Description-Core Services	Total Cost Not-to-Exceed
MEETINGS AND FACILITATION	
Alliance, PIE & TC Committee and SWAG meetings; Staff Support	\$95,097
ARC ADVOCACY AND ADMINISTRATION	
General Administration (Includes Task 2:a - i from Appendix A)	\$55,548
TOTAL COSTS "CORE SERVICES" =	\$150,644
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT & EDUCATION COMMITTEE	
Measuring our Success Poster	\$18,250
Planning Committee Oversight	\$2,500
Household Hazardous Waste Education	\$6,000
Septics Maintenance Reminder Postcard	\$9,000
Information Packet	\$3,750
Website Design, Content & Fees	\$12,160
PIE COMMITTEE TOTAL COSTS =	\$51,660
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE	
Watershed Management Plans Update	\$196,483
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE TOTAL COSTS =	\$196,483
TOTAL 2008 COSTS =	\$398,788

*See ED Supplemental Table for Hourly Cost Breakdown

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLE - ARC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HOURS AND COSTS INCLUDING WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN ALTERNATIVE

14-Nov-07

		ECT Staff	Jim Ridgway	Kelly Karll	Zachare Ball	Chris Omeara	Junior Staff	Admin Staff	Total Labor Costs by Task	Overhead @ 1.6773	Fixed Fee @ 15%	Total Cost by Task
Task No. Task Description		Hourly Rate	\$60	\$45	\$37	\$27	\$25	\$22				
1	MEETINGS AND FACILITATION											
1a	Full Alliance Meetings (3)	18	18	18	24				\$3,204	\$5,374	\$1,287	\$9,865
1b	Executive Committee (4)	16	20	20	32				\$3,464	\$5,810	\$1,391	\$10,665
1c	Organizational Committee (4)	16			8				\$1,176	\$1,973	\$472	\$3,621
1d	Public Involvement & Education Committee (4)			98	95				\$6,191	\$10,384	\$2,486	\$19,061
1e	Technical Committee (5)	24	70		16				\$5,022	\$8,423	\$2,017	\$15,462
1f	SWAGs	24	40	40					\$4,720	\$7,917	\$1,896	\$14,532
1g	Finance Committee (3)	24			12				\$1,764	\$2,959	\$708	\$5,431
1h	Ongoing Support Services	40	28	28					\$4,696	\$7,877	\$1,886	\$14,458
Total Hours Task 1 Meetings		162	176	204	187	0	0		Total Cost Task 1 Meetings			\$93,097
2	ADVOCACY AND ADMINISTRATION											
2a	FOIA and Open Meetings Act (1 hr/month)				10				\$270	\$453	\$108	\$831
2b	Routine Distribution of Materials (1 hr/month)				10				\$270	\$453	\$108	\$831
2c	ARC Website Maintenance (2 hrs/month)	included in 2008 PIE budget request							\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2d	Advocate for RR Watershed & Primary Liaison	100							\$6,000	\$10,064	\$2,410	\$18,473
2e	Quick Books Setup and Monthly Tracking (32 hours setup and mtgs w/ WC; monthly mtgs w/ WC & reporting 6 hrs/mo)				104				\$2,808	\$4,710	\$1,128	\$8,646
2f	Administrative Oversight & Contractor Management	10	50						\$2,850	\$4,780	\$1,145	\$8,775
2g	ARC Marketing & Communications Strategy	8		16	40				\$2,152	\$3,610	\$864	\$6,626
2h	Annual Report	8	8	56					\$2,912	\$4,884	\$1,169	\$8,966
Total Hours Task 2 Support for the ARC		126	58	72	164	0	0		Total Cost Task 2 Support for the ARC			\$53,148
Total Estimated Hours by ECT Staff									Total Estimated Expenses-Core Services (includes \$400 for Quickbooks software)		\$4,400	
									TOTAL COST FOR CORE SERVICES		\$150,644	

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLE - ARC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HOURS AND COSTS INCLUDING WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN ALTERNATIVE

14-Nov-07

Task No.	Task Description	ECT Staff	Jim Ridgway	Kelly Karl	Zachare Ball	Chris Omeara	Junior Staff	Admin Staff	Total Labor Costs by Task	Overhead @ 1.6773	Fixed Fee @ 15%	Total Cost by Task	
		Hourly Rate	\$60	\$45	\$37	\$27	\$25	\$22					
Task No. PIE Committee Tasks - ECT Costs													
1	Main 3-4 Measuring Our Success Poster												\$18,250
2	Planning Committee Oversight												\$2,500
3	Household hazardous Waste Education												\$6,000
4	Septics Maintenance Reminder Postcard												\$9,000
5	Information Packet												\$3,750
6	Website Design, Content & Fees												\$12,160
TOTAL COST PIE COMMITTEE TASKS											\$51,660		

Task No.	ED ALTERNATIVE TASK: Watershed Management Plan Update											
A	Evaluate and Summarize Watershed Characteristics	8	80	32	12	280			\$12,588	\$21,148	\$5,060	\$38,796
B	Develop Water Quality Improvement Goals and Load Reductions	8	40	40	12	100			\$6,584	\$11,061	\$2,647	\$20,292
C	Prioritize Critical Areas and Implementation Actions	8	110	80	12	200			\$13,714	\$23,040	\$5,513	\$42,267
D	Technical and Financial Assistance	8	36	24		40			\$3,988	\$6,700	\$1,603	\$12,291
E	Public Participation and Involvement	16	18	28	24	48			\$4,654	\$7,819	\$1,871	\$14,344
F	Action Implementation Timeframe/Interim Measurable Milestones	8	36	24		40			\$3,988	\$6,700	\$1,603	\$12,291
G	Criteria for achieving load reductions/Monitoring plan component	8	40	16	12	60			\$4,696	\$7,889	\$1,888	\$14,473
H	Draft and Final Watershed Management Plans	32	40	40	50	40			\$7,550	\$12,684	\$3,035	\$23,269
Total Hours (WMP Update) =		96	400	284	122	808			Printing and Expenses			\$10,000
ECT Subtotal											\$188,022	
30% contract to M/WBE-ECT has 15% markup											\$8,461	
Total Estimated Cost for Watershed Management Plan Update											\$196,483	

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLE - ARC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HOURS AND COSTS INCLUDING WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN ALTERNATIVE

14-Nov-07

Task No.	Task Description	ECT Staff	Jim Ridgway	Kelly Karl	Zachare Ball	Chris Omeara	Junior Staff	Admin Staff	Total Labor Costs by Task	Overhead @ 1.6773	Fixed Fee @ 15%	Total Cost by Task
		Hourly Rate	\$60	\$45	\$37	\$27	\$25	\$22				
									TOTAL COST CORE SERVICES		\$150,644	
									TOTAL COST PIE & TECHNICAL COMMITTEES		\$51,660	
									TOTAL COST WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE		\$196,483	
									TOTAL ARC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR		\$398,788	



Working together, restoring the river

ALLIANCE OF ROUGE COMMUNITIES MEMORANDUM

TO: ARC Membership
 FROM: Tim Faas, ARC Treasurer
 DATE: November 30, 2007
 SUBJECT: Recommendation on 2008 Budget

- Allen Park
- Auburn Hills
- Beverly Hills
- Bingham Farms
- Birmingham
- Bloomfield Hills
- Bloomfield Twp.
- Canton Twp.
- Commerce Twp.
- Dearborn
- Dearborn Heights
- Farmington
- Farmington Hills
- Franklin
- Garden City
- Inkster
- Lathrup Village
- Livonia
- Melvindale
- Northville
- Northville Twp.
- Novi
- Orchard Lake
- Plymouth
- Plymouth Twp.
- Pontiac
- Redford Twp.
- Rochester Hills
- Romulus
- Southfield
- Superior Twp.
- Troy
- Van Buren Twp.
- Walled Lake
- Washtenaw County
- Wayne
- Wayne County
- West Bloomfield Twp.
- Westland
- Wixom
- Ypsilanti Twp.

BACKGROUND:

Attached is a copy of the final recommended budget for approval by the full Alliance. Should any member wish to have copies of all the detailed submittals from the ARC Committees, do not hesitate to contact ECT.

ACTION REQUESTED:

I move to approve the requested budget totaling \$706,790, including the contingency, as presented by the Treasurer and as depicted in the attached budget documents for the 2008 Budget of the Alliance of Rouge Communities.

Motion made by: _____ ()

Seconded by: _____ ()



2008 BUDGET FOR THE ALLIANCE OF ROUGE COMMUNITIES

Submitted to: ARC Membership

December 12, 2007

Prepared by: ARC Finance Committee

Document Index

Cover Page

Memo

Executive Summary Report

2008 Recommended Budget

Executive Director Services Cost & Hours Summary



Working together, restoring the river

ALLIANCE OF ROUGE COMMUNITIES MEMORANDUM

Allen Park
Auburn Hills
Beverly Hills
Bingham Farms
Birmingham
Bloomfield Hills
Bloomfield Twp.
Canton Twp.
Commerce Twp.
Dearborn
Dearborn Heights
Farmington
Farmington Hills
Franklin
Garden City
Inkster
Lathrup Village
Livonia
Melvindale
Northville
Northville Twp.
Novi
Orchard Lake
Oakland County
Plymouth
Plymouth Twp.
Pontiac
Redford Twp.
Rochester Hills
Romulus
Southfield
Superior Twp.
Troy
Van Buren Twp.
Walled Lake
Washtenaw County
Wayne
Wayne County
WCAA
West Bloomfield Twp.
Westland
Wixom
Ypsilanti Twp.

TO: **ARC Membership**
CC: Razik Alsaigh, Wayne County DOE
FROM: Tim Faas, Treasurer
DATE: November 30, 2007
SUBJECT: 2008 ARC Budget Recommendation

Here is a copy of the recommended 2008 Fiscal Year budget for the Alliance. Both the Finance Committee and Executive Committee has reviewed it and approved the budget and are recommending it to the full Alliance for approval.

TIM

2008 ALLIANCE OF ROUGE COMMUNITIES (ARC) BUDGET SUMMARY

November 30, 2007

The attached documents detail the recommended budget for 2008. Since the total requests for funding tasks in 2008 exceeded the anticipated revenues coming into the ARC, an alternate “balanced” budget was ultimately approved by the Executive Committee at its October 25th meeting.

REVENUES

The assessment to ARC members is proposed to remain the same again in 2008 for a total of \$296,530. The budget does not include any assessment to our three (3) member Counties.

Wayne County has agreed to extend its offer to provide Federal grant funding to the ARC again in 2008 in an amount of \$247,390. The budget depicts another \$45,000 in revenue from other grants during the year.

The last piece of the revenue side of the budget is the anticipated roll over of funds unspent from 2007. As of this date, that amount is projected to be \$117,870 by year-end.

The total anticipated revenues for 2008 are \$706,790.

EXPENDITURES

Many of the funded tasks for 2008 are similar to past years, with a few exceptions as outlined in the detailed budget request forms.

Some of the deletions from 2007 are as follows:

- No financial sustainability study for the PIE committee, no radio advertisements, or any printing of training materials.
- No surface water quality monitoring is budgeted.
- No data dissemination or lab services.
- Data sharing opportunities is folded into the sub-watershed management plans update line item.

The proposed 2008 budget does include the following tasks:

- An extension of the ECT contract into 2008.
- Funding to update the seven (7) sub-watershed management plans.

The PIE Committee and Technical Committee proposed a \$110,000 joint project which could not be funded without a substantial increase (i.e. 23%) in membership dues. The project was titled “Tree canopy – green infrastructure analysis” and was split between the PIE and Technical Committee budget submissions.

In the past years, the Finance Committee has always recommended a budget including a contingency of roughly 5% of total expenses. That contingency appears in the last line of the budget spreadsheet entitled "Available Budget".

The balanced budget as approved ⁽¹⁾ by the Executive Committee depicts a total amount of expenses of \$656,078 leaving an available balance of \$50,712 (i.e. roughly 7% of budget). This figure was accomplished with the elimination of the \$110,000 of expenditure for the tree canopy – green infrastructure analysis task. Should adequate funds be available in 2008, after the 2007 financials are closed out, the ARC might reconsider the request to include the tree canopy – green infrastructure analysis.

The Executive Committee recommended two other significant items relative to the 2008 Budget. First, there was unanimous support to extend the service contract with ECT through the end of 2008. Second, ECT was authorized to undertake the Watershed Management Plan updates that are due to the MDEQ by November 2008. With respect to the latter, the original RFQ for Executive Director Services included a provision that this work could be included under the scope of services with the selected proponent. Given the tight timeframe to complete the work, together with the anticipated savings through coordination of the updates, the Executive Committee supported having ECT perform the work based on its written proposal.

Yours truly,

Tim Faas, ARC Treasurer

Footnotes:

(1) A few minor revisions were made to the budget for the Watershed Management Plan Update task, the Household Hazardous Waste Education program and the Septic Tank Maintenance Reminder task which were omitted previously by the PIE Committee.

**Alliance of Rouge Communities
2008 Budget
Recommended to the Full Alliance: December 12, 2007**

Expected Budget Available for 2008

* 2008 Dues from Communities	\$	296,530	
** 2008 Rouge Project Grant	\$	247,390	
Future other Grants (Estimated)	\$	45,000	
<u>Rollover Budget from 2007</u>	\$	117,870	Assume 50% dues and 50% Rouge Grant
REVENUE TOTAL =	\$	706,790	

* Based on 2007 dues amounts

** Amount may be less if some of the costs associated with pursuing other funding sources is determined to be ineligible

2008 Budget Items	TOTAL	Funding Source			"Service Provider"
		ARC Dues	Rouge Grant	Other Source	
Organization Committee					
OC1 Staff, Committees and SWAG Support	\$ 95,097	\$ 47,549	\$ 47,549		ECT
(1) OC2.a ARC Insurance	\$ 4,140	\$ 4,140	\$ -		outside purchase
(3) OC2.b Fiduciary Services	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		Wayne County
OC4 ARC Advocacy and Administration	\$ 55,548	\$ 27,774	\$ 27,774		ECT
<i>Organization Committee Total</i>	\$ 154,785	\$ 79,463	\$ 75,323		
Public Education and Involvement Committee					
PIE2 Long-Term Planning Efforts	\$ 2,500	\$ 1,250	\$ 1,250		ECT
(4) PIE3 Household Hazardous Waste Education	\$ 6,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000		ECT
PIE4 Main 3-4 Measuring Our Success Poster	\$ 18,250	\$ 9,125	\$ 9,125		ECT
PIE5 ARC Website Design and Maintenance	\$ 12,160	\$ 6,080	\$ 6,080		ECT
PIE6 Information Packet for ARC Members/Local Officials	\$ 7,000	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500		ECT & Wayne County
(4) PIE7 Septic System Maintenance Reminder Cards	\$ 9,000	\$ 4,500	\$ 4,500		ECT
<i>PIE Committee Total</i>	\$ 54,910	\$ 27,455	\$ 27,455		
Technical Committee					
TC1 Baseline Sampling Program	\$ 107,400	\$ 53,700	\$ 53,700		RPO Contractor
TC4 Collaborative ARC IDEP Activities	\$ 10,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000		Not Defined
(2) TC7 Pursue Other Grant Funding Opportunities	\$ 105,000	\$ 52,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 45,000	Not Defined
TC9 SWPPI Template	\$ 27,500	\$ 13,750	\$ 13,750		Not Defined
(4) TC10 Update of Storm Water Management Plans	\$ 196,483	\$ 98,242	\$ 98,242		ECT
<i>Technical Committee Total</i>	\$ 446,383	\$ 223,192	\$ 178,192	\$ 45,000	
Total Amount Requested by All Committees	\$ 656,078	\$ 330,109	\$ 280,969	\$ 45,000	
Available Budget	\$ 50,712	\$ 25,356	\$ 25,356	\$ -	

Notes

- (1) Not a Rouge grant eligible item; funded 100% from ARC dues. This item is included in the budget by the Finance Committee.
- (2) Eligibility of using Rouge Grant funds to prepare applications to other funding sources needs to be investigated. Grant Writing is currently budgeted 50/50 (ARC/Rouge Grant), while the project is Budgeted 50/50 (ARC/New grant). this request anticipate \$45,000 grant, \$45,000 Match and \$15,000 grant pursuing effort.
- (3) Wayne County will be providing this service. Wayne County cost is not included in ARC Budget.
- (4) These figures revised since approval by the Executive Committee on October 25, 2007

RECOMMENDED BUDGET

11/30/2007


TABLE 1: 2008 ARC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BUDGET SUMMARY WITH WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE

Task Description-Core Services	Total Cost Not-to-Exceed
MEETINGS AND FACILITATION	
Alliance, PIE & TC Committee and SWAG meetings; Staff Support	\$95,097
ARC ADVOCACY AND ADMINISTRATION	
General Administration (Includes Task 2:a - i from Appendix A)	\$55,548
TOTAL COSTS "CORE SERVICES" =	\$150,644
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT & EDUCATION COMMITTEE	
Measuring our Success Poster	\$18,250
Planning Committee Oversight	\$2,500
Household Hazardous Waste Education	\$6,000
Septics Maintenance Reminder Postcard	\$9,000
Information Packet	\$3,750
Website Design, Content & Fees	\$12,160
PIE COMMITTEE TOTAL COSTS =	\$51,660
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE	
Watershed Management Plans Update	\$196,483
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE TOTAL COSTS =	\$196,483
TOTAL 2008 COSTS =	\$398,788

*See ED Supplemental Table for Hourly Cost Breakdown

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLE - ARC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HOURS AND COSTS INCLUDING WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN ALTERNATIVE

14-Nov-07

		ECT Staff	Jim Ridgway	Kelly Karll	Zachare Ball	Chris Omeara	Junior Staff	Admin Staff	Total Labor Costs by Task	Overhead @ 1.6773	Fixed Fee @ 15%	Total Cost by Task
Task No. Task Description		Hourly Rate	\$60	\$45	\$37	\$27	\$25	\$22				
1	MEETINGS AND FACILITATION											
1a	Full Alliance Meetings (3)	18	18	18	24				\$3,204	\$5,374	\$1,287	\$9,865
1b	Executive Committee (4)	16	20	20	32				\$3,464	\$5,810	\$1,391	\$10,665
1c	Organizational Committee (4)	16			8				\$1,176	\$1,973	\$472	\$3,621
1d	Public Involvement & Education Committee (4)			98	95				\$6,191	\$10,384	\$2,486	\$19,061
1e	Technical Committee (5)	24	70		16				\$5,022	\$8,423	\$2,017	\$15,462
1f	SWAGs	24	40	40					\$4,720	\$7,917	\$1,896	\$14,532
1g	Finance Committee (3)	24			12				\$1,764	\$2,959	\$708	\$5,431
1h	Ongoing Support Services	40	28	28					\$4,696	\$7,877	\$1,886	\$14,458
Total Hours Task 1 Meetings		162	176	204	187	0	0		Total Cost Task 1 Meetings			\$93,097
2	ADVOCACY AND ADMINISTRATION											
2a	FOIA and Open Meetings Act (1 hr/month)				10				\$270	\$453	\$108	\$831
2b	Routine Distribution of Materials (1 hr/month)				10				\$270	\$453	\$108	\$831
2c	ARC Website Maintenance (2 hrs/month)	included in 2008 PIE budget request							\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2d	Advocate for RR Watershed & Primary Liaison	100							\$6,000	\$10,064	\$2,410	\$18,473
2e	Quick Books Setup and Monthly Tracking (32 hours setup and mtgs w/ WC; monthly mtgs w/ WC & reporting 6 hrs/mo)				104				\$2,808	\$4,710	\$1,128	\$8,646
2f	Administrative Oversight & Contractor Management	10	50						\$2,850	\$4,780	\$1,145	\$8,775
2g	ARC Marketing & Communications Strategy	8		16	40				\$2,152	\$3,610	\$864	\$6,626
2h	Annual Report	8	8	56					\$2,912	\$4,884	\$1,169	\$8,966
Total Hours Task 2 Support for the ARC		126	58	72	164	0	0		Total Cost Task 2 Support for the ARC			\$53,148
Total Estimated Hours by ECT Staff									Total Estimated Expenses-Core Services (includes \$400 for Quickbooks software)		\$4,400	
									TOTAL COST FOR CORE SERVICES		\$150,644	

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLE - ARC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HOURS AND COSTS INCLUDING WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN ALTERNATIVE

14-Nov-07

Task No.	Task Description	ECT Staff	Jim Ridgway	Kelly Karl	Zachare Ball	Chris Omeara	Junior Staff	Admin Staff	Total Labor Costs by Task	Overhead @ 1.6773	Fixed Fee @ 15%	Total Cost by Task	
		Hourly Rate	\$60	\$45	\$37	\$27	\$25	\$22					
Task No. PIE Committee Tasks - ECT Costs													
1	Main 3-4 Measuring Our Success Poster												\$18,250
2	Planning Committee Oversight												\$2,500
3	Household hazardous Waste Education												\$6,000
4	Septics Maintenance Reminder Postcard												\$9,000
5	Information Packet												\$3,750
6	Website Design, Content & Fees												\$12,160
TOTAL COST PIE COMMITTEE TASKS											\$51,660		

Task No.	ED ALTERNATIVE TASK: Watershed Management Plan Update										
A	Evaluate and Summarize Watershed Characteristics	8	80	32	12	280		\$12,588	\$21,148	\$5,060	\$38,796
B	Develop Water Quality Improvement Goals and Load Reductions	8	40	40	12	100		\$6,584	\$11,061	\$2,647	\$20,292
C	Prioritize Critical Areas and Implementation Actions	8	110	80	12	200		\$13,714	\$23,040	\$5,513	\$42,267
D	Technical and Financial Assistance	8	36	24		40		\$3,988	\$6,700	\$1,603	\$12,291
E	Public Participation and Involvement	16	18	28	24	48		\$4,654	\$7,819	\$1,871	\$14,344
F	Action Implementation Timeframe/Interim Measurable Milestones	8	36	24		40		\$3,988	\$6,700	\$1,603	\$12,291
G	Criteria for achieving load reductions/Monitoring plan component	8	40	16	12	60		\$4,696	\$7,889	\$1,888	\$14,473
H	Draft and Final Watershed Management Plans	32	40	40	50	40		\$7,550	\$12,684	\$3,035	\$23,269
Total Hours (WMP Update) =		96	400	284	122	808		Printing and Expenses			\$10,000
ECT Subtotal										\$188,022	
30% contract to M/WBE-ECT has 15% markup										\$8,461	
Total Estimated Cost for Watershed Management Plan Update										\$196,483	

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLE - ARC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HOURS AND COSTS INCLUDING WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN ALTERNATIVE													
14-Nov-07													
Task No.	Task Description	ECT Staff	Jim Ridgway	Kelly Karl	Zachare Ball	Chris Omeara	Junior Staff	Admin Staff	Total Labor Costs by Task	Overhead @ 1.6773	Fixed Fee @ 15%	Total Cost by Task	
		Hourly Rate	\$60	\$45	\$37	\$27	\$25	\$22					
												TOTAL COST CORE SERVICES	\$150,644
												TOTAL COST PIE & TECHNICAL COMMITTEES	\$51,660
												TOTAL COST WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE	\$196,483
												TOTAL ARC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	\$398,788



James W. Ridgway, P.E.
Executive Director

ALLIANCE OF ROUGE COMMUNITIES
Position Paper
TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOADS (TMDLs)

Allen Park
Auburn Hills
Beverly Hills
Bingham Farms
Birmingham
Bloomfield Hills
Bloomfield Twp.
Canton Twp.
Commerce Twp.
Dearborn
Dearborn Heights
Farmington
Farmington Hills
Franklin
Garden City
Inkster
Lathrup Village
Livonia
Melvindale
Northville
Northville Twp.
Novi
Oakland County
Orchard Lake
Plymouth
Plymouth Twp.
Pontiac
Redford Twp.
Rochester Hills
Romulus
Southfield
Superior Twp.
Troy
Van Buren Twp.
Walled Lake
Washtenaw County
Wayne
Wayne County
Wayne County Airport
Authority
West Bloomfield Twp.
Westland
Wixom
Ypsilanti Twp.

Position: The Alliance of Rouge Communities recognizes that the MDEQ is required to perform a TMDL on every water that consistently fails to meet water quality standards but we disagree with the assessment methods used for establishing TMDLs within the Rouge River Watershed.

What are TMDLs? TMDL represents the amount of a pollutant from both point and nonpoint sources that a waterbody can accept and still meet state water quality standards. In the Rouge River Watershed, three TMDLs were issued for public notice and comment in July 2007. The ARC provided written comments to these TMDLs but our comments were not incorporated into the final documents. These TMDLs include the following:

- 1) **TMDL for E. coli:** In an effort to limit the amount of sewage entering the Rouge, the MDEQ erroneously assumed that E. coli measurements above water quality standards were indicative of sewage releases. Sewage releases will cause elevated E. coli reading but so will other, non-humans sources. Problems and issues associated with the E. coli measurement are summarized in a separate ARC position paper.
- 2) **TMDL for Dissolved Oxygen for Johnson Creek:** The TMDL is based upon the assumption that sediments associated with stormwater are causing low DO during Drought periods. The data presented in the TMDL does not support this assumption. The resulting TMDL seeks to limit various pollutants, such as sediment, from entering the creek during wet weather in order to maintain a high dissolved oxygen concentration necessary for a coldwater fishery..

Although the ARC is certainly supportive of maintaining the Rouge's only coldwater fishery, the MDEQ's data analysis and interpretation for establishing the TMDL make broad assumptions that, in turn, will cause the municipalities to expend funds to install control measures that may not result in any change to the low flow DO. It is our belief that much of the data used for the assessment is over 6 years old and is not representative of existing conditions. In addition, the low flow and fluctuating DO levels have historically been present in Johnson Creek which was not a consideration by the MDEQ. Finally, the MDEQ has proposed to achieve an 85% reduction in suspended solids loading from MS4 permitted entities. However, this only represents 3% of the total suspended solids loading to the creek. The majority of the problem is from nonpoint sources which are not addressed by this proposed TMDL. Until those sources are considered and managed, regulating 3% of the sources is not an effective use of a community's or county's financial and staff resources. Past litigation requires that the non point sources share in the appropriate reductions..

- 3) **TMDL for Biota:** Biota represents fish and macroinvertebrate communities in the creeks and Rouge River. The lack of numbers and diversity has shown that portions of the Rouge are under stress. The MDEQ has made the assumption that reduction in the sediment load to the river will alleviate this stressed condition. The ARC argues that sediment is only one of a

large number of stressor and sediment reduction, in itself, will not replenish the fish and macro invertebrates. In this case, the MDEQ has proposed to establish a suspended solids concentration limit in the water throughout the watershed.. The ARC argues against making the entire watershed part of this TMDL; much of the collected data demonstrates acceptable macroinvertebrate community populations. The TMDL associated with fish communities is based on very limited sampling. The ARC also questions the MDEQ's assumption that suspended solids, river flow and storm water management are directly correlated and will result in improved fish and macroinvertebrate communities. We believe that it is quite possible that even with a substantial decrease in wet weather suspended solids concentrations, an observed improvement in the biota may not be realized. The ARC takes the position that costly management practices should be reserved for project that yield proven results.



Working together, restoring the river

James W. Ridgway, P.E.
Executive Director

ALLIANCE OF ROUGE COMMUNITIES
Position Paper
Use of *E. coli* as a Regulatory Measurement
November 5, 2007

Allen Park
Auburn Hills
Beverly Hills
Bingham Farms
Birmingham
Bloomfield Hills
Bloomfield Twp.
Canton Twp.
Commerce Twp.
Dearborn
Dearborn Heights
Farmington
Farmington Hills
Franklin
Garden City
Inkster
Lathrup Village
Livonia
Melvindale
Northville
Northville Twp.
Novi
Oakland County
Orchard Lake
Plymouth
Plymouth Twp.
Pontiac
Redford Twp.
Rochester Hills
Romulus
Southfield
Superior Twp.
Troy
Van Buren Twp.
Walled Lake
Washtenaw County
Washtenaw County
Commission
Wayne
Wayne County
Wayne County Airport
Authority
West Bloomfield Twp.
Westland
Wixom
Ypsilanti Twp.

Position: The Alliance of Rouge Communities (ARC) opposes the use of *E. coli* as a regulatory measure for determining compliance of storm water permits.

E. coli has been used to determine effectiveness of disinfection of treated sewage. Because sewage is a source of *E. coli*, this is an appropriate use of the measurement. Communities can control these sources.

E. coli has been used to determine when a beach is safe for swimming. This use has been questioned by researchers that have found *E. coli* from multiple sources (waterfowl, wildlife, pets, “unknown”) that cannot be tracked back to humans. Communities cannot control these sources.

Projects performed in all of the Southeast Michigan Counties had documented *E. coli* exceedences in their storm water that cannot be tied to human sources. Communities have no ability to control these sources.

Thus the ARC has concluded that using *E. coli* as a means of identifying sewage contamination in our waterways is not appropriate. The ARC communities should only be required to limit those sources for which they have the ability to control. We all agree that there is no place for sewage in our waterways but the *E. coli* test is NOT the tool to measure the presence or absence of sewage.

- 1) ***The procedures for measuring E. coli are not timely, they are highly variable, and they are un-reliable.*** If a group of people measures water temperature in a river at the same time and at the same place, they would all get very nearly identical measurements. That is not the case for *E. coli*. After sampling, first they would have to wait at least a day for their individual results and then they could all get vastly different numbers. Studies have shown that *E. coli* levels can vary substantially over very short distances (as little as a few centimeters) and short time periods (minutes to hours). That is one reason why water quality professionals find it so difficult to get “repeatability” in *E. coli* measurements. The state requires multiple samples and some statistical tools to “smooth out” the results but that does not change the fact that the test itself has tremendous variability.
- 2) ***E. coli come from a very large number of sources in urban areas.*** There are numerous studies that documenting that naturally occurring *E. coli* sources contribute substantial loads that certainly will lead to violations of water quality standards. Is this suggesting that counties and communities must round up birds (notably sea gulls and geese), pets (wild dogs and feral cats), and urban wildlife (raccoons, squirrels, opossums). Other studies show that *E. coli* populations are naturalized, widespread, and persistent in beach sand, river sediments, and

even in the slimy algal layer covering rocks (epilithic periphyton). These non-animal sources of *E. coli* constitute an uncontrollable nonpoint source of fecal bacteria.

- 3) ***There are no published studies that suggest that urban communities can ever meet the Michigan Water Quality Standards for *E. coli* during wet weather.*** The largest concern is the understanding that urban storm water routinely exceeds the state Water Quality Standards for bacteria and will likely always exceed these standards. Why would any community sign a permit knowing that the permit limits will be exceeded regularly?



James W. Ridgway, P.E.
Executive Director

ALLIANCE OF ROUGE COMMUNITIES
Position Paper
DRAFT NPDES Phase II Storm Water Permit

Allen Park
Auburn Hills
Beverly Hills
Bingham Farms
Birmingham
Bloomfield Hills
Bloomfield Twp.
Canton Twp.
Commerce Twp.
Dearborn
Dearborn Heights
Farmington
Farmington Hills
Franklin
Garden City
Inkster
Lathrup Village
Livonia
Melvindale
Northville
Northville Twp.
Novi
Oakland County
Orchard Lake
Plymouth
Plymouth Twp.
Pontiac
Redford Twp.
Rochester Hills
Romulus
Southfield
Superior Twp.
Troy
Van Buren Twp.
Walled Lake
Washtenaw County
Wayne
Wayne County
Wayne County Airport
Authority
West Bloomfield Twp.
Westland
Wixom
Ypsilanti Twp.

Position: The Alliance of Rouge Communities (ARC) strongly disagrees with the restrictive, cumbersome and costly requirements drafted by the MDEQ for the new NPDES Phase II Draft Permit.

The draft permit language places new costly and prescriptive measures on communities and counties already facing budgetary concerns.

The draft language places emphasis on individual documentation and reporting rather than emphasizing cooperation with watershed partners in identifying innovative mechanisms to solving and implementing cost-effective water quality solutions.

The draft language removes local control and decision-making that has been a guiding principle of the watershed permit. It now specifies the who, what, where, when and how for all required permit actions and discourages implementation of alternative, cost-effective approaches based on existing watershed conditions.

Specific permit examples of these costly requirements include the following:

- 1) **Outfall Observation Monitoring, Labeling and Mapping:** Communities/counties must now document and inspect each and every storm sewer outfall into waters of the state multiple times each year. The current requirement is once every 5 years. The costs associated with the monitoring component alone varies depending on the number of outfalls, but is estimated at \$1,200 per day with some counties estimating over 4,000 outfalls. Mapping estimates for drainage networks have ranged from \$300,000 to \$2 million over a multiple year period of development.
- 2) **Post-Construction Runoff Controls:** The draft language requires a “one-size fits all” standard for storm water management for all new developments and redevelopments. The draft language imposes requirements inconsistent with the local and county innovative solutions developed in Wayne County.
- 3) **Good-Housekeeping Procedures:** Paved surfaces must now achieve a documented 25% reduction in sediment using a computer model to calculate before and after conditions. Fleet Maintenance documentation procedures have increased exponentially by reviewing, verifying and reporting on all procedures associated with maintenance of vehicles.

**ALLIANCE FOR ROUGE COMMUNITIES
POLICY FOR MEASURING IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS OF COUNTIES**

Article III Assessment of Costs to Members provides: based on the in-kind contributions currently provided by the member counties (Wayne, Oakland and Washtenaw), the counties will not be assessed to support the budget of the ARC.

In determining whether or not assessment will be made to the Counties, the following policy is established for determining the level of in-kind contributions.

1. Definition - In-kind Contributions
 - a. In-Kind Contributions shall be measured as an account of a member County's time, expenses and materials contributed to ARC and/or Rouge River Watershed activities.

2. In-kind Contributions include:
 - a. County staff participating in watershed management, educational or other conferences that specifically benefit of the ARC and/or Rouge River Watershed activities.
 - b. County staff contributing to ARC Committee Activities
 - c. Time and materials employed by County staff exclusive of County permit required activities for ARC or Rouge River watershed activities including but not limited to ARC meeting participation, routine information requests, program development, direct assistance to communities, watershed events, investigating and elimination of illicit connections, environmental education, River Day activities .
 - d. Any material and supplies provided by Counties that further interests of the ARC and/or Rouge River Watershed activities including lab analysis, printed material, transportation, signage, and Mapping.
 - e. Other related activities such as studying problems, planning and implementation of activities designed to address surface water quality or water flow issues within the Rouge River watershed.

3. Calculation of In-Kind Contributions

The following factors shall be used in calculating In-Kind Contributions of Member Counties:

 - a. Direct Labor (includes amount paid to employee as well as a mark up for recovery of non-productive benefits – such as vacation, holidays, etc).
 - b. Customary Fringe benefits and indirect costs as allowed by:
 - i. Generally Accepted Accounting Practices (GAAP)
 - ii. US EPA Grant Regulations,

DRAFT #4

- iii. Allocations consistent with County specific approved cost allocation plans (or equivalent).
- c. Services and/or Materials/Goods purchased that benefit the ARC.
- d. County Internal Service Fund charges for direct services benefiting the ARC (e.g. printing services from the County print shop).

If it is determined that counties will be assessed dues, the maximum assessment total in any year to all members shall not exceed 12 % of the combined total assessment for the fiscal year for all other Primary Members. The 12% assessment limitation will be determined based upon the total amount assessed the other primary members in the adopted annual ARC budget for a given fiscal year and not the subsequent actual assessment paid. In the event that the total assessment to the counties determined on or before August of any given year for the following fiscal year exceeds 12% of the total for all other primary members subsequently approved in the ARC budget for the same fiscal year the total amount assessed to the counties will be reduced such that the total does not exceed 12 % of that Assessed all other primary members.

The 12% assessment will be prorated to each county based the drainage area within the watershed excluding Detroit.

- 4. If a county seeks a waiver of the assessment , the requesting county will provide an accounting of their In-Kind contribution to the ARC Finance Committee showing previous year's in-kind contributions and Budget Year's anticipated in kind contributions to the ARC or Rouge River Watershed activities . The report will include a summary of the costs and a narrative describing how the costs benefited the ARC mission. The ARC Treasurer will make a recommendation to the ARC Executive Committee for their determination and approval.



Strategic Planning Document Draft of 9/24/07

The following document was assembled to help guide the ARC members through a strategic planning process. The format, content, and topics are all open to discussion. Comments are encouraged. Please forward written comments to comeara@ectinc.com for inclusion in subsequent drafts.

INTRODUCTION

The Rouge River Watershed, located in Southeast Michigan, runs through the most densely populated and urbanized land area in the state. The watershed is approximately 438 square miles in size and includes all or part of 48 municipalities in three counties, with a population of over 1.4 million people.

The Alliance of Rouge Communities (ARC) is a voluntary public watershed entity currently comprised of 39 municipal governments (i.e. cities, townships and villages), three counties (i.e., Wayne, Oakland and Washtenaw) and the Wayne County Airport Authority as authorized by Part 312 (Watershed Alliances) of the Michigan Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act (MCL 324.101 to 324.90106) as amended by Act No. 517, Public Acts of 2004. (*Further information is available at www.allianceofrougecommunities.com*)

Officially formed in January of 2006, the ARC members represent public agencies with storm water management responsibilities whose jurisdictional boundaries are totally, or in part, located within the Rouge River Watershed located in southeast Michigan. The state law authorizing the formation of watershed alliances throughout Michigan was modeled after a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) adopted by the Rouge River watershed communities and counties in August of 2003, which successfully guided a regional effort over a three-year period to address watershed-wide water quality and water quantity issues.

STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS

In 2007, the Alliance of Rouge Communities hired an executive director to run its day-to-day operations. Previously, the ARC determined that once an executive director was in place, a strategic plan would be developed in cooperation with and approved by the Executive Committee.

This is a draft document based on a meeting of the Organizational Committee's Strategic Plan Subcommittee on August 22, 2007 and September 18, 2007 in Plymouth Township. The nine subcommittee members were asked to discuss where they would like the ARC to be in five years. Comments from that session were distilled into four focus areas: Membership, Financing, Storm Water Permitting and Communications.

STRATEGIC PLAN FOCUS AREAS

Membership

How to retain members and gain new ones:

Retention of existing members and addition of new members to the Alliance of Rouge Communities (formerly the Assembly of Rouge Communities) remains a challenge. Since the ARC began operations in 2003, the officers and membership have been focused on formalizing the ARC's organizational structure by pursuing watershed alliance enabling legislation, writing bylaws and hiring an executive director. The ARC has done well retaining its membership during this transitional period. The pieces are in place and now the ARC must conduct activities that are meaningful to its membership.

The day-to-day operations of the ARC are performed through a group of standing committees. Currently, the Technical Committee oversees activities such as the monitoring program, the illicit discharge elimination program, and pursuing grants. The Public Involvement and Education Committee oversees broad initiatives such as, conducting workshops, distributing materials and helping to publicize successes. The Organizational Committee oversees membership requirements and rules. The Finance Committee oversees budget matters, including membership dues and finances. All ARC members receive the benefits of these activities, but these benefits must be sufficiently valuable to retain existing members and engage others. The obvious question to be answered is, "Why should communities continue to be members of the ARC and why should other communities and agencies join the ARC?"

The strategic plan should provide reasoning for ARC membership in order to translate the message back to the community. The community is a dynamic entity with changing demographics, officials and stakeholders in general.

Actions to accomplish this goal:

1. Work with MDEQ to create a single permit for the Rouge River Watershed
2. Offer cost-effective permit compliance support.
3. Encourage school districts, universities and industry to participate in the ARC.

Formalize nomination process for officers.

The nomination process for ARC officers should be reviewed and either endorsed or modified to reflect the concerns of ARC members. Currently the ARC elects officers for two-year terms. They are: the Chairperson, the Vice-Chairperson and the Treasurer. In the past, a nominating committee has been appointed by the ARC Chairperson to receive nominations for officers and to make recommendations to the Executive Committee which then recommends the slate to the full ARC. What should the rules be for nominating officers?

Actions to accomplish this goal:

1. The Committee has determined that this effort is of a lower priority than other challenges and has chosen to made changes to the nominating process a long-term goal
- 2.

3.

Be more efficient/share costs

The ARC continues to seek methods for long term funding. One of the underlying reasons for creating the ARC was to reduce the cost of storm water permit compliance by working together to address water quality policy in general, storm water permit issues and PEP and IDEP compliance. Currently, 50% of ARC activities are funded by Wayne County using the Rouge Project funds. The other 50% of ARC costs are paid for by the member communities. Other storm water activities in the Rouge River watershed are funded through a county grant program that provides 50% of total project costs. Total federal funding for Rouge River watershed activities has been reduced over the years and could stop all together in 2009. At the same time, costs to local governments for stormwater compliance are increasing and revenues are decreasing. It could be harder to pay to support permit activities. Are there storm water management activities that can be conducted by the ARC or shared by communities to reduce the cost of the storm water permit?

Actions to accomplish this goal:

1. Continue to pool resources for monitoring. The cost effectiveness of this effort must be documented for presentations to local boards and councils to clearly demonstrate the efficiencies gained through participation on the ARC.
2. Leverage county resources. The County services remain a cost effective means for permit compliance and should be coordinated and documented through the ARC.

3.

Financing

Review ARC membership dues structure

The membership dues structure should be reviewed and either endorsed or modified to reflect the concerns of the member communities. Since the ARC was created in 2003, member communities have paid dues based upon equal weight to the population of the unit of government within the watershed according to the most recent United States census and the land area within the watershed. The current assessment is not reduced based upon the addition of new members. There is some concern that dues may have to be increased to make up for the funding that could be lost when federal funding ends. If dues are not increased when federal funding ends, the ARC would have to conduct its business with half of its current operating budget. Should the ARC increase its dues? Should the formula used to calculate the member community dues be changed? *The Strategic plan should address potential funding changes and ways to secure new funding.*

Actions to accomplish this goal:

1. Correlate any dues increase with activities of subcommittees to increase effectiveness.
2. Finance Committee should investigate the use of a contingency plan/reserve funds to augment the transition to funding the ARC using dues (when the RPO grant ends)
3. The Executive Director should investigate and pursue alternative funding sources.

4. The ARC should explore increasing membership dues incrementally.

*Communicate what member communities get for their dues.
Explain why communities should continue to be part of the ARC.*

As mentioned previously, ARC dues pay for 50% of the following items:

- Executive Director and staff
- Water Quality Monitoring Program
- Public Education activities
- Liability insurance
- Subwatershed Management Advisory Group facilitation
- IDEP activities
- Advocacy with agencies like MDEQ, USEPA, the Michigan congressional delegation, US Corps of Engineers

Are there other services the ARC should be providing to its members? Is there a better way to keep members apprised of the benefits of being ARC members?

Actions to accomplish this goal:

1. Communications Strategy (report out from the committees, issue press releases, etc.)
2. Annual report targeted to local boards and commissions.
3. Generate a monthly e-mail that discusses issues being addressed and other information that is important to ARC members.
4. Make ARC staff available for presentations to local boards and commissions.

Storm Water Permitting

*Explore the possibility of a single permit for the entire Rouge River Watershed.
Develop standard reporting methods/one annual report written on behalf of members.*

The cost of permit compliance continues to grow but the ARC is looking for ways to control cost while improving water quality. Currently there are seven subwatershed management plans for the Rouge River Watershed. This means seven sets of goals and a plethora of objectives to fulfill those goals, as well as dozens of community actions to fulfill the objectives. A single permit would:

- Allow all ARC communities to address the same set of goals and objectives;
- Allow the ARC to focus on watershed-wide solutions to solve water quality problems,
- Pave the way for a single annual report which would outline comprehensively all ARC activities that addressed permit activities in a year and reduce the amount of time communities have to spend writing their annual reports;
- Provide for consistent reporting on watershed activities.

While addressing this objective, consideration would have to be given to Rouge River Watershed border communities, such as Troy, who are in more than one watershed.

One watershed permit would dovetail nicely with the planned Rouge River watershed management plan update slated for 2008. One watershed management plan could be developed with a chapter devoted to each subwatershed.

The committee members should consider whether this approach should be pursued? Would the ARC be the responsible agency to oversee the activities of a single watershed permit? To respond to MDEQ? How should this idea be promoted to other ARC members and to MDEQ? Is there a downside to this strategy?

Actions to accomplish this goal:

1. Work toward getting a single Rouge River Watershed permit within two years.
- 2.
- 3.

Develop a strategy for addressing Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)

The ARC must determine how best to work within the legal constraints of the TMDL program to improve water quality and control costs to local communities. The TMDL policy of the USEPA has been challenged in court continuously for decades. The result is a haphazard program that varies from state to state and Region to Region. The ARC has had a preliminary meeting with MDEQ regarding proposed TMDLs for the Rouge River Watershed. In addition, the draft storm water permit which will be implemented by MDEQ in April, 2008, requires communities to address TMDLs in many areas of the proposed permit. What should the TMDL strategy be? Should there be a subcommittee created to deal directly with TMDLs?

Actions to accomplish this goal:

1. Establish a working group to address this problem.
2. Negotiate with MDEQ to revisit the E. coli requirement.
3. Negotiate all TMDL requirements in the Rouge River Watershed with MDEQ.

Communications

Long term communications strategy with:

- *MDEQ*
- *Members*
- *Other watershed alliances/groups*
- *SEMCOG*
- *U.S. District Court Judge John Feikens*
- *The Media*

The Environmental programs continue to evolve and the cost of compliance changes from year to year. The ARC should consider how best to impact these changes in a manner that continues water quality improvement but limits the cost of less productive bureaucratic procedures. A comprehensive communications strategy should be developed to communicate with the listed parties, and others. Should

the ARC meet with MDEQ on a regular basis, like the Rouge Program Office used to do? What is the best way to communicate with members? The website? How should the ARC communicate with other watershed alliances and groups? By attending their meetings? Should the ARC regularly communicate with Judge Feikens?

Does the ARC want to take the lead on issues, as opposed to other organizations speaking on behalf of communities who are also ARC members?

Actions to accomplish this goal:

1. Media plan (issue press releases, discuss important issues with editorial boards)
2. Make presentations to city councils, governmental boards and councils.
3. Regular meetings with MDEQ and USEPA as required.