



Lake Champlain Steering Committee

APPROVED Meeting Minutes

December 17, 2024 10:00AM – 3:00PM

IN PERSON/HYBRID Teleconference (Contact LCBP for connection information)
Location: The Atrium at The Essex Resort and Spa, Essex Junction, Vermont

ATTENDANCE:

STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Julie Moore (Meeting Chair - VTANR), Nathalie Provost (Quebec MELCCFP), Joe Zalewski (NYS DEC), Pierre Leduc (Chair, Quebec CAC), Denise Smith (Chair, VT CAC), Buzz Hoerr (Chair, E&O Committee), John Krueger (Chair, HAPAC), Neil Kamman (Chair, TAC), Susan Sullivan (NEIWPC), Jennifer Curran (USACE), Laurie Earley (USFWS), Jean-François Ouellet (Quebec MELCCFP), Anne Jefferson (Lake Champlain Sea Grant), Travis Thomason (NRCS VT), Phil Giltner (NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation), Laura DiPietro (VT AAFM for Alyson Eastman), Laura Trieschmann (VT ACCD), Jenn Callahan (for Craig DiGiammarino VTrans), MaryJo Feuerbach (EPA R1), Antony Tseng (EPA R2)

STAFF: LCBP: Eric Howe, Mae Kate Campbell, **Kerry Crowningshield, Katie Darr, Colleen Hickey, Lauren Jenness, Elizabeth Lee, Corrie Miller, Ryan Mitchell, Meg Modley Gilbertson, Matthew Vaughan, Sonya Vogel, Jim Brangan, Erin Vennie-Vollrath (Lake Champlain - NY Coordinator NYS DEC), Sarah Coleman (Lake Champlain - VT Coordinator, VT ANR), Sarita Croce (NEIWPC), Daniel Tremblay (Quebec MELCC), Steve Garceau (MELCCFP), Bryan Dore (EPA R1), Michele Fafette (EPA R2), Theresa Vander Woude (EPA R1), Sophie Moffat-Bergeron (MELCCFP), Paul Tumminello (USACE), Veronique Connolly (MELCCFP), Karyn Hanson (NYSDEC), Guy Parenteau (QC MELCC), Karin Stainbrook (NYS DEC), Maya Dehner (USACE), Edo Jakupovic (QC MELCCFP)**

GUESTS: Tom Berry (GLFC), Ethan Hinch (Sen. Sanders' office), Owen Doherty (Cong. Balint's Office), Marcel Belaval (USGS), Joance Martin (for Audrey Bogemans, provincial representative)

Arrival, networking teleconference, and webinar open

9:30AM

KC MEETING BEGINS

10:00AM

INTRODUCTIONS: Julie Moore, VT ANR, Chaired the meeting.
Julie opened the meeting with a round of introductions.

Approval of Summary of September 10 meeting

ACTION ITEM: Approve Meeting Minutes from **September 10, 2024** Steering Committee Meeting

- Motion By: Buzz Hoerr
- Second by: Laurie Earley
- Discussion on the motion: None
- Vote: All in favor
- Abstentions: none

LJK PUBLIC COMMENT

10:15 AM

- None

SV BRIEF CONGRESSIONAL UPDATES

10:20 AM

- Ethan shared that Congress needs to pass a funding bill by this Friday before the Government shuts down and that would continue current funding. He expects a funding resolution that would push the vote to March, and we have no idea what that would look like.
- Owen shared that Congresswoman Balint was excited to co-sponsor the boat registration fees which were needed due to a change in Coast Guard leadership. This resulted in a letter of non-compliance being sent of coast guard regulations.
- Ethan said that Senator Welch introduced the LCBP reauthorization act that would make several administrative changes to how the program is run. He did not expect that it would be included in the bill being Friday's bill.

KD ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES

10:30 AM

Update from the Steering Committee Chairs and the Ad Hoc committee

Ad Hoc Committee Update (Neil Kamman):

The Ad Hoc Committee is collaborating with a consultant to evaluate the administration of the Lake Champlain Basin Program (LCBP). Neil highlighted three simultaneous areas of focus:

- Conducting a detailed review of Opportunities for Action (OFA), emphasizing clarifications in roles and responsibilities for the Steering Committee, Executive Committee, and the host entity. Language edits to tighten these roles are under review, pending approval from Steering Committee chairs.
- Exploring alternative administrative models for LCBP, including the current host entity model and a standalone 501(c)(3) foundation model, to identify strengths and areas for improvement.
- Awaiting the consultant's final evaluation to integrate findings into actionable recommendations for Steering Committee chairs and the full Steering Committee.

Consultant Progress (Julie Moore):

Julie shared progress from consultant Sophie Legendre, who has conducted 22 out of a planned 25 interviews. These open-ended discussions explore objectives, structural relationships, challenges, and areas for improvement within LCBP. Preliminary findings include:

- Diverging cultures and visions among stakeholders.
- Need for clarity in decision-making processes, particularly between the host entity and the Steering Committee.
- Opportunities to enhance communication channels and performance measurement expectations.

Julie reviewed next steps proposed by Sophie, including further meetings with key stakeholders to refine observations, collaboration with the Ad Hoc Subcommittee, and presenting a comprehensive report at the February 2025 SC meeting.

Discussion:

- **Nathalie Provost (Quebec MELCCFP):** Thanked the Ad Hoc Committee for their efforts.
- **Buzz Hoerr (E&O Committee Chair):** Emphasized the importance of addressing these long-standing issues to create better outcomes.
- **Ethan Hinch (Senator Sanders' Office):** Encouraged deeper exploration of differing objectives among stakeholders.

Next Steps:

A dedicated Steering Committee meeting will be held on February 24, 2025, in Grand Isle and via Teams, to review the Ad Hoc Committee and consultant's recommendations.

NEIWPCC Presentation: Who is NEIWPCC and LCBP Financial Reports 11:00 AM

Sarita Croce, NEIWPCC Water Resource Protection, Division Director

Sarita Croce delivered a comprehensive presentation on NEIWPCC, covering the organization's history, mission, financial overview, and challenges related to managing the Lake Champlain Basin Program (LCBP). The presentation agenda included an overview of NEIWPCC, fiscal summaries, a discussion of an EPA request letter, and a workload assessment.

Overview of NEIWPCC:

- NEIWPCC (New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission) was established in 1947 by an act of Congress. Its mission is to advance clean water initiatives across its member states, which include New England and New York.
- NEIWPCC's work spans three divisions: water quality, water resources, and wastewater treatment. Its services include staff training, fostering collaboration between states, and grant management to achieve member state goals.
- The organization supports the goals of the Lake Champlain Basin Program by administering grants and ensuring compliance with the Opportunities for Action (OFA).

Financial Overview:

- Sarita shared detailed fiscal summaries, including sources of LCBP funding, indirect costs, and the allocation of resources. Indirect costs cover essential administrative functions such as payroll, HR, business operations, accounting, and grant reporting requirements.
- A 5-year payroll summary showed that while total expenses have increased from 2020 to 2024, staffing levels have not kept pace with the workload. This disparity has resulted in administrative bottlenecks.
- Contract management has also seen a sharp increase, with the number of open contracts growing from 120 in 2020 to 285 in 2024. This increase has stretched existing staff resources.

Challenges and Discussion Highlights:

- **Workload Assessment:** Sarita explained that an administrative backlog has arisen due to insufficient staffing relative to the growth in LCBP funding and workload. She emphasized the need for additional hires and process streamlining to manage the growing demands effectively.
- **Questions from Committee Members:**
 - **Antony Tseng:** Asked about discrepancies in funding amounts across fiscal reports. Sarita clarified the timing differences between reports.
 - **Anne Jefferson:** Inquired about how budget estimates were made given FY25 uncertainties. Sarita explained that NEIWPCC and EPA fiscal years differ, and the figures represented FY24.
 - **Neil Kamman:** Asked about staffing coverage in Vermont. Sarita noted that Vermont staff payroll excludes Sarah Coleman's role as NY Coordinator.
 - **Pierre Leduc:** Asked about plans for increasing staff to handle contract workloads. Sarita shared that staffing adjustments would be discussed further in the next presentation.
 - **Julie Moore:** Suggested creating a chart to illustrate how LCBP fits into NEIWPCC's overall workload, which Sarita agreed would provide clarity.

Branding Discussion:

- Antony Tseng asked why NEIWPCC operates under its current name despite expanding beyond New England. Susan Sullivan explained that while the organization considered a formal rebranding, changing its Congressional charter would be impractical. NEIWPCC has instead implemented a 5-year branding plan to improve perceptions and inclusivity.

Key Takeaways:

- NEIWPCC's administrative challenges stem from the increased funding and workload, which have outpaced staffing growth.
- Additional staff and improved grant management processes are critical to maintaining operational efficiency.
- The Steering Committee encouraged NEIWPCC to provide clear data on LCBP's portion of the organization's workload and efforts to address administrative inefficiencies.
-

The next presentation will cover specific time allocations for LCBP staff and further insights into grant management challenges.

EPA REQUEST FOR CONTRACTING INFORMATION AND STAFF
WORKLOAD DISCUSSION

11:15 AM

Bryan Dore and MaryJo Feuerbach

Bryan: quick refresher of ask and reasoning. Presentation, first three slides. Have heard Bryan at the last few SC meetings, talked about messaging, things we've heard, to get to the bottom line of what is going on with processes and to have a better understanding to facilitate a solution. We have a quick In September we issued a letter to NEIWPCC that in Sept asked for a body of info to try to get hands on what is out there, timeline, to have a full in depth conversation. Not to try to say this PO is having trouble, no pointing fingers. Hoping to look at processes and work collaboratively. In our request we asked for three different groups of info. 1) understand procedures used to make subawards and contracts. 2) info and data points on current status of subawards. 3) completed contracts and subawards from 10/1/2023 - 9/4/2024. Also 5 randomly selected from 2021 when pressures on program started to rise.

Travis: the genesis of topic came from subrecipients sharing concerns with timeliness of systems...gathering from EPA questions dont have standard performance metrics. Bryan - there is sufficient progress measures. Each grant is a littel different. It's if the funding is hitting street, staying on timelines, etc. not in statute or anything.

Travis: NEIWPCC,I have a lot of program. Do you have standard metrics for grant administration?

Sarita: will talk about it. Have processes. Was impacted by increase in funding. And also covid, which put stall on things. Could have exacerbated existing problems. Our timeline, have been with NEIWPCC since JAn 2023. Timeline before, pretty much doubled. Thats what we needed to do to hire people, address issues.

Buzz: has NEIWPCC asked for consultant help to look at processes and what could be improved?

Sarite: have not, but changes implemented so far have seen improvement. Not sure if we need it at this point. Do need to look at LCBP. at the time did evaluation in Aug had 285 open contracts, that is a lot. In general to have people manage that many contracts. And then look at previous years lower #. # of contracts issued since Sept 30th, maybe 20 more issued. A lot in queue.

Pierre: LCBP is not unique. There are other programs throughout US. does EPA have those metrics for toher programs and can we benchmark with others?

Bryan: have geographic programs, are many. LISS, Chesapeake Bay, etc. similar in that they are place based programs. Statuses are all unique. All operate with partnerships and with different management hierarchies. One to one comparison would be hard - size structures all different. No performance measures that reach across all geo programs. Is a community that we talk within, troubleshoot etc. but based around your partnerships within the locations.

Pierre: would there be value in looking at best in practice metrics?

Bryan: would be hard, we operate differently.

Antony: LIS is administered by EPA, fiscal agent. Within LIS can make changes internally, like what NEIWPCC is trying to do. But what works for one doesn't work for all. That's why we need this conversation.

Travis: how big of a program is LIS?

Antony: is considerable. Did #s, total amount, FTEs, not the same. Larger funding wise but smaller FTE wise. One of things that Bryan brought up internally, try to manage in LEAN type system. What is the best process, efficiencies. Communication issues, etc.

Bryan: do try to pull good examples. A lot of them would be suggestions to bring to SC and then enact. Would take collective efforts to make changes. How grants are structured, timelines, process, etc. will talk about. That is part of next presentation.

KD EPA request for contracting information to NEIWPCC/LCBP – MaryJo Feuerbach and Bryan



Response to EPA Contracts Data Request and Staff Workload Assessment - Sarita Croce

- Sarita: I want to say that NEIWPCC was thrilled when EPA sent the letter, this kind of evaluation is essential to the success of the program. There were comments and complaints being received from partners. Without the letter, it would have been hard to dive into some of the details that needed to be addressed. Summarized NEIWPCC's key takeaways from the letter (slide 3). Unliquidated obligations = rate at which NEIWPCC spends down grant funds it is receiving. Summarized NEIWPCC's response to the information request (slide 6, 7, 8, 9). Sarita SC approval date is now on the contract request form, tracking date workplan is received, tracking date workplans were approved, and date the information was received. Decreased invoice payment time: if all materials to approve invoice are not in hand, send invoice back to contractor, have them resubmit once deliverables have been received. Now on average in the less than 45 day range.
- Slide 10 unliquidated obligations- EPA concerned drawdown was too slow. Once we have made an award or made a contract, consider that obligated. As we approve those invoices or reimbursement requests, now Lucia is updating all of the account information. Not everyone is billing after every task. Some contractors wait until the project is complete. Payment schedule is not necessarily something we can control.
- Workload analysis (slide 11): Looked at number of projects people had, if you look at that and the letter on page 9, you will see an evaluation of those projects. You will see an evaluation assuming that 48 hours is what people spend on each project. Anywhere from 940 -3,000 hours would be spent. Next slide is what people think they are spending on projects. Is the number of projects/person reasonable? To answer question from LISS perspective, LISS utilizes partners to distribute ~\$40M in base funding to manage some of this funding. Does it make sense for someone in this organization to manage these smaller projects or pass that on to another entity?
- Eric shared the workload assessment from the staff's project.

Discussion

- Pierre: clarification, define contract execution?
 - Sarita: Day neiwpc issued contract, signed by both grantee and susan.
- Neil: When SC issues award, don't have that award funding yet from EPA. There is an increment of time where we are waiting for federal money to come in.

- Nathalie: Decision by SC, some time where we don't understand what's happening, on average 49 days to clearly understand contract to package it, and then another 40 days. So the 187 is 49 + 40 + something we don't know.
 - Sarita: 187 to get to Lowell, 252 on average to get a contract.
- Jennifer: How long does it usually take from SC to EPA providing funds? Sarita: in April for a future award, typically get award October 1st.
 - Jennifer: so 4 months of that. Sarita: not all of them.
 - Jennifer: seems like an important data point to add to the table.
- Antony: Question in the room, are folks under the understanding that EPA funding is tied to each award or not? EPA gives NEIWPCC funds in 2 lump sums (subawards), in some awards, NEIWPCC has funds on hand for some of the other awards they need to wait for the April lump sum. Depends on which allotment.
 - Neil: Depends on which contract NEIWPCC is acting on as well.
 - Sarita: In some cases, going back to previous subawards to award a contract. Not an easy question to answer but we can go back and take a look.
- Jennifer: a comparison of this to the first grants awarded after SC, didn't have as big of a workload in 2021, another missing piece of the puzzle.
- Tom: you may have touched on some of this- distinction between work done by grand isle office to NEIWPCC lowell office, trying to picture what that looks like to a grantee. Is there a clear distinction of what is addressed by staff in basin or staff in lowell?
 - Sarita: I do think it is assumed when a package is forwarded to lowell it is ready for approval. Some issues that come up, that I think we have since addressed, workplan issues with comments/draft, things didn't match up in workplan, insurance/sam not being sent.
- Tom: to clarify then, to the extent that the contract isn't immediately approvable when it arrives in Mass, that would probably indicate a communication that needs to take place between staff in basin and staff in lowell and the potential grantee is dealing with staff without distinction about where they are based.
 - Sarita: not sure exactly what the grantee knows, see that it takes 1 year/9 months from award to contract.
- Neil: fundamentals of getting a contract through your office: need scope, need business goods w-9, SAM, insurance, DBE. That all makes sense. Will offer that there may be some efficiency in compiling work that has to do with the business things away from staff that are dealing with technical projects and scopes.
 - Sarita: Not so sure we have all the efficiencies in place, part of the conversation about how we do this. Lots of opportunities in this process to improve, make things easier. What we want the technical staff to focus on are the projects. How we do that, not sure we are there yet. Have made some improvements to what has been done in the past, will be a continuous process.
- Anne: thinking about those 187 days, some of that time is working on the workplan, waiting to present to TAC, getting their comments, revising plan. My grant, presented to TAC in november, period of months waiting. Would like to see more details about how we get to 187 days within the LCBP to understand where slowdowns might be happening. Once we were done in November, it was still 7 months until we had a contract. I sort of know what

happened in the first 5 months, don't understand what happened in the 7 months. I have a staff, do a lot of contract execution, don't understand what's happening before then.

- Sarita: one of the things happening was during the latter half of FY23 and most of FY24 we were getting emails as part of the communications requesting we expedite certain contracts because of the massive workload. Didn't talk about it in the letter because it is symptomatic of the bigger problem, the workload is too much. Need to look at the system/process, perhaps it's taking some of the administrative load off certain people.
- Anne: also a request for more granularity in the data you're presenting.
- Sarita: have a lot of notes/communications in the Lowell office, not sure it's a complete picture of the data. Does that answer question?
- Anne: flow chart from when the SC says yes to the contract being executed, who touches what/when would be helpful. It would help the SC to know what that process is.
- Buzz: 25 years at this, not deep in the grant weeds. Listening and learning what we're attacking and going for, used term earlier "density." Things were simpler earlier, topline effort and people who didn't have a lot of experience. Now there's way more experience and depth of understanding, increases complexity, cost, etc. Densification of work effort we're involved in is much more complex.
 - Sarita: agree.
- Neil: Last observation- in reference to technical projects, can see a way to slice that time down without sacrificing TAC's ability to get into the workplan. Know that only constitutes a small portion of the projects moving through LCBP/NEIWPC.
- Eric: ~12 or so research proposals that move through TAC. E&O large grants are also awarded in april, can't move fwd until after Oct 1st. ~25 projects that are in extended workplan development from April - october. E&O committee does not review the workplans.
- Neil: TAC has 1 - 3 month period for review, can see opportunities to trim that down.
- Tom: invoice process- goes to grand isle, review invoice and work product, review and approve for payment, and a subsequent approval process in Lowell?
 - Sarita: look at contract, makes sure amount in invoice matches contract that was sent. If there are any discrepancies send it back, if not send it to be paid.
 - Tom: Internal back and forth that has to occur with multiple staff approving the same invoice, may be time that's lost with back and forth between Lowell and Grand Isle staff.
 - Sarita: I don't approve the work product, all I do is compare the invoice to what was in the contract. The work product approval comes from the grand isle office. Do think we're very close to being under that 45 day timeline which is from the invoice date.
- Unliquidated Obligations:
 - Antony: look at big picture, don't want to imply that we don't. We separate % of award expended and % of award obligated.

- Jean Francois: What is BIL? Sarita: Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, put in place by president Biden to help communities with infrastructure needed to address water quality issues.
 - Eric: This column is different because EPA and SC have been adding funds to this account for three years. That's why it looks very low compared to expenses expended and obligated.
 - Sarita: will ask for a 2 year extension also. Land acquisition projects will be with us shortly. Looking at putting together contract terms and conditions.
 - Sarita: for the next major meeting, hoping to have update on contracts with the statistics and metrics you are looking for. In our quarterly reports, will provide an update of the contracting process and more granularity for the timeline and processes taking place in the notes.
- Eric: A typical 12-month, full time employee works about 1,200 hours per year, about a quarter of this time is spent managing grants. The number of grants they are PO on varies from a few to 51 grants. Some of the projects are more streamlined on the administrative side than others. For example, StreamWise is set up in such a way that the admin work is minimal for these grants. Much harder to capture in the data are the projects that require a lot of admin time, working with a small org that doesn't have the staff to guide the assumption of SAM.gov, etc. That type of work can take a significant amount of time and is difficult to budget for.
 - Sarita: About 10 hours a year for these projects? Whether that is accurate or not is not important, it's more about how much work they have to do.
 - Antony: How long do amendments take.
 - Sarita: Depends on the amendment. No-cost extensions are now much shorter to administrate, but an advanced amendment will take the same or more time than a new contract. It's the complexity of understanding where changing in a workplan are being made and why,
 - Antony: Within the EPA, amendments take significantly less time than new awards. Maybe something to look into.
 - Sarita: Like I said no-cost extensions take less time, but no change to our process for advanced amendments. I was planning to talk with Bryan today to discuss how we could make changes to the amendments that may change this.
- Eric: Sarita and I thought it would be good to share the summary of the duties that staff do across the program outside of grant management. Managing and planning for our meetings (EC, Advisory, SC), developing RFPs to get to the grant management stage, in house research, collaboration with our partners (extremely important and time consuming). One comment I've received is that the LCBP shows up! We go to our partners meetings to share the perspective of the work we do, let folks know about different things that happen. We do field work, data analysis, communications and marketing materials, outreach, training, etc. I agree with Sarita that the team has been working in emergency mode in the context of grants management since March 2023. I think we do need more support, and to continue to improve our tools and processes that make this easier. We look forward to improving workflows and get some extra staff support to help out team out.

Next steps: EPA Region 1, MaryJo Feuerbach and Bryan Dore

- Bryan: we want to have opportunity, EPA looking at info collected so far. Show you the little slice of insights to date. Recognize what comes next as this was the first step of the process. Still waiting on key piece of info that has slowed down analysis. This is the most up to date info we have (shared slide). It has been difficult without key piece of info - understanding of when workplans come into POs at Grand Isle. EPA has date when SC approves funding and when PO approves a workplan. Gap in analysis. Not a ton of confidence in our #s at the moment because of this. Most of contracts are E&O related.
- Travis: curious about \$ attached to each category.
- Bryan: have that info, can add.
- Bryan: timelines - it is becoming clear that more complicated a workplan is the more time it takes to get through the process. By recipient type - larger, complicated projects are also with Academic recipient. Academic institutions went through a big contract negotiation process this past fiscal year.
- Sarita: SUNY projects- universities refused to accept general terms and conditions. Had conference where came up with own general terms and conditions then had to work with SUNY system and other universities to develop a template everyone could accept. WAS done by Bob Brown previous attorney. When removed #s the avg didnt change that much.
- Bryan: removing outliers, larger more complicated projects till take longer. (Subawards >300,000).
- 2 pinch points identified: administrative review and approval of required paperwork and contract review and signature process.
- Commonly cited reasons for delay. 60% cited reasons for delay.
- Really important to untangle with staff what is working/not working at a process level.
- Antony: 121 contracts is not 121 entities, 65 unique entities. Most awards received by one entity was 8.
- Bryan: still have one piece of info to wrap in. once we have had opportunity it will be important to present findings NEIWPCC and LCBP staff - going into great detail, sitting down. Do have a date in Jan set aside. These are the in-dept convos needed to find most efficient and best ways to adapt and move in. will keep sc in loop. Put up graphic of EPA ELMS lean management system - will use this to help find efficiencies.
- Sarita: Susan says as well. From NEIWPCC's perspective think feedback is a gift. Continuous improvement is always the key to success. Thank you.
- Julie: knowing have meeting on Feb 24th, will you have time to provide an update?
- Bryan: yes we can give an update at least on what has happened to date.
- Pierre: two ways to improve the staff overload situation. Find efficiencies, process improvements and then hire more staff. Haven't seen #s from 2021 or where we were for # of projects/\$/person when things were "normal". What is the goal? Do we need to hire more staff? Will we have a view of that in February?
- Bryan: I hope so. A lot of work to do in remaining analysis and also so much will come out in discussions with staff.

- Julie: couple of hiring positions that SC supported months ago that haven't been effective. NEIWPCC has it's perspective on what to hire vs what SC recommended. Lets brfeak for lunch, return by 1:15pm. Delay green schools until next SC meeting. 15min conversation on immediate staffing concerns at LCBP.

LUNCH BREAK

12:15 PM

Julie: SC had approved in March 2024 a new position for two new positions. One in second grant administration person. Additional position was intended to be partial grant admin but also metrics collection/data interpretation to get up and running for EPA requirements and more broadly across the board in meeting OFA goals.

Julie: NEIWPCC has alternative proposal?

Sarita: before I got here, decision made to hire first grants manager position. Went through five rounds, extended time to hire someone. Issues associated with how it worked, process side.

Tomorrow interviewing for an Environmental Analyst - who has admin experience and technical background to help managing grants in specific section. From our perspective. NEIWPCC works - EAs have this responsibility. Manage grants, put together packages. That is the plan at this point. Will interview tomorrow and then move forward. Move forward with this model.

Susan: this is me. Not comfortable with where we were. Wasn't successful. Type of person we need has to have technical skills. Would be better served to hire an EA. had talked with Eric and Meg about filling Logan's job with EA position. Would like to do similar with Colleen in E&O work, as well as operational responsibilities. Workload high expectations high. Better served going EA route. Not interested in hiring IO and going through same process.

Laurie: two positions approved in April

Eric: original grants manager was approved by SC in April 2022 as part of that budget cycle. We posted that position in late summer of 2022 and went through rounds to hire. March 2023 was when Logan started. SC approved second GM position to provide same type of support in April 2024.

Laurie: the focus was on delivery of grants and that was LCBP vision. Suggestion from NEIWPCC is to change to EA and have admin.

Sarita: correct. Want to point out, grants manager Logan handling was issues was workplan.

Those need to be addressed with technical staff at LCBP. added to timelines, increased. Always going through Logan to get things resolved. Was in private sector and consulting already gone to model where project managers did large portion where admin played smaller role. Dont think we are taking on model that doesn't work.

Anne: currently advertising for EA based in Grand Isle?

Sarita: interviewing tomorrow

Anne: is that different?

Eric: refilling vacancy when Logan left in October he was grant manager. Funding for that position has been retooled to EA role. Working on Admin Team. interviewing tomorrow for position for EA but using funds. HE team.

Anne: comment on the motivation behind pivot. Is it the same different in vision for GM, EA, or is it you as director have important.

EH: Sarita and Susan suggestion. Still feel a good conversation to have about direction we want team to go. If we want program staff to continue with more of an admin role in managing grants vs approach the approach that SC took two years ago. Timing was timing for start of that position. Unfortunate start time helped feed into delays. When Logan started in March 2023 that is when the new funding, including BIL arrived. Had to learn his job by trial and error. Other transitions at LCBP and Lowell. A lot of moving parts at that time. Increase in grants, burden for a new position, early career person to bare.

Laura: SC made decision to fund position. NEIWPCC had different interest. Giving that SC approves budget and position, was there communication back to SC? What is the other position, where is the conversation at, personal comment. Hard to find person to do specifically grant management. Is an important aspect. There is a lot of technical expertise. How much funding, do need support for someone t

Sarita: NEIWPCC is responsible for management of staff, all staff report to NEIWPCC. Direct communication with SC - no. was an evaluation we did in house to figure out best approach. Other position - right now hiring first position will then look at next two. Current plan is to hire 1 E&O and 1 for CW. Hired Sonya a few months ago.

Laurie: also EA?

Sarita: yes

Nathalie: What is today's expectation regarding this issue with the SC? We made a decision and we thought it would be applied as we decided, but NEIWPCC chose differently. For today, what is expected?

Travis: Who has the authority to make that decision?

Nathalie: That is the elephant in the room. But for today, what are we doing? I think it's important to consider it

Sarita: It's NEIWPCC.

Susan: Apologize can't hear the conversation, feedback. One of the conversations that is making me as ED uncomfortable, we have a relationship and commitment to LCBP and EPA to get work done in a timely manner including making decisions about staffing to get that done. Hands are tied, Arguing over semantics about who is the right person to get the work done. We are in a tight situation because of the workload, whether we hire an EA or IO, no difference in pay. Difference in skillset, what we saw in the last year was a need for technical skills. Not enough to have an admin person. Disappointing to me that we're having this in depth conversation about this and that you do not trust our professional judgement.

Julie: We approved a specific position 9 months ago, and there has been zero communication about the position back to the SC. I think that it shows that NEIWPCC hasn't prioritized communication with the SC.

Susan: comes back to conversations that we have been struggling with, discussing at SC level feels awkward to me.

Julie: agree.

Nathalie: What's the expectation today?

Julie: Don't want to get in the way of the hiring process. Appreciating that the communication channels are awkward or under defined in OFA, there are ways we could have threaded this that don't result in 9 months of delay and is being effectively presented as a fait accompli today without dialogue with SC.

Susan: I think the best option would be to discuss what hiring looks like and communication between the SC and NEIWPC. It's something fundamental that we need to do, there are changes happening at the LCBP that require changing how things are set up.

- Neil: think we learned a lot this morning in terms of data analysis. Also thank Susan. This SC has never had opportunity to see inside the books. Questions have come up over the years. Where are things in process, seeing it now. See very strong parallels to situation that secretary helped guide us through. Struggling to implement 10-20K awards where technical staff responsible for 30-40 awards. All good on trying to find EA, but if they are going to deal with awarding docs - they are going to leave. That is not environmental work. Looking forward once ad hoc committee, consultant does review. What is a back office vs front office. Does host entity need capacity or LCBP need capacity. That is not a model we are discussing.
- Laura: timeline for other positions?
- Sarita: would hire for position and then advertise for the next position. Job description, posting is all set to go. Received 122 applications for current posting. Made it clear that responsibility would be responsible for grant admin. HR talked to them to make sure they understood. Need to take step back and find appropriate path forward. Do have EAs doing both right now.
- Laura: EA already, what about GM as IO, then get what we want.
- Denise: three total positions.
- Sarita: two more EAs, all three EAs.
- Neil: put at NEIWPC
- Sarita: interesting concept. Would need additional admin.
- Sarita: gets confusing for grantees when multiple people calling and asking questions. Good to have one contact.
- MaryJo: from my perspective opinion not wait until we have further analysis...where issues opportunities are before we make recommendations for how to go forward with new positions.
- Julie: suggesting pause following hiring after next person to have benefit of completion of body of work.
- MaryJo - my perspective is - need help now. Don't pause on interviews tomorrow but for next two positions wait until analysis is complete.
- Julie: What is the timeline between posting a job to starting the position?
- Sarita: Two parts. One part is regarding the grants management position from 2022- we didn't have a lot of applicants, it took many rounds. Typically we review the position role description (1 week), post job (~1 month), interviews (2 weeks), reference check, then extend an offer. Sometimes there is a hold up in the reference check stage.
- Julie: so about 90 days from SC approval?
- Sarita: Yes.
- Laura: What is the need between technical and admin? How do they align?
- Sarita: Technical issue is the workplan development, there have been issues with workplans. Administrative side is all of those forms needed to take a workplan to contract.

QAPPs are challenging, some projects that needed them and didn't have them. That decision is a technical one.

- Julie: If I may interpret Laura question, does it make sense/will additional information help us make a decision in February.
- Laura: There is already a deep technical bench, more administrative work experience is lacking. Processes in place that makes it difficult for people to jump in and help. You can work at workplans and quality, the applicant not doing the work isn't the issue. Processing and keeping track of where projects are at in the process is critical and doesn't require a science background. I know this data and analysis is important, but don't paralyze yourself analyzing it. They need people.
- Julie: I will make a proposal. NEIWPCC will hire the EA position that is currently ongoing, then we will table some of this conversation for our meeting in February. Additional job postings will not be made until our next discussion, but the current process should continue. It is important to have a shared understanding before we move. Based on what we heard here, this is my summarized approach.
- Pierre: Check to make sure that NEIWPCC will respect the decision of the steering committee.
- Sarita: Yes, a conversation offline will help us align on our processes. A singular recommendation to the next steering committee meeting will be useful.
- Denise: Alignment and communication. I thought we were going to look at staffing, if NEIWPCC is hired to run this process, the SC must still be included in what is going on here.
- Jean Francois: It is not our responsibility as the SC to micromanage Eric on a regular basis. A flowchart of how NEIWPCC sees their decision making, and one for LCBP and the SC. That way we can see and come together on this issue.
- Sarita: To answer part of your question. We do have flow charts and I can commit to sharing that at the next meeting. On the communication side, I agree Denise. There was some nuance on the request/approval of a new position that I didn't know about prior to this meeting.
- Julie: SOphie will in some ways facilitate this through her sharing of interviews.

SV FY2025 BUDGET PROCESS

1:30 PM

FY2025 Budget process and schedule (Eric Howe)

- Eric: I am going to propose that we make up some time on the agenda. Let's focus on the line items for the SC, new tasks that are proposed by folks at this table or from advisory committees. The core projects (long term monitoring, boat launch steward, etc.). Jim: Any CVNHP core projects today?
- CVNHP
 - Jim: There is the SUMmit, wayside exhibit program, Katie Darr and CABN, and the biosphere in your backyard program
 - Eric: Those are all not new to the SC, and have been approved in the past. SO I propose we move forward with the line items. We can loop back if there is time. Looking ahead to our April SC meeting regarding our FY2025 appropriation (currently on continuing resolution) which will be decided in April 2025.

FY2025 Core Projects:

- Clean Water and Healthy Ecosystems
 -

- Education and Outreach
 - Ryan: LCBP website update, \$45,000 budgeted for that. Last update was in 2021. By the time we can get around to that, it will be time.
 - Lauren: Property assessment. This is an expanded grant program based on the StreamWise grant model that would fund projects for property assessment.
 - Colleen: Lawn to Lake, Don't P on Your Lawn and Raise the Blade would be included. We found that many respondents were not aware of the P laws that were passed 10 years ago. LCC had a small grant to kick off the effort last year, now they have the support of VT ANR. This money would support the effort, including but not limited to signage through store and events, marketing materials to showcase that work in VT and NY, and remind people about the limits set to P loading in those states.
 - Ryan: This is a two component project from SeaGrant. One is a workshop about communicating about climate change, and another would be social media marketing training for industry professionals. The next task is a tag on to this, that would fund social marketing campaigns to advertise, marketing materials, or hire a consultant to help expand or make a new program. \$60,000.
 - Colleen: Through our large grants SeaGrant NY and SUNY Plattsburgh are seeking to extend education efforts into NY. To support 40-45% staff there and some supplies.
 - Anne: The idea of moving this to line item was to give us the stability for this work rather than relying on a bi-annual grant. Vermont educators should be able to capitalize on the resources through ECHO, Rubenstein Lab, and SeaGrant. We want to be able to build better partnerships moving forward.
 - Eric: I want to emphasize that not in the budget this year is the StreamWise/LakeWise. What is not articulated here is that the property assessment asks are consolidated efforts for multiple pieces of work including StreamWise, LakeWise, etc.
 - Ryan: For the E&O perspective, we see this as a one stop shop for homeowners.
 - Neil: This would have funding for LCBP, Streamwise, and the states?
 - Lauren: Yes, we would work collaboratively between the states, LCBP, SeaGrant, and StreamWise.
 - Sarah: Maybe you are thinking of the VT LakeWise Neil? That is still part of our core projects, so this unification does not include that yet.
 - Lauren: It would include VT based groups to apply to LakeWise funding through that program?
 - Sarah: Yes. To Neil's point, the unifying stormwater line item, there would not be funds going to the VT stormwater work.

FY2025 Line-Item requests

- Sarah: We broke up our line item requests this year based on body of work. The first is the design and implementation in the regulatory stormwater space. We've had a few years of MS4 communities to meet their stormwater requirements. We also want to help communities this year meet the 3 acre stormwater management
- Erin: One project in the design and implementation category is another round of funding in the flood resiliency category. We have a set of reports on flooding, ice blocks, etc. that are looking into Great CHazy, Little CHazy, mettawee, Bouquet, etc. Looking for ~1 million dollars in support for these projects.
- Julie: Were there two appropriations in 2024?
- ErinL: That is total. The other design and implementation is for a third round of agricultural soil BMPs. Asking for \$250,000 for this. Buffers, cover crops, manure storage, etc. are examples of this work. Working with SWCD in the counties.
- Sarah: Organizational capacity. VT requested \$250,000 for on-site WWTP program education. In addition, these dollars would support an education and recruitment program to aid in the recruitment of the next generation of these professionals.
- Erin: In NY the focus of this funding will be on watershed groups, their organization capacity and implementation work. Specifically funneling into wastewater treatment plant facilities recruitment to bolster staff support and increasing staff on hand. Promotional exams included in this. Requesting \$300,000.
- TOM: Is this mostly for informational purposes to discuss later or are we pre-approving them for the April meeting?
- Eric: This is for an opportunity for feedback, suggestions, etc so that they can be refined ahead of the April meeting.
- Tom: Missing some of this info so I appreciate that clarification.
- Eric: APologies, it looks like something disappeared from the meeting folder that would be helpful here. Just dropped this back in.
- Pierre: Some of these are repetitions of previously funded work. It would be helpful to break down how much funding has been allocated in the past.
- Sarah: Information can be provided at another time. The next project is for investigating drought, low stream flows, climate change impact on low flow conditions and aquatic habitat. Changing categories for funding in inventory and assessment space. From FOrrest, Parks, and Rec, request to do research on the use of recreation use on roads. Inventory of recreation use of class 4 town highways and legal trails to provide an assessment and toolkit to towns.
- Tom: Is this assessment specific to the water quality aspects of recreational use?
- Sarah: Yes, the goal of technical study is to clarify the effects of heavy rec use on water quality.
- Erin: In NY we are asking for \$200,000 to look into hot spots for stream bank erosion. We would like to work with SWCD to assess areas of erosion, and in some instances repair.
- Sarah: The next funding request is a project for tagging of walleye in LC to see how stocking is impacting the population. One example of the application of genetic sampling

would be to assess the spawning population relative to the entire population in LC. Another request is to continue to a third year of AIS funding in VT.

- Erin: In our shared document we have a summary table and descriptions of each project.
- Antony: Two comments. It would be cool to use the OFA strategy task area metrics to identify the task area that is being met by the funding. It would be great to see how much we are spending on each task. Back in July 2016 there was a MOU to revise the TMDLs of this MOU, so come July 2026 we will need to develop updated TMDLs. The MOU says the work must start in 2026. Good to consider in this context.
- Julie: We would benefit from having the expectations clarified by the EPA about what is needed. The reporting tasks are difficult on top of other things, so perhaps this is an offline conversation.
- Antony: I bring this up in terms of the budget. The TMDLs benefited last time by outside EPA funding, so I think we would have that this time.
- Eric: This is the LCBPs funding, and an opportunity for the states to request funding directly from the SC.
- Neil: To speak to a couple of these projects. The workforce development project in NYS...Wastewater treatment operators are a huge need in both states. I would encourage the committee to consider these funding opportunities strongly. The fisheries proposal is very very cool and worth investing in (based on fisheries TAC member comments).
- Julie: This is just a briefing. No action necessary.

FY2025 BIL funding priorities

-

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

2:30 PM

Advisory Committee Appointments

Motion to enter executive Session: Joe Zalewski

Second: Neil Kamman

Pierre Recused himself for executive session

Colleen and Ryan introduced the E&O Committee appointments

- Elizabeth Lee, Cornell Cooperative Extension, experience with ag community which is currently lacking on committee
- Tom Collins, AWI, brings lots of education and outreach experience in, social media, forestry interest which is also lacking on committee, well connected in NY
- Julie Reinling, OBVBM communications is a significant part of her role there. Presently a gap in QC representation on the committee
- Ken Mervis, independent brings a lot of private sector expertise to the table.

Discussion

- None.

Motion to exit executive session by: Antony Tseng

Second by: Anne Jefferson

Open session:

ACTION ITEM: Motion to approve Advisory Committee Membership Appointments as discussed in the Executive Session

- Motion By: Anne
- Second by: Jennifer Curran
- Discussion on the motion: None
- Vote: all in favor
- Abstentions: Pierre recused himself from the discussion and the vote

Executive Session: FY2025 Clean Water and Healthy Ecosystems Research Pre-Proposal TAC Recommendation (Neil Kamman, Matt Vaughan)

- Motion to enter EC: Julie
- Second: Buzz
- Matt and Neil reviewed the preproposal process and the 17 projects that TAC has recommended to move to the full proposal stage.
- Julie: total budget for the 17 and total amount available? Matt: total amt available not set, worked with ballpark of \$3M. Last year, funded ~\$1.9M. \$5.7M in requests slated to advance to full proposal.
- Neil: reminder that in dam removal category got a lot of good ideas including competing methods for what we were asking for.
- Neil: have one proposal where we would like the SC's input in category of general OFA. Proposal to expand on the emerging contaminants evaluation currently underway, recall we have funded 2 phases of that work to develop an emerging contaminants monitoring framework. Expensive work, the intended wastewater sampling exceeded the budget in phase 2, worked on pulling that out. Last year through EC, received plus up request for carry over funds to put that back in. Did not feel comfortable with that, asked them to come back in through regular funding cycle. \$130,000 proposal to sample pfas and other contaminants. Thought this was an SC call if it would be a good use of LCBP funds. Know there are independent funding mechanisms to look at pfas in effluent, influent, and biosolids.
 - Joe Zaleswki: shared this preproposal with technical staff. With respect to pfas sampling at wastewater treatment plants, duplication of efforts. One of the goals seemed to be to compare different treatment technologies but if they are only sampling at the end of the pipe, don't know the influent and don't have a great point of comparison. EPA method 1633 recommended for pfas monitoring. Yes to PCBs and pharmaceuticals, no to PFAs for NY due to existing efforts.
 - Matt: Nice advantage of this process, can provide feedback to applicants. Influent and effluent sampling and considering PFAS.
 - Laura DiPietro: Want to make sure that the data will be available to the contractors, no one should pay for anything twice. Don't know timeline/availability etc, make sure the contractor can include state data in the report even if they haven't collected the samples.
 - Neil: don't have the data, know VT contractor has the data, sure it will be accessible.

- Joe confirmed the NY data will be public as well. That monitoring should be underway before this LCBP funding would get started.
- Sarita: part of EPA's pretreatment program requires monitoring for pfas and requires sampling up gradient to see where it is coming from as well. Having done pfas sampling interesting to see difference between influent and effluent, some time in the treatment process you actually develop pfas due to the combination of precursor compounds.
- Neil: getting a sense we want to see the full proposal without pfas. Julie: agree with Joe in that regard.
- Matt: seeing nods.
- Julie: question about track 5 about the lake trout oxithermal habitat survey. Struggling to get native species project proposals in. Curious what the thinking was knowing lake trout is an area of active interest what the concerns were for the preproposal.
 - Neil: relied a lot on Margaret Murphy's perspective on this. Methodologically a little problematic, concerns about methods answering the question at hand, access issues looking at private lands.
 - Laurie: Wasn't getting at the management questions that fish tech want to understand about lake trout.
 - Julie: get a lot less species and wildlife applications that contaminants. That management team, are they connected into the research community so they have an understanding of the most critical questions to study.
 - Laurie: Want to see more proposals here as well. Could do a better job as a team prioritizing and listing key research questions we have and make known to researchers in the area not just those who advise the committee.
 - Neil: pushed some of the habitat and native species projects, mud puppy, sturgeon, American eel.
 - Laurie: meeting in january, will take this thought back to discuss with the fisheries technical committee.
-

Exit Executive Session.

- Motion By: Neil
- Second by: Nathalie

ACTION ITEM: Conditionally APPROVE FY25 Clean Water and Healthy Ecosystems Research Pre-Proposals to advance to Full Proposal stage as discussed in Executive Session.

- Motion By: Neil Kamman
- Second by: Buzz Hoerr
- Discussion on the motion: none
- Vote: All in favor
- Abstentions: Laurie Earley

SV BRIEF STEERING COMMITTEE UPDATES

Jurisdictional Updates (States, Provincial, US Federal)

3:00 PM

- Joe: I will refer to the written updates in the meeting folder. Good news, since April, DEC has completed electrofishing of round goby and NONE have been detected past lock C1.
- Nathalie: It has been a difficult year for us. Government is at a deficit and we are reducing our workloads and capacity, but this shouldn't affect any of our work here.
- Jean Francois: I had a few slides. We are happy to have more people. Copper redhorse is an endangered species only found in Quebec. Grass carp documentary is an interesting story about the capture of a few grass carp. eDNA and electrofishing in July-September, none caught, some eDNA detection. Round goby on the Richelieu River. There have been three captured fish on the upper side of the dam last year. We caught 60 this year, so the population is slowly expanding. There was also positive eDNA detection up to the Chambly dam. Field visits to the eel ladders in the Chambly and Saint -Ours dams. Rabid raccoons near the border, concern being dealt with, with collaboration from the USDA.
- Julie: did just as clean water board adopt a FY26 set of funding priorities. 44.5M dollars of state funding available in 2026. Funding gets spread across work within ANR and AAFM and AOT. outgrowth of work started in ARPA Healthy Homes - working with individual property owners, expanded initiative to support manufactured communities in complying with 3-acre sw permit. This will come up in news...concerns starting to be raised on cost. Sw retrofits are high cost projects ANR invests in.
- Bryan: written updates. Have been thinking about environmental justice, technical assistance centers. Up and operational. Several overlap with LCB. receive \$10M in funding. For R1 - UCONN is DAC. west harlem environmental corporation. Vermont Institute for Sustainable Communities in Montpelier. branch chief Mel retired, second acting chief Regina Lyons. Manager of ocean and protection unit in Boston. She is awesome and has great background working with geo and NEP programs.
- Antony: have federal subgroup meeting on 11/15 to discuss water quality data and modeling efforts. Output is that we need to learn more about VT TBPs. in R2 trying to have additional communication between NRCS counterparts for NPS pol;lution.
- Travis: currently change of admin coming in Jan. our directive is to implement as much IFA funds. Interested in strengthening local conservation districts, conservation district plans. NRCDs, SWCDs. Helping then to rely on TBPs and aligning our EQUIP to align with the high priorities. This will be first year on that. April State TEchnical Committee meeting.
- Laurie: back to Sept update- Ken Sturm refuge manager - observation of water chestnut in missiquoi bay has grown - quite concerned. With FY24 our partners program able to complete 27 projects 10 miles 81 acres 91 upland 20 acre AIS, 21 miles of AOP through removal of 8 barriers. Able to complete 2 sea lamprey control - winoski and missiquoi, both delayed due to low water levels. In 2023 thought would have record # of LLAS. 2024 had 224 fish return! Also most # of fish 309 fish in Saranace. #s are looking good! Hope we can continue to see this trend.
- Jennifer: no update, waiting to see what will happen.
- Anne: late breaking written update. Have open RFP 2026-2028 to any organization in LCB - VT and NY. northeastern state cooperative - also open. Have a 1 in every 6 year

site review from a federal program in June. some of you may be tapped to speak to how we have been engaged with local partner organizations.

- Sarita: we have in line with EPA have all staff meeting on March 27-28, Nashua NH. focus is JDEI. one of things we have done - introduced an activity asking staff to participate. JDEI touchpoints, Mae Kate was instrumental. Idea is that everyone is encouraged to participate in optional learning activities. The All-Staff meeting will feature a session to share what they've learned. Communication topic - how to communicate to the public when we know 1 in 4 people have disabilities. Going to have a commissioners panel, talking about the state revolving fund and how it's working today as it applies to Disadvantaged communities, how funding is impacted, visioning for 30 years in future.

CAC (NY, Quebec, VT), E&O, HAPAC, TAC

- Denise: The VTCAC has completed our 2025 Action Plan. Thank you KD and EL at the LCBP for the work on this. We spent a lot of time on this as a committee and tied a lot of that into clean water, flooding work, etc in the state. We launched it last week officially in Shelburne. Coordinated with the State of the Lake presentation.
- Pierre: Monitored sites and found no water chestnut on the QC side of Missisquoi bay. Catastrophic algal blooms, though, impacted accessibility of drinking water from those that rely on the MB. A vegetable plant, microbreweries, etc. were impacted. There was a loss of confidence in the ability to provide drinking water in the area. Opened many eyes to the severity of the situation on Missisquoi Bay. We've never received so many calls. It will be a serious need to consider an action plan, beginning in 2025. We will have 50 farmers not apply any P on their corn crop to test how their crop is affected.
- Katie: Written NYCAC update in the folder, highlight in collaboration with the LCBP held a Love the Lake. The hybrid meeting was well attended. There are written updates for the Champlain-Adirondack Biosphere Network in the folder. The youth board had the first Environmental Leaders Skill Building Seminar in November, Grace Palmer and Emma Dannenberg did a great presentation on science communication. Check out the other updates in the folder.
- Jim: Check out the CVNHP update in the folder. We received 37 proposals, looking at 29 of them. Artist and Residence proposals are open, Katie's work on the biosphere has been exemplary. That's all I can think of!
- Buzz: nearing end of Colleen's tenure...applause...can't begin to tell what working with her has meant. Will be a lot of celebration. Give the opportunity to give applause.
- Colleen: currently starting to review Small E&O grants...looking for confidential reviewers! Also shout out to Emma D who has been working with us. She has developed a beautiful mural of the Adirondack mountains. Will see it produced in January.
- Ryan: I encourage you to look at CABN exhibits. Project is a great example of working across teams in LCBP.

Neil: TAC has been busy advancing workplans approved for funding in April. Did clear lake sturgeon and american eel projects and nutrient and cyano related projects. Finger on final report PSC AWI for lake watershed action planning in NY. really valuable investment for how NY can manage lakes. Produced action plans to plug into local imp funding at LCBP. made roadmap for lake associations CWICNY, etc.

Additional Steering Committee member updates

- NONE

LCBP Updates

- Eric: TAC is often appropriately referred to as the hardest working committee, I would like to nominate the executive committee as the second hardest working committee in the program. There have been 4 EC meetings since the last SC meeting. 55 new grants have been moved forward since September, almost \$10 million in funding. New grants coming up- E&O Small Implementation, VT and NY Organization support, Quebec Artist-in-residence, etc. The rest of the updates are available on the written document.

ADJOURN

3:30 PM

Motion by: Buzz

Second by: Antony

Anticipated Outputs for this meeting include:

1. Approval of Meeting Summary from September 10, 2024 Steering Committee meeting
2. Discussion of LCBP Contracting report
3. Appointment of Advisory Committee members
4. Approval of FY25 Research pre-proposals advancing to full proposal stage
5. Committee updates