



Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy & Environmental Affairs

Department of Environmental Protection

One Winter Street Boston, MA 02108 • 617-292-5500

Charles D. Baker
Governor

Karyn E. Polito
Lieutenant Governor

Matthew A. Beaton
Secretary

Martin Suuberg
Commissioner

**Water Quality Monitoring Grant Program
MassDEP Official Answers to Questions Received during the
December 6, 2018 Pre-Grant Proposal Meeting
And to Questions Received Via Email
By December 28, 2018**

Questions regarding timeline for MassDEP's Water Quality Monitoring Grant Program: At the December 6, 2018 pre-grant proposal meeting, MassDEP was uncertain about what grant award approach was possible given that the 2019 sampling season (April 2019 to October 2019) will straddle two state fiscal years (FY19 and FY20). At that time, MassDEP believed this current grant round would require all grantee project expenses to be incurred in FY19, by June 30, 2019.

The Department has amended the parameters of the grant program to allow applicants to apply for funds to cover sampling costs incurred for the entire sampling season (April 1, 2019 to October 15, 2019). MassDEP's FY19 operating budget allocates \$200,000 water monitoring grants, which will provide funding for activities completed by June 30, 2019. For FY19, MassDEP plans to award grants of \$5,000 to \$15,000 per eligible entity. Additional funding could be made available in FY19 if the quality and quantity of the proposals exceeds the current allocation.

Applicants may submit proposals for projects that will start in FY19 (April 2019) and end in FY20 (October 2019). The \$200,000 allocated to the FY19 grants expires June 30, 2019 and is therefore available to reimburse awardees for costs incurred on or before June 30, 2019. Applicants are encouraged to develop project proposals that maximize incurred costs prior to June 30, 2019. The amount of grant funds that will be available for FY20 (which begins July 1, 2019) cannot be determined until the Commonwealth's FY20 budget has been finalized (on or after July 1, 2019). While MassDEP anticipates continued funding for the water monitoring grant program in FY20, reimbursement for costs incurred after June 30, 2019 are contingent upon appropriation of funds. MassDEP will notify all grant awardees of the status of FY20 funds as soon as possible after the FY20 budget is finalized. In the event that FY20 funds are not available for this grant program, awardees will need to proceed with any remaining commitments utilizing an alternate source of funding.

There were a number of the questions posed at the pre-grant conference related to the timing and budgeting of activities that required completion by the Fiscal Year 2019 end date of June 30, 2019. In light of the approach outlined above, for efficiency, those specific questions are omitted from this Q&A document in order to avoid confusion. MassDEP has also updated the power point presentation that was

This information is available in alternate format. Contact Michelle Waters-Ekanem, Director of Diversity/Civil Rights at 617-292-5751.

TTY# MassRelay Service 1-800-439-2370

MassDEP Website: www.mass.gov/dep

Printed on Recycled Paper

given during the meeting to help guide grant applicants and will make this available on the MassDEP webpage.

Q1. Can a fiscal sponsor be a non-profit organization, while the entity conducting the grant activities is not? (i.e., the non-profit organization is acting as a “pass-through” providing grant funds to an ineligible entity).

A1. Eligible Applicants for projects that are awarded through this Water Quality Monitoring grant program are limited to non-profit organizations which can substantiate the organization's non-profit status through documentation. The required documentation would consist of evidence of the organization's status as a non-profit under federal requirements, typically referred to as 501(c)(3) status. MassDEP will not allow fiscal sponsors to receive the grant and provide the funds to an ineligible entity to conduct the grant activities. MassDEP would determine that the Applicant is ineligible for the project. Laboratory analysis is performed by private entities and grant funds may be used for these services. However, fiscal sponsors could partner with ineligible entities to provide matching cash funds or in-kind services for the project to support the work of the grant recipient.

Q2. Is there a limitation regarding matching funds? Such as, can the matching funds be from a municipality?

A2. There is no limitation in the grant application with respect to matching funds, in the event that an Eligible Applicant has either matching funds and/or in-kind services in addition to the grant funds. Therefore, matching funds and/or in-kind services can be from a municipality.

Q3. If you already have a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)- or MassDEP-approved quality assurance project plan (QAPP) or another entity has one, can you just include the QAPP by reference?

A3. Yes; however, the Applicant must clearly reference the approved QAPP that the organization will be utilizing for the grant-funded project. Applicants should also note that the work specified in that QAPP must include a focus on the collection of bacteria data at assessment-level quality.

Q4. If a state lab does bacterial analysis (example = MWRA), can they be paid with this grant money (i.e., can state grant money be given to a state entity)?

A4. Grant funds can be utilized to pay for bacterial analysis performed by the MWRA, which is a state authority, not a state agency, and is certified to perform various types of analyses. In general, laboratory analysis is performed by private entities (which are also certified to perform specific analyses by the Commonwealth), and grant funds can be used for these services in order to provide the grant recipient with the required analysis associated with the collection of bacteria sampling data.

Q5. How often do you need to renew a QAPP?

A5. EPA requires QAPP review every 5 years and MassDEP also plans to standardize the review of QAPPs so that MassDEP and the EPA have consistent review requirements. In general, it is good scientific practice for entities to update the QAPP periodically as methods and sampling technology evolve.

Q6. What parameter is MassDEP looking for, *E. coli* or total coliform?

A6. *E.coli* or Enterococci (for fresh water) will be preferred over total coliform, as *E.coli* and Enterococci indicate a public health threat; total coliform does not necessarily indicate a threat

and is not an acceptable indicator parameter for pathogens. Enterococci is preferred for Marine or brackish waters. For example, if the Colilert ® system is used for analysis, the first step in the procedure provides total coliform results and the second step provides *E. coli* results. These details will be specified in the grant application.

Q7. Should QAPPs be targeting only bacteria, or can they include other parameters as well?

A7. The grant is specific to bacteria analyses; however, as long as the QAPP includes all the specifications for the bacteria sampling and analysis, it could also include other parameters as well.

Q8. Can MassDEP provide a “fill-in-the-blank” standardized, universal QAPP for bacteria sampling, especially for those using a commercial lab for the analysis? Maybe produce one for those doing in-house sampling and one for those using a commercial lab?

A8. MassDEP does not currently have a standardized QAPP for bacteria monitoring only. The agency has posted the following generic QAPP’s on the MassDEP’s website:

- Massachusetts Inland Volunteer Monitoring General Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP)
- Massachusetts Coastal Volunteer Monitoring General Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP)

These documents contain elements of bacteria monitoring QA and can be used as a template for developing a project specific QAPP. To access these documents use the following link.

<https://www.mass.gov/guides/water-quality-monitoring-for-volunteers#guidance-on-quality-assurance-project-plan-qapp->

Q9. Doesn’t MassDEP allow methods for both *E.coli* and Enterococci for fresh water? Groups may prefer analyzing for enterococci since it is cheaper.

A9. Yes, MassDEP’s standards (found at 314 CMR 4.00) allow for either parameter in fresh water; therefore groups have flexibility to choose either or both parameters.

Q10. Can the money be used for bacteria source tracking?

A10. No. The focus of this grant is on external bacteria data collection that can be utilized in MassDEP’s §§305 (b)/303(d) water quality assessments for primary and secondary contact recreation activities (e.g., swimming and boating), which would not include the type of sampling conducted in source-tracking.

Q11. Is the statewide TMDL for bacteria completed?

A11. No.

Q12. What happens if you don’t have enough applicants? Will applicants have access to more money to reach the maximum of \$200,000?

A12. MassDEP does not anticipate insufficient interest in this grant program, given the number of interested organizations that attended the December 6, 2018 pre-grant meeting. The grants to be awarded are capped and must range between \$5,000 and \$15,000 each, for a total FY 19 grant award of \$200,000.

Q13. If a QAPP is still under review, would that count as an approved QAPP?

A13. Yes, a completed draft QAPP will qualify for the purposes of this grant.

Q14. Will the analytical methods be specified in the package?

A14. Yes.

Q15. Can you use the grant to mobilize a monitoring project?

A15. Yes.

Q16. Can you use the grant to expand existing programs?

A16. Yes, if the existing program includes bacteria monitoring, or if the expansion is focused on bacteria monitoring of the type described (i.e., to assess primary and secondary contact recreation activities).

Q17. Will MassDEP favor capacity-building activities over sampling activities?

A17. No, both types of proposed activities will be weighed equally, based upon the overall value of the proposal.

Q18. What are the options for submitting data (i.e., which portal should be used)?

A18. Bacteria data may be submitted to either MassDEP's external data portal or the National WQP portal. External data must be submitted to only one of these portals (i.e., do not submit data to both the MassDEP portal and the WQP portal).

Q19. Portal link is illegible in the handout. Could MassDEP send the presentation to all?

A19. The presentation has been updated to be consistent with the restructuring of the grant program and is posted on webpage.

The link for MassDEP's External Data Portal, including a description of data submittal format, is <https://www.mass.gov/guides/external-data-submittals-to-the-watershed-planning-program>. The link for the Water Quality Data Portal, sponsored by the USGS, US EPA and USDA, is <https://www.waterqualitydata.us/portal/>.

Q20. If an entity received a §604(b) grant for a project under stream "A" but wants to sample stream "B", could you still submit an application?

A20. Although MassDEP had stated at the December 6, 2018 pre-grant meeting that recipients of prior §604(b) grant funding were not eligible for this grant program, the agency has reconsidered this issue, and determined that recipients of prior §604(b) grant funding are also eligible to receive funding through this grant opportunity.

Q21. If obtaining a valid field blank is difficult and/or costly, can you eliminate the blank?

A21. No. MassDEP requires defensible data that adheres to the protocols of an approved QAPP; therefore, field blanks are required for sampling activities.

Q22. What is the timing for the release of the grant solicitation and what is the due date for completed applications?

A22. The agency's timeline is to issue the grant solicitation is January 30, 2019, with a grant application deadline of February 27, 2019 at 5 PM. Proposals must be submitted electronically to Therese Beaudoin (therese.beaudoin@mass.gov) by that date and time. This timeline will allow sufficient time for Eligible Applicants to prepare and submit their grant applications for MassDEP's subsequent review and evaluation. After the release of the grant solicitation, MassDEP staff will not answer questions regarding grant proposals, nor will staff provide any assistance in the preparation of grant proposals by Applicants.

Q23. Can the grant be used to hire technical assistance to establish a database?

A23. Yes, this activity would be considered part of organization's capacity-building for future bacteria data collection. However, the applicants must demonstrate in their proposal that this technical assistance for a database is needed in order to collect bacteria data in the future.

Q24. Is there a template for data entry to MassDEP?

A24. Yes, the template is available on MassDEP's website. See <https://www.mass.gov/guides/external-data-submittals-to-the-watershed-planning-program>.

Q25. Can the grant be used to expand in-house lab capacity for bacteria analysis?

A25. Yes.

Q26. Can municipalities work with watershed groups? For example, can watershed groups work under the City of Worcester's bacteria QAPP?

A26. Eligible non-profit organizations (such as watershed groups) can utilize another entity's EPA- or MassDEP-approved bacteria QAPP (including, but not limited to, a municipality's QAPP).

Q27. Would bacteria sampling in Webster Lake be eligible if the town is already conducting sampling there?

A27. An eligible applicant may conduct bacteria sampling (under an approved QAPP) even if another entity is also sampling for bacteria for public health concerns for recreational activities (e.g., public beach closures), particularly if the other entity's sampling activities are not being performed under an approved QAPP. In addition, an eligible grant project could include (but not be limited to) collecting data to support the work of the local authority such as sampling the tributaries to the lake.

Q28. Can the grant be used to collect data in May and June?

A28. Yes.

Q29. Can the money be used to analyze past data?

A29. Yes, if the grant proposal demonstrates that these activities will build the group's capacity for continuing/expanding bacteria data collection and analysis into the future.

Q30. I plan to have my local DPW lab test my samples and another volunteer group to help out in the field. Should I include this information in my grant proposal?

A30. Yes, grant applications must discuss all project partners and activities in the grant proposal. Also, applicants must submit, as part of their proposal, letters of support from any organization(s) that will provide optional matching funds or in-kind services for a proposed project.

Q31. Will MassDEP assemble a list of minimally required equipment to share with the potential pool of applicants for this grant?

A31. No. MassDEP does not anticipate that all grant applicants will be purchasing monitoring equipment, since the grant opportunity allows for grant proposals for funding a wide range of eligible projects. For example, some groups receiving grant funding may use contract lab services, while other groups will use the grant funds to support completely different scopes of work (e.g., QAPP or SAP development).

Q32. How important is it that this work is done in a sterile hood? That could be a limiting factor.

A32. No a sterile hood is not mandatory.

Q33. Do the Colilert ® trays need to be sterilized before disposal?

A33. The trays need to be disposed of as biohazardous waste, and must be sterilized prior to disposal.

Q34. Will any black light work to read the samples, or does it need to be shortwave?

A34. Per the method, the light source needs to be UV (~10-400) with a preferred wavelength of 365 nm.

Q35. Will MA DEP offer a “Train the Trainer” workshop?

A35. MassDEP will be offering two training workshops in the spring of 2019 and anticipates collaborating with the Mass Rivers Alliance on the content of the training.

Q36. Could you query the groups that already do bacteria monitoring to find out what they estimate their annual consumable costs are? This will be an important factor going forward after the initial year of supplies are used up and/or expired.

A36. No. Entities interested in applying for the grant will need to provide their own best estimates regarding costs, since this type of work is project specific, and there may be economies of scale depending on the number of samples collected.

Q37. It would help if applicants were able to speak with a group that has an established bacteria monitoring program. Can you share the contact information of a group that has been involved in *E. coli* monitoring? I want to map out the feasibility of adding *E. coli* monitoring in MA both from a monetary perspective and a time perspective.

A37. Many groups include bacteria in their parameter list; MassDEP recommends that applicants reach out to one of the many established groups that attended the December 6, 2018 pre-grant meeting to obtain additional information regarding bacteria monitoring programs.

Q38. Is it okay to share the list of names and groups that participated in today’s (i.e., December 6, 2018) meeting?

A38. The list of attendees has been posted on MassDEP’s web page; the link to the web page was provided in the email announcing the release of the grant solicitation.

Q39. Is your goal to only determine where impaired waters exist? Or would it be useful to also know where unimpaired streams are?

A39: As noted in the December 6th power point presentation (see MassDEP’s web page for presentation), MassDEP has listed 3 general types of priority waters. Unimpaired streams would be considered to be waters where MassDEP has previously sampled for bacteria, but does not have current data; or waters that MassDEP has never assessed. MassDEP considers both to be important information.

Q40. Will MassDEP provide a list of stations or locations where it has identified a need for bacteria data?

A40. Yes, that information has been provided in Appendix B of the Grant application as a list of bacteria-impaired waterbodies taken from the draft *Massachusetts Year 2016 Integrated List of Waters* (see <https://www.mass.gov/media/1638446/>). In addition, MassDEP is also seeking bacteria data from waters that have never been assessed, as well as waters that need more current

data (regardless of whether they were “clean” or “dirty” according to historic data). See also Answer 39 to Question 39 above.

Q41. Would the grant cover an organization to upload existing bacterial data to EPA’s WQX from 2018?

A41. MassDEP’s preference is for the collection and uploading of current bacteria data, in keeping with the overall purpose and goals of the grant program. However, MassDEP will consider grant funding for this type of project if the goal of the proposed project is to develop the organization’s ability/capacity to upload current bacteria data.

Q42. What is needed for a robust dataset by DEP?

A42. The details of monitoring for a robust dataset will be provided in the application package.

Q43. Can the funds cover supplies such as test kits for ammonia, surfactants and chlorine?

A43. No, this grant program is targeting the collection of bacteria data for assessment purposes.

Q44. Will you provide a list of municipalities that have current Administrative Consent Orders (ACO)? We have this information for some of our communities but sometimes something like this slips by us.

A44. No. This question is beyond the scope of this grant program question and answer process.

Q45. Would Salem Sound Coastwatch be considered eligible for the Watershed Group Monitoring Grant? The wording “volunteer groups across the state. This grant program will support watershed groups conducting baseline monitoring program activities, as well as those who wish to build program capacity” makes me think you are not looking for staffed organizations?

A45. Yes, MassDEP will consider all grant proposal applications from eligible entities. Salem Sound Coastwatch will be eligible for this grant program if it meets the eligibility requirements of the grant application.

Q46. If a proposal is budgeted at \$15,000 and DEP does not have enough funds to go around, will they fund the NGO for less money?

A46. All proposals will be evaluated based on the scoring criteria. It is anticipated that the top-ranked proposals will be fully funded until the \$200,000 for the grant program is exhausted. However, the Department reserves the right to negotiate a more compact scope or budget with any grant recipient.

Q47. Will the grant cover staff time to update an existing EPA- or MassDEP-approved QAPP or develop a new one for bacterial sampling?

A47. Yes, grant funding may be utilized for these activities.

Q48. A YSI is not needed for bacterial sampling, but provides useful data when visiting streams and ponds. Would the purchase of a YSI [or similar in situ multi-probe] (parameters: conductivity, salinity, temperature) be funded?

A48. YSI equipment purchases are not eligible for this grant funding, since YSIs are not utilized for bacteria sampling.

Q49. It sounded like the grant will not fund sampling costs even if sampling takes place from April to June 30. Is this correct?

A49. Through this solicitation, applicants may apply for reimbursement for sampling performed from contract execution in April 2019 through October 15, 2019. However, as stated on page 1 of this Q&A, applicants are encouraged to develop project proposals that maximize incurred costs prior to June 30, 2019. The amount of grant funds that will be apportioned to FY20 (which begins July 1, 2019) cannot be determined until the Commonwealth's FY20 budget has been finalized (on or after July 1, 2019). While MassDEP anticipates continued funding for the water monitoring grant program in FY20, reimbursement for costs incurred after June 30, 2019 are contingent upon appropriation of funds.

Q50. As was mentioned, it does not seem efficient to have 10-20 groups each develop a QAPP; is it possible to have a standard QAPP made available which the groups could modify as needed (sample location, personnel involved, etc.) and have the fundamentals of the program (sampling protocol, holding times, labeling, analytes, etc.) standardized; have one recipe to make the cake and make edits on the side (different color frosting); could have the group sign an acknowledgement that they will follow the standardized procedures.

A50. See Answer 8 to Question 8 above.

Q51. Is there a WBE/MBE requirement as part of the grant?

A51. No.

Q52. Many municipalities test swimming areas regularly during the recreational season- will this lessen the chances of a lake association to obtain a grant?

A52. No.

Q53. Will MassDEP put a second round of budget requests for this program into its FY2020 request or does a capital amount get awarded and then MassDEP decides how to spend the capital funds?

A53. The FY19 funding is from MassDEP's operating budget. MassDEP is hopeful that this funding will be made available in FY20 and in subsequent years, if the budget allows.

Q54. Outside of the Taunton, are there other groups who would be testing saline/salt waters?

A54. MassDEP does not have any knowledge as to whether any groups that test saline/salt waters are interested in this grant program.

Q55. Why would a municipality like Worcester not qualify---are they thought of as a "for profit" organization?

A55. A municipality is ineligible for this grant program because cities and towns are not non-profit organizations. In addition, municipalities are already required to perform some related work activities as part of their compliance obligations under the Phase II Stormwater permit.

Q56. It did not seem that any of the stormwater coalitions were at the meeting--could they qualify?

A56. The stormwater coalitions are composed of municipalities, and therefore they are not eligible 501(c)(3) non-profit organizations.

Q57. Are there particular sites from the Category 5 impaired waters in the Nashua basin you would like to obtain more data on as part of our proposed project?

A57. No. Any sites on the Category 5 list that are identified as impaired for pathogenic contamination will be considered for a grant proposal, which will allow a grant recipient some latitude to target

certain subwatersheds, or towns, for sampling activities. See Answer 39 to Question 39 above for further information on the sites that MassDEP considers priorities for this grant.

Q58. Would the sites you had monitored under the [MassDEP] SMART program be a priority for monitoring in our proposed project?

A58. Yes, if the sites are a Category 5 water for pathogens, or were monitored in the past for pathogens (including the SMART stations that were “clean” for bacteria), or were never assessed for pathogens.

Q59. We just updated our QAPP and it has been approved. Would this QAPP be sufficient for the project or would you want us to look at modifying our SOPs as part of our proposed project to better align with your requirements for external data? We have submitted our data in the DEP required format and it has been accepted.

A59. If the approved QAPP is focused on bacteria monitoring to meet assessment requirements, it will suffice for this grant program. See Answer 3 to Question 3 above.

Q60. Will there be a suggested ratio between administrative/staff expenses and equipment/supplies expenses?

A60. No. The grant applicant would need to specify these items as part of the grant proposal.

Q61. Are there certified or suggested local vendors for the biohazard disposal of the IDEXX trays that we can contact for costs estimates? Do all the trays have to be disposed as biohazards or only those with a certain number of positive wells?

A61. MassDEP does not endorse any contractors for the proper disposal of biological waste. Proper waste management of biological waste involves autoclaving to disinfect all waste materials in contact with the sample and then disposal. Most bacteria analytical labs have autoclaving equipment which could be used following their analysis of samples or which might be used for autoclaving services only (organizations will need to check with labs).

Q62. What is the required frequency of sampling? Weekly? 2X/month?

A62. Here is some information that will be included in the application package:

- Sampling Period: Bathing and contact season (April 1-October 15; prioritize June-September, at a minimum)
- Sampling Frequency: Weekly for all waters within a 90 day period, from June-Sept. preferred. These frequencies will ensure an adequate sample number within the 90-day averaging period.

Q63. Will there be a cap or ration requirement for indirect costs?

A63. No. However, as with all other aspects of a submitted grant proposal, grant applicants must specify the need and the budget for indirect costs, and must relate these costs directly to projects which are eligible for grant funding. For this reason, indirect costs such as general secretarial/administrative office responsibilities would not be considered as eligible grant project funding items.

Q64. Will wet weather samples be required (in addition to regularly-scheduled sampling)?

A64. For assessment purposes, bacteria samples can be collected during wet- or dry-weather conditions, although wet-weather data generally should not comprise the majority of inputs to the averaging calculations. Dry-weather data is more typical and preferred, especially for bathing waters (i.e., more representative of conditions when primary contact recreation usually takes

place). For wet weather-related monitoring objectives (e.g., Combined Sewer Overflow impacts), however, wet-weather bacteria data may be more relevant and appropriate.

Q65. Is there a priority/extra points given in the grant funding for sites monitored under the [MassDEP] SMART program [Nashua River watershed]? Would those sites have to also be on the §303(d) list?

A65. No, MassDEP has not specifically targeted sites monitored under the SMART program with respect to this grant funding opportunity. However, applicants should review Appendix B in the grant Application Form, as well as the draft final *Massachusetts Year 2016 Integrated List of Waters* (see <https://www.mass.gov/media/1638446/>) relative to stations located in the Nashua River watershed.

Q66. Would buying equipment such as an autoclave to help support our bacteria monitoring be eligible for this grant?

A66. Yes, since an autoclave is required to address the waste from bacterial analyses.

Q67. What about other equipment that is directly related to bacteria monitoring but would build our overall monitoring capacity such as turbidity meters?

A67. No, items such as turbidity meters are not eligible.

Q68. Is it ok to have a single proposal that includes both capacity building and the programming activities?

A68. MassDEP cannot respond to this question in its current form due to inadequate information.

Q69. Are there any updates on when the RFP might be released?

A69. The Grant Opportunity was released on January 30, 2019.

Q70. Could you provide me with a list of equipment that the State uses for *E. coli* analysis?

A70. MassDEP utilizes the ColiLert ® system; more information can be found at www.idexx.com.

Q71. If Berkshire Community College (BCC) was the site of the [bacteria] lab, is there a QAPP or SOP that they would need to develop to become a “certified” lab? Is there a template? Is there a watershed organization that you know about that has partnered with their local college that you think we might talk to? Is there a process to annually renew their “QAPP or protocol” for being the “certified” lab. Who would we work with to develop this? Could students do the analysis?

A71. Proposed lab(s) should develop a laboratory-specific Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for MassDEP review and approval. MassDEP’s lab SOP is available for use as a template. Certification by the MA Certification office is not required. Note the lab SOP is separate and distinct from the requirement for project-level monitoring QAPP(s). If students perform analyses, training and oversight must be fully described in the SOP. Cohasset Center for Student Coastal Research is one example where students run bacteria analyses (<http://ccscr.org/watershed1.aspx>).

Q72. The space BCC is considering to use to set up the equipment is the microbiology lab. Students are in and out of that lab; would there be concerns about students going in and out of the lab – or is that just up to us as a group to develop protocol or QAPP and not MA DEP’s concerns?

A72. Interruption of sample testing due to other activities in busy labs is a concern that must be addressed (and mitigated) in the lab SOP.

Q73. BCC is concerned that if they are set up to accept samples, that they would have to accept samples from anyone. Again – I think this is a more internal discussion and not MA DEP’s call. I am thinking the organizations submitting samples would develop an agreement with BCC and that can be revisited periodically.

A73. Lab analysis of samples should be contingent on samples being collected and delivered per a MassDEP- or EPA-approved QAPP.

Q74. As a state college – I don’t know if BCC is considered a non-profit, so I am assuming BEAT or HVA or HooRWA would have to submit the proposal and administer the grant if successful – BCC would just be the location of the lab.

A74. The grant is open to academic institutions provided that the institution is a qualified non-profit organization.

Q75. Priority sites for Bacteria sampling in Berkshire County?

A75. MassDEP’s priority waters for this project include: unassessed waters (those that have never been assessed, as well as those that have not been assessed in 5+ years); all waters identified as impaired for pathogens (including *Enterococcus*, Fecal Coliform and *Escherichia coli*) in the table of Category 5 waters in the draft final *Massachusetts Year 2016 Integrated List of Waters* (see <https://www.mass.gov/media/1638446/>); and all Category 5 waters for which (current) bacteria monitoring has been specifically recommended, which is provided in Appendix B of the Grant Application Form. See additional information in MassDEP’s Grant Opportunity document.

Q77. If a nonprofit is named in a §604(b) grant as a partner by the municipality, but most of the §604(b) grant funds will be going to the municipality with a match provided by the nonprofit, would the nonprofit be eligible to apply for a watershed monitoring grant this year?

A77. See Answer 20 to Question 20 above. A recipient of a prior §604(b) grant is eligible for this grant opportunity provided that the applicant is an eligible non-profit organization.



Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy & Environmental Affairs

Department of Environmental Protection

Central Regional Office • 8 New Bond Street, Worcester MA 01606 • 508-792-7650

WATERSHED MONITORING

MEETING ATTENDANCE SIGN-IN SHEET

PRE - GRANT PROPOSAL MTG

SUASCO

MASSDEP

12-6-2018

Meeting Name/Organization

Meeting Room

Presenter

Date

NAME	AFFILIATION	E-MAIL ADDRESS	TELEPHONE
PETER ATKINSON	INDIAN PONDS ASS. MAZSTON'S MILLS	PANDFINCABO@GMAIL.COM	
TACK JOSTI	FRC	JTJOSTI@JUNO.COM	508 754 0269
Joseph Wade	FRC	joseph.wade@yahoo.com	508-461-9813
Nat Ladewig	ESS Group	mladewig@essgroup.com	401-330-1204
Kath Davis	CAFWC	chicopeewatershed@gmail.com	
Mike Lirerty	LOWA	info@lirertyconcrete.com	774-287-4419
Steven Cronin	LOWA	cro@townisp.com	(508) 890-5530
ERNIE BENNETT	WEBSTER LAKE ASSOC.	ERNIEB@CHARTER.NET	508-943-8804
Rolan O'Donnell	TRWA	roland@leipswichriver.org	978-412-8200
HEATHER LOCKWELL	BANSTABLE CLEAN WATER COALITION	hrockwell@bdcleanwater.org	508-430-0780
ALISON DIXON	HVA	adixon@hvatoday.org	413 298 3024
STEVE McPHEE	HACKENSACK	S.McPHEE@HACKENSACK.org	413 458 2742



Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy & Environmental Affairs

Department of Environmental Protection

Central Regional Office • 8 New Bond Street, Worcester MA 01606 • 508-792-7650

MEETING ATTENDANCE SIGN-IN SHEET

Meeting Name/Organization _____ Meeting Room _____ Presenter _____ Date _____

NAME	AFFILIATION	E-MAIL ADDRESS	TELEPHONE
SUSAN THOMAS	BRC	ACADIA 54 @ zoho.com	508-471-0988
Rebecca Hill	Cook's Pond Club	rebecca.hill30@gmail	978-434-1083
Chris Hirsch	NepRWA	hirsch@nepa.org	
Lisa Kumpf	CRWA	LKumpf@crwa.org	508-479-6489
STEVE SILVA	TRWA	STEVE124@EMAIL.COM	508-824-7345
DAN GIZA	COOK'S POND CLUB / ASA	DGIZA@ASAC.COM	508-277-4981
Peg Kirby	Friends of Patch Reservoir	pkirby619@aol.com	508-826-8804
Kim Provo	Mystic River Watershed	Kimberly.provo@mysticriver.org	781-316-3438
Peter Savarone	River Merrimack	peter@rivermerrimack.org	978-727-2252
Julia Paratt	Mass Rivers	you have it	
Alison Field-Juma	OARS	"	978-369-3956
Raul Hagan	Halden / Woodard + Curran	phogan@woodardcurran.com	774-364-2893



Department of Environmental Protection

Central Regional Office • 8 New Bond Street, Worcester MA 01606 • 508-792-7650

MEETING ATTENDANCE SIGN-IN SHEET

Meeting Name/Organization

Meeting Room

Presenter

Date

NAME	AFFILIATION	E-MAIL ADDRESS	TELEPHONE
JERRY A. MULLINS	PARKER RIVER CLEAN WATER ASSOC.	INDYTERRY@HOTMAIL.COM	978 618 9154
SUSANNE LUCAS	SIX POND IMPROVEMENT ASSOC.	SusanneLucas@GMAIL.com	508 685 0342
Glorianna Davenport	Living Observatory	glorianna@livingobservatory.org	617 642 7934
Cheryl Fischer	Living Observatory	Kingfischer@VHint.net	617 642 7934
Elizabeth Cianciola	ES	ecianciola@gray.com	617 642 7934
Ryan O'Donnell	CT River Conservancy	rodonnell@ctriver.org	617 642 7934
Dor Williams	Herring Pond's Watershed Association	dorwilliams2003@yahoo.com	617 642 7934
Elia Del Molino	Berkshire Environmental Action Team (BEAT)	eliamol@thebeatnews.org	413 429 6416
Anna Williams	Blackstone River Coalition	dwilliamsbr@adl.com	508 335 8393
Deborah Bums	City of Worcester	burns@cityofworcester.org	508 335 8393
Dan Heef	ES&M	dheef@esm-inc.com	508 335 8393
Andres Ripley	NEPWA	iripley@nepwa.org	508 335 8393



Central Regional Office • 8 New Bond Street, Worcester MA 01606 • 508-792-7650

MEETING ATTENDANCE SIGN-IN SHEET

By Phone

WASSER

Meeting Room

Presenter

12-6-2018

Date[illegible]