



**SAN FRANCISCO ESTUARY INSTITUTE**

4911 Central Avenue, Richmond, CA 94804 • p 510-746-7334 • f 510-746-7300 [www.sfei.org](http://www.sfei.org)

**RMP Steering Committee Meeting**

July 19, 2016

San Francisco Estuary Institute

**Meeting Summary**

**Attendees**

<b>SC Member</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Representing</b>	<b>Present</b>
Jim Ervin	City of San Jose	POTW-Large	Phone
Dan Tafolla	Vallejo Sanitation and Flood Control District	POTW-Small	Yes
Karin North**	City of Palo Alto	POTW-Medium	Yes
Adam Olivieri	BASMAA / EOA, Inc.	Stormwater	Yes
Peter Carroll	Tesoro Golden Eagle Refinery	Refineries	Yes
John Coleman	Bay Planning Coalition	Dredgers	No***
Jessie Burton Evans	US Army Corps of Engineers	USACE	No
VACANT		Industry	
David Frandsen	NRG Energy	Cooling Water	No
Tom Mumley*	SFB Regional Water Quality Control Board	Water Board	Yes

\* Chair, \*\* Vice Chair

**Guests and Staff**

- Phil Trowbridge (SFEI)
- Jay Davis (SFEI)
- Rebecca Sutton (SFEI)
- Lawrence Leung (SFEI)
- Jennifer Sun (SFEI)
- Jack Fischetti (BPC)\*\*\*
- Naomi Feger (SFRWQCB)

## 1. Introductions and Review Agenda

The meeting started with a quorum of representatives: Dan Tafolla, Tom Mumley, Karin North, Peter Carroll, and Jack Fischetti (alternate for John Coleman). No changes were made to the agenda.

## 2. Decision: Meeting Summary from April 19, 2016 and Set Future Meeting Dates

No comments were made on the April 19, 2016 Steering Committee meeting minutes. The proposed April 18, 2017 meeting date was identified to have a conflict, so a new meeting date will be chosen over email. The group requested that committee members be sent a Google Calendar invite for future proposed meeting dates prior to the Steering Committee meeting, at which the proposed date can be verified.

### **Items for Approval**

- Karin North made a motion to approve the April 19, 2016 Steering Committee meeting summary. Peter Carroll seconded the motion. None were opposed.

### **Action Items**

- Post April 19, 2016 Steering Committee meeting summary to the Bay RMP website. (Jennifer Sun)
- Send an email to Steering Committee members to schedule the April 2017 Steering Committee meeting. (Phil Trowbridge)

## 3. Information: TRC Meeting Summary; MP Workgroup Summary

Adam Olivieri joined the meeting starting with this agenda item.

Phil Trowbridge presented a summary of major topics discussed at the June 9, 2016 TRC Meeting and June 29, 2016 Microplastic Workshop, outlined below

### TRC Meeting

1. Special Studies - TRC recommendations were further discussed in a later agenda item.
2. Emeryville Crescent PMU report - the draft report has been distributed and comments will be incorporated once the last set of comments is received. Steering Committee members did not express a need to review the report. Tom Mumley and Jay Davis noted that Fred Hetzel, the author of the PCB TMDL, has been actively involved in the development of this report and the planning of the San Leandro Bay PMU study.
3. RMP Update report - a few comments on the draft text were received and are being incorporated. A fully laid out version of the report will be distributed for review by August 1.
4. RMP Annual Meeting agenda - TRC recommendations were further discussed in a later agenda item.
5. Status & Trends monitoring update - 2016 monitoring includes bird egg and bivalve sampling. The TRC also discussed the format of the report on California Toxics Rule contaminants monitored during the 2015 Water Cruise.

6. PCB sediment lab selection - AXYS was selected as the RMP's new sediment PCB lab. A second recommendation was to identify a second lab to include in a regular lab intercomparison study. The AXYS method being used is not exactly the same as the EPA 1668C method, but involves using a modified extraction method (Dean Stark). Karin noted that her lab is running into issues with measuring blanks using the 1668C method.

### Microplastic Workshop

The Microplastic Workshop held on June 29, 2016 was attended by about 35 local stakeholders and scientists and 3 invited experts.

The first study priority identified by the workshop participants was to further develop microplastic identification and monitoring methods. Tom Mumley warned that efforts to improve methods, including detection limits, should only be funded if it is clear that the desired improvement will strengthen the ability to manage microplastic pollution.

The second priority was to better characterize microplastic contamination in the Bay. Jim Ervin in particular was very interested in focusing on fish monitoring, as fish are an impairment indicators and may be easier to monitor (i.e., sampling and processing methods are better developed and fewer particles would need to be counted and identified). Phil noted that identifying the type of plastic in the fish may help to identify sources.

Karin North noted that she had spoken with the Patagonia representatives at the meeting about potentially funding a second UCSB Bren School study to further study microplastic release from washing machines. One potential outcome could be to take top loading washing machines off the EPA and other agencies' lists of environmentally-friendly washing machines, because they can increase plastic fiber release. Karin also highlighted that some BACWA representatives were concerned about distinguishing between microfibers that have been positively identified as plastic fibers and those that have not. The scientific experts clarified that fibers larger than 0.5-1 mm in width can be positively identified as microfibers by microscopy, but fibers smaller than this size would need to be identified using FTIR or Raman spectroscopy. Karin requested that the microplastic fact sheet be updated to include a disclaimer about this terminology and the methods used in the initial RMP study.

Phil noted that microplastic studies have not yet been developed following this workshop and are not being proposed for funding from the 2017 RMP Special Studies budget. However, separate funding requests to support these studies may be made at future meetings. Based on this workshop, a Microplastic Strategy will be developed and distributed in draft form in the fall.

### **Action Item**

- Revise Microplastic Fact Sheet to include a disclaimer indicating that fibers smaller than 0.5 mm were not positively identified as microplastic using spectroscopy. (Rebecca Sutton)

## 4. Information/Decision: RMP Financial Update for 2016 Quarter 2

Lawrence Leung and Phil Trowbridge provided an update on RMP 2016 Quarter 2 financials, including an update on the 2014-2016 budgets, and the status of the undesignated and designated funds pools. The financial update now includes a record of Alternative Monitoring Requirement (AMR) and Supplemental Environmental Project (SEP) funds received, as well as projects funded using SEP monies. SEP funds received as mandatory minimum penalties (MMPs) and settlements are tracked separately. This new section of the financial memo will be provided to Bill Johnson at the Water Board, who will be the new Water Board contact for SEP projects (replacing Lila Tang).

### 2014 Budget

Two remaining labor tasks include the 2014 Sport Fish Report and the Alternative Flame Retardants report. Three subcontracts also remain open - the USGS benthic impact study, nutrient modeling through Deltares and UCSD, and the bioanalytical tools study. These subcontracts are all nearing completion, and the two reports will be completed in the fall.

### 2015 Budget

84% of the 2015 RMP budget has been expended. Phil highlighted four tasks within the 2015 RMP budget that are likely to finish over-budget (QA system, CTR report, Emeryville Crescent PMU report, and Bay Margins Sediment Study), although all tasks are expected to be completed less than \$5k over-budget. About \$150k has already been unencumbered from the 2015 budget, so overall the 2015 budget has a significant net surplus.

### 2016 Budget

44% of the 2016 RMP budget has been expended. Two tasks are currently projected to be completed over-budget. The workgroup meeting subtask was and will be used to cover several additional workgroup meetings in the summer and fall (Trends Strategy meeting, Selenium Monitoring Workshop, and the Sport Fish workgroup meeting). However, the entire governance task is not expected to go over budget. The water cruise data upload into CEDEN is also expected to cost about \$4k more than budgeted.

### Undesignated Funds and Set-Asides

Phil explained that RMP Dedicated Set-Aside funds are funds stored from earlier budget years. Aside from the recently approved Water Quality Improvement Fund Set-Aside (\$50k), additional funds are not currently being added to this funding pool.

### AMR and SEP funds

About \$113k in Alternative Monitoring Requirement funds have been received; at least an additional \$100k is expected. Karin noted that the new state Recycled Water Permit requires priority pollutant monitoring, which could counterbalance the cost savings from the AMR policy within a few years.

\$45k in MMPs has been received, and an additional \$4.5k is expected. A \$82.6k settlement has also been approved. These funds will be used to fund Phase 1 of the San Leandro Bay Priority Margin Unit study

(budget of \$132.1k). Coastal Conservation & Research will begin sampling during the second week of August, following the sampling design approved by the PCB Workgroup.

## 5. Discussion: Process for Supplemental Environmental Project Funding

Phil presented a draft policy describing the process for proposing and approving potential projects for Supplemental Environmental Project (SEP) funding through the RMP. For minimum mandatory penalty (MMP) payments, SFEI will receive funds and save them separately from base RMP fees; these fees can then be later combined to fund a larger project. For SEP settlements, the RMP will provide an approved project list to the Water Board, which will then provide a subset of relevant projects with a clear nexus to the violation to the discharger as project options. RMP projects and project budgets mutually agreed upon by the Water Board and discharger must be explicitly described in the settlement agreement.

Adam suggested that the proposed SEP project list be broadened beyond typical RMP Special Studies projects, including proposals to support education and outreach work, as well as peer-reviewed journal publications. Tom confirmed that the SEP policy is broad enough to allow for the funding of such projects, but cautioned that the RMP already has many competing priorities. New projects should focus primarily on expanding the scope of existing focus areas, rather than identifying new management concerns.

Tom also noted that the SEP policy specifically indicates that the discharger must pay for project oversight, although this has not always been required during past projects. Project proposals should either include project management budgets or identify when additional project management costs will need to be included, beyond what the RMP budget can absorb. Jay indicated that the San Leandro Bay SEP project budget already includes the project management budget. Phil will attempt to track extra costs associated with SEPs and may propose an increase in RMP funding to manage these projects if the cumulative SEP funding exceeds a certain threshold (e.g., \$500,000 per year).

Several specific suggestions to modify the SEP funding process policy and project list are summarized below:

- In the draft policy in the section “Requirements for RMP Projects to be Eligible for SEP Funding,”
  - Revise “monitoring and special studies” to simply state “projects” in bullet three, to broaden the range of activities that can be funded with SEP monies;
  - Delete “recommended by a RMP workgroup” from bullet three. Eligible projects might be those approved or consulted on by workgroups, but ultimately projects can be approved by the Steering Committee alone.
- The proposed project list should be presented in a matrix format that includes categorization of projects by topic and stakeholder relevance.
- Karin suggested developing project proposals with a nexus to salt pond restoration activities, such as mercury and other pollutants flowing through the ponds.
- Adam suggested working with the Water Board to identify information needed to be able to find violators.

**Action Items**

- Work with the Water Board and workgroups to develop a working list of potential SEP project proposals to be discussed at the November Steering Committee meeting. (Phil Trowbridge)
- Add agenda items to the November Steering Committee meeting to discuss adding text describing the SEP and AMR funding processes to the RMP Charter. (Phil Trowbridge)

## 6. Decision: Confirm RMP Fees for 2017-2018 and Discuss 2019-2021 Fees

### Confirm RMP Fees for 2017-2018

The group confirmed that RMP fees for 2017 and 2018 would follow a 3% fee increase schedule, and would be set at \$3.536 million and \$3.604 million respectively. These fees were approved at an earlier meeting, but the percentage of the total fees among participants have changed slightly because cooling water participants no longer participate in the RMP. The percentage of the total fees for remaining participants were increased slightly to account for this difference although the actual deficit from the cooling water participants will not be made up by the other participants.

Jay noted that the graphic showing RMP fees in the RMP Update would include a note explaining the change in participant fee allocation due to the loss of cooling water participant fees. Adam Oliveri requested that a second note be added to explain that the dredger fee deficit accumulated through 2016 would not be recovered.

### 2019-2021 Fees

Phil presented several options for RMP fee increases for the 2019-2021 period, and recommended that fees be increased by 3%, consistent with the fee increases in the past few years. The average CPI increase since 1997 has been 2.7%. The group agreed with this recommendation. SEP and AMR funds will be accounted for separately from the core RMP budget.

### Dredger Fees

Phil explained that the dredger stakeholder group has been meeting but has not yet established a new fee structure for 2017 and beyond.

The total fees owed by all dredgers for 2017 is \$635k, but the current fee structure is expected on bring in \$395k, leaving a shortfall of \$240k. Phil suggested the following compromise.

- The USACE would be expected to increase its payment from \$250k to \$400k to account for 24 years of inflation, which would address \$150k of the shortfall. Funds from USACE are passed through to USGS for suspended sediment monitoring, so the shortfall in the USACE contribution directly affects the number of suspended sediment monitoring stations in the Bay, but not the RMP special studies budget. However, suspended sediment monitoring is a critical dataset for sediment management and beneficial reuse decision-making and should be fully funded. The expectation is that USACE and the local dredgers will seek increased funding for the USACE from Congress to make up this difference.

- Local dredgers would be expected to make up the difference between the total RMP dredger fees and the expected \$400k USACE contribution. For 2017, this would amount to \$235k (\$635k - \$400k). For 2018, this approach would amount to \$254k (\$654k - \$400k). The local dredgers can develop any method to divide up the total fees owed. The current fee structure is expected to bring in \$145k in 2017, which is \$90k below the compromise target.

Tom indicated that the Water Board is prepared to enforce a permit requirement for individual monitoring of dredging operations if the dredger fees are not paid in full; and that the compromise proposed should be revisited after a few years if increased USACE funding does not materialize.

The Steering Committee confirmed that the percent of RMP fees owed by the different participant groups should not be changed to reduce the amount owed by the dredgers because that would either decrease the Program budget or require another participant group to pay more.

## 7. Science Update: 2014 Sport Fish Monitoring

Jennifer Sun presented results from the 2014 RMP Status and Trends Sport Fish monitoring event, which was the seventh round of RMP Sport Fish monitoring. Fish were collected from all segments of the Bay between April and August 2014, including at locations in the Carquinez Strait and Suisun Bay, where samples have not regularly been collected in the past; however, drought conditions in 2014 resulted in more saline conditions in these regions and allowed for some limited collection of target species. Several additional fish - largemouth bass, striped bass, and carp - were collected in August 2015 from Artesian Slough, at the outfall of the San Jose-Santa Clara Regional Wastewater Facility (SJSCRWF), through a collaboration with SJSCRWF. Eric Dunlavey explained that largemouth bass stay in Coyote Creek, while striped bass found in the Slough can move throughout Lower South Bay but can also move into freshwater sections of the Slough.

The core parameters analyzed included mercury, PCBs, dioxins, selenium, PBDEs, and PFCs. Key results are summarized below:

- Mercury, PCBs, and Dioxins
  - TMDL exceedances continue for Hg and PCBs.
  - Elevated Hg concentrations were observed in striped bass collected from Artesian Slough, although these fish move throughout Lower South Bay and may be accumulating mercury from other sources.
  - No clear long-term trend in these contaminants in fish is apparent in the Bay.
  - PCBs and dioxin concentrations are elevated in Oakland.
- Selenium
  - Concentrations in white sturgeon show a distinct spatial trend, with significantly higher concentrations in Suisun Bay, and lower concentrations in Central Bay.
  - Concentrations in the two individual white sturgeon caught in Suisun Bay exceeded the North Bay TMDL threshold.

- Fewer exceedances of the TMDL target were observed historically in South Bay compared to San Pablo Bay. No samples were collected in Suisun or Central Bay prior to 2014.
- PBDEs - Concentrations continue to decline in shiner surfperch.
- PFOS - Concentrations may be approaching levels of concern. Measured concentrations are below the 40 ppb threshold for 1 meal/wk fish consumption established in Minnesota, but could be approaching levels of concern if assuming a 2- or 3-meal/wk consumption rate. The highest concentrations were observed in fish collected from Artesian Slough.

The draft Sport Fish report will include additional analyses and will be completed by August 2016. The Sport Fish WG will meet in the fall of 2016 to review the draft report and discuss the design of the next S&T sampling that will occur in 2019.

## 8. Decision: Approve Special Studies for 2017

### Funding Availability and TRC Recommendation

Phil Trowbridge presented the TRC recommendations for special studies funding, which included consideration of expected AMR and SEP funds, and potential use of Undesignated Funds. Since the TRC meeting, several revisions to the estimated funding budget were made. Phil Trowbridge made recommendations for revising the funding sources for TRC-recommended studies as described below and outlined in Attachment A:

1. The estimated core RMP budget available for Special Studies was revised upwards to \$1,066k, based on a revision of the estimated dredger shortfall impact on the Special Studies budget (the potential USACE shortfall will impact USGS sediment monitoring, but not the Special Studies budget).
  - a. Two of the studies identified as a high priority for funding using Undesignated Funds - Steinberger Slough PMU Conceptual Model (\$60k) and Selenium Workshop monitoring recommendations (\$20k) - could be funded through the core RMP budget.
  - b. The two top priority CEC studies - CEC Strategy Support (\$50k) and Imidacloprid in Water (\$40k) also could be funded through the core RMP budget.
  - c. The remaining four CEC studies could likely be funded with AMR funds, which are expected to exceed the requested budget for these four studies (\$195k).
2. A SEP settlement currently in process has been identified as a likely funding source for Nutrients moored sensor monitoring. The additional \$122k that was not recommended for funding from the core RMP budget will likely be funded through this SEP.
3. Additional AMR funds were received, totalling \$153k at the time of the meeting. A total of \$289k of optional invoices were billed to dischargers. Karin estimated that \$200k in total funds was a very conservative estimate, and at least \$250k in AMR funds would likely be received.

Two studies remained as low priorities for funding: \$30k for developing a Climate Stressor Indicator (“Ocean Acidification”) Monitoring Strategy, and \$100k in additional funds for the Small Tributaries Loading Strategy’s Trend Strategy development.

Discussion

Tom and Karin clearly stated that AMR funds should be included with the core budget when making future budget decisions. Funding for CEC projects should not be limited to AMR funds, which were meant to supplement but not replace core RMP funding. Additionally, the TRC should focus on clearly prioritizing studies for funding, rather than making recommendations for use of different funding sources, including Undesignated Funds. If total funding amounts are not clear in the future, the TRC should simply produce an ordered priority list of studies from which the Steering Committee can later select studies to fund.

Tom and other committee members also felt strongly that the use of Undesignated Funds should be reserved for urgent, time-sensitive projects only. Funding requests for time-sensitive projects can be made outside of this special studies process as the need arises. AMR funds received at a later date and new SEP funds can help to supplement funding for these future requests.

Further discussion of specific studies is summarized below.

*Triclosan in Small Fish (ECWG)*

Multiple group members questioned whether this study was a priority for funding; it was the lowest priority for both the ECWG and TRC, and under the TRC's recommendation for the exclusive funding of CECs with AMR funds may not have been funded. Under the revised funding proposal, this study could be funded with expected AMR funds. When asked by the Committee, Rebecca Sutton indicated that despite a lack of toxicity thresholds in biota, this study has the benefit of being able to potentially influence federal activity on triclosan (i.e., triclosan registration review, reevaluation of human health and ecological risk assessment). Based on this information the group agreed to fund this study.

*Climate Stressor Indicator Monitoring Strategy (EEWG)*

Phil Trowbridge explained the time-sensitivity of portions of this funding request, which is tied to the Ocean Acidification workshop being held this fall that has already been funded by EPA. This workshop will primarily focus on the impact of ocean acidification on existing water quality concerns in the Bay, such as nutrients, toxicity, and restoration. \$10k of the request would be required to develop a strategy document based on the outcomes of the workshop. \$5k would be needed to support travel costs for the science advisors; since the development of this proposal the group decided not to pay honoraria. The Steering Committee agreed to fund \$5k for travel costs out of Undesignated Funds. An additional \$10k can be requested after the workshop if the development of a strategy is determined to be a high priority and alternate funding sources are not available.

*Trends Strategy (STLS)*

Phil clarified that the TRC ranked the need to fully fund this study as a low priority. The \$100k for this study that was recommended for funding through the core RMP budget will be used solely to collect additional data in 2017. An additional \$100k in 2018 would be used to analyze this and other historical data, write a report, and update the Trends Strategy, together with the help of external science advisors. These tasks could be funded at a later time; however, immediate funding would help to keep important external experts engaged in developing the strategy. The total budget would increase by about \$12k to

spread the study out over two years. Adam Olivieri confirmed Chris Sommers's recommendation to reduce funding for the Trends Strategy rather than for reconnaissance monitoring, and agreed with the group that it is unnecessary to provide full funding for the Trends Strategy. If additional funding for the Trends Strategy is determined to be time-critical at a later time, an additional funding request will be made to the TRC.

*Selenium Monitoring Workshop Recommendations (Selenium WG) -*

Peter Carroll expressed concern that the proposed placeholder of \$20k would not be sufficient to support recommendations coming out of the July 27, 2016 Selenium Monitoring Workshop. Peter thought that the Water Board expressed interest in implementing this monitoring recommendation on a short timescale, which could potentially require more RMP funds this year. Naomi Feger noted that the workshop will include consideration of a broad selenium monitoring program that will not be funded exclusively by the RMP, and that the availability of at least a small amount of RMP funds could help to leverage other funds. Tom agreed that if immediate monitoring using RMP funds is found to be critical, a separate request for Undesignated Funds could be made.

Naomi also noted that the USGS may be experiencing at least a short-term funding gap for clam monitoring that could potential require RMP funding to support, although Tom Mumley expressed concern over using RMP funds to fill funding gaps from other agencies. Jay explained that the group would be developing both robust and minimal essential monitoring options, so future funding requests would likely only be for essential monitoring needs.

Microplastic

Karin North proposed that any additional AMR funds received above the requested \$194k be made available to fund microplastic studies. Tom clarified that any amendments to this current 2017 budget decision based on receipt of additional funds can be made at the Multi-Year Planning meeting. Funding requests for microplastic studies should be made at the Multi-Year Planning Meeting.

**Items for Approval**

- Tom Mumley motioned to release \$5k in Undesignated Funds to support travel costs for the Ocean Acidification workshop advisors. The group recognized the need for an additional \$10k to develop an Ocean Acidification strategy but will consider funding for this need at a later date. Karin North seconded the motion. None were opposed.
- Karin North motioned to approve the list of recommended special studies as listed in Attachment A, using \$194k of expected AMR funds and \$1,070k from the core RMP budget, conditional on receiving the expected AMR funds. Adam Olivieri seconded the motion. None were opposed.

## **9. Decision: Approve Agenda for RMP Annual Meeting**

Jay reviewed the proposed agenda for the 2016 RMP Annual Meeting and modified the version distributed in the Steering Committee meeting agenda package to include a discussion to the third session of the day. All discussion sessions would then be about 15 minutes long.

The group then selected a proposed list of session moderators. The role of the moderator is to facilitate, but not necessarily significantly add to, the discussion.

- Nutrients - Jim Ervin (confirmed)
- Contaminants of Emerging Concern - Karin North (confirmed)
- General RMP - Karen Taberski (alternatively Bridgette DeShields)
- Sediments - Naomi Feger (alternatively Tom Mumley)

Phil Trowbridge had been originally planned to give an introductory presentation at the beginning of the day to introduce the RMP and provide context for the day's sessions and linkage to management actions. This presentation was cut due to time constraints, but committee members suggested instead providing summary slides including background information and discussion prompts to rotate on the stage prior to the meeting instead.

Maureen Downing-Kuntz (USGS) has been confirmed as one of the sediment session speakers, but other speakers will need to be confirmed. Peter Carroll suggested Jeff Cotsifas at Pacific EcoRisk to present on the practical applicability of RMP sediment-related data as an alternate to Brian Ross, if Brian is not available to speak. Jeff's expertise focuses on toxicity testing of benthic organisms and chemical analyses related to dredging.

## 10. Discussion: RMP Update Report, Upcoming Estuary News Articles, RMP eUpdate

### RMP Update

The next draft of the RMP Update report in laid-out format will be distributed August 1. Comments will need to be returned on a short timeline.

### Estuary News

The Estuary News articles for September and December will focus on Nutrients and CECs, respectively. The group agreed that these Estuary News articles were valuable should continue to be funded.

e-Update - the Spring RMP e-Update was skipped but the next e-Update will be released shortly with 11 items.

### Fact Sheets

\$16k is currently still available in the 2016 budget to develop fact sheets. Jay presented possible options for developing new fact sheets, including (1) an addendum to the microplastic fact sheet, (2) stormwater, and (2) CECs such as pharmaceuticals. Tom indicated that fact sheets should be produced judiciously, as they can be very time consuming, sensitive, and often non-essential, and felt that no further CEC fact sheets were currently necessary.

Karin and Adam indicated that a fact sheet on water quality in stormwater, and the relationship between this and other stormwater, water quality, and green infrastructure-related work in the Bay, would be beneficial for communicating with stormwater management agencies and other non-technical public

audiences. Karin noted that a ballot initiative to increase stormwater fees will be considered in February 2017, and such a fact sheet could help to explain the need for additional funds for stormwater management.

## 11. Information: Status of RMP Deliverables and Action Items

Phil briefly reviewed the status of overdue deliverables, which are all nearing completion. No action items were overdue, but some items were deprioritized and delayed, such as the web demo of CD3 enhancements and the RMP archives tool, update of “new focus areas” list, and development of a policy for using RMP grant funds as match for federal grants, and update of the internal review report.

The overdue deliverables included:

- QAPP - the draft QAPP was presented to the TRC in June and distributed to RMP laboratories. Final edits are being incorporated.
- Bioanalytical Tools report - The draft report was shared with the EEWG and TRC, and the authors at the University of Florida are incorporating edits and final data to fill in gaps in a dose-response curve. Jay indicated that this type of monitoring could potentially be incorporated into RMP Status and Trends monitoring within the next few years. Similar to toxicity testing, these bioanalytical assays indicate whether or not estrogenic impacts exist, but do not identify sources, causes, or confounding factors. For this reason, they are best suited to demonstrate when no impact exists. This type of monitoring is meant to complement but not replace directed monitoring.
- CTR monitoring report - The draft report was completed in June and is currently in review.

## 12. Discussion: Plan agenda items for future meetings

The next Science Update is scheduled for the January Steering Committee meeting and will focus on Environmental Informatics tools and resources available. The November Steering Committee meeting will include discussion and approval of additional projects proposed for funding through SEP penalties, additional AMR funds received, and any other funding sources. Peter Carroll requested an update on potential funding sources, if any, for the RMP as a result of the approved Measure AA parcel tax.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30