



Bay RMP Steering Committee Meeting

July 22, 2020

San Francisco Estuary Institute

Meeting Summary

Attendees (all participants attended remotely)

SC Member	Affiliation	Representing	Present
Eric Dunlavey	City of San Jose	POTW-Large	Yes
Robert Wilson	City of Petaluma	POTW-Small	No
Karin North**	City of Palo Alto	POTW-Medium	Yes
Adam Olivieri	BASMAA / EOA, Inc.	Stormwater	Yes
John Coleman	Bay Planning Coalition	Dredgers	No
Tessa Beach	US Army Corps of Engineers	USACE	Yes
Tom Mumley*	SF Bay Regional WQCB	Water Board	Yes
Maureen Dunn	Chevron	Refineries	Yes
<i>Xavier Fernandez</i>	<i>SF Bay Regional WQCB</i>	<i>Water Board</i>	Yes
<i>Roman Berenshteyn</i>	<i>Bay Planning Coalition</i>	<i>Dredgers</i>	Yes

* Chair, ** Vice Chair; alternates in gray and italicized

Guests and Staff:

- Mary Lou Esparza - CCCSD
- Yuyun Shang - EBMUD
- Jay Davis - SFEI
- Melissa Foley - SFEI
- Nina Buzby - SFEI
- Jen Hunt - SFEI
- Miguel Mendez - SFEI
- Alicia Gilbreath - SFEI
- Don Yee - SFEI
- Diana Lin - SFEI
- Becky Sutton - SFEI
- Patrick Walsh - SFEI
- Ezra Miller - SFEI

1. Introductions and Review Agenda:

After a quick round of introductions, Tom Mumley briefly reviewed the meeting's agenda. He noted that the item concerning RMP fees would not involve any decision making, but would serve more as a discussion to preface the upcoming Multi-Year Planning Meeting (MYP) in October. Melissa Foley also shared tips on Zoom meeting etiquette such as using the raise hand and chat functions.

2. Decision: Approve Meeting Summary from April 22, 2020 and Confirm/Set Dates for Future Meetings

Tom Mumley asked the Steering Committee (SC) members if they had any questions or comments on the past meeting's summary. There were no concerns raised by the members. Additionally, no members voiced any conflicts with upcoming meeting dates, including the 2020 and 2021 RMP Annual Meeting (AM) dates.

Action Item:

- Send out both 2020 and 2021 AM calendar events to RMP committee members. (Nina Buzby, 7/31/20)
- Confirm 2021 meeting date with the David Brower Center (Melissa Foley, 7/31/20)

Decision:

- Maureen Dunn motioned to approve the meeting summary. Karin North seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

3. Information: TRC Meeting Summary

Melissa Foley provided the SC with a summary of the previous month's Technical Review Committee (TRC) meeting. She noted that the meeting took place slightly later in June than usual, which allowed extra time for RMP staff to revise proposal documents and assemble the large agenda package. Per a TRC request for more context on NMS program activities, Dave Senn presented an update on the program to provide an overview of the nutrients special study proposals. The TRC meeting also covered special studies, Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEPs), as well as Workgroup (WG) budgets; all of which are topics the SC will discuss.

In addition, the TRC brainstormed on and reviewed options for the upcoming RMP Annual Meeting and Data Exploration Challenge. Melissa noted for the SC that it would be the third year of the Data Challenge and it would kickoff in August and wrap up in December. If the participation in the challenge remains small, the annual challenge would not continue.

The TRC also received an update on Status and Trends (S&T) review activities, which Melissa also briefly reviewed for the SC members. Specifically, the timeline for upcoming efforts and meetings with experts.

4. Information: RMP Financial Update for 2020, Quarter 2

Jen Hunt presented the financial update to the committee. Highlights included additional SEP funds, an unforeseen \$18K deficit in the 2020 budget due to the \$200k deficit in dredger fees, and 98% and 95% of budgets expended for 2019 and 2018, respectively. When showing a timeline of fee collections, the members noted that negative dredger reserves did not represent values that require payment; it is the sum of fees not contributed to the RMP by dredgers.

Jen posed a request to the meeting participants: to unencumber \$10K in funds from the 2016 budget. The committee members agreed to this and had no other questions for Jen.

Decision:

- Adam Oliveri motioned to unencumber 2016 funds, Karin North seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

5. Discussion: RMP Fees for 2022-2024

As an introduction to the item, Melissa explained the impetus to discuss fees was the uncertain economic situation due to the pandemic. Though the group will decide on a new fee structure (starting in 2022) at the October MYP meeting, Melissa asked the meeting participants if stakeholders are still planning to commit to the 3% increase in fees for 2021 and what the future might look like concerning fee increases. Melissa showed the group various fee increase scenarios (0-3%) and the associated reductions in revenue compared to projected spending.

After a brief discussion, the group consensus was that the program should expect 2021 fees to be paid as planned and it would be prudent to keep fees flat for 2022. The meeting participants also considered the schedule of assessing the fee structure - either on a yearly basis or for a three year chunk, as was done previously. Karin, Maureen, and Mary Lou Esparza agreed that after flat fees in 2022 the RMP should tell stakeholders to plan for 3% increases for the foreseeable future. This would allow the RMP to revisit the fee increase on a yearly basis, and only have to communicate a reduction in fees to stakeholders. Eric Dunlavey also noted that until some stability is established, the topic of RMP fees should be a point of discussion at every SC meeting.

Action Item:

- Show multi-year scenarios after 3% increase in fees for 2021 and a 0% increase for 2022 at the October MYP meeting. (Melissa Foley, 10/21/20)

6. Decision: Approve Workgroup Structure for 2021

Melissa reported to the group that the TRC had discussed the proposed 30% budget cut for operating RMP Workgroups. The TRC had concerns that it would be difficult for the emerging contaminants workgroup (ECWG) to absorb the microplastics workgroup (MPWG) and that strategy funds allow staff to pursue novel and more ad-hoc opportunities, which would be restricted with reduced budgets. Given these concerns, the TRC proposed an alternative 20% cut that would allow the MPWG to operate independently and slightly increase strategy funding for the ECWG and small tributary loading strategy team (STLS).

When asking the group for feedback, the majority of the discussion focused on the responsibility of the RMP to fund microplastic efforts. The participants weighed multiple aspects of the topic, including the recent OPC grants awarded to SFEI, difference in ECWG and MPWG advisor expertise, lack of regulatory actions, and supporting interests of stakeholders who do not contribute to RMP funding. The participants acknowledged the importance of establishing a microplastic strategy specific to the Bay, given the leverage it allows to look for external funding. The group agreed to support the MPWG in a strategy-focused capacity, by providing funding for the group to hold a 'workshop' - rather than a workgroup meeting - and continue work on the microplastic strategy.

Acknowledging that the scaled back budget is an experiment, the SC members agreed that WG leads can ask the SC for additional funding if needed and/or unforeseen circumstances/opportunities arise.

Action Item:

- Update WG budget cuts and write up specifics related to MPWG funding in the 2021 RMP Workplan. (Melissa Foley, 10/21/20)

Decision:

- Karin North motioned to approve the modified workgroup structure and funding. Eric Dunlavy seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

7. Decision: Approve Special Studies for 2021 and List of Eligible RMP Studies for SEP Funding

Melissa presented the special studies, noting how the TRC recommended funding was allocated across the WGs, as well as study types (desktop, monitoring, modeling, strategy). Additionally, Melissa mentioned the studies not recommended for studies, noting particular projects, like a study of quaternary ammonium compounds (QACs) in wastewater, that would be

good options for MMP SEP funds. The meeting participants then voiced questions and concerns related to the TRC recommendations. Two major points of discussion concerned the microplastics ecotoxicology workshop and Dredged Materials Management Office (DMMO) database enhancement studies.

For the microplastics ecotoxicology workshop, the MPWG recommended funding the project at a lower cost than proposed because the higher funding level would support manuscript completion that the WG did not consider a priority. The TRC decided to recommend the higher funding level, including manuscript preparation, but the SC members held a similar opinion to the MPWG. After hearing more details from the RMP project lead, Ezra Miller, the SC members noted the importance of RMP engagement in the workshop, but agreed that manuscript funding was not necessary. Tom Mumely also voiced concern at funding this study with Alternative Monitoring Requirement (AMR) funds because such funds typically cover monitoring efforts that have a direct nexus with a management action.

Related to the DMMO database enhancements, the meeting participants discussed if and what stakeholders see value from the outcomes of that project. Tom noted a lack of interest from the Waterboard, and Maureen Dunn and Tessa Beach also indicated a lesser value for dredgers (but maintaining the DMMO database is a priority for dredgers). RMP staff noted current and upcoming studies that the database improvements would support. Because of the mixed opinions, the participants agreed to leave the project on the funding list - with provisional approval - with the intention of reconsidering it at the October SC meeting. With the WG budget cuts, additional funding (~\$80k) could be available for special study efforts, so further discussion of special studies will likely be necessary. In addition, not all of the AMR funds were allocated to emerging contaminants projects. Tom and Melissa will discuss project options for these funds.

The length of the special studies discussion left a short amount of time to consider projects for the Supplemental Environmental Project (SEP) list and funding of projects using Mandatory Minimum Penalty SEP funds. After reviewing the new SEP ideas, the group had no issues with adding them and the unfunded special studies to the list. Additionally the participants agreed that the QACs in wastewater study (~\$58k) and land-use updates (\$50k) were relevant and unique opportunities that should be funded with accumulated MMP funds.

Action Items:

- Discuss the DMMO study funding at the October SC meeting (Melissa Foley, 10/21/20)
- Discuss how to use leftover AMR funds for emerging contaminants projects (Melissa Foley and Tom Mumley, 10/21/20)

Decision:

- Eric Dunlavey motioned to approve the TRC special study recommendations, reducing the budget for the MP ecotoxicology workshop to \$18k and provisionally approving the DMMO database enhancement study. Adam Oliveri seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

- Karin North motioned to approve adding new project ideas and unfunded special studies to the SEP list. Maureen Dunn seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.
- Adam Oliveri motioned to approve funding the QACs study and land-use update with MMP funds. Eric Dunlavey seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

8. Decision: Communications Update

Jay Davis quickly told the committee members that RMP staff was currently working on the 2020 RMP Update, two Estuary News articles, and an eUpdate to share with the RMP mailing list. The conversation then focused on the 2020 RMP Annual Meeting, building off the TRC's initial brainstorming. The SC was adamant that the Annual Meeting should take place using a virtual platform.

The participants discussed various aspects related to the meeting, including meeting length, format, talk themes, and potential speakers. SC members were all in favor of a single day meeting rather than spreading it across multiple days. The SC supported the idea of more RMP-centric topics such as the S&T redesign process, and other programmatic updates, rather than non-RMP related talks from our experts. Building off of this outline, the group agreed that the virtual platform would be a good opportunity to have a mix of SFEI staff and WG science advisors on the agenda. Additionally the SC agreed with the TRC idea to have shorter talks and allow more time for panels and discussion sections. Jay then asked the meeting participants for specific speaker suggestions. He will reach out to the people identified during the meeting and possibly follow up with the committee for further feedback.

Decision:

- Reach out to potential Annual Meeting speakers. (Jay Davis, 08/07/20)

9. Discussion: Agenda for 2020 Multi-Year Planning Meeting

The goal of this discussion was to identify agenda items for the 2020 MYP meeting. In 2019, a subgroup of committee members met to discuss options, which Melissa suggested be implemented again because the meeting was running slightly late. She identified SC-related business items such as finalizing the 2022 fee structure and approving the 2021 annual workplan, as well as potential topic options such as budget allocations for 2022 special studies and revisiting the budget for the S&T review.

Meeting participants provided additional options for MYP discussion, including diversity, equity, and inclusion; future vessel needs; and consequences associated with various fee schedules.

The group agreed to convene a subgroup and Tom, Karin and Maureen volunteered to participate.

Action Item:

- Schedule MYP agenda planning subgroup meeting. (Melissa Foley, 8/15/20)

10. Discussion: Status of RMP Deliverables and Action Items

To begin the item, Melissa provided a brief description of delays experienced due to the coronavirus. Mainly the delays were in receiving data due to lab inability to process and/or analyze samples, as well as slight slowing in workflow due to childcare constraints. Melissa also noted that field projects were ramping up; highlighting that most efforts do not involve SFEI staff since collaborators are not allowing external participants. She also mentioned that workflow issues are a concern, particularly for the data management team. She suggested that some projects slated to start in 2021 may need to start sooner to keep RMP staff busy.

Melissa then listed recently and near completed deliverables. Tom Mumley voiced that the nearly-done items have forecasted completion dates that could be too ambitious. Melissa agreed and noted that having a better idea of what the RMP should prioritize would help push specific items to finalization. She also explained that while the RMP hasn't checked off specific deliverables, the program is learning and applying lessons from such projects. Melissa and Tom also provided funding updates to the SC, highlighting external funding accomplishments and recent SEP funding.

Action Item:

- Check-in with Tom Mumley about priorities related to RMP deliverables. (Melissa Foley, 10/21/20)

11. Discussion: Plan Agenda Items for Future Meetings

Because a subgroup would be meeting to specifically discuss MYP agenda items, the group did not spend time on this item.

12. Discussion: Plus/Delta

The group unanimously agreed that the meeting was highly productive but lacked the added benefit of social interactions that occur at in-person meetings. Karin North suggested scheduling time for brief social conversation, not related to the meeting's agenda.

Jay Davis also explained that his recent immersion in Delta RMP activities has highlighted the smooth operation of the Bay RMP in comparison. He commended the group on the efficient and

effective accomplishment of approving over \$1 million worth of funding for a diverse portfolio of studies in an hour.