



SAN FRANCISCO ESTUARY INSTITUTE

4911 Central Avenue, Richmond, CA 94804 • p 510-746-7334 • f 510-746-7300 www.sfei.org

Bay RMP Technical Review Committee Meeting

June 8, 2017

San Francisco Estuary Institute

Meeting Summary

Attendees

TRC Member	Affiliation	Representing	Present
Nirmela Arsem	EBMUD	POTWs	No
Rod Miller	SFPUC	POTWs	Yes
Tom Hall	EOA, Inc.	POTWs	Yes - (remote access)
Ross Duggan	SFPUC	POTWs	Yes
Eric Dunlavey	City of San Jose	POTWs	Yes
Bridgette DeShields*	Integral Consulting	Refineries	Yes
Chris Sommers	BASMAA (EOA, Inc.)	Stormwater	Yes
Shannon Alford	Port of SF	Dredgers	Yes
Ian Wren	San Francisco Baykeeper	NGOs	Yes
Naomi Feger	SFB RWQCB	Water Board	Yes
Luisa Valiela	US EPA	US-EPA IX	Yes

*Chair

Guests and Staff

- Brian Anderson - UCD (remote access)
- Steve Bay - SCCWRP (remote access)
- Dave Schoellhamer - USGS (remote access)
- Phil Trowbridge - SFEI
- Jay Davis - SFEI
- Jennifer Sun - SFEI
- Don Yee - SFEI
- Becky Sutton - SFEI (remote access)
- Diana Lin - SFEI
- Lester McKee - SFEI (remote access)
- Adam Wong - SFEI

1. Introductions and Review Agenda

After introductions, Bridgette DeShields called for any changes to the agenda. There were none.

2. Decision: Approve Meeting Summary from March 9, 2017 and confirm/set dates for future meetings.

Comments were solicited for the March 9, 2017 Technical Review Committee meeting summary, but there were none. Chris Sommers motioned to approve the summary, Luisa Valiela seconded, all were in favor.

September 14 and December 14 of 2017 were agreed upon for the next two meeting dates. Using the second thursday of each third month was tentatively agreed to as a recurring meeting date, but the issue will be revisited during the September meeting.

3. Information: SC Meeting Summary from April 26, 2017

Phil Trowbridge presented a summary of the April 26, 2017 Bay RMP Steering Committee meeting. No questions were raised.

4. Discussion: Presentation of Special Studies Proposals Recommended by Workgroups

Phil Trowbridge began this item by presenting figures on the available budget for special studies for 2018 (1076k from Core RMP funds, 289k intended for emerging contaminants work from AMR funding). He then discussed how he had organized the proposals for presentation into functional groups rather than by the originating workgroup. Phil presented brief summaries for each of the proposals by group:

Functional Groups for Proposals



Questions focused on the sediment proposals because they did not go through a workgroup approval process. Steve Bay (M-AMBI Benthic Assessment), Brian Anderson (Sediment toxicity causes), and David Schoellhamer (Lower South Bay sediment flux and Mallard Island monitoring) were available by phone to provide additional information.

The main clarifications were regarding the M-AMBI benthic index, sediment flux, and causes of sediment toxicity proposals. The M-AMBI project's range of \$21-50k could be split into \$21k for calibrating the index for use with existing SF Bay SQO data and \$29k for applying the index and generating a report. The sediment flux work would be performed over three years, but project cost could not be split up and funded from different budget years. A large portion of the cost was for equipment that would need to be purchased in the first year. Data analysis and reporting would occur in the third year. The only way to ensure that the RMP received a product for its investment is to commit funds for the whole study. Dave also described the differences in instrumentation at the various proposed funding levels: Option 1 would replace existing equipment and continue to operate the site (some improvement of understanding flocculation would be possible with this new equipment); Option 2 would add a vertical profiler and “floc cam”; Option 3 would add acoustic velocity instrumentation and add more robust measurements of SSC. Additionally, he also clarified that there would not be significant cost savings from not working on a peer reviewed report, as the interpretation would already require a document for consumption by the RMP. Finally, there was some discussion about the causes of sediment toxicity proposal. The discussion centered around how the tool would be used after it was developed. Participants asked how the RMP would “operationalize” the test on S&T sediment samples and what that would cost. There was interest in focusing the effort on sediment toxicity to hotspot areas where the causes might be easier to determine.

The other explanation of note was that four of the emerging contaminant projects were preemptively collecting samples during the margins cruise currently in progress. Collection of field samples had to start early to take advantage of the cruise. Phil acknowledged the risk associated with this task but explained that the projects were ranked as high priority and no alternatives were available.

Phil then explained that the workgroups were asked to recommend (but prioritize) projects above the available funding level, and that some projects were approved with a high and low budget. At the high end, the proposal requests were numbers were ~70% above the actual funds available, primarily because the planning budget was larger than the actual budget and because of the unanticipated sediment projects.

5. Decision: Recommendation for Special Studies for 2018

The committee provided two options (Option A and Option B) for funding special studies in 2018, shown in the attached tables. The major differences between the two options were:

- Option A allocated \$120k to the Lower South Bay sediment flux proposal (which resulted in reduced or zero funding for a few other studies).

- Option B did not fund the sediment flux proposal and increased funding for nutrients projects to \$400k, provided partial funding for the Richmond PMU Conceptual Model, and increased funding for hosting and visualizing the DMMO database.

The three proposals not recommended for any funding were the causes of sediment toxicity, ocean acidification strategy development, and analysis of DMMO PCB data. All other projects were either recommended for full or partial funding in one of the options.

6. Decision: Update List of RMP Projects Eligible for Supplemental Environmental Project Funding and Recommend Allocation of Existing SEP Funds

Phil Trowbridge led the discussion of adding recommended but unfunded proposals to the SEP list. He also solicited input on removing currently listed projects. Seven projects were added, six of which represented fully funding projects that were only partially funded by RMP core funds. Although there was discussion about several existing SEP projects, there was no final decision to remove any. The updated list will be presented to the Steering Committee in July.

7. Decision: Changes to the Status and Trends Monitoring Design for 2017- 2023

Phil Trowbridge presented proposed changes to upcoming RMP Status and Trends monitoring for approval by the TRC. Discontinuing PBDE analysis in bivalves had consensus approval. It was also agreed to only monitor nutrients during the Water Cruise at the Golden Gate site. Fipronil (addition) and legacy pesticides (removal) were marked for revisitation after results from the current margins cruise.

There was a conversation about moving all future sediment cruises to summer sampling. Maintaining the current plan (alternating between winter and summer every four years) would allow for better characterization of the range of conditions, while consistently sampling during summer would increase trends power, as well as providing for more streamlined logistics. However, there was not a consensus among the TRC members. Phil will follow-up offline, as planning for a sediment cruise in early 2018 would need to begin soon.

Last was a discussion about the removal of sediment toxicity and benthic macroinvertebrate analysis from the upcoming sediment cruise. While there was an extensive conversation about alternative work regarding the SQO lines of inquiry (to be continued at the multi-year planning meeting), there was consensus that these two analyses should be skipped for the 2018 sediment cruise. The rationale was that interpretation of the results of these tests is highly uncertain. Resources should not be spent on collecting more data until the interpretation methods are established.

Action Items:

- Update the S&T design with the consensus adjustments: discontinuing PBDE analysis in bivalves; curtailing nutrient monitoring during the Water Cruise; and skipping sediment toxicity and benthos for the 2018 sediment cruise.

- Add an agenda item to a future TRC meeting about CTR parameters for RPA.
- Add particulate selenium to the target list for the 2017 Water Cruise.
- Change S&T design table to note that bird eggs were tested in 2016, not 2015.
- Present a proposal to the TRC for testing archived tern eggs from 2016 for PBDEs. Determine the cost for analysis and data management. Review trends graphs to determine the value of getting more data.
- Follow-up with TRC members to reach resolution on summer vs winter for the 2018 sediment cruise.
- Discuss focusing RMP efforts with SQOs to hotspots during the Multi-Year Planning meeting.

8. Discussion: Comments on 2017 Pulse Articles and Update on Annual Meeting Planning

Jay Davis presented an update on the progress for the 2017 Pulse and Annual Meeting (October 6, 2017). Chris Sommers provided feedback on the 25th anniversary article, and Jay asked that others provide feedback as soon as possible, and no later than June 15.

9. Discussion: Comments on Proposed Scope of Work for Sediment Supply Synthesis

Funding for this project was allocated by the SC previously. Comments were requested on the scope of work. Lester McKee gave a brief overview of the proposed scope of work for a sediment supply synthesis document. Phil asked for feedback by 6/9/17 so that the proposal could be sent to the SC for approval.

10. Information: Status of Deliverables and Action Items

Phil Trowbridge presented the most recent version of the deliverables scorecard and action items (stoplight) report. There were no questions.