



RMP Steering Committee Meeting

April 30, 2019

9:30 AM – 3:00 PM

Meeting Summary

Attendees

SC Member	Affiliation	Representing	Present
Eric Dunlavey	City of San Jose	POTW-Large	Yes
Leah Walker	City of Petaluma	POTW-Small	Yes
Robert Wilson	City of Petaluma Alternate	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	Yes
Tawny Tran	US Army Corps of Engineers	USACE	No
Tom Mumley*	SFB Regional Water Quality Control Board	Water Board	Yes
Maureen Dunn	Chevron	Refineries	Yes

* Chair, ** Vice Chair

Guests and Staff

- Jay Davis - SFEI
- Melissa Foley - SFEI
- Nina Buzby - SFEI
- Ila Shimabuku - SFEI
- Don Yee - SFEI
- Dave Senn - SFEI
- Jen Hunt - SFEI
- Patrick Walsh - SFEI

1. Introductions and Review Agenda

Tom Mumley began the meeting by welcoming Committee members, allowing time for introductions, and briefly reviewing the agenda items. Tom noted the lighter meeting agenda,

commenting that the RMP is currently in the midst of Workgroup meetings in preparation for special study funding actions that will take place later in the summer.

2. Decision: Approve Meeting Summary from January 23, 2019, and Confirm/set Dates for Future Meetings

Karin North noted a conflict with the July Steering Committee meeting, and though while her position could be covered, meeting participants agreed that having her present as Vice Chair would be important for the special studies funding decision. The meeting participants discussed possible alternate dates, and settled on pushing the meeting to August.

Decision:

- Eric Dunlavey motioned to approve the January Steering Committee meeting summary, Karin North seconded the motion. The motion for approval was carried by all present members.

Action Items:

- Reschedule the July SC Meeting for 8/13/19 and send out updated calendar invitation (Nina Buzby, 5/1/19)

3. Information: TRC Meeting Summary

Melissa Foley updated the SC on the recent Technical Review Committee meeting. Melissa commented on the recent short-term archive purge efforts that resulted in a roughly \$900/month cost savings and a memo documenting the rationale for the discards. The meeting also included an update on the next iteration of the Data Visualization Challenge, which will have a more optimized timeline and focus outreach efforts to students at the high school and college levels. Melissa also noted that this project is being advised by a subcommittee of RMP staff and TRC members. The TRC also learned about pH and carbonate chemistry work being done by Karina Neilson and the SFSU Romberg Tiburon Center in the Bay. The efforts are focusing on sensor data collection to assess the presence of upwelled bottom water and will continue in the summer of 2019.

Melissa also informed the group that Dave Senn gave an update on the status of the SFEI Nutrient's group status with the USGS partnership, though did not provide much detail as Dave would be giving a similar presentation later in the day.

Action Item:

- When Data Visualization Challenge is released, forward to SC members so they can disseminate to their high school and university contacts (Cristina Grosso, 8/31/19)

4. Information: Workgroup Dates & Special Studies Budget

Melissa Foley informed the Committee of the status of workgroup efforts, noting that three meetings have already occurred and reminded Committee members of the dates still to come if anyone was interested in attending. She then reminded the group of the planning structure put in place in order to help decision making, specifically by the TRC. Workgroups were asked to identify and rank high priority studies that are time sensitive as well as create modular proposals when possible to allow for maximum flexibility. There was discussion amongst the Committee members that the buffer of 50% between the planning budget and actual funding amount was an improvement from last year, with an additional note that there is a need to standardize workgroup budgets to a greater extent (for example, ECWG lists all studies of interest; SPLWG only lists studies that fit within their planning budget).

Melissa brought up a topic that would be covered more extensively in the financial update, informing the Committee that the workgroup task will likely be over budget this year. Along the lines of standardization, currently some workgroups use strategy funding to cover workgroup meeting preparation costs, while others use both their strategy costs and the workgroup task. Tom Mumley noted that this is an important difference to be aware of and should be addressed going forward. The SC will be given an update at the August meeting on the budget overrun and also possibly report on how much each workgroup asked for in funding.

Action Items:

- Update the SC on the budget overrun for the workgroup meetings (Melissa Foley, 8/13/2019)

5. Decision: Approve 2019 Multi-Year Plan

In January, the SC approved the 2019 Multi-Year Plan contingent on a few edits. Melissa presented the changes, including new special studies budget charts showing SEP and external funding contributions, as well as a standardization of how budgets were presented across workgroups.

Decision:

- Karin North motioned to approve and publish the Multi-Year Plan on the SFEI website, Tom Mumley seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

Action Items:

- Add total funding amounts to MYP special studies budget charts. (Melissa Foley, 5/1/19)

6. Information: RMP Financial Update for 2019 Quarter 1

Jen Hunt provided a financial update on the first quarter of 2019. The update began with a discussion of “surplus” or “unallocated” funds, covering how these funds come about and what to do with the amounts (i.e., when a year is closed out transfer to undesignated funds). Jen noted that the 2018 budget is rather tight, though expected to be within budget; 15 of the 2018

special studies are complete; 2 dredgers have yet to pay their portion of 0.3% of fees; and the University of Florida recently submitted a remittance of \$319.54 from a 2014 project.

Jen and Melissa then informed the Committee members of the budget status of the 2018 Dredged Material Management Office (DMMO) SEP effort. The task finished approximately \$8,000 over budget due to unanticipated difficulties with the database, as well as in depth comments on the draft report. Melissa presented two possible options for how to cover this overage: (1) using the small pots of Mandatory Minimum Penalties (MMPs) that have yet to be allocated, or (2) take from RMP undesignated funds. Committee members discussed these choices and other possibilities and decided to use undesignated funds instead of MMPs. Tom Mumley commented that it would be better to accumulate more MMPs until the funds are sufficient to fund a higher priority project rather than using them as pocket change to fund studies that go over budget. Tom also pointed out that the RMP is on the hook for making sure SEP projects are completed so taking money out of undesignated funds is legitimate. There was a broader discussion about how the Program Manager should bring these proposals (for all RMP and SEP projects) to the SC in the future. The SC would like to see a proposal that lays out the criteria for communicating with the Chair and Vice Chair (Tier 1) and the SC (Tier 2) before a project goes over budget.

Jay Davis then informed the Committee about the status of the 2019 Status and Trends Sport Fish budget. The sampling design made with the Sport Fish Strategy team was approximately \$50K above the available funds, and there were initial plans to propose a new design that would reduce this total value. However, Jay informed the Committee of a possible alternate funding stream that could cover the additional \$50K required for the enhanced sampling design. He noted these funds are not 100% secured, so planning in this manner would mean the RMP would take a small risk and he requested SC approval to set up the contracts with the higher funding amount in mind.

Steering Committee members were curious for the source of the extra costs, which stem mostly from additional species requested by OEHHA and extra analysis efforts. This led to a discussion on OEHHA participation and a desire to know the potential needs of the group going forward, given that the RMP doesn't have an ever-increasing budget to monitor a growing number of fish species.

Decisions:

- Leah Walker moved to approve the transfer of the University of Florida remittance to undesignated funds, Adam Oliveri seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.
- Leah Walker moved to approve the transfer of remaining LAIF interest to undesignated funds, Adam Oliveri seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

- Leah Walker moved to approve coverage of the DMMO SEP overage (roughly \$8,000, 17% of total cost) with undesignated funds, Karin North seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

Action Items:

- Contact former RMP Manager Phil Trowbridge to further understand the source of “surplus” funds from past years and report back to SC. (Jen Hunt, 8/13/19)
- Generate a policy outlining how to deal with project overages in the future, noting what threshold requires just SC Chair and Vice Chair approval, and what would require full Committee input. (Melissa Foley, 8/13/19)
- Present an update on the sport fish budget and OEHHA’s role in the planning process at a future SC meeting. (Jay Davis, 8/13/19)

7. Decision: Update on 2019 Pulse Outline and Speakers for Annual Meeting

Jay Davis asked the meeting participants for input on the upcoming RMP communication items, including the Pulse outline and Annual Meeting speakers. Jay informed the Committee that the deadline for Pulse article drafts would be pushed to June, given the busy schedule for the RMP in May. With that in mind, Jay identified the current efforts on articles involving actual draft writing, stakeholder input, and author identification.

In presenting the plan for the 2019 Annual Meeting, Jay commented that the meeting is usually meant to correspond with the Pulse theme and aims to attract audience members from all the discharge groups. The proposed session topics refer to each discharge pathway. Jay proposed to have a regulator, stakeholder, and scientist present for each topic and asked SC members for suggestions on who may be able to fill these slots. In their suggestions, the meeting attendees discussed the objective to have new faces present, as well as showcase the RMP and SFEI at the same time.

Specific suggestions on Annual Meeting speakers and presentations that came from the committee member discussion included:

- The municipal wastewater session could involve an HDR-nutrients related talk or a presentation from Jeremy Lowe (SFEI) on horizontal levees or other nature-based solutions.
- BACWA will discuss their input at their next meeting.
- Asking Richard Looker to speak in the stormwater session would be a good idea, but he will be on vacation.
- Reid Bogert (with advice from Chris Sommers) would be a new face to speak from the stormwater realm, potentially on using RMP data in management.
- Bridgette DeShields would be good speakers for the industrial wastewater session.
- The industrial wastewater session does not have to include a science talk, but replace this with a RMP Highlights talk from Melissa Foley.
- Xavier Fernandez could speak as a regulator for the dredged material session.

- John Coleman expressed interest in presenting as a stakeholder for dredged material.
- Leah Walker suggested presenting on biosolids in levees for the science aspect of the dredged material session.

Action Items:

- Revise Annual Meeting plan given the input from SC conversation and send to SC members for further review (Jay Davis, 5/31/19)

8. Information: Nutrient Science Update; USGS Bay-wide Cruise Status and Next Steps

Dave Senn presented on the structure and current efforts of the Nutrients group, with a brief overview of the context of nutrient loading within the Bay. The Nutrient Management Strategy (NMS) recently updated the 10-year science plan that outlines the program priorities. Dave spoke specifically to the priorities of assessing nutrient loads and transformations, as well as phytoplankton and productivity loads within the Bay and how such topics relate to ongoing and future modeling and monitoring efforts.

Dave outlined the specific modeling management questions which include: (1) What are nutrient sources to habitats? (2) How do individual habitats respond to (and influence) nutrients? (3) How will the system respond to nutrient increase and decrease? (4) How effective will various management approaches be? (5) How much confidence or uncertainty do we have in making predictions? Both the core nutrient full-Bay model as well as a more highly resolved Lower South Bay (LSB) model are working to address these questions, though Dave noted the importance of maintaining monitoring work in order to assess the effectiveness of such models. Providing an overview of current ship-based and moored sensor monitoring, Dave indicated that future efforts may look towards deploying more sensors (outside of LSB) throughout the Bay.

With the NMS monitoring efforts in mind, Dave updated the SC on the status of the USGS program formerly headed by scientist Jim Cloern, who recently retired. The USGS is still in discussions as to whether they will fund Jim's position in the future. High level USGS staff are also in the process of a broader funding restructure of the water mission. SFEI and NMS have been working to bring more specifics into the conversation with USGS and move the dialogue along, developing scenarios that involve different levels of USGS support or a complete divergence from partnering with USGS. Scenarios have been shared with the USGS and SFEI staff are also looking into the other partnership opportunities, such as with SFSU or the California Maritime Academy.

Dave and Melissa asked for feedback from the SC on a threshold for maintaining the partnership with USGS, as well as what the RMP and NMS want to get out of a continued collaboration. The group discussed the importance of having an ability to utilize the boat for other efforts (i.e., RMP projects) and being able to dictate, to a greater extent, what science actually occurs.

A higher-level topic that came up during these discussions was investigating the pathway of state funding. Adam Oliveri noted the importance of San Francisco Bay to the State of California as a whole, and proposed that state legislature would likely have a vested interest in knowing what is going on in the region. Tom Mumley noted some difficulties with going down this road, but mentioned that it is important to continue this dialogue.

9. Information/Discussion: DMMO PCB Report

Don Yee presented on the recently completed DMMO PCB report, which was the deliverable associated with the previously discussed DMMO SEP that went over budget. Don's presentation outlined some of the difficulties encountered in the project, including time periods and projects with no recorded chemistry data, missing detection limits, as well as mismatched naming conventions.

The work involved digging into the database and comparing the DMMO concentrations to existing RMP and Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program (BPTCP) data. The team also calculated the transport of PCB loads in and out of the Bay. Meeting participants noted that existing data sources (RMP and BPTCP) refer to surface-level sediments, while DMMO data may come from deeper layers that are exposed during dredging operations. In addition, due to the high number of non-detects in the dataset, multiple scenarios for handling below-detection-limit values (e.g., ND = 0 or ND = detection limit) were explored when making statistical calculations with DMMO concentrations. This was because the DMMO database contained a higher proportion of ND entries compared to RMP and BPTCP data.

Don informed the Committee that RMP and DMMO data were relatively similar (both in margins and open Bay regions) within a non-detect uncertainty range. Additionally the report found that dredging is a net PCB export pathway with approximately half of the loads going to upland reuse efforts or to the ocean. This second finding was consistent, regardless of ND scenario handling. From these conclusions, Don outlined possible future work efforts including advice on how the RMP should manage the database going forward.

The discussion after the presentation touched on the value of such work and ongoing database management efforts, given the DMMO data were not adequately managed until the recent SFEI work. Don noted the PCB calculations were not insignificant, despite the fact they don't spell out any specific management strategy ideas. The most valuable aspect of maintaining the database is to assist with future "what if" scenarios and in helping to build tools that identify opportunities for sediment reuse.

10. Information/Discussion: Status of RMP Deliverables and Action Items

Melissa Foley informed the group of the status of deliverables and action items - noting that many deliverables are due in the near future and appear to be on track for on-time completion. The high proportion of deliverables and WG products, Melissa noted, are a result of the remaining workgroup meetings that will be happening in the following weeks. Committee members did not have any comments on the deliverable report.

11. Discussion: Plan Agenda Items for Future Meetings

Jay Davis noted that the timing of the meeting would correlate well with the completion of the sediment conceptual understanding and monitoring strategy. This along with an update on S&T sport fish efforts would be good options for a science update at the August meeting. Karin North noted the necessary budget decisions that need to be made may not allow time for two science update presentations, so sport fish should be considered the first priority and then if time allows try to work in an update from the sediment leads.

Tom Mumley brought up preparing for the Multi-Year Planning Workshop as an item, specifically as an opportunity to recap last year's efforts and propose any possible changes. Additionally, after Jay and Committee members finalize the Annual Meeting outline (likely over email) there should be time allotted in the upcoming meeting for the SC to confirm the agenda.

ADJOURN