



Bay RMP Multi-Year Planning Workshop and Steering Committee Meeting

October 23, 2019

San Francisco Estuary Institute

Meeting Summary

Attendees

| SC Member | Affiliation | Representing | Present |
|----------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Eric Dunlavey | City of San Jose | POTW-Large | yes |
| Leah Walker | City of Petaluma | POTW-Small | no |
| <i>Robert Wilson</i> | <i>City of Petaluma</i> | <i>POTW-Small</i> | yes |
| Karin North** | City of Palo Alto | POTW-Medium | no |
| 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* | SF Bay Regional WQCB | Water Board | yes |
| Maureen Dunn | Chevron | Refineries | yes |

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

| TRC Member | Affiliation | Representing | Present |
|----------------------|--|--------------|---------------|
| Irene Lui-Wong | EBMUD | POTW | no |
| Mary Lou Esparza | Central Contra Costa Sanitary District | POTW | yes |
| Tom Hall | EOA, Inc. | POTW | no |
| Ross Duggan | City and County of SF | CCSF | no |
| Anne Hansen | City of San Jose | POTW | no |
| Bridgette DeShields* | Integral Consulting | Refineries | remote |
| Chris Sommers | BASMAA (EOA, Inc.) | Stormwater | yes |

| | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|------------|
| Shannon Alford | Port of San Francisco | Dredgers | no |
| Richard Looker | SF Bay Regional WQCB | Water Board | no |
| Luisa Valiela | US EPA | US EPA -IX | yes |
| Ian Wren | Baykeeper | NGOs | no |
| <i>Xavier Fernandez</i> | <i>SF Bay Regional WQCB</i> | <i>Water Board</i> | yes |
| <i>Shelah Sweatt</i> | <i>US Army Corps of Engineers</i> | <i>USACE</i> | yes |
| <i>Samantha Engelage</i> | <i>Palo Alto</i> | <i>POTW</i> | yes |

*Chair, alternates in gray and italicized

Guests and Staff:

- Jay Davis - SFEI
- Melissa Foley - SFEI
- Nina Buzby - SFEI
- Becky Sutton - SFEI
- Jen Hunt - SFEI
- Karen McLaughlin - SCCRWP
(Southern California Bight Program)
- Laura Lao - EPA ORISE fellow
- Rebecca Franklin - Delta RMP
- Don Yee - SFEI

Multi-Year Planning Workshop

1. Introductions and Review Goals for the Meeting

Tom Mumley began the meeting allowing time for introductions, noting that the first part of the day would focus on multi-year planning (MYP) efforts followed by regular steering committee items. Prefacing the morning’s tasks, Tom noted that they would be slightly different from previous years. Specifically, the growth and development of the RMP have introduced new challenges beyond “business as usual.” As a result, there are a number of topics that need to be discussed to set in motion future actions.

Understanding that all the topics in the MYP meeting would not be completely resolved at the end of the day, both Tom Mumely and Melissa Foley advised meeting participants that the goal of the meeting would be introducing a dialogue and identifying next steps.

2. Discussion: Status and Trends Redesign

Melissa Foley first gave an overview of the current Status and Trends (S&T) program, reviewed the last major program redesign (1998-2001), and presented a potential scope for a new redesign. The future of legacy contaminant monitoring, on-ramping emerging contaminants, and the future of collaborations with the USGS are a few priority topics of the redesign. Jay Davis added his support for the timing of this discussion after 20 years of implementation of the current design, noting the importance of looking at past data and thus the need for a synthesis effort.

Melissa Foley introduced the idea of forming a subgroup to work out details on the scope of work, budget, and time frame for such efforts. Multiple committee members responded positively to both the redesign and the subgroup option. Members expressed a desire to have the subgroup report back to the TRC as work progresses. Adam Oliviera recalled that there is money in a set-aside account for program review. Currently, there is \$88K available in that fund, which could be used for the S&T Redesign. There is also \$50K in the monitoring contingency fund. These funds are typically reserved for sampling rare events (e.g., large storm, fire), but could be used for the redesign if the SC approves.

Action Item

- Identify interested members to participate in a smaller redesign subgroup for each represented sector (TRC & SC members, 11/15/19)

3. Decision: Workgroup Coordination and Planning Costs

For the past two years, the RMP workgroup expenses have exceeded the allocated budget by \$35-\$40K. Evaluating the number of workgroups and the scope of activities is necessary to minimize the cost of workgroups increasing over time. In addition, increasing transparency and standardization of costs across workgroups is needed. Melissa Foley outlined the current budget setup for RMP workgroups, which further identified the inconsistent and complex structure of the current budget.

The initial strategies to improve the situation that Melissa posed to the group included increasing the overall workgroup task budget, standardizing “strategy” costs, as well as pre-establishing the coordination funding apportioned to each workgroup. Chris Sommers suggested another option to have special studies proposals build in the cost

of presenting results (specifically at WG meetings) into their budgets. The meeting participants agreed that the first steps to addressing this issue would involve first reorganizing coordination funds into separate pots for each working group, followed by standardizing workgroup strategy items/proposals.

Because 2020 special studies have already been funded, changes to strategy billing/standardization can not be incorporated until 2021. However, updating the workgroup coordination tasks in the FY2020 budget would be possible as it would only be an internal accounting matter.

Action Item

- Appropriate 3020-002-C funds to each separate workgroup (Melissa Foley, 12/31/19)

4. Decision: Formation of a Coordination Workgroup

Given increasing overlap and coordination amongst workgroups, another issue the group addressed was making these efforts more efficient and productive. Melissa Foley prompted the conversation with various questions like re-evaluating the workgroup structures and whether or not a coordination workgroup should be formed.

Chris Sommers and Luisa Valiela brought up the role of the TRC, noting that cross-pollination amongst workgroups often happens while proposals are in development. Therefore, incorporating an item into TRC agendas or convening a focused meeting on the topic of workgroup coordination would be a good strategy. In agreement, Melissa suggested finding time in the March TRC meeting to discuss linkages of priority proposals to provide input to workgroup leads.

The conversation then shifted to workgroup management and the hours SFEI dedicates to this task. Tom Mumley and Chris identified the need for workgroups to improve their own management to reduce SFEI staff time. The group agreed on appointing a chairperson from the stakeholder group for each workgroup to help with coordination and management.

Action Items

- At March TRC meeting discuss linkages of priority proposals to provide input to workgroup leads (TRC, 3/31/19)

- Identify a stakeholder chairperson for each workgroup (Workgroup leads, 3/31/20)

5. Discussion: Anticipated Management Decisions and Policies, and Related Information Needs

Melissa Foley first updated the group on priorities gleaned from stakeholder meetings, specifically on topics the RMP isn't currently looking into. Additionally, the group went over the Anticipated Management Decisions, Policies, and Actions table from the 2020 Multi-Year Plan. Chris Sommers brought up the point that none of the listed actions relate to sea level rise and climate change, which have clear ramifications for all RMP stakeholders. The meeting participants agreed that this topic would be an important addition to the status and trends redesign discussion. Other minor edits were suggested for the Management Decisions table in the MYP.

The group dedicated particular attention to the PCB TMDL review timing. Jay Davis provided an update on the work that would inform the TMDL review. The Water Board needs to finalize their questions and data needs before embarking on the review. PCB workgroup discussions indicated an overall desire to document success stories related to control actions. Xavier Fernandez and Tom Mumley noted that many of the critical decisions leading to the TMDL review are in the Water Board's court.

Action Items

- Incorporate minor edits to the MYP (Melissa Foley, 12/31/19)
- Add climate change and sea level rise to the Anticipated Management Decisions table (Melissa Foley, 12/31/19)

6. Decision: Setting Planning Budget for Workgroups

After sharing the projected special studies budget (approximately \$1 million) and the sum of high priority special studies (approximately \$1.7 million), Melissa Foley noted that the difference in actual and planned funding was slightly higher than the 150% level used in 2020 special studies planning. The meeting participants agreed to task the workgroups with refining the priority list/budget before the January Steering Committee meeting. This seemed plausible to the group given the Sediment Workgroup's need to refine their scope and the possible decrease in workgroup support needs after the previously discussed reorganization and standardization of strategy costs. Getting into

more specifics, Adam Oliveri suggested that after determining the apportioned workgroup coordination budgets workgroup leads should determine how many proposals they can develop in that time, which would intrinsically restrict the number of studies put forward for 2021 funding.

In addition to discussing workgroup budgets, the group also discussed the role of the RMP relative to ongoing microplastics efforts. Going around the room, the meeting participants each provided their perspective on how to proceed. The group consensus was that the RMP should remain engaged in the topic, but with an ideally lower level of funding. Jay Davis noted that one of the strengths of the RMP is being able to provide a forum for discussion, so maintaining the microplastics workgroup would accomplish that goal. Becky Sutton added that it would be ideal to maintain SFEI's status as technical experts in the field and that the workgroup strategy identifies where outside funding is necessary and is helpful in obtaining outside funds.

Decision

- Continue to convene the Microplastic Workgroup

Action Item

- Refine planning budgets for workgroups (Melissa Foley and workgroup leads, 1/22/20)

Steering Committee Meeting

7. Introductions, Review Agenda, and Confirm Chairs for 2020

After a second round of introductions, the group confirmed the committee chair and vice chair for 2020 as Tom Mumley and Karin North, respectively. Even though Karin North was not present at the meeting, Sam Engelage confirmed that she was willing to continue as vice chair.

Decision

- Adam Oliveri motioned to approve the 2020 committee chairs. John Coleman seconded the motion. The motion for approval was carried by all present members.

8. Decision: Approve Meeting Summary from August 13, 2019, and Confirm/Set Dates for Future Meetings

None of the meeting participants had comments on the August meeting summary nor conflicts with the proposed future meeting dates. Tom Mumley suggested inviting the TRC to the January Steering Committee meeting, given that it would likely involve further multi-year planning discussions.

Decision

- Adami Oliveri motioned to approve the August 13, 2019, meeting summary. Eric Dunlavey seconded the motion. The motion for approval was carried by all present members.

Action Item

- Invite the TRC to the January SC meeting (Nina Buzby, 12/31/2019)

9. Information: TRC Meeting Summary

Melissa Foley provided the committee members with a brief summary of the September TRC meeting. The meeting focused on three central items, including the sampling design for 2020 North Bay margins monitoring, reviewing the S&T bivalve data and sampling design, and an update on 2017 Copper and Cyanide results. In addition, SFEI staff presented and obtained feedback on their planned RMP Annual Meeting presentations. The SC did not pose any questions pertaining to the TRC meeting or meeting summary.

10. Decision: Approve Two SEP Proposals from STLS

Two SEP study proposals from the STLS were recommended by the TRC for SC approval in September 2019. The first proposes further PCB and mercury sampling in select tributaries, while the second proposes using passive samplers to assist in sampling at tidally influenced sites. The committee members had no objections or questions about the two SEPs.

Decision

- John Coleman motioned to approve adding two additional STLS proposals to the SEP list. Adam Oliveri seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

11. Information: RMP Financial Update for Quarter 3

Jen Hunt presented an overview of the RMP budgets for years 2019, 2018 and 2016-2017, noting that despite some overages there is still an expectation that 2019 will finish on budget.

At the previous meeting, RMP staff advised the SC that the workgroup budget was estimated to be overbudget by \$38K. Due to a second PCB workgroup meeting in October, the overage increased to \$42K. Approval for this budget item will be sought at the end of the year when we have a better sense of how much will be balanced out by the other Program Management tasks. Jen also informed the meeting participants of an overage in 2019 Water Cruise spending of \$11K. Jen noted that this overage is likely due to incorrectly stringent budgeting.

Action Items

- Update SC on status and trends set aside (program review) funds. (Jen Hunt, 1/22/20)
- Water Board representative will call Napa River Park Marina about outstanding fees (Tom Mumley, 1/22/20)

Decision

- Eric Dunlavey motioned to approve the Water Cruise overage. John Coleman seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

12. Decision: Approve the 2020 Budget and Detailed Workplan

Based on the previously agreed-upon 3% increase in fees, Melissa informed the committee of the \$3.9 million plan 2020 budget. Melissa's planning budget incorporates an anticipated \$150K deficit from dredgers, which is slightly lower than past years given the Army Corps funding increase from \$250K to \$400K. The conversation covered the concern with the deficit, and meeting participants were reminded that dredging fees are difficult to predict and were recently changed to match the calendar year. John Coleman

assured the SC that the program should see balanced fees in 2020 given recent formula and schedule adjustments.

After presenting the proposed programmatic, S&T, and special study budgets, it was clear to meeting participants that the general budget and detailed workplan would have some moving pieces in order to incorporate earlier discussions in the multi-year planning meeting.

There were no edits suggested to the detailed workplan during the meeting. The detailed workplan will be reviewed again in January in light of discussions at the MYP meeting. In addition, the narrative version of the detailed workplan will be distributed prior to the January SC meeting.

Action Item

- Follow up with the SC on the dredging deficit. (Melissa Foley, 1/22/20)

Decision

- Maureen Dunn motioned to approve the 2020 Budget. Eric Dunlavey seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

13. Discussion: Funding Plan for 2022 and Beyond

This item focused on whether or not to adjust the 3% increase for future fees. Melissa Foley noted that previous projections referenced an inflation rate of 2.5%; however, the average of the past four years shows a rate of 3.5%. Adam Oliveri noted the pushback that would come from stormwater municipalities if the fee increases went above 3%, and that in some cases they have to contribute for both stormwater and wastewater. Stormwater agencies do not have a dedicated funding stream from rate payers to absorb additional fees to the RMP.

The group acknowledged that future fee decisions would actually occur at the following year's meeting, though any possible changes should be communicated much earlier than the end of 2020. Looking into individual stakeholder group contributions, the conversation turned to dredgers once again. In particular, the effectiveness of getting smaller dredgers to conduct beneficial reuse was discussed. While this practice is encouraged, it poses somewhat of a dilemma as it takes funding away from the RMP, which bases fees on in-Bay disposal only.

Tom Mumley noted that sticking with the 3% increase would be the best option for the short term; however, in the future there will need to be serious consideration of what will not be accomplished due to a lack of a fee increase. More specifically, we will need to determine the extent and point at which lower fees are a significant detriment to the RMP.

14. Information: Upcoming Reports and Communication Products

Jay Davis began the item by sharing Annual Meeting survey responses and asking for meeting participants' feedback on the recent Annual Meeting. The committee members expressed an appreciation of the structure and amount of coordination at the meeting. There were a lot of other meetings in October; we should pay attention to the timing of these events when scheduling future meetings. The group agreed that the RMP should continue to strive to create an agenda for the meeting that brings in stakeholders from all sectors. To help keep track of attendance by sector, the committee members suggested adding group affiliation to registration forms.

The group agreed that delaying the microplastics article for Estuary News until March was a good idea, given the recent extensive press coverage of microplastics efforts. The December issue will focus on the State of the Estuary Conference.

Decision

- Delay the Estuary News article on microplastics to March

Action Item

- Add group affiliation to the Annual Meeting registration form (Nina Buzby, 8/1/20)

15. Discussion: Deliverables and Action Items

Tom noted that there needs to be more information in the reports so it is easy to see how many times a product has been delayed and by how much time.

Action Item

- Add new columns to reflect these needs (Melissa Foley, 12/31/2019)

16. Discussion: Plan Agenda Items for Future Meetings

Future agenda items brought up throughout the day's discussion included: further multi-year planning, finalize and approve the Multi-Year Plan, further discussion of workgroup costs and allocations, and updating the committee on the status of dredger contributions to the budget.

Prior to the January meeting, a subcommittee to discuss the S&T redesign is intended to convene and then report to the TRC. Regularly planned items for the meeting are reviewing incomplete projects from previous years, going over an outline for the RMP Update, and finalizing a date for the next Annual Meeting.

17. Discussion: Plus/Delta

This time was used to gauge reactions and opinions of meeting participants to the new structure of the annual MYP meeting. Eric Dunlavey suggested holding a short SC meeting at the beginning of the day and then devoting the rest of the day to the MYP workshop.