



**Bay RMP Multi-Year Planning Workshop and Steering Committee Meeting**  
 January 22, 2020  
 San Francisco Estuary Institute

**Meeting Summary**

**Attendees**

<b>SC Member</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Representing</b>	<b>Present</b>
Eric Dunlavey	City of San Jose	POTW-Large	<b>No</b>
Leah Walker	City of Petaluma	POTW-Small	<b>Yes</b>
Karin North**	City of Palo Alto	POTW-Medium	<b>Yes</b>
Adam Olivieri	BASMAA / EOA, Inc.	Stormwater	<b>phone</b>
John Coleman	Bay Planning Coalition	Dredgers	<b>No</b>
Tawny Tran	US Army Corps of Engineers	USACE	<b>No</b>
Tom Mumley*	SF Bay Regional WQCB	Water Board	<b>Yes</b>
Maureen Dunn	Chevron	Refineries	<b>Yes</b>

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

<b>TRC Member</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Representing</b>	<b>Present</b>
Irene Lui-Wong	EBMUD	POTW	<b>No</b>
Mary Lou Esparza	Central Contra Costa Sanitary District	POTW	<b>No</b>
Tom Hall	EOA, Inc.	POTW	<b>phone</b>
Ross Duggan	City and County of SF	CCSF	<b>Yes</b>
Anne Balis	City of San Jose	POTW	<b>phone</b>
Bridgette DeShields*	Integral Consulting	Refineries	<b>phone</b>
Chris Sommers	BASMAA (EOA, Inc.)	Stormwater	<b>Yes</b>
Shannon Alford	Port of San Francisco	Dredgers	<b>No</b>

Richard Looker	SF Bay Regional WQCB	Water Board	<b>phone</b>
Luisa Valiela	US EPA	US EPA -IX	<b>No</b>
Ian Wren	Baykeeper	NGOs	<b>No</b>
<i>Xavier Fernandez</i>	<i>SF Bay Regional WQCB</i>	<i>Water Board</i>	<b>Yes</b>
<i>Shelah Sweatt</i>	<i>US Army Corps of Engineers</i>	<i>USACE</i>	<b>Yes</b>
<i>Samantha Engelage</i>	<i>Palo Alto</i>	<i>POTW</i>	<b>Yes</b>

\*Chair; alternates in gray and italicized

**Guests and Staff:**

- Jay Davis - SFEI
- Melissa Foley - SFEI
- Nina Buzby - SFEI
- Jen Hunt - SFEI (phone)
- Jamie Yin - SFEI
- Tan Zi - SFEI
- Miguel Mendez -SFEI
- Diana Lin - SFEI
- Pat Walsh - SFEI
- Rebecca Sutton - SFEI (phone)

## Multi-Year Planning Workshop

### 1. Introductions and Review Agenda

Tom Mumley began the meeting by allowing introductions and providing additional time for new staff to give a brief summary of their background and current role at SFEI. Afterward, Tom quickly went through the day’s agenda, noting that the meeting would begin with a continuation of multi-year planning discussions that took place in October 2019.

### 2. Discussion/Decision: Update on Status and Trends Review and Redesign

Melissa Foley informed the Committees that a Status and Trends (S&T) Redesign subgroup had been formed and that they had met twice. Melissa reviewed the goals and objectives of the Status and Trends (S&T) program redesign that the subgroup had discussed. Of such objectives, Melissa highlighted the importance of coming out with a program that can be adaptable to future growth, especially for emerging contaminants (CECs).

The meeting participants were then presented with planned next steps for the redesign, as well as a draft schedule for the first year of effort. The proposed schedule recommended assessing and prioritizing each matrix based on what year they are planned for collection (e.g., Water & Bird Eggs will be collected in 2021, so they would be the initial focus). This draft prompted a

discussion among committee members concerning the efficiency and constraints of such a structure. Members of the Committees suggested reviewing by analyte class, rather than matrices. Specifically, CECs will need to be considered in a different manner than legacy pollutants, given the lack of historical data for CECs. In addition, meeting participants encouraged the development of a timeline that considers the full scope of the review and looks beyond 2021. Karin North commented that workgroups should consider the redesign when creating workgroup meeting agendas to ensure that special study discussions will take the redesign into account.

Melissa then reviewed the available funds for the redesign efforts, recommending that the SC initially approve the use of \$88K available in the Program Review Set-Aside Fund to begin the work. Once a clearer scope of work is developed, a more robust budget will be developed.

In the meeting agenda package, Jay Davis recommended stopping the S&T bivalve sampling largely due to the fact that the data are not being used for management purposes. However, he modified his recommendations concerning bivalve S&T monitoring efforts based on a call he had the day before the meeting with stakeholders interested in oil spills (NOAA, NRDA, Chevron). On that call he learned that RMP data were used after the Cosco-Busan oil spill to develop the settlement agreement. There is also ongoing interest in having a PAH baseline in case there is another spill in the Bay. However, the call participants communicated that bivalve data from the middle of the Bay are not as useful as data from the edges of the Bay.

Jay's proposal to develop a new bivalve design that includes the shoreline locations currently used by the Nutrient Management Strategy (NMS) and less frequent monitoring was positively received by the group. The committee members encouraged SFEI to scope out cost and partnership opportunities (e.g., NMS) of shoreline monitoring, incorporate such information into S&T redesign efforts, and discuss whether baseline PAH monitoring is within the RMP purview.

**Action Items:**

- Ask oil spill stakeholders for data needs required for keeping PAH baseline, and bring information to S&T Redesign subgroup for discussion. (Jay Davis, 6/30/20)

### 3. Information and Discussion: Update on Workgroup Coordination and Planning Costs

To facilitate discussion of the Workgroup budget allocations, Melissa presented the coordination budgets allocated to each individual workgroup for 2020. With the exception of the PCB and Selenium Workgroups, which have already funded 'strategy' allocations that cover workgroup coordination, each WG has a coordination budget based on the approximate number of hours used in 2019.

The TRC has agreed to include overall workgroup coordination as an agenda item at their March meetings. In order to prepare for that discussion, the meeting participants were asked to provide charge questions for the TRC members to consider. The groups proposed that each workgroup develop a one-page document that communicates the value of the workgroup, the consequence of discontinuing the workgroup, key deliverables and future questions, and alignment with S&T work. Tom Mumley also suggested the TRC consider areas the current groups do not cover, as well as consideration of meeting frequency. Richard Looker stressed the importance of the workgroup leads coordinating amongst themselves early in the process so the TRC can focus on broader coordination concerns.

The group also discussed the structure of special studies and workgroup efforts. Meeting participants noted that as special studies continue to involve multiple workgroups that there are constraints on compartmentalizing the work. In addition, special studies are becoming increasingly more aligned with S&T efforts. With the S&T redesign in mind, WGs should be particularly aware that redesign efforts could also affect the type and number of workgroups, as well as their focus. Chris Sommers commented that while WG scope can change over time and with staff, most of the efforts are driven by analytes. He proposed that the WG model could shift to analytes, broader activities, or pathways (e.g., modeling, stormwater). Regardless of the workgroup structure, the group suggested that each workgroup should have an official strategy.

**Action Items:**

- Distribute a table to SC and TRC members outlining WG budget allocations and differentiates the strategy needs of each WG (Melissa Foley, 3/31/20)
- Develop a one-page description on key attributes (Melissa Foley and Workgroup leads, 4/30/20)

#### **4. Decision: Setting Planning Budgets for Workgroups**

The group reviewed the 2021 workgroup budget and the priority studies for each workgroup. The total dollar amount for priority studies is 55% higher than available funding (excluding the \$279K available for CEC studies only). Melissa Foley then outlined the priority studies for each workgroup, noting instances where workgroups are seeking external funding and answering any questions from committee members. After hearing the priority study overviews, the meeting participants agreed that the WGs should proceed in developing proposals for the priority studies.

## Steering Committee Meeting

### 1. Review Steering Committee Agenda

Tom Mumley reviewed the agenda for the Steering Committee meeting. Melissa Foley noted that Chris Sommers was attending in place of Adam Oliveri for the remainder of the meeting. Adam participated remotely during the Multi-Year Planning discussions.

### 2. Decision: Approve Meeting Summary from October 23, 2019, and Confirm/Set Dates for Future Meetings

This item took place after Item 4 of the agenda to accommodate for the previous half of the meeting running long. No committee members had comments on the previous meeting's summary, or upcoming meeting dates.

**Decision:**

- Maureen Dunn motioned to approve the 10/23/19 meeting summary. Tom Mumley seconded the motion. The motion for approval was carried by all present members.

### 3. Information: TRC Meeting Summary

This item also took place after Item 4, following Item 2. Melissa Foley gave a brief summary of the December 2019 TRC Meeting. She highlighted two microplastics deliverables - the microplastics in bivalves technical report and the microplastic strategy document - the latter of which would be discussed later in the meeting. The TRC also received an update from Data Management and considered possible intercomparison studies for 2020.

### 4. Information: RMP Financial Update for 2019 Quarter 3

This item occurred prior to items 2 and 3 to allow Jen Hunt to present at the previously scheduled time, despite the meeting running off schedule. She presented the budget for the final quarter of 2019, reviewed the open RMP projects from 2016-2019, and highlighted any project budgets of concern. Jen requested additional funding for two ongoing projects and one new project, which were not included in the financial memo. The RMP asked to offset overages on two 2019 projects (Water Cruise data management and North Bay selenium monitoring) using the remaining balance from 2019 RMP core tasks. The SC was also asked to allocate \$88K from Program review funds to start the Status and Trends redesign process.

**Decisions:**

- Leah Walker motioned to approve using the remaining 2019 RMP core tasks balance to cover \$2,000 and \$4,200 overages on the data management and North Bay selenium monitoring, respectively. Karin North seconded the motion. The motion for approval was carried by all present members.
- Leah Walker motioned to allocate \$88,000 of Program review funds to begin the S&T redesign efforts. Karin North seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

## 5. Decision: Dredger Fee Schedule Review

Melissa Foley informed the group that the Water Board needs a new fee memo to distribute with dredging permits at the end of January 2020. Melissa explained that the previous fee structure involved a fixed amount paid by USACE and a tiered system based on the type of dredger and in-Bay disposal volume. Because this structure was static for three years, it did not address the 3% per year fee increase that other RMP participants pay. In addition, due to an increasing amount of sediment being used for beneficial reuse projects, that amount of sediment disposed of in-Bay is declining. As a result, dredger fees have been consistently below the contribution target of 18.2% of RMP fees overall.

Given the complexity of this issue, it is not possible to solve it completely by the end of January. Melissa recommended that the Water Board communicate a one-year extension of the current fee structure. The Committee members were in agreement with this idea, and also proposed that the extension increase fee amounts by 3%. Additionally, the group agreed that the memo communicating the extension should inform dredgers that the RMP will be restructuring the dredger fees in the following year(s).

Though John Coleman was not present at the meeting, the group agreed that both John and Maureen Dunn should participate in future fee discussions. The group noted that dredger participation in RMP planning has waned in recent years, so there may need to be additional outreach to groups like the Port of Oakland.

### **Decision:**

- Karin North motioned to approve the extension of current dredger fees for one year, with a 3% increase. Leah Walker seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

### **Action Item:**

- Communicate with John Coleman about bringing up fee restructuring at upcoming February Bay Planning Coalition Meeting (Melissa Foley, 1/31/20)

## 6. Decision: Approve the 2020 Budget and Detailed Workplan

With few changes to the workplan since the last SC meeting, Melissa Foley quickly went over the distribution of RMP contributions and resulting allocations of the funds into the RMP budget. She pointed out that the S&T budget would be subject to change based on the outcome of bivalve planning. Also Melissa had spoken with Maureen Downing-Kunz of the USGS about what to do with the additional \$150K from increased USACE contributions.

### **Decision:**

- Karin North motioned to approve the 2020 budget and detailed workplan. Leah Walker seconded the motion. The motion for approval was carried by all present members.

### **Action Item:**

- Update chart in Workplan to include the additional \$150,000 in USACE funds (Melissa Foley, 1/31/20)

## 7. Decision: Allocating Mandatory Minimum Penalty Funds to Projects

Mandatory Minimum Penalty funds (MMP) come to the RMP in small amounts, and the Program has been accumulating such funds in order to fully fund a future study. With \$77K currently available, Melissa Foley asked the SC to discuss studies would be selected for funding. Tom Mumley explained the difference between MMP and Supplemental Environmental Project (SEP) funds. SEP funds need to be allocated at the time of settlement to a specific project and that project must have a nexus with the violation. MMPs, on the other hand, do not have to be allocated to a specific project at the time of payment, nor does the funded project have to align with the violation.

After discussing various possible structures and schedules for approval, the SC decided that funds could be allocated at any point in the year. The projects to be funded are likely to come from the SEP list or special studies in the multi-year plan. There was group interest and consensus on funding an unfunded CECs project that was proposed to the ECWG in 2019. This proposed study would measure sunscreen chemicals in wastewater effluent. The proposal was being discussed for funding from BACWA. The appeal of the project stemmed from its piggy-back nature (samples collected with bisphenols), along with BACWA's willingness to further contribute. Melissa noted that it would be helpful to flag unfunded proposals during the WG process that seem capable of fitting into the budget scope available from MMP funds.

### **Decisions:**

- MMP funds can be allocated at any point in the year

- Karin North motioned to approve using MMP funds for the sunscreens in effluent study. Leah Walker seconded the motion. The motion for approval was carried by all present members.

**Action Items:**

- Confirm budget scope and project specifics on sunscreens in effluent study and report back to the Steering Committee. (Melissa Foley, Diana Lin; 1/31/20)
  - Scope of work sent to SC on 2/10/20
- Update the Workplan to record the funding decision. (Melissa Foley, 4/22/20)

## 8. Decision: Approve the Multi-Year Plan

The only change to the MYP since the previous October meeting was the addition of sea-level rise and climate change as potential program drivers. There were also minor updates to the budgets and the Sediment Workgroup's MYP table.

**Decision:**

- Karin North motioned to approve the Multi-Year Plan. Leah Walker seconded the motion. The motion for approval was carried by all present members.

## 9. Decision: Approve the addition of a Proposal from the Sediment Workgroup to the SEP List

Because the Sediment Workgroup is still in the developing stages and is currently working on a plan for sediment monitoring and modeling, initial broad projects are starting to materialize with more specifics. In order to take advantage of SEP opportunities, the Sediment Workgroup is proposing the addition of a new proposal on flocculation in the Lower South Bay to the SEP List. Melissa informed the Committee that the TRC was shown the proposal and agreed to recommend its addition.

**Decision:**

- Karin North motioned to approve the addition of the sediment proposal to the SEP list. Leah Walker seconded the motion. The motion for approval was carried by all present members.

## 10. Information: Review Incomplete Projects from 2016-2019

Melissa Foley reviewed the 36 ongoing projects from 2016 through 2019. Many of the remaining projects are technical reports that require a final review from lead scientists. Additionally, many

CEC-related projects have been delayed due to the large amount of time needed from staff to work on the Moore Foundation microplastics work. Committee members noted that there should be some foresight related to larger projects to consider what effect non-RMP projects will have on the RMP.

Melissa highlighted that the Field Sampling Report, an open 2018 task, is a redundant effort and the funds for this project would be better used to update the program's Field Operations Manual (FOM). Discussion of this change prompted a desire from the SC to have a better understanding of the purpose and role of various RMP S&T publications.

Action Item:

- Send link to QA publications table (Nina Buzby, 02/7/2020)

## 11. Science Update: Microplastics in SF Bay and Future Priorities

Diana Lin, the new MPWG lead, presented the microplastics update to the SC. The update included a summary of existing knowledge and priority questions of the workgroup, as well as currently identified gaps in knowledge. After completing a 3-year study for the Moore Foundation, the priorities of the Workgroup have shifted towards ecological impacts and stormwater work. In addition, a key item for the MPWG will involve discussing and leveraging external funding sources.

Diana noted that State Bill 1263 now requires the Ocean Protection Council to develop a statewide microplastics strategy, for which the RMP has developed multiple proposals. When asked about the likelihood of gaining funding from the source, Diana and Melissa Foley noted that one of the proposals to host an ecological impact workshop along with the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project (SCCRWP) has a high likelihood. Other proposal decisions may potentially come after the OPC February board meeting.

The meeting participants continued the conversation of external funding sources. Committee members were in agreement that the scope of microplastics work is beyond the RMP, but remaining involved would have value. To make the most of the spring workgroup meeting, SC members encouraged the RMP to communicate existing external efforts ahead of time and be upfront about the lack of funding relative to the financial needs of the knowledge gaps. Members also noted that the number of non-public agency workgroup attendees makes the meeting an advantageous opportunity to ask for external funding.

## **12. Information: Annual Meeting Date, Upcoming Reports, and Communications Products**

The group confirmed the planned date for the 2020 Annual Meeting as October 6th and approved the plan for the RMP Update proposed by Jay Davis. The RMP Update would follow a structure similar to previous years by providing information on the impact of the program, program highlights, and updates on each study area. The group agreed that it would be good to highlight the S&T redesign efforts in this publication.

Jay also asked the group about what they would like to hear in terms of science updates at the next meeting. Because of the lighter April agenda, it would be possible to accommodate two science updates. The group agreed on hearing about PCB work in Steinberger Slough and from the newly hired hydrologist Tan Zi. Other update interests that were brought up included: North Bay fires, nutrient modeling, and PFAS.

## **13. Discussion: Status of RMP Deliverables and Action Items**

Because of the more in-depth discussion of incomplete projects from item 10, Melissa simply pointed out the new additions to the deliverables/action items tables that provided a better record of project delays. Conversation on this item brought up the observation that transparency with stakeholders is a helpful motivator to complete projects, and that final products tend to funnel through senior staff, creating pinch points in the process.

## **14. Discussion: Plan Agenda Items for Future Meetings**

The group reviewed the agenda items that came up during the course of the meeting as well as annual recurring items. These included planning for the RMP Annual Meeting, providing additional guidance to workgroups, planning future Estuary News topics, and reporting back on MMP funding. The science updates would be from Jay Davis on the PCBs in Steinberger Slough work and from Tan Zi on his background and the watershed modeling strategy.

**Adjourn**