



Bay RMP Steering Committee Meeting

April 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	No
Leah Walker	City of Petaluma	POTW-Small	Yes
Karin North**	City of Palo Alto	POTW-Medium	Yes
Adam Olivieri	BASMAA / EOA, Inc.	Stormwater	yes
John Coleman	Bay Planning Coalition	Dredgers	Yes
Tessa Beach	US Army Corps of Engineers	USACE	Yes
Tom Mumley*	SF Bay Regional WQCB	Water Board	Yes
Maureen Dunn	Chevron	Refineries	Yes
<i>Robert Wilson</i>	<i>City of Petaluma</i>	<i>POTW-Small</i>	Yes
<i>Xavier Fernandez</i>	<i>SF Bay Regional WQCB</i>	<i>Water Board</i>	Yes

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

Guests and Staff:

- Jay Davis - SFEI
- Melissa Foley - SFEI
- Nina Buzby - SFEI
- Jen Hunt - SFEI
- Tan Zi - SFEI
- Miguel Mendez - SFEI
- Alicia Gilbreath - SFEI
- Don Yee - SFEI
- Diana Lin - SFEI
- Becky Sutton - SFEI
- Lester Mckee - SFEI
- Patrick Walsh - SFEI

1. Introductions and Review Agenda

Given the Bay Area's shelter-in-place orders, the Steering Committee (SC) was conducted remotely via the Zoom platform. To help the meeting run smoothly, Melissa Foley began with a brief summary of best practices for virtual meetings. Tom Mumley then conducted a roll call with Committee members and SFEI staff. While reviewing the agenda, Tom noted that the two items held after the planned lunch break would be science updates so that business items could be completed earlier in the agenda.

Tom noted that City of Petaluma representative Leah Walker would be retiring in June so this was her last SC meeting. The Committee Members and Jay Davis thanked her for her work with the RMP, and Leah communicated that Robert Wilson would be taking her place.

2. Decision: Approve Meeting Summary From January 22, 2020

None of the Committee members had any questions or comments on the past meeting's summary.

Decision:

- Leah Walker motioned to approve the meeting summary, Adam Oliveri seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

3. Information: TRC Meeting Summary, and Confirm/Set Dates for Future Meetings

While presenting future meeting dates, Melissa Foley noted that the June TRC meeting will be held slightly later in the month to allow for more time to hold Workgroup meetings and prepare the TRC agenda package. She also noted that the RMP is still planning to hold the Annual Meeting in October, and that the participants would discuss in what manner later in the meeting.

Melissa then summarized the past TRC meeting, commenting that it was the first entirely remote meeting of the COVID19 pandemic held by the RMP. The group reviewed the program's workgroup structure, considering the budget breakdown worthwhile and not seeing an obvious way to rework things. Leah Walker asked what budget breakdown the TRC was shown; Melissa noted that it was 2019 budget numbers rather than the updated 2020 budget reflecting the cost savings of holding remote workgroup meetings. The TRC also decided on the past year's Data Exploration Challenge Winners and planned to hold the competition for another year. John Coleman asked about the costs, and Melissa noted that while the costs to hold the challenge were low, she agreed that if the Program needed to address budget issues, it would be a lower priority.

When the TRC was informed of the past SC decision on MMP fund allocation, they agreed to flag any ideas at their June meeting that would be possible options for the funding stream. The SC would then be shown the resulting list of ideas during the July meeting.

4. Information/Discussion: Workgroup Meetings and Structure for 2021

After reminding SC members of upcoming workgroup meeting dates, Melissa reviewed the current workgroup costs and previous TRC discussion in more detail. Specifically, the TRC decided to defer decisions related to the Microplastic Workgroup (MPWG) until after reviewing their recommended proposals. The TRC also made a few suggestions to possibly reduce costs by decreasing strategy budgets for the ECWG and/or the SPLWG, as well as sunsetting the PCB Workgroup after the TMDL update. Including the selenium work in Status and Trends was another option discussed by the TRC.

While discussing the TRC's decisions, SC members were surprised at the lack of budget cutting. The Committee agreed that a greater efficiency in the WG process would be needed and suggested that either the TRC or a smaller group do a more thorough review. The motivation for cost reductions brought up by Committee members include lack of management drivers, a likely plateau in fees, and increasing need for cross-WG participation. Along these lines, Melissa asked what amount of savings would the SC expect, and Tom proposed developing scenarios for 10% and 30% cuts.

Action Items:

- Perform a more comprehensive and critical review of the WG budget, and convene a small group to develop cost-savings scenarios, including SC and TRC members (TRC, 6/24/20)

5. Information: RMP Financial Update for 2020 Quarter 1

Jen Hunt provided a financial update to the SC, noting key points from 2018-2020 budgets. The program has collected 98% of fees for 2019 and only 9% of the 2020 budget has been expended. Discussion of outstanding fee collections prompted a discussion on how to make fee payments easier. Because it is difficult to know when to expect an invoice and that they can be sent to the wrong contact, the Committee members agreed that establishing an online portal or tracking system would be beneficial. Members will provide their input to the RMP. Jen also noted that there are a few 2017 tasks open and that remaining 2016 funds would be unencumbered at the July SC meeting.

The SC was then asked to make a decision about unused USGS Menlo Park support funds that originally came from the RMP. From 2018-2019 the USGS did not use \$175,000, and SFEI staff

suggested using that money in future years or allocating it to other NMS priorities. The meeting participants agreed that if the RMP funding was already intended for nutrient-related work, then the funds should remain as such.

Melissa then outlined a WQIF proposal that SFEI is submitting to the EPA. The proposal's fact sheet was sent to the SC and would involve filling knowledge gaps related to green stormwater infrastructure and urban greening activities. The EPA requires a 1:1 match of funding, which can be entirely covered by SFPUC. However, to show that other partners are in support of the project, the Committee agreed to provide a letter of support and in-kind support for the project that would involve no additional cost to the RMP due to existing RMP commitments.

Action Items:

- Send email to SC members asking for input on how to better facilitate fee invoicing (Melissa Foley, 4/30/20)
- Review SC input on fee payments and explore options with SFEI operations staff (Melissa Foley & Jen Hunt, 7/22/20)

Decisions:

- Karin North motioned to approve the allocation of unused USGS Menlo Park support to NMS projects. Eric Dunlavey seconded the motion; the motion was approved by all present members.
- Leah Walker motioned to approve that the RMP writes a letter of support and provides in-kind support to the WQIF proposal. Adam Oliveri seconded the motion; the motion was approved by all present members.

6. Discussion/Information: COVID-19 Impacts and Response

Melissa Foley provided an update on confirmed and potential RMP project interruptions due to the coronavirus. After explaining that summer field efforts to collect North Bay margins sediment may be unaffected and that North Bay selenium monitoring may be delayed due to vessel shortages. Melissa noted that three RMP projects have experienced definite delays. These include WY2020 stormwater sampling, Status & Trends Sport Fish analysis, as well as ethoxylated surfactant sample collection from WWTPs. Monthly USGS cruises have also been on hold, but will hopefully resume in May along with a confirmed decision on continued funding.

Melissa also highlighted an ongoing project in the Bay Area to collect and archive WWTP samples to test for the presence of coronavirus. While the RMP is not directly involved, SFEI is trying to help coordinate work and ensure findings are connected to decision-making. Adam Oliveri is closely involved with the project and noted that they are in the process of finalizing a QAPP and considering the possibility of detecting the virus in samples from earlier in 2019 (e.g., October or November). Karin North and Eric Dunlavey commented that their facilities were providing samples to a related study with Stanford led by Dr. Ali Boehm.

7. Discussion: RMP Fees for 2022-2024

Given the economic impact related to the coronavirus, Melissa expressed a desire for feedback from the SC about concerns for meeting 2020 and/or 2021 fees. Adam Oliveri commented that while he got little pushback on the planned fee increase, he had not raised the subject with stormwater municipalities since the pandemic concerns. Other SC members provided similar information that current fees won't likely be an issue, but future years will be more cause for concern. Specifically, Leah, Karin, and Eric noted that paying fees would be easier as WWTP entities compared to stormwater entities due the use of Enterprise versus General Funds. Because many cities' general funds are taking a big hit, many departments are/will be asked to make substantial cuts. The Committee members agreed to revisit the issue once the situation further unfolds and people have a better understanding of the range of cuts that will need to be made.

Action Items:

- Inform Adam Olivieri of current outstanding stormwater fee payers (Melissa Foley, 5/4/20)
- Follow up on any 2020 and 2021 funding concerns with RMP staff (SC Members, 7/24/20)
- Add fee discussion to July meeting agenda (Melissa Foley, 7/24/20)

8. Decision: Communications Update

Jay Davis began the item by asking the meeting participants if the RMP Annual Meeting should be held in-person or remotely, given the current coronavirus situation. When asking about the David Brower Center (DBC) reservation, John Coleman noted that the Bay Planning Coalition was able to shift the booking fee for their 2020 meeting to the following year, and the RMP should be able to do the same. The SC members agreed that the meeting should be virtual and noted that it would be an opportunity to innovate and do things well, and serve as an example for other conference-like events.

When asking about possible speakers, the group discussed the idea of getting more high-profile speakers from around the country. Eric Dunlavey and Tom Mumely suggested asking RMP workgroup advisors to speak, noting the potential for participants to become more familiar with their expertise.

Jay then informed the Committee of the timeline for the RMP Update and that the feature story would be on the S&T redesign efforts. Tom Mumely commented that the story could be premature; Jay noted that the article would focus on the process not outcomes. Jay also reminded the group that no RMP article would be included in the June edition of Estuary News because it will be covering climate adaptation in various counties. Instead, the RMP would have

two articles in the September edition. The TRC suggested covering the vessel shortage topic, which SC members appreciated and also suggested the topic of non-target analysis work.

Action Items:

- Ask SC members for examples of successful virtual events (Melissa Foley, 7/24/20)
- Create and send a list of potential speakers and agenda for the RMP Annual Meeting to SC committee members for feedback (Jay Davis, 7/24/20)
- Discuss future Estuary News articles topics at July SC Meeting (Jay Davis, 7/24/20)

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

Melissa Foley went over the status of deliverables and action items, highlighting recently or nearly-completed deliverables such as the Steinberger Slough report and the Current Use Pesticides in South Bay Margins report. Melissa also outlined the status of high priority action items, including finding a new lab to conduct TOC, TN, and grain size analysis for upcoming margins sediment work. The SC members had no questions or comments on this item.

10. Discussion: Plan Agenda Items for Future Meetings

Melissa Foley noted that the big items for the July meeting would include approving the special study recommendations from the TRC, an update on the S&T redesign, as well as continuing discussion on 2021-2023 dredger fees and the 2022-2024 fees for other dischargers. Related to discussions earlier in the meeting, there should also be an update on the workgroup structure review and the Annual Meeting plan. None of the meeting participants had any science update ideas or requests, but liked the model of having the science updates at the end for remote meetings.

11. Information: Steinberger Slough Science Update

Report authors Jay Davis, Don Yee, and Alicia Gilbreath presented an overview of the approach and findings of the Steinberger Slough PCB conceptual model report. The TRC also listened to this presentation at their March meeting.

Jay introduced the report by reminding the Committee Members of previous work done in the other Priority Margin Units (PMUs), Emeryville Crescent and San Leandro Bay. Similar to those efforts, the questions the Steinberger Slough project aimed to answer were whether the area can expect any decline, how to manage loads, and how to monitor any reductions. After noting unique characteristics and high concentration source areas in the PMU, Jay highlighted that the approach used a two-box model to reflect the separate Steinberger Slough and Redwood Creek systems.

Alicia Gilbreath then outlined the methods and results of the Loadings chapter, pointing out that soil from catchment areas with old industrial land use showed high PCB concentrations. This reflects the report's finding that even though the majority of the unit is made up of residential land use, the highest proportion of PCB loads come from commercial and old industrial areas. Additionally, Alicia informed the Committee that the vast majority of PCBs were flushed from the landscape during smaller storms (e.g., below the 1-in-1 year event).

Don Yee then described the investigations on the short- and long-term fate of the PCBs. The hydrodynamic model simulated the flow of discharged water, and showed that most stormwater discharge stays inside the PMU area after storms. The report's findings also indicate that loads and tidal exchange contribute most to contaminant fate, as well as the concentration of PCBs in water outside of the PMU (i.e., ambient South Bay levels). Don commented that the burial term had a greater influence in the Redwood Creek model compared to Steinberger Slough.

Jay then presented on bioaccumulation impacts in the area, noting that sampling for shiner surfperch as part of the 2019 shiner surfperch screening study (piggybacked on 2019 S&T sport fish monitoring) revealed very little biota in Steinberger Slough. Very few fish, and no shiner surfperch, were caught in Steinberger Slough; shiner and other species were, however, caught in Redwood Creek. Jay informed the meeting participants that the RMP is continuing to discuss the significance of the observation because shiner surfperch are a key sport fish indicator in the area.

Jay then summarized answers to the management questions articulated for the study, noting that the PMU would expect a decline in PCB levels if loads were reduced. Suggested future work includes collecting more baseline data (e.g., passive sampling, sediment survey, prey fish survey), as well as developing a data synthesis to help inform the TMDL revision. Jay concluded the presentation by specifying that the PCB Workgroup is pivoting to focus more on monitoring specific management actions and filling information gaps in preparation for the TMDL revision.

After Don asked about tracking bioaccumulative congeners instead of total, Tom Mumely noted the merit of the question in looking to avoid excess efforts. Similar to the TRC members response, some Steering Committee members were struck by the lack of biota observed in Steinberger Slough.

12. Information: Introducing Tan Zi and Regional Hydrologic Model Update

SFEI's new hydrologist, Tan Zi, presented an update on the regional hydrologic model. Tan also gave the SC members a sense of his professional background. Notably, Tan's past projects involved integrated modeling, multi-objective optimization, and climate change adaptation. This experience aligns well with SFEI's general modeling objectives as using quantitative tools to

support management efforts is also the motivation of the Bay Regional Watershed Model (BRWM).

When explaining the approach and status of the BRWM, Tan noted the need for up to date land-use data because the most recent dataset is from 2006. Tom Mumley commented that the RMP could possibly incorporate additional funding to ensure that the new data meets the model's needs. Tan also outlined the planned timeline for the work, highlighting the goal to have the model set up by the Sources, Pathways, and Loadings Workgroup meeting at the end of May. He is currently working on developing a high resolution daily rainfall data layer.

When addressing limitations of the model such as tidal impact, sediment dynamics, and the Bay-Delta boundary, Tan and meeting participants agreed that there are many opportunities for an integrated modeling framework. Steering Committee members expressed their appreciation for Tan's work and insight into a more integrated approach to modeling.

13. Discussion: Plus/Delta

Prior to adjourning the meeting, Committee members commented on the remote-meeting experience. Tom Mumley commended the productive amount of dialogue and participation, and Karin North noted the benefits of member attendance despite physical distance. Karin also suggested that the positive response from meeting participants could promote a 'hybrid' approach for future meetings.

Adjourn