



Bay RMP Multi-Year Planning Workshop and Steering Committee Meeting
 October 21, 2020
 San Francisco Estuary Institute

Meeting Summary

Attendees

SC Member	Affiliation	Representing	Present
Eric Dunlavey	City of San Jose	POTW-Large	Yes
Amanda Roa	Delta Diablo	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	No
Tessa Beach	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
Yuyun Shang	EBMUD	POTW	No
Mary Lou Esparza	Central Contra Costa Sanitary District	POTW	Yes
Tom Hall	EOA, Inc.	POTW	Yes
Ross Duggan	City and County of SF	CCSF	No
Anne Hansen-Balis	City of San Jose	POTW	Yes
Bridgette DeShields*	Integral Consulting	Refineries	Yes
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

*Chair, alternates in gray and italicized

Staff and Others:

- Jay Davis - SFEI (for morning)
- Melissa Foley - SFEI
- Nina Buzby - SFEI
- Jen Hunt - SFEI
- Miguel Mendez - SFEI
- Jim Haussener - California Marine Affairs and Navigation
- Becky Sutton - SFEI

Multi-Year Planning Workshop

1. Introductions and Goals for the Meeting

Tom Mumley began the day by welcoming everyone and reminding the participants that the first half of the meeting would encompass the RMP Multi-Year Planning (MYP) Workshop, while the second would cover regular Steering Committee (SC) items. The group went through a round of expanded introductions for the newest SC member Amanda Roa. From Delta Diablo, Amanda is the replacement SC representative for small POTWs after Robert Wilson moved on from his position with the City of Petaluma.

After introductions, Tom acknowledged that the RMP is in a state of transition, with the S&T program review and economic downturn, so the group will need to think more strategically than usual. The main goals for the meeting will be to update the MYP and come up with a plan for workgroup funding levels.

2. Discussion: Setting the Scene - Planning for 2022 and Beyond

Tom Mumley provided context on the program’s upcoming budget constraints, noting the working decision to not raise fees in 2022 and ongoing shortfalls in dredger fees. Melissa Foley gave more background on the challenges and opportunities for the RMP. In doing so, Melissa went over some of the Program’s highlights and specific 2022 budget challenges - with the take home message that the group needs to set management priorities and decide what topics can be reduced or delayed.

Melissa also showed the group future budget scenarios based on different fee increases in 2023 in 2024, noting the high amount of S&T work planned under the current S&T Program for 2025 and the resulting need to draw from reserve funds. Luisa Valiela called out the 2025 scenario as

an important reminder that the Program can't continue to grow without increases in funding. However, the role of the reserves is partially to build up funds in order to cover years when various S&T matrices fall within the same year. Tom pointed out that RMP fees come through a regulatory process, and the Program needs to consider how much of RMP funds are going towards monitoring work that doesn't directly benefit dischargers. Along with several other Committee members, Adam Oliveri brought up the need for the SC to consider a modification to how the Program formally views dredger contributions going forward. Maureen Dunn noted that dredgers would need sufficient notice of any fee changes. When discussing the recovery of reserve funds, Eric Dunlavey asked whether reserve fund use will continue to drop after 2025. Melissa responded that the reserve balance will increase but at a lower rate because of the discrepancy between inflation and fee increases.

Action Items:

- Review RMP funding structure (particularly dredger contributions) at upcoming SC meeting (Melissa Foley, 1/31/21)

3. Discussion: Potential Future Topics of Interest to the RMP

Jay Davis explained a pivotal reason for the annual MYP Workshop is to determine upcoming management decisions in order to tailor future program efforts. To begin the brainstorming exercise, Jay presented a list of potential future topics, gleaned from recent stakeholder meetings. These included large, event-based (e.g., wildfire-related) monitoring; diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) and community engagement; atmospheric deposition; biodiesel facility discharge; Wetland RMP collaboration; and beneficial reuse guidelines and monitoring. After hearing details on the topics, Tom Mumley asked if any Committee participants supported any of the suggested ideas. Luisa Valiela suggested the group engage in a poll to determine the relative priority of the topics. The poll showed a preference for beneficial reuse, and a three-way tie for second place among large event-based monitoring, community engagement, and the Wetlands RMP, which the group discussed following agenda item 4 (Information Priorities for 2022-2024).

The discussion on beneficial reuse began with Luisa Valiela noting the importance of identifying opportunities and growth areas that serve more needs than just water quality and help diversify the end users of RMP data (i.e., RMP participants). Luisa also stressed the importance of identifying the science that is needed to support beneficial reuse policy. Tom Mumley suggested that the topic would entertain new funders, specifically leveraging USACE funding through collaborative efforts. Karin North noted that POTWs are looking at beneficial reuse in relation to biosolids because of increasing challenges related to agricultural use.

Related to large events, Luisa highlighted the importance of being prepared given that such events are going to be an increasing part of reality going forward. The Program should prioritize planning where the RMP can contribute to these more sporadic, and time-sensitive projects. Eric Dunlavey added that science advisors to the NMS are grappling with nutrients standards as

the climate changes, and how large events are changing the general understanding of Bay water quality. Luisa also suggested the Program seek out a resource with knowledge on atmospheric deposition related to wildfire events, though noting the need to determine questions and whether they can be definitely answered. Tom Mumley acknowledged all the participants' points and suggested building discussions on these topics into upcoming TRC and SC meetings.

Action Item:

- Include "Future priorities" in MYP Workshop for 2021 (Melissa Foley, 10/31/2021)
- Consider sampling for large events in S&T Program Review (Melissa Foley, 12/31/2021)
- Schedule talk on air deposition for an upcoming TRC meeting (Melissa Foley, 09/30/2021)

4. Discussion: Information Priorities for 2022-2024

The item's goals were reviewing the management decision table from the MYP and identifying priority management needs. After going through high priority and potential future management drivers, Melissa asked the group if the list was complete or needed any potential modifications/additions. Luisa suggested removing the South Bay (SB) Selenium TMDL from the list. Tom Mumley added that given the EPA's proposed criteria for the SB that at some point there will be a need to respond to the listing in a manner that shouldn't be restricted to a TMDL. Tom Hall also mentioned that management based on Se levels in fish tissue would be the preferred approach. In relation to adding sediment priority drivers to the table, Xavier Fernandez and Luisa suggested adding the LTMS goals and the Water Board's sediment testing criteria for reuse (DMMO) to the high priority category.

Action Items:

- Substitute South bay selenium TMDL for "regulatory action"; add LTMS and DMMO sediment goals and criteria to the MYP priority management list (Miguel Mendez, 1/31/21)
- Send revised management table to SC and TRC (Melissa Foley, 12/15/2020)

5. Decision: Setting the Planning Budget for 2022 Special Studies

Melissa started the item by reviewing the planning budget set for workgroups and reminding the Committee members of the active workgroups set to meet in 2022. She provided the group with the context of what percentage of the overall RMP budget was allocated to special studies in 2021 and the ratio of high-priority special studies to actual available funding in 2022. Additionally, she showed the group the varying fractions of funding associated with each workgroup. Melissa asked the group to consider how WG priorities align with the management priority discussions from previous items.

Chris Sommers began the discussion by reminding the group that the Program has experienced seeing twice the amount of proposals compared to available funding, which prompted the decision to cap “planning” at a 1.5 ratio. This decision was motivated by a desire to maintain constructive dialogue at workgroups, while not wasting resources on eventually unfunded proposals. The group thought the 1.4 ratio of proposed:budget was acceptable for 2022. Related to workgroup coverage, Luisa asked about needs for data on fire-related dioxins, specifically suggesting talking to an expert to answer whether it should be a priority going forward. Jay Davis noted that a minimum approach would be looking at dioxins in fish which is currently happening in S&T efforts.

Decision:

- Karin North motioned to approve the 2022 special studies planning budget. Eric Dunlavey seconded the motion, and the motion was carried by all present members.

Adjourn Planning Workshop

Steering Committee Meeting

7. Introductions and Review Goals for the Meeting

Tom Mumley quickly reviewed the desired outcomes of the meeting’s agenda items, and the group moved on to the SC related topics planned for the afternoon.

8. Decision: Approve Meeting Summary from July 22, 2020, and Confirm/Set Dates for Future Meetings

The group had no questions or comments on the previous meeting’s summary. Karin North expressed a conflict with the planned July 2021 meeting date, to which the group agreed to move to the previous week (July 21, 2021).

Decisions:

- Adam Olivieri moved to approve the July 22, 2020, meeting summary. Karin North seconded the motion, and the motion was carried by all present members. Amanda Roa abstained from the vote because she was not present at the past meeting.

Action Items:

- Send updated meeting calendar invite to SC (Nina Buzby, 10/31/20)

9. Information: TRC Meeting Summary

Melissa briefly reviewed the prior month's TRC meeting summary, noting that half the meeting was used to practice annual meeting presentations. Most significantly, the TRC discussed the plans for 2021 S&T sampling efforts. The group agreed to proposed bird egg site relocations and to wait on sample analysis until after the Program is able to review the matrix as a part of the S&T redesign. The TRC also supported adding bisphenols and OPEs to the 2021 dry season water cruise, which Melissa clarified would add an additional \$1000 per sample - the full cost depending on the number of sites sampled. Funds that could cover these analytes include money initially intended for "PCBs, PAHs, and legacy pesticides" that the S&T review concluded should be removed and instead added to CTR efforts. The SC had no comments on Melissa's summary and were in support of the TRC's decisions related to S&T sampling.

10. Information: RMP Financial Update for 2020, Quarter 3

Jen Hunt presented the agenda item to the group. She noted that the Program received another large contribution to MMP funds and is predicted to be under budget for the program management tasks (1-5) in 2020. Jen also presented the fee collection status for 2017-2019. Prior to the meeting the SC was asked to approve an additional \$15K in funds to allow the S&T Program review work to continue - the full cost being \$235K for the two year project. During the meeting, Jen presented an additional funding request to the Committee members; utilizing \$15K of undesignated funds to supplement the budget for the North Bay selenium monitoring. Melissa provided some details as to why the project required more funding, specifically due to pandemic complications that caused tasks to be less straightforward than expected, in addition to significant coordination with labs on data format and submissions. Tom Mumley commented that the selenium work is a continuation of previous USGS efforts and the group should keep in mind the plan to move the work to S&T efforts.

The meeting participants brought up a few questions, mostly related to outstanding fee payers. Jen reminded the group that the update was referring to payment numbers from September, so she could check again at the end of the present month, October. Maureen Dunn mentioned that staff changes at organizations could be a source of fee delays. Melissa agreed and reminded the group that a similar idea to updating the current invoicing system had been brought up at a previous SC meeting, with the motivation to address the challenge of staff turnover.

The group also asked to change the "dredger shortfall" language in the financial memos to "reduced dredger budget." The previous wording implied dredgers were not paying their fees to the Program, which is not the case. The updated wording better communicates that the RMP fee structure does not adequately allow for collecting the full contribution amount.

Decision:

- Maureen Dunn motioned to approve additional funding for the North Bay selenium monitoring. Karin North seconded the motion, and the motion was carried by all present members.

Action Item:

- Send reminders for outstanding 2019 and 2020 RMP fees (Melissa Foley, 12/15/2020)

11. Decision: Approve the 2021 Budget and Detailed Workplan

Melissa began the item by showing the group figures related to the expected revenue and planned budget for 2021. The budget she presented included a \$130K deficit. Most notably, Melissa highlighted an additional aspect of the 2021 budget related to S&T Program review, which is driving the budget deficit. The S&T Review will require \$220K to cover staff labor, honoraria for experts, and subcontractors helping with power analyses. For the program management tasks (1-5), she noted that the budget was decreased by approximately \$60K. While these tasks tend to end up with some surplus that can cover over-budget projects in other years, this decrease will take away such ability and require a close attention to project budgets. Tom Mumley inquired about the costs associated with RMP website maintenance, to which Melissa explained that the RMP is planning to redo the program webpage to make it easier to navigate and find information. Other programmatic pages on the SFEI website have undergone similar updates, so changes to the RMP page will implement similar strategies.

The following group discussion began with a conversation on covering the budget deficit. Adam Oliveri made several suggestions, including reducing funds for special studies and not producing as thorough a Pulse document. Tom Mumley also noted the existing \$112K of MMP funds as well as the possibility of using SEP funds. The group agreed to make a final decision on how to balance the budget in January, with the primary options being MMP and SEP funds. A lower priority option could be cutting back on the Pulse budget, though the group did not want to go further down that path without the presence of Jay Davis.

Decisions:

- Adam Olivieri motioned to approve the 2021 budget and detailed workplan, with the assumption to use SEP funding to cover the deficit (either MMP or Discretionary Enforcement funds). Eric Dunlavey seconded the motion and the motion was carried by all present members.

Action Item:

- Report back on deficit-closing options at January SC meeting (Melissa Foley, 01/31/2021)

12. Discussion: Annual Meeting Feedback

After briefly discussing the feedback at the close of the MYP workshop, Melissa showed a few graphic highlights to the Committee members. The meeting hosted attendees from a wide range of fields, the majority of which listened to two or more of the day's sessions. Additionally, the preference towards virtual or in-person meetings was split evenly. Luisa suggested posting the

graphics Melissa showed to the group to the SFEI webpage, which Melissa noted could also be shared through the RMP eUpdate.

The group then discussed potential ideas for the upcoming Estuary News article. Normally a topic brought up by Jay Davis at meetings, Melissa stepped in, in Jay's absence, and informed the group of the issue's theme and potential topic areas. The meeting participants brainstormed a few potential ideas, with the most supported being an article summarizing the RMP Annual Meeting (AM) and RMP Update publication. Tom Mumley suggested highlighting the success of the AM on a virtual platform, which Luisa agreed would be a good way to reach an audience that didn't participate in the meeting and could seek out the posted videos and resources.

Action Items:

- Send summary document of Annual Meeting Survey to TRC and SC (Nina Buzby, 10/31/20)
- Include survey results in eUpdate (Jay Davis, 12/31/2020)

13. Discussion: Status of RMP Deliverables and Action Items

Melissa presented the deliverables to the group in three categories: (1) recent completions, (2) items in progress, and (3) delayed projects due to pandemic or staff time. Many of the waiting deliverables are being held up with academic partners. Tom Mumley commented that the Program should consider not taking on more work while old projects remain incomplete. Melissa then relayed that upcoming due dates, prior to the next SC meeting, are on schedule for completion and action items have been addressed in a timely manner.

14. Discussion: Plan Agenda Items for Future Meetings

Melissa presented items that came up during the course of the day's meeting, including: revisiting the 2021 budget and reviewing 2022 special studies priorities. Melissa also asked the group if they would like a science update at the next meeting or prefer to keep meetings shorter. Most committee members were in support of a shorter meeting, and Melissa noted that the April agenda is usually light, so a short science update may be possible.

15. Plus/Delta

Tom Mumley congratulated the group on successfully completing a virtual MYP workshop, with a similar amount of dialogue to past meetings. Melissa added that the day required presentation of many details and numbers, and would welcome any suggestions on other ways to present them. Tom also asked what the potential timeline for reviewing the updated MYP document would be. Melissa said she would email a draft of the MYP to both committees, likely in November, and include a deadline for review.

Adjourn