Bay RMP Technical Review Committee Meeting

December 07, 2023

Meeting Summary

Attendees

TRC Member	Affiliation	Representing	Present
Alicia Chakrabarti	EBMUD	POTW	**Y**
Mary Lou Esparza	Central Contra Costa Sanitary District	POTW	**N**
Tom Hall	EOA, Inc.	POTW	**Y**
Heather Peterson	City and County of SF	CCSF	**N**
Samantha Engelage	City of Palo Alto	POTW	**Y**
Bridgette DeShields*	Integral Consulting	Refineries	**Y**
Chris Sommers	BAMSC (EOA, Inc.)	Stormwater	**Y**
Shannon Alford	Port of San Francisco	Dredgers	**N**
Richard Looker	SF Bay Regional WQCB	Water Board	**Y**
Luisa Valiela	US EPA	US EPA-IX	**Y**
Ian Wren	Baykeeper	NGOs	**N**
Jamie Yin	US Army Corps of Engineers	USACE	**N**

Staff and Others

- Jay Davis – SFEI
- Amy Kleckner – SFEI
- Martin Trinh – SFEI
- Don Yee – SFEI
- Craig Jones – Integral Consulting
- Bryan Frueh – City of San Jose
- Paul Salop – Applied Marine Sciences

1. Introductions and Review Agenda (00:03:00)

Bridgette DeShields opened the meeting with a round of introductions and a brief review of the day's agenda. Key agenda items include updates on EPA's draft annual priority list, S&T monitoring, data services and informatics, and event-based monitoring.

2. Decision: Approve Meeting Summary from September 19, 2023, and Confirm/Set Dates for Future Meetings (00:04:45)

Bridgette asked the group for any final comments on the previous meeting's summary. Bridgette noted Mary Lou Esparza should be recognized for her contributions to the TRC and RMP. Receiving no other comments, Bridgette confirmed the dates for upcoming meetings. The Committee confirmed the first TRC meeting of 2024 for March 26, 2023 and scheduled the following meeting for June 13, 2024. The Committee confirmed the RMP Annual Meeting for October 16, 2024.

Action Item:

- Edit requested: the 9/19 meeting summary to include recognizing Mary Lou Esparza. Update Meeting Summary and repost to website etc. (Martin Trinh, 12/31/2023)
- Send out calendar invites for June 13, 2024 TRC meeting (Martin Trinh, December 15, 2023)

Decisions:

- Richard Looker motioned to approve the meeting summary. Luisa Valiela seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

3. Information: MYP and SC Meeting Summary from November 1, 2023 (00:09:23)

The Multi Year Plan workshop began with Amy setting the stage - planning for 2024 and beyond. This included a summary of the 2024 RMP budget, work highlights and priorities in 2024, and outcomes of discussions with stakeholders in recent meetings. Included in the discussion of the RMP budget was increased funding from WQIF grants and planning for additional funds from the EPA SF Bay Program in the future. Some of the work highlights included preparing for upcoming storm events, building of the SFEI Mayfly remote sampler, and final years of pilot studies of wet season water sampling and marine mammals. Future priorities discussed at stakeholder meetings included a need for baseline information to support monitoring climate-related changes, trash and microplastics, modeling watershed PCB and Hg loading more broadly, and CECs monitoring to identify sources.

Tom Mumley led the next agenda item reviewing the RMP management driver table. The tables remained mostly unchanged except for review of 303(d) listings for sediment hotspots now listed as ongoing and the addition of specific CECs to the table of potential future drivers.

Amy then reviewed the changes to the S&T plan for 2024 compared to what was originally laid out in the last MYP update. The grand total budgeted for S&T activities in 2024 is $1.95M compared to the $2.2M forecasted in last year's MYP. The changes in 2024 are to pause North Bay selenium sampling to allow for a review of the data and sampling and analysis plans. Non-target analysis and passive samplers for water will be delayed until 2025 and 2026. Budget adjustments to Bird Eggs and Sport Fish were made to cover anticipated costs in 2024. These adjustments factored in previous actual expenditures for these efforts and also anticipated cost increases for subcontractors and labor. A model maintenance budget of $50k was added to S&T for 2024.

RMP staff sought guidance on priorities and funding levels for workgroups with the group proposing to maintain 2023 funding levels. The multi-year plan underwent changes, incorporating core funds and adjusting the ranking and prioritization process for study proposals. Instead of categorizing proposals as high priority and SEP, a two-tier approach was adopted, with Jay tasked to develop a format for tier 2 proposals. Jay also presented a review of the priority workgroup agenda items and scheduling plans, maintaining a structure similar to 2023. The summary action items included the completion of a revised multi-year plan draft, with a final call for comments scheduled for the Steering Committee meeting in January. An internal kickoff meeting with workgroup leads is set for January 18 to review Committee-outlined guidance for work groups.

To begin the Steering Committee meeting, Tom shared his plan to retire by summer 2024. Karin expressed a willingness to chair post Tom's retirement, and Tom expressed a desire to continue his participation post retirement but as to what role or capacity was not defined. It was understood that this may require potential modifications to the charter to delineate a role. A motion to approve Tom as Chair and Karin as Vice Chair was approved.

Kelly presented an update on the progress of the remote sampler purchase. She shared that at the SST meeting on September 21 that the recommendations were to continue with the plans for SFEI Mayfly sampler, conduct pilot sampling with the current design in WY (Water Year) 2024, while in parallel working on improvements to address contamination issues. The plan is to use these funds to build up to 10 Mayflyies this

winter. Plans for WY 2025 depend on outcomes of the pilot deployments this year, how far we can get on the Mayfly improvements, and the Stormwater CEC Approach. Future considerations include a possibility of a second set of Mayfly samplers to minimize CEC contamination concerns, use of ISCOs and possible permanent ISCO installations. Current budget should be sufficient to cover all sampler purchases but not cover the building of permanent installations.

Beth delivered the financial update for Quarter 3 outlining percentages of annual budgets expended and fee collections. Beth outlined changes in the LAIF and Set-Aside funds showing interest updates and withdrawals and contributions. An early release of funds was approved for a stormwater project that had not previously been included in earlier meetings requests for early release of funds.

Amy then presented the 2024 budget and workplan. All members present approved the workplan and budget.

The group discussed event-based monitoring, which types of events to target, and the need to establish a more structured approach. The consensus was that the RMP will develop a matrix of event types and subsequent monitoring needs, with a priority given to high flow events and HABs. An initial small group meeting (Jay, Amy, Richard Looker, Dave Senn) will be scheduled to brainstorm types of events, level of effort and ways to pull in other groups.

Jay elaborated on the format for tier two proposals, proposing a condensed one-page document covering essential elements such as a short summary, rationale, description of planned activities, budget information, and participant names. The discussion delved into considerations about the necessity of timelines and the suggestion to offer flexibility in estimating project timelines for easier researcher planning. The group contemplated the idea of setting a budget threshold that would trigger the requirement for a full proposal for higher-cost projects. Chris Sommers also brought up the importance of assessing the actual cost savings for staff in writing shorter proposals, suggesting a post-implementation review to evaluate the effectiveness of the two-tier approach. The discussion contributed to the formulation of a comprehensive plan for the Tier 2 proposal format.

Action Items:

- Send final reminder for comments/edits to the MYP draft. (Amy Kleckner, 12/15/23)
- Finalize MYP for SC Meeting on 1/22/24 (Amy Kleckner 1/12/2024)

4. Discussion: EPA Program Office Update (00:31:45)

Luisa Valiela presented the annual program priority list for the expanded San Francisco Bay Program, included as part of the National Defense Authorization Act. The Act served as a funding mechanism, leading to the establishment of an authorized program called the San Francisco Bay Program. Language in the legislation included direction to EPA to create an Annual Priority list which identifies needed projects and studies. In creating the list, EPA should consider recommendations from the SFEP, SF Water Board, SFBRA, and other stakeholders. Luisa highlighted the significant increase in funding, from approximately $5 million per year to the authorized level of $54 million. Luisa presented the draft priority list, emphasizing that these were not ranked priorities but rather program areas intended to reflect collaborative efforts for Estuary restoration. Feedback was sought on the proposed priorities, with adjustments already made based on previous input, such as specifying "habitat, eelgrass, and oyster reef restoration" under the "Subtitle A" category. Luisa welcomed ongoing feedback and suggestions for additional venues or stakeholders to engage with, recognizing the importance of refining the list collaboratively. Luisa concluded with an overview of the timeline for finalizing the list, targeting the end of winter or early spring, and highlighted the need for quick action to allocate funds incrementally under continuing resolutions. The challenges of moving away from a competitive grant program and developing new funding mechanisms were acknowledged, with a focus on figuring out the logistics with the help of the department, headquarters, and legal experts. The TRC suggested potential categorization improvements, such as using a Venn diagram or broader categories, to enhance the clarity of the proposed priorities. Luisa also sought input on how stakeholders preferred to receive updates on the program's progress in the long term.

The TRC acknowledged the increased attention on the topics of climate resiliency and equity, but expressed difficulty in incorporating these concepts into their existing framework. To address this, a decision was made to add additional language to the existing documentation, including a priority list presented as a table with explanatory language. The focus was on aligning with the Biden administration's justice and equity goals, emphasizing meaningful engagement with underserved communities or tribes in funded projects. To specifically address climate resiliency and equity concerns, it was decided not to create separate buckets but to integrate these considerations into the existing priorities. The commitment was made to include language in funding agreements emphasizing engagement and equity considerations.

Chris Sommers offered input on structuring the information to make it more comprehensible for the public, suggesting two broader categories: habitat restoration (including monitoring) and contaminant control programs. Chris raised concerns about the absence of the term "emerging contaminants" in the presentation. He suggested

explicitly mentioning projects related to emerging contaminants, such as PFAS, and discussed the need for clarity in language.

The discussion continued with various comments on organization of the illustration, the inclusion of specific terms like "trash," and considerations for funding distribution. Towards the end, there was a conversation about the readiness of the organization to handle the anticipated flow of funds. Luisa acknowledged that the current year might feel messy due to simultaneously developing programs and disbursing funds. There were also discussions about potential regional entities to manage funds efficiently, with a focus on finding suitable organizations and municipalities willing to accept federal funding.

The TRC acknowledged the need for detailed planning and consideration of the scale of projects, expressing a preference for streamlining processes and avoiding unnecessary complexity. The ongoing work on the Wetlands Regional Monitoring Program was highlighted as an example of a project actively being prepared for funding.

The conversation continued with Chris asking about the annual review process and decision-making for the funding. Chris highlighted the importance of readiness in the first year, but he sought clarification on the review process and decision-makers in the subsequent years. The conversation shifted to the mechanics of decision-making, and the participants expressed uncertainty, with a mention of the latitude given to the EPA in making decisions based on the legislation. There was a discussion about collaboration and the entities named in the list provided by the legislation. The importance of finalizing the list to ensure satisfaction among stakeholders was emphasized. The group acknowledged the challenge of reporting progress to different entities with potentially conflicting interests, and the need for metrics and reporting mechanisms was raised.

The discussion turned to the possibility of funds being allocated to management actions and projects on the ground. Questions arose about staffing and management, and considerations for the allocation of funds to different projects. The conversation delved into the complexity of reporting back to Congress and managing expectations. Chris noted the potential need for metrics, and mentioned the numerous Excel spreadsheets that need to be filled out regularly for progress tracking. Luisa acknowledged the ongoing inquiries from Congress about the progress of the program office.

The discussion shifted to the Delta and whether the funding can be used for Delta-related work. The participants expressed a focus on San Francisco Bay but acknowledged the connection with the Comprehensive Conservation and Management

Plan (CCMP), which includes Delta work. Luisa noted the decision not to have a separate Delta bucket unless directed otherwise.

The conversation concluded with a discussion about the potential establishment of a PFAS workgroup. The need for coordination and the challenges of intra-work group coordination were highlighted. Concerns about bandwidth and institutional capacity were raised, emphasizing the importance of effective communication and coordination among workgroups, technical advisors, and stakeholders. Chris expressed his concerns about the increasing workload and the need for organizational discussions around capacity and resources.

Action Items:

- Discuss formation of PFAS workgroup with Steering Committee (Jay Davis, 1/12/2024)
- Discuss Program Office with PCB Workgroup (Jay Davis 1/12/2024)
- Include this agenda item for the 1/22/24 SC meeting (Amy/Jay 1/12/24)

5. Information: 2024 Workplan (01:22:00)

Amy presented the TRC with the updated 2024 Workplan. She noted the core fees totals assumed a dredger shortfall of $200k, additional funding from POTWs for alternate monitoring and reporting, $100k from stormwater, a $500k withdrawal from the S&T set aside (this is lower than the planned $650k), $320k from the undesignated reserve; $180k for the remote sampler purchase, and $140k for workgroup strategy allocations. The expected revenue totaled $5,216,129 with expenses at $5,216,074, leaving a balance of $55.

Amy addressed the Program implementation costs for 2024, emphasizing that most increases were related to labor costs associated with annual salary raises. Program management increased over 2023 to cover internal coordination needs and staff salary increases. Governance maintains a similar workgroup structure to 2023 with in-person/hybrid meetings with potentially accommodating more advisor travel. QA and Data Services increased in line with staff salary increases. Annual Reporting increased for the Pulse in 2024. What was not spent in 2021 for the RMP Update supplemented the 2022 budget to produce the Pulse. The 2023 and 2024 planned budgets more accurately reflect what will actually be spent in those years. The communications budget assumes more in person conference attendance, associated travel costs, and general design work.

Amy presented a graph showing the Special Studies Budgets, for Core RMP funds only, in 2024. These slices do include strategy funds. In 2024, ECWG was allocated

$100k from Stormwater CEC funds and $339,488 from AMR Funds, so the remaining amount of RMP funds that went to ECWG was $275,112. The chart also does not include any potential future SEP funds, anticipated WQIF funds, or other pro bono sources that may come available in 2024.

Major portions include sport fish, bird eggs, and water, with additional allocations for USGS sediment and nutrients. Amy showed a chart illustrating special study budgets for the core RMP funds, specifying that these slices did include strategy funds.

6. Information: Watershed Modeling Update (01:28:30)

Jay provided an update on the RMP's watershed modeling, including challenges, progress, and future plans. Jay noted the departure of Tan had been a major obstacle, but the Institute was making steps to move forward. Jay updated the TRC on the ongoing discussions with key stakeholders, including Richard, Tom, and Chris.

Jay praised Pedro Avellanda's excellent work thus far at the RMP, detailing his progress on various tasks, including CEC data analysis, a model exploration report, San Leandro Bay watershed modeling, and NextGen Urban Greening. Jay noted that multiple RMP projects have been on hold, creating a backlog.

Jay enthusiastically reported nearing the conclusion of a hiring process, with the expectation of having a new watershed modeler on the team by January. The anticipation is that this addition will significantly contribute to addressing the existing gaps in the team. Luisa requested to meet the new hire at the next TRC meeting, raising questions about the status of the Regional Watershed Spreadsheet Model (RWSM) and its potential impact on CEC projects.

Jay discussed the exploration of external consulting help. Detailed discussions with Lester, Tom, Richard, and Chris have been ongoing, sorting out who and how to bring in external support. The next step in this process is to examine budgets and revise workplans.

Chris acknowledged the challenges of the more transient nature of the workforce, emphasizing the need to create stable teams that require less onboarding. The importance of consultant support to create stability and overcome turnover was underlined.

Jay provided a thorough overview of the challenges faced, the progress made, and the strategies moving forward in the realm of watershed modeling.

7. Information: S&T Monitoring Update (01:50:00)

Amy began this item with an update on the RMP's 2023 efforts. All samples have been collected. Nearly all have reached the labs for analysis, with data beginning to trickle in. Amy had started drafting a contract with CCSF to analyze the sturgeon samples we had collected in the Spring and also had been in communication with Dr. Ben Linhoff who is the new selenium PI at USGS. They discussed being able to run future selenium tissue samples at the USGS starting in summer 2024, but unfortunately the RMP had a freezer failure on November 21st and the sturgeon tissue plugs were compromised. The samples were completely thawed out, but were kept. They are now refrozen but Amy sought guidance on whether or not the samples should be analyzed. There were only 12 samples, with CCSF serving as an interim lab until USGS took over. Concerns were raised about the limited value of data from CCSF, given differences in methods compared to Amy's preferred approach. Despite being cost-effective, CCSF's data was viewed with caution. Jay considered the data high-profile, contemplating the implications of marking it with an asterisk, with Bridgette agreeing.

Amy followed by providing updates on the completed sediment cruise, with data expected by the end of January. Emphasis was placed on grain size analysis for ALS, near-field, and margin sediments. Preparations for harbor seals for AXYS and prioritizing PFAS data in dry season water samples were also covered.

Wet weather sampling is now in its third year, aiming for consistency between WY23 and WY24. The team aimed to sample two storm events and once in the dry season at 4 near-field and 4 Bay stations, focusing on PFAS, the TOP assay for PFAS, bisphenols, OPEs, and stormwater CECs. The bird eggs and sport fish projects involved drafting contracts by the end of 2023, with sample collection by USGS-WERC staff and analysis by SGS-AXYS. Samples for both projects will be analyzed for PFAS, PCBs, PBDEs and legacy pesticides.

For Marine Mammals, 2024 marked the second year of a two-year special study aiming for 10 harbor seals and 10 harbor porpoises. PFAS analysis, non-target analysis, and sample collection were delegated to SGS AXYS, the Crimmins lab, and Marine Mammal Center, respectively. Amy noted the RMP was beginning the final stages of the North Bay Selenium Data Report 2019-2020 and ongoing discussions with USGS regarding lab analysis. In 2023, liver and blubber samples were collected from 3 harbor seals and serum samples from 6 harbor seals. There were no harbor porpoises collected.

Amy provided an update on the RMP's selenium efforts, noting that the North Bay Selenium Data Report for 2019-2020 is currently in the final internal review stages. The

draft of the 2021-2022 data report is estimated to be available by March 2024. Additionally, ongoing discussions with the USGS regarding lab analysis were highlighted, and the next steps in this collaboration were under consideration.

Action Item:

- Invite Committee members to CW team meetings with guest speakers. (Jay Davis, 12/31/2023)

8. Information: Event-based Monitoring (02:12:40)

Jay led a discussion on event-based monitoring, initially proposed last year in response to the significant events of 2022. The group decided not to address it in 2023 due to ongoing strategy development work but has now decided to prioritize it, given greater bandwidth this year. The Steering Committee discussion included technical input from individuals like Tom Mumley, Eric Dunlavy, and Richard Looker. The focus is on preparing for various events, such as spills or fires, and developing plans and matrices for monitoring responses, considering factors like urgency and impact time. The matrix will summarize event types and monitoring responses. A key step involves collaborating with Dave Senn. There was a suggestion to potentially involve others from Richard's group, considering their expertise and potential availability. The group planned to move forward, acknowledging the need for a rapid response plan for certain events and aiming to involve various stakeholders in the process. The next steps include scheduling a meeting with a small group, including Dave, Richard, Amy, and Jay, to start developing plans and matrices for event-based monitoring.

Action Item:

- Schedule meeting w/ Richard, Dave, Amy & Jay (Jay Davis, 12/31/23)

9. Information: Data Services and Informatics Update (02:24:00)

Adam Wong, SFEI's Data Services Manager, provided an update on the data management in the RMP. Adam began by discussing the datasets finalized in 2023, including North Bay Selenium in water and clam samples, archived sport fish PFAS, stormwater CECs, ethoxylated surfactants, and various matrices in North Bay margins.

Adam noted that some finalized data are not yet public due to ongoing work on manuscripts and reports. He acknowledged challenges with the 2023 timeline, noting that despite completing the Quality Assurance (QA) review process, most data are not yet available on CD3.

Adam discussed budget allocations for database maintenance and process improvements. Adam mentioned changes in flagging processes compared to the past and ongoing efforts to script queries. The team is reserving funds for implementing CEDEN 2, anticipating it in 2024.

CEDEN, which is experiencing leadership changes, poses uncertainties. Adam addressed staff availability issues and discussed the workload associated with multi-year projects, including PCBs in stormwater, involving three separate years.

The presentation featured graphs on data progress, indicating projects completed and ongoing work across various projects. Adam touched on lab timeliness, noting challenges and discussions within SWAMP regarding similar issues.

Chris Sommers raised concerns about the timeliness of POC stormwater data for PCBs, emphasizing its role in guiding inspections and sampling. Adam explained the issues related to splitting contracts with the lab, resulting in delays. Chris stressed the importance of prioritizing the analysis and QA of these data for effective decision-making.

Miguel Mendez's role in QA/QC procedures was highlighted as a positive development, aiming to expedite data processing. Adam shared improvements in communication and collaboration within SFEI to address data processing bottlenecks.

Chris discussed the decision to move away from AXYS due to time considerations, acknowledging that other labs may also pose challenges. The broader industry trend of consolidation was mentioned as a factor affecting service quality. Paul Salop, shared his experiences with AXYS, noting recent improvements in responsiveness. Paul highlighted positive changes in communication and quicker responses to inquiries, which have positively impacted turnaround times for deliverables.

The item concluded with discussions on industry-wide challenges, including turnover and delays with other labs such as Brooks. The TRC expressed hope for continued improvements in lab responsiveness and data delivery timelines.

10. Discussion: Communications Update (02:44:00)

In the communications agenda item, Jay thanked all for their contributions to the 2023 RMP Update and asked TRC members to make requests for the numbers of hard copies of the RMP Update they would like to receive. Jay followed by giving a summary of attendee feedback from the Annual Meeting. 110 people attended in person and 168

attended virtually. A post meeting survey was conducted, with responses mainly from regulators and wastewater/stormwater professionals. Overall, the feedback was positive, with a high level of satisfaction and positive comments about the speakers, topics, and organization. There was feedback on some of the audio and participation issues for online participants and the RMP will be using “Zoom meeting” instead of “Zoom webinar” in the future to try and address these issues. Jay also previewed the 2024 RMP Pulse with the recommendation to have CECs as the theme.

The discussion then shifted to planning for the Pulse, with a focus on CECs. The goal was to create a guide for CECs in the Bay similar to the 2013 Pulse. There was a proposal to expand the CEC profile section, given its enduring value, and the need to represent both the Water Board and DTSC (Department of Toxic Substances Control).

The group discussed updating the management section, hoping for input from Kelly, who was not part of the 2013 team. The risk tier based framework was highlighted, and the group suggested that the updated version should be a centerpiece of the Pulse. The group acknowledged the need for early collaboration and feedback.

The group revisited the structure of the 2013 Pulse, and emphasized a need to update and expand sections, especially in light of increased information on CECs, was recognized. The possibility of EPA input on PFAS was raised, and it was suggested to include a placeholder for EPA information. The challenges of analytical methods, particularly with CECs, were also acknowledged, with a proposal for a one-page section or sidebar on the topic.

Attendees were encouraged to provide additional feedback, and the item concluded with a general consensus that the planning was on track.

11. Information: Status of Deliverables and Action Items (02:57:30)

In her update on the status of deliverables and action items, Amy reported on various completed, overdue, delayed, and upcoming tasks. Among the completed projects are the Sediment Monitoring and Modeling Workplan (SFEI Contribution No. 1100), the WY24 S&T Wet Season Water SAP (SFEI Contribution No. 1154), and a productive RMP Update/Meeting with WSPA (Western States Petroleum). Additionally, the 2024 Annual Workplan and Budget, along with the Draft 2024 MYP Update, have been completed.

Turning to overdue tasks, the MTC Bay Area Land Use Update (SEP) has faced delays due to a lack of updated data, prompting Tony to consult with Caitlyn Sweeney and involve Tom Mumley. Despite Eileen White's outreach to Therese of MTC, the project has been deprioritized due to a shortage of staff capability and funding. Luisa suggested the potential use of EPA funding.

Regarding STLS Regional Model Development, Tan's departure has caused delays in deliverables, and a revised timeline is still in development. The Stormwater Monitoring Strategy for CECs is a work in progress.

In the delayed category, various projects include the analysis of selenium in sturgeon muscle tissue, bird eggs analysis, and the updated model for RWSM. The timeline for the latter is expected in May or June 2024, contingent on Pedro's availability. Nutrients light attenuation and moored sensors work is underway but delayed due to prioritizing permit-related tasks. Approval from WQIF, expected on Friday or Monday, will influence the new estimated timeline for the deliverable, set for 6/2024. The Ethoxylated Surfactants Final Report is experiencing delays in analysis, with remaining sediment and wastewater samples anticipated in spring 2024 and the final report expected by 12/31/24. Data releases for Sediment Delivery to Marshes, initially scheduled for the end of the year, have been postponed until April 2024. The 2023 Interlab comparison study results presentation is still pending, with Eurofins delivering, Enthalpy working on completing their CEDEN EDD, AXYS estimating mid to late January for results, and CCSF's results trickling in. Don is expected to present the results at the next meeting.

Tasks due before the next TRC meeting include the North Bay Selenium Clam and Water Report, the 2023 QAPP Update, the 2021 QA Summary, the Microplastics Strategy Update, the NTA Sediment Data Manuscript and Fact Sheet, the PFAS in Archived Sport Fish Manuscript, and the CECs in Urban Stormwater.

Action Item:

- Share revised draft of margins report after reanalysis (Don Yee, December 12, 2023)

12. Discussion: Plan Agenda Items for Future Meetings (03:09:40)

The group will reconfirm the TRC in March and the group will continue to ensure coordination of special studies, and provide planning guidance for groups. The lab

comparison results report will be shared. The TRC requested updates on the new watershed modeler and decisions about the possibility of a PFAS workgroup.

The discussion then shifted to decision-making on the thawed samples. The loss of samples and its significance were debated, with a potential 20% loss mentioned. The need for documentation of the decision and its justification was emphasized. The importance of clarity and transparency in handling missing data points, especially given the rarity of such occurrences, was underscored.

13. Discussion: Plus/Delta

Overall, the group commended Jay and Amy on the efficient meeting. The TRC particularly appreciated the RMP's sustained efforts on S&T monitoring. In-person attendees noted the eggnog was particularly delicious this year and that the TRC could make an interesting podcast.