



Bay RMP Steering Committee Meeting

April 26, 2023

San Francisco Estuary Institute

Meeting Summary

Attendees

SC Member	Affiliation	Representing	Present
Eric Dunlavey	City of San Jose	POTW-Large	Y
Amanda Roa	Delta Diablo	POTW-Small	Y
Karin North**	City of Palo Alto	POTW-Medium	Y
Adam Olivieri	BAMSC / EOA, Inc.	Stormwater	Y
John Coleman	Bay Planning Coalition	Dredgers	N
Tessa Beach	US Army Corps of Engineers	USACE	N
Tom Mumley*	SF Bay Regional WQCB	Water Board	Y
Maureen Dunn	Chevron	Refineries	Y

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

Staff and Others:

- Jay Davis, SFEI
- Amy Kleckner, SFEI
- Martin Trinh, SFEI
- Jen Hunt, SFEI
- Melissa Foley, SFEI
- Kelly Moran, SFEI
- Luisa Valiela, EPA
- Xavier Fernandez, SFBRWQCB

1. Introductions and Review Goals for the Meeting

Tom Mumley began the meeting with a brief round of introductions and then reviewed the day's agenda. Key agenda items included presentations on CECs in stormwater, discussion on upcoming prey fish work, a new proposed process for accumulated MMP funds, strategy updates, and ongoing workgroup processes. Updating the list of projects available for SEP funding has been added to the agenda as a standing item.

2. Summary from SC Meeting on January 25, 2022; Confirm Dates for Future Meetings

Tom Mumley asked the group for any final comments on the previous meeting's summary. Receiving no comments, he continued to confirm the dates for upcoming meetings. The SC meeting was confirmed for August 10, 2023, and the proposed date for the Multi-Year Planning (MYP)/SC meeting was approved for November 1, 2023. The Technical Review Committee (TRC) will meet on June 20, 2023 and September 19, 2023.

The RMP Annual Meeting has been confirmed for October 12, 2023. Melissa Foley previously confirmed the David Brower Center was available and that SFEI has a hold on that date.

Action Item:

- Send out calendar invitations for the November 1, 2023 SC meeting (Martin Trinh, May 1, 2023)

Decision:

- Karin North motioned to approve the meeting summary. Eric Dunlavey seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

3. Information: TRC Meeting Summary

Jay Davis provided an overview of the previous Technical Review Committee meeting. Xavier Fernandez summarized the recently updated 303(d) list with an integrated report set to be released for Region 2. Xavier reported there would be 14 new listings for indicator bacteria in the Bay, with four listings being driven by shellfish harvesting use. Other notable items have been listed as Category 3 ("watch list") due to insufficient data, but beneficial uses are potentially threatened. Temperature, ocean acidification, and microplastics are being considered. Tom Mumley added that there is a significant step change in the level of effort going into the integrated report and outgrowth of legal challenges. The 303(d) list is combined with the 305(b) report to generate an integrated

report. Kevin Lunde and Tom weighed in on the state recommendations as staff in Sacramento wanted to list the Bay as impaired by microplastics using preliminary data from RMP. Richard Looker and Tom weighed in strongly about data and threshold manipulation. Microplastics were instead moved to the watchlist, indicating that that standards may not be met, but regulatory bodies need more data before making any decisions. However, the Committee emphasized that the RMP should consider standard methods or available thresholds as well as how third parties will interpret and manipulate RMP data. Karin North noted that having voluntary POTW participants in Northern California is strongly preferred to the situation in Southern California where POTWs are required to participate. Luisa Valiela added that microplastics should be primarily handled by OPC and the RMP should develop more strategy over the next 3-5 years as the Bay should not be the first region listed. The Bay has just wrapped up its 2024 round for 303(d) and will be up for consideration again in 2030. Karin suggested inviting regulators such as Erica Kalve (senior leading effort at state board) to future conversations, with Tom adding it is inevitable that there will be big pushes to add a listing for PFAS.

Alicia Gilbreath of SFEI gave the TRC an update on this year's historic wet season sampling. To date, this year has recorded 154% of the normal rainfall and currently ranks as one of the top five wettest wet seasons in San Francisco's rainfall record. This is in stark contrast to the drought-like conditions of the previous years. This has allowed the stormwater team to obtain samples for a variety of efforts for both legacy and emerging contaminants for both the Water Board and EPA.

Amy Kleckner proceeded to give an update on the S&T monitoring occurring in the past year as well as in the upcoming year. She began by reviewing the timing of the various S&T efforts with wet season water sampling ongoing between October and April, dry season water along with Bay sediment by SFEI and AMS between July-September, near-field prey fish and sediment along with margins sediment with Moss Landing Marine Labs in August, and marine mammals with the Marine Mammal Center beginning now through September.

Jay expanded on the near-field sediment and prey fish pilot effort. Currently 12 stations have been budgeted for sediment and fish, which will be sampled concurrently by Marco Sigala. The effort will focus on areas where there is an overlap with near-field wet season water, PCB PMU, and sport fish sampling. At the December meeting, the TRC discussed adding the airport stations. The effort will collect Mississippi silverside or topsmelt as primary indicator species at 12 stations with three composites per station for PFAS analysis. Samples will be archived for potential analysis of other contaminants (e.g., bisphenols, OPEs, other CECs, PCBs). The original draft had a budget in the MYP of \$120K. Following more detailed planning, Jay requested an additional \$31K to

fund the inclusion of staghorn sculpin collection at nine stations (1 composite per station, totaling \$19K, with other additional costs of \$12K). Sculpin had the highest levels of PFAS in a previous prey fish pilot study. An additional request of \$7K was made for analysis of PCBs at PMU stations in San Leandro Bay, which covers an element of the PCB multi-year plan. The TRC approved of this adjusted scope.

Amy concluded her section by reporting that the S&T Design Report currently had a draft in review. Following final advisor comments, a final draft is expected to be delivered in June 2023.

Don Yee reviewed the 2020 North Bay Margins Sediment results. Overall, observations somewhat followed expectations for legacy contaminants. Margins concentrations were highest in the Central Bay followed by the South and North Bays respectively. For the upcoming round of sampling, Don described the plan for S&T sampling at 12 targeted “near-field” sites at some repeat sites to evaluate trends near known expected sources, often upstream of margins “frame”. The proposed plan for margins sampling calls for 24 stations, including new GRTS sites for discovery and some fixed stations. The proposed plan calls for 17 deep Bay sites sampled for CECs every 5 years (7 historical +10 GRTs random CB/SB/LSB) and 27 sites sampled for CECs and CTR/legacy contaminants every 10 years (possibly 7 historical + 5 GRTS repeat + 15 GRTS random). Jay noted this work had already been included in the budget and redesign report. Tom agreed on keeping margins sampling roughly as planned, and pointed out the need to coordinate with the Wetland Regional Monitoring Program. Luisa Valiela agreed on coordinating with the WRMP and suggested scheduling a meeting with Christina Toms to discuss fixed stations to complement WRMP biological monitoring and fill the sediment contaminant monitoring data gap for the WRMP. Xavier Fernandez supported this action item. The Committee approved of the deep Bay 5 year design (7 historical + 10 GRTS random CB/SB/LSB), and stated that the deep Bay 10 year design can be decided further down the road.

Don presented on the Floating Percentile Method Report. This special study was approved to determine if this method could help characterize dry/dredged sediment material for disposal. There was noise and delays in the PCB data, which undermined its benefits. It will not be used going forward.

Don also presented on the interlaboratory comparison study. Working with Brooks Applied Laboratory (BAL), the RMP compared BAL’s legacy “reductive precipitation” method (1640m) with their new column chelation method (BA-5021) for copper. Through several rounds of intercomparisons, Don found a consistent relationship, concluding that the intercomparison could end. The TRC agreed, but asked

for follow up with Richard Looker. Opportunities for a 2023 PFAS intercomparison study was also discussed.

For Status & Trends, the TRC agreed to pilot a study to consider the inclusion of marine mammals into the program, working with the Marine Mammal Center for opportunistic sampling. ECWG experts expressed concern about cost effectiveness and representativeness for animals (collecting dead, possibly sick animals). Becky clarified for Luisa that necropsies will be conducted that may establish the cause of death, with special attention to immune function. Tom cautioned this would be a difficult matrix to take on and the effort will be closely observed by the ECWG. Eric noted that the advisors supported this effort but emphasized that parties should exercise caution in interpreting the data. The Committee emphasized that the additional collection of fish should be a standard aspect of S&T, always collecting more samples for the archive if possible.

Revisions to the scope and budget of the near field sediment and prey fish pilot effort will be discussed in a later agenda item.

Action Item:

- Plan ahead to be proactive for microplastic consideration for 2030 303(d) list - discuss at MYP Workshop (Jay Davis)

4. Information: RMP Financial Update for 2023 Quarter 1

Melissa Foley opened this item by updating the committee on WQIF Destination Clean Bay. The method used by the RMP to calculate was incorrect, as the federal approved rate is lower than the RMP labor rate. However, changing match throughout the course of the project is allowed. Future S&T activities have been approved as match for the effort, but the RMP will avoid using PFAS projects so they can move forward this year. Tom expressed he was not concerned and appreciated that the RMP can adapt matching contributions which provides flexibility. By design, the RMP should be ready to commit more funds if necessary. Melissa clarified that the RMP is not committing special studies to match at the moment, just S&T. Melissa will stay on the Destination Clean Bay project.

Jay shared with the RMP funding requests from the Sediment Workgroup that were approved via email. \$11K was granted to complete the sediment conceptual model report and \$8.2K to complete the effort of developing the Sediment and Modeling workplan and for updating management questions 3-5. These funds, totaling \$19.2K will come from Undesignated Funds.

Jen Hunt provided the regular financial update for Q1 of 2023. For 2023, 12% of funds have been expended on the year, with invoices being sent out now. The 2023 deficit is \$20K and will be balanced by balances in tasks 1-5 and SEP funds. Jen clarified that the RMP operates on the calendar year while POTW operate on the financial year. However, the RMP does not collect fees in advance. Karin offered to help Jen contact BACWA, with Jen noting that the RMP contact list has recently been updated. The 2022 budget has been 72% expended, with 98% of invoiced fees collected. There is a surplus of \$30k that has been reduced from \$138k in the previous quarter after funding for various projects was approved by the SC. Many subtasks within Tasks 1-5 have been closed. For 2021, 83% of funds have been expended with 99% of invoiced fees collected. For 2020, 93% of the budget has been expended and 100% of fees have been collected. For years 2019 and 2018, both years have had 99% of the budget expended and all fees collected. Jen reported earnings of \$24.2k (2.07% rate) from the Q4 LAIF interest. Jen showed the summary of unbudgeted funds and noted the set-aside funds had been steady in recent quarters. The S&T set aside funds and budget chart has been updated through 2028. The S&T will be withdrawing \$300k in 2023 and contributing \$500k in 2025 and \$25k in 2026. By 2028, there will be a balance of \$1.039 million. There were no requests for encumbrances this quarter.

Jen provided an update on the Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) used to manage RMP funds. The LAIF is part of the Pooled Money Investment Account and as of Feb 2023, there is ~ \$5M of RMP funds in the LAIF account. The RMP's current bank is First Republic Bank and it now will keep all balances below the FDIC insured limit. Due to recent bank volatility, the RMP has investigated more about the LAIF account. According to the CA State Treasurer, funds are safe and \$27B invested in LAIF including from the State of CA General Fund. The LAIF prioritizes safety and liquidity over yields and the RMP's funds appear to be safe but are not guaranteed. Jen clarified that the RMP move funds between the LAIF to First Republic to pay bills.

Action Item:

- Let the SC know the final version of matching fund assignments (Melissa Foley)
- Check on whether the \$100K for CECs starts in 2023 or 2024 (Jen Trudeau)

5. Decision: Pursuing WQIF Funding in 2023

Jay introduced the item by asking Luisa to share more about the new pot of funding available from the EPA. Luisa announced that the WQIF will be sizable again this year: \$30 million for new proposals. The RFA will be released in May and be open for two months.

Jay shared that SFEI is going through a process across programs to consider whether it will submit proposals for this round, as SFEI is currently involved in multiple WQIF efforts. As such, there is limited labor capacity. However, Kelly Moran and Becky Sutton of the ECWG have brought together a proposal they would like to submit for funding this year. The first aspect of this project is the development of a stormwater PFAS monitoring program. Acquiring these funds would allow the RMP to accelerate its monitoring work and collect as many samples as possible, at a much higher rate than previously possible. This would really accelerate current PFAS work. Additionally, the RMP's scope does not extend all the way to product research, but this grant would allow the RMP to work from the product side down. The Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC)'s Safer Consumer Program is the primary way the State has to address PFAS in products that are associated with either urban runoff or wastewater pollution. Anne-Cooper Doherty told Kelly that PFAS is one of their priorities and there is a strong need to identify the products they should be focusing on to best protect water quality. DTSC is interested in a potential partnership to find this information, enabling the RMP to access their proprietary databases. Otherwise, it would normally be beyond the RMP's financial means to obtain the licenses necessary to access this data. DTSC's ability to do structured queries would allow them to compile and share information with us on chemical content for some classes and sales databases for the Bay Area. DTSC is going to put out a work plan in 2024 so this effort would aim towards their 2027 work plan. The ultimate goal is to produce actionable information to support their decision-making on selecting the products that would be the biggest priorities to protect water quality with the knowledge that they have both PFAS and water quality protection as priorities. The RMP would look for chemical markers in the monitoring data based on the products and locations identified. After conversations with Eric Dunlavey and Mary Cousins, Kelly could entertain the addition of wastewater, as DPR's work in sewers along with past RMP efforts with BACWA show that there are great opportunities to link specific uses and sources. Kelly reiterated that PFAS has been identified as the highest priority of a number of state agencies. This would be a helpful financial supplement to major RMP focus areas and SFEI has capacity to support this work, with the addition of two new hires. Tom noted that availability is not guaranteed but expressed support. Luisa clarified the matching rules; there will be a 50% match, but the RMP cannot match with federal funds. However, equipment, staff time, and contracts are all eligible for match. Luisa inquired if there was any connection to drinking water as drinking water has been the highest priority for the EPA, with most efforts aimed to support the establishment of a methodology and regulatory framework. Kelly stated that the RMP was downstream of drinking water, but the PFAS concentration in RO concentrate is a real issue affecting the potable reuse of wastewater. This also applied to potable reuse of stormwater, urban runoff, and groundwater infiltration. She emphasized this would be

an urban-focused project. Tom stated that the Water Board is responsible for groundwater and cautioned the group about scope creep, questioning how far upstream the RMP should go. He supports this proposal and appreciates Kelly's conversations with Anne-Cooper. Kelly clarified this process would be entirely upstream of the Bay, with the goal of identifying sources possibly through land use or chemical correlations to allow DTSC to identify classes to potentially regulate. Tom asked Kelly to consider adding more analytes in addition to PFAS to look for other factors that may help enhance our understanding. Kelly noted it is possible the RMP might have to develop PFAS specific samplers to work with DTSC's timeline, but does see a way that securing this grant would allow the RMP to add other contaminants in the future. The funds would coincide with the RMP's 2024 funding, which would allow the RMP to augment any study. Luisa and the rest of the group expressed support for the project. Tom noted that there are data that exceed forthcoming PFAS thresholds and that some listings could occur.

Tom noted there was much to be done in the world of sediment (first order conceptual model) and could easily champion the need for meeting sediment data gap study needs. The Committee advised the RMP to be proactive rather than reactive, and plan in advance in case WQIF continues to be funded well. Luisa expects the program funding level to stay level at \$50 million for a while. Luisa hopes to fund science proposals as contracts, while community projects may still be competitive.

Action Item:

- Submit draft proposal to SC for review via email (Kelly Moran, June 30, 2023)
- Plan ahead to be proactive for WQIF in 2024 and beyond - discuss at MYP Workshop (Jay Davis)

Decision:

- Karin North motioned to approve the plan to submit the WQIF proposal to the EPA and use RMP funds as match (piggybacking other analytes if possible). Eric Dunlavey seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

6. Decision: Stormwater CEC Groundwork Project Budget and Scope Revision

Jay introduced the need for a revision of the budget and scope of the Stormwater CEC Groundwork Project. Kelly Moran of SFEI had been working with a small team of stakeholders and science advisors to adjust the scope of the project. Kelly clarified that the initial proposal was written as a placeholder so the first task had already been to revise the scope and budget. The total budget has not changed, but funds have

been shifted around. Kelly shared that, due to the USGS developing their sampler slowly and going in a different direction, SFEI had to spend more money on developing a remote sampler that fit the needs of the ECWG in addition to issues looking for parts and components. Additionally, there were over 200 flow-gauged sites that fit the criteria of the study, which will be investigated more by science advisors and stakeholders and will require more funds. To accommodate these additions, the modeling work will be moved to next year, but monitoring funds should be available for early release. Tom noted early release of funds was historically used for the wet season. However, this project while yet to be funded is a high priority. The contingency funds built into this effort have been exhausted. Karin stated that there is enough in the Undesignated Funds and that this project can be approved in August. A request to adjust the scope and budget was circulated through email thread on March 14 with approvals from Lisa Austin, Steve Corsi, Rob Budd, Jon Butcher, Derek Muir, Miriam Diamond, Anne-Cooper Doherty, and Tom Mumley.

Action Items:

- Consider early release of groundwork project funds at the August SC meeting (Amy Kleckner, August 8, 2023)

Decision:

- Karin North motioned to approve the adjusted scope and budget of the Stormwater CEC Groundwork Project. Adam Olivieri seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

7. Decision: Revised Scope for Prey Fish Component of Status and Trends

Jay presented on the near-field sediment and prey fish pilot effort. Currently 12 stations have been budgeted for sediment and fish, which will be sampled concurrently by Marco Sigala. The effort will focus on areas where there is an overlap with near-field wet season water, PCB PMU, and sport fish sampling. At the December meeting, the TRC discussed adding the airport stations. The effort will collect Mississippi silverside or topsmelt as primary indicator species at 12 stations with three composites per station for PFAS analysis. Samples will be archived for potential analysis of other contaminants (e.g., bisphenols, OPEs, other CECs, PCBs). The original draft had a budget in the MYP of \$120K. Following more detailed planning, Jay requested an additional \$31K to fund the inclusion of staghorn sculpin collection at nine stations (1 composite per station, totaling \$19K, with other additional costs of \$12K). Staghorn sculpin had the highest levels of PFAS in a previous prey fish pilot study. An additional request of \$7K was made for analysis of PCBs at PMU stations in San Leandro Bay, which covers an

element of the PCB multi-year plan). The TRC approved of this adjusted scope. Eric noted the addition of the PCB element saves the RMP \$57K in 2025.

Action Items:

- Allocate \$38k from undesignated funds to Task 3023-06-G (Amy Kleckner, Beth Ebiner)

Decision:

- Eric Dunlavey motioned to approve the adjusted scope and budget of the near-field sediment and prey fish pilot. Karin North seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

8. Break

9. Decision: Process for Consideration of MMP Proposals

Jay introduced this item by identifying the need to standardize the process for considering MMP proposals. Jay proposed that new proposals for MMP funding can go directly to SC but are strongly preferred to be vetted by the TRC first. MMP proposals do not have to be run through workgroups. Tom clarified MMP funds should be used for discrete projects, not just adding funds to complete existing projects.

Action Item:

- Update document for consideration of MMP proposals (Jay Davis, June 15, 2023).

Decision:

- Karin North motioned to approve the revised process for consideration of MMP proposals. Adam Olivieri seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

10. Decision: Updated SEP List

Based on discussion at the January SC meeting, Jay updated the SEP list by removing outdated items and including NMS studies. Workgroup leads provided further edits. The Emerging Contaminants Workgroup (ECWG) removed the PFAS in SF Bay Seals and NTA in South Bay harbor seals projects as they have now been incorporated into the S&T program. The development of bioscreening thresholds for glucocorticoid receptor cell assay has been removed following SCCWRP's launching of an effort on this. Finally, the efficient extraction of endocrine disruptors from sediments from San Francisco Bay was removed as it is no longer a priority for the ECWG. For the

Microplastics Workgroup, the analysis of microplastics in South Bay sediment cores has been removed as it is currently underway as a pro-bono study.

The PCBWG has removed the second survey of PCBs in prey fish in San Leandro Bay as it has been included in the current S&T prey fish effort. Jay noted the addition of the Napa and Sonoma Sediment Loads effort, which was a Special Study proposal put forth in 2023, but not selected. The SPLWG kept the development of a statistical model for trends evaluation, but will change the content of the previously proposed work and get further feedback at the upcoming SPLWG meeting. Tom proposed an ad hoc project that was previously part of the nutrient work. This project would investigate harmful algal blooms in the Bay. This \$252K effort would build on past work done. The Committee voiced support for this effort.

Decision:

- Adam Olivieri motioned to approve the updated SEP list with the addition of the proposed HAB monitoring project. Amanda Roa seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

11. Information: Progress on Workgroup Strategy Updates and Additional Planning Guidance to Workgroups

Jay introduced this agenda item by informing the Committee that it would remain a standing item through the remainder of this year as the RMP workgroups update their respective strategy documents.

The Microplastics workgroup held a strategy meeting on March 14 and held a full WG meeting on Monday, April 10, 2023 where they updated their management questions. Current projects overlapping with other workgroups include the Stormwater monitoring (SPLWG, ECWG), Air monitoring (ECWG) and planned future projects with overlap include stormwater monitoring (SPLWG, ECWG) and air monitoring (ECWG). Additionally, a state plastics monitoring strategy and pilot have been planned so the RMP process can inform state activities.

The Emerging Contaminants team held a workgroup meeting on April 19-20, 2023 and expects to finalize their management questions (particularly question four) at these meetings. Current projects overlapping with other workgroups include the SPL monitoring/modeling, in-Bay model and planned future projects with overlap include SPL monitoring/modeling, in-Bay model, air monitoring. Science and Stakeholder (SST) meetings will help integrate EC and SPL strategy (includes selecting near-term MQs

specific to this effort). Introductory strategy revision chapters were shared with the strategy subgroup in mid-March.

The Sources, Pathways, and Loadings (SPL) team will hold a strategy meeting on April 12 with a core group to update management questions with full workgroup meeting days meeting with ECWG on Apr 20, one day on May 23. Current projects overlapping with other workgroups include the CEC stormwater groundwork (ECWG), IWBMS (PCBWG, ECWG, SedWG, MPWG) and planned future projects with overlap include stormwater M&M, WDM application.

The RMP is developing a Stormwater CECs Approach as a cross-workgroup project between the ECWG and SPLWG to address ECWG management questions and support Status & Trends CECs work. This effort currently uses \$250K-\$300K per year of Special Study funds and is overseen by an external advisory group drawn from ECWG & SPLWG (a Stormwater CECs Stakeholder Science Advisor Team (SST)). Monitoring will be piloted in WY 2024 with near-term priority sub-management questions to guide the Approach being discussed at the ECWG/SPLWG joint meeting on Apr 20 with the goal to obtain feedback and finalize. A project update will also be provided at the joint meeting, with the next SST meeting in summer.

The Sediment Workgroup conducted strategy meetings on January 31, 2023 (Part 1. MQ3-5), February 8, 2023 (MQ 1-2), and March 23, 2023 (Part 2. MQ 3-5). A full workgroup meeting is scheduled for May 11, 2023 where management questions will be updated. Current projects overlapping with other workgroups include the In-Bay model (PCBWG), IWBMS (SPLWG) and planned future projects with overlap include the In-Bay model (PCBWG) and WDM applications (SPLWG). The workgroup is currently focused on developing a sediment monitoring & modeling workplan and updating MQs 3-5. Updating MQ 1-2 was put on hold after the strategy meeting with SC members. The workgroup is still considering adding a 3rd advisor. A draft sediment conceptual model report was shared with the workgroup on March 16.

The PCBWG will meet in the beginning of June. Its management questions are currently updated. Current projects overlapping with other workgroups include the In-Bay model (ECWG, SedWG, Nutrients) and IWBMS (SPLWG). Jay noted most of the PCBWG multi-year plan funding is covered by the WQIF and a SEP.

Jay and Amy provided additional context to the Committee about ongoing selenium efforts. Jay reminded the Committee of a proposal to sample selenium in the fall after a wet winter when clams move to the South Bay, but the Committee indicated that this is not a priority to pursue. Robin Stewart is no longer leading the selenium effort at USGS. Karin noted an internal Palo Alto specific study focused on sampling in creeks.

12. Decision: Approval of Rationale for Workgroup Formation/Deactivation

To open this item, Jay highlighted some of the past inactive RMP workgroups. He presented a list of factors to consider when creating/deactivating workgroups such as:

- Addressing unanswered high priority management questions
- Significant, multi-year body of RMP special study work needing peer review of plans and projects,
- Opportunities to influence other funders via a strategic plan to answer priority Bay questions
- Ensuring high quality peer review of RMP studies
- Making good use of science advisors' time
- Distributing workgroup workload (preventing overload).

He noted past moves such as the separation of the Microplastic and Emerging Contaminant workgroups. However, he emphasized that workgroups will not be created unnecessarily, with staff time and effort in mind. Committee members commented that an overall program review was unnecessary because there is consistent high quality peer review of RMP studies.

Action Item:

- Update document (bullet 2) to say how these review processes make it unnecessary to perform an overall program review of the RMP (Jay Davis, June 1, 2023)

Decision:

- Eric Dunlavey motioned to approve the proposed rationale for workgroup formation/deactivation. Karin North seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

13. Break

14. Discussion: RMP Website Update

Martin Trinh of SFEI provided an update on the RMP website redesign. Following feedback from the SC and TRC, Martin and Tony Hale created a beta version for SC members to review. Martin invited Committee members to provide feedback on text and structural components of the website. Once final feedback has been provided, the new website design will go live. Committee members recommended small tweaks to the current iteration of the design at the meeting, such as grouping calendar events by year

and creating a page for “policies/procedures documents” such as the MMP proposal doc (Agenda Item #9) and the SEP list etc.

Action Items:

- Send email reminders to review the website (best on Thursday afternoons) by the 5/26 deadline (Martin Trinh, May 15, 2023)

Decisions:

- Website will be reviewed by SC after which the new RMP webpages will finalize and launch (Martin Trinh, June 9, 2023)

15. Discussion: Communications

Jay opened discussion to brainstorm ideas for various RMP communication products. In preparation for the upcoming RMP Annual Meeting, the Committee prioritized CECs, nutrients, and a general session for the Annual Meeting sessions. Sediment was also deemed important. There could be two sessions devoted to CECs, with efforts such as the CECs in stormwater screening study, Phase 2 of the BACWA PFAS study, S&T PFAS in fish analysis, and the CEC Strategy revision as possible topics. It was suggested that Amy could give a program update on the RMP, highlighting the wet season sampling effort. This presentation would highlight the flexibility and adaptability of the RMP and could also feature the HAB work. Tom emphasized that a major focus of the talk should be the RMP’s prioritization of CEC monitoring. Tom suggested a presentation on the overall integration of monitoring and modeling within the framework of the WQIF, supporting the RMP’s ability to answer future questions about climate change. He also suggested that the RMP should not be thinking about bacteria or the 303d listing as potential topics. For high profile speakers, Karin suggested someone on the Water Board, and the group supported the idea of Tom presenting a keynote talk given his upcoming retirement. The RMP Update will feature the CECs in stormwater effort.

16. Discussion: Status of RMP Deliverables and Action Items

Amy reviewed the deliverables and action items with the TRC members. The stoplight report for this meeting was recently updated with the 2022 and 2023 deliverables. Amy began by reporting the short-term RMP sample archive purging, Margins Draft Report, Floating Percentile Draft Report, Stormwater Conceptual Model Report - SFEI Contribution #1109 and study design for Special Study: PFAS in Archived Sport Fish had all been recently completed. The Ethoxylated Surfactants in Water report was recently published in the journal Environmental Sciences and Toxicology.

Following with overdue items, she expanded on the PCB In-Bay contaminant modeling report section, for which modeling work began earlier this year with a revised timeline to be developed at PCBWG meeting in June 2023. Sturgeon sampling is currently being conducted for sturgeon selenium monitoring data management. The QA summary report for 2020 S&T activities is nearing completion.

Overdue items scheduled for completion soon include the NB Selenium Clam and Water Data Report (4/30/23), 2020 QA Summary for S&T Activities (3/31/23), and 2021 QA Summary for S&T Activities currently waiting for bird egg data (5/31/23). The CECs stormwater monitoring strategy document has been delayed due to complications in the stormwater groundwork project (2/28/24) while the Sediment Flux Richmond Bridge Data Release will not be moving forward in 2023 as planned due to USGS staffing issues (12/31/24). Tom will speak to the MTC next week.

Projects due before the August SC meeting include final Margins report, the final floating percentile sediment guidelines, the Sunscreen in wastewater technical report, Sediment conceptual model report, S&T QA Reports, North Bay Selenium Report, , and Integrated watershed modeling and monitoring strategy for which a draft is in review and expected to be completed by mid-May.

17. Discussion: Plan Agenda Items for Future Meetings

The main items for the August SC meeting include voting on special study funding, planning the agenda for the MYP workshop, a report on the SFEI financial audit, and Annual Meeting talks. Given the agenda is already full, a technical update from SFEI was deemed optional.

18. Discussion: Plus/Delta

The group commended Amy and SFEI for hosting the hybrid meeting. Both in-person and remote attendees were commended for accommodating the hybrid format and staying flexible. In-person attendees recommended building in more time in the agenda for lunch and other breaks as these breaks can affect meeting efficiency. A point of major emphasis going forward was to ensure that RMP data is not misrepresented and misused by third parties.

Adjourn

About the RMP

RMP ORIGIN AND PURPOSE

In 1992 the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Board passed Resolution No. 92-043 directing the Executive Officer to send a letter to regulated dischargers requiring them to implement a regional multi-media pollutant monitoring program for water quality (RMP) in San Francisco Bay. The Water Board's regulatory authority to require such a program comes from California Water Code Sections 13267, 13383, 13268 and 13385. The Water Board offered to suspend some effluent and local receiving water monitoring requirements for individual discharges to provide cost savings to implement baseline portions of the RMP, although they recognized that additional resources would be necessary. The Resolution also included a provision that the requirement for a RMP be included in discharger permits. The RMP began in 1993, and over ensuing years has been a successful and effective partnership of regulatory agencies and the regulated community.

The goal of the RMP is to collect data and communicate information about water quality in San Francisco Bay in support of management decisions.

This goal is achieved through a cooperative effort of a wide range of regulators, dischargers, scientists, and environmental advocates. This collaboration has fostered the development of a multifaceted, sophisticated, and efficient program that has demonstrated the capacity for considerable adaptation in response to changing management priorities and advances in scientific understanding.

RMP PLANNING

This collaboration and adaptation is achieved through the participation of stakeholders and scientists in frequent committee and workgroup meetings (see Organizational Chart, next page).

The annual planning cycle begins with a workshop in October in which the Steering Committee articulates general priorities among the information needs on water quality topics of concern. In the second quarter of the following year the workgroups and strategy teams forward recommendations for study plans to the Technical Review Committee (TRC). At their June meeting, the TRC combines all of this input into a study plan for the following year that is submitted to the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee then considers this recommendation and makes the final decision on the annual workplan.

In order to fulfill the overarching goal of the RMP, the Program has to be forward-thinking and anticipate what decisions are on the horizon, so that when their time comes, the scientific knowledge needed to inform the decisions is at hand. Consequently, each of the workgroups and teams develops five-year plans for studies to address the highest priority management questions for their subject area. Collectively, the efforts of all these groups represent a substantial body of deliberation and planning.

PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

The purpose of this document is to summarize the key discussion points and outcomes of a workgroup meeting.

Governance Structure for the Regional Monitoring Program for Water Quality in San Francisco Bay

Figure 1. Collaboration and adaptation in the RMP is achieved through the engagement of stakeholders and scientists in frequent committee and workgroup meetings.

