



Bay RMP Steering Committee Meeting

August 24, 2023

Meeting Summary

Attendees

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

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

Staff and Others

- Warner Chabot - SFEI
- Amy Kleckner - SFEI
- Beth Ebner - SFEI
- Luisa Valiela - EPA Region 9
- Jen Trudeau - SFEI
- Kayli Paterson - SFEI
- Rebecca Sutton - SFEI
- Kelly Moran - SFEI
- Xavier Fernandez - Water Board
- Patrick Walsh - SFEI
- Bella Clemenza DeLuca - SFEI
"woof"

1. Introductions and Review Goals for the Meeting

Tom Mumley called the meeting to order and took a roll call. All Steering Committee members except for John Coleman were present. He reviewed the agenda and recognized some standard issues related to fees and the MOU so that they did not catch members by surprise. They also need to put some attention into planning the Multi-Year Planning Workshop that will be happening this fall, as well as the Annual Meeting. Tom Mumley noted Jay Davis's absence and the unfortunate circumstances that led to his absence, Tom and Amy Kleckner have stepped up to hold this meeting in his absence. With the introductions made and the agenda reviewed, the meeting was called to session.

2. Decision: Approve meeting Summary from SC meeting 4/26/23 (05:38)

The first item was to review the April Steering Committee meeting summary. Tom Mumley asked if anyone had any corrections they wanted to add to the summary, but no one did. Tom Mumley moved to approve the meeting summary from 4/26/23, and Adam Olivieri seconded the motion for approval. All members were in consensus and approved the motion.

After the April meeting notes were approved, Tom Mumley pivoted to talk about the upcoming Steering Committee meeting in November. Tom noted that the next Annual Meeting was October 12, 2023, and the Committee had yet to schedule their meetings for 2024. They will set up the schedule for the 2024 meetings for consideration at the November meeting. Tom proposed having the meetings on the third Wednesday for the months of January, April, July/August, and October/November. Karin North asked to move the meetings from a Wednesday to a Thursday due to her number of planning meetings on Wednesdays. Adam Olivieri also stated that Wednesdays were a tough day for him to schedule a meeting as well. However, Eric Dunlavey had moved most of his standing meetings to Thursday. Adam Olivieri proposed moving the meetings to Mondays. Most members of the Committee said that Mondays could work for them. Tom Mumley noted he had some internal meetings on Monday, but these could be shifted. Amy Kleckner noted moving the meetings to Mondays. However, she also noted that the third Monday in January was MLK day and that many holidays happened or were observed on Mondays. The 4th Monday of January looked like it could be a contender for the meeting, this decision will be postponed until November.

Decisions:

- Tom Mumley motioned to approve the meeting summary from 4/26/23. Adam Olivieri seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members. The meeting summary from the SC meeting on 4/26/23 was approved.

3. Information: TRC Meeting Summary (8:54)

Amy Kleckner gave an update on the most recent TRC meeting and recent and upcoming accomplishments. Tom Mumley noted that he had perfect attendance for all the workgroup meetings and TRC meetings and was able to add input for all the special study project proposals.

4. Information: RMP Financial Update for Q2 (10:43)

Jen Trudeau presented the financial update for all projects since 2018 and the most recent audit. This financial report includes a summary of the surplus/deficit and balances for all projects since 2018. Jen Trudeau mentioned that the budget for 2023 is a \$98K surplus, which was updated from previous information released to the Committee. The expenses for 2023 were on target; 31% has been expended for the year, and 43% of invoices have been received. The surplus of \$98K for 2023 is due to the receipt of SEP funds that were originally going to come from the RMP for \$118,250, so the budget was reduced by this amount for the calendar year 2023. The SEP funds received were to support task 45 Sediment Delivery to Marshes in the C&N Bays. For 2022, 78% of funds have been expended, 98% of 2022 invoices have been received, and they have a surplus of \$18K, which has been reduced over the last few quarters from Steering Committee requests. For 2021, 85% of the budget has been expended, and 99% of invoices have been collected. There have been efforts to complete the invoices; however, they are still working on contacting the San Francisco Marina. Amy Kleckner noted an outstanding invoice with the Water Board and said she had contacted Jazzy and asked if there was someone else she should be contacting. Xavier Fernandez said he would follow up with Jazzy and see what is happening with this outstanding invoice. Tom Mumley noted that the invoice from the San Francisco Marina may be an issue with their internal bureaucracy, and he may have to exert some Water Board power to get them into compliance. For 2020, 93% of the budget has been expended, and 100% of the RMP fees have been collected. For 2019, 95% of the budget has been expended, and all fees have been collected. For 2018, 98% of the budget has been expended, and all fees have been collected. There is one final invoice from 2018, and that should be taken care of quickly then, the rest of the budget can be unencumbered and put into the undesignated reserve.

Jen Trudeau continued with the updated financial resources, summarized the undesignated funds, and noted that the rise in interest rates has been adding to this

pool. Tom Mumley wanted to confirm that the budget surplus of around \$98K has not been acted on, and no formal action for these funds has been proposed yet. He noted that these funds could be allocated to a project that needs attention right now or placed into the undesignated reserve.

Jen Trudeau moved on to talk about SFEI's most recent audit. Jen Trudeau stated that the audit for FY22 has been completed, and they will start the FY23 audit. The auditor is O'Conner and Company. Jen Trudeau noted that SFEI is two entities: SFEI and the Aquatic Science Center. The Aquatic Science Center is a JPA and is a pass-through, it does not have any employees. Karin North stated that she still did not understand the relationship between SFEI and the Aquatic Science Center and why these two entities existed. Jen Trudeau said that because the Aquatic Science Center is a JPA, it is a way for public entities to fund them, and it is a way to contract with state and local entities. Tom Mumley elaborated on this a little further and said that the creation of the Aquatic Science Center made it easier for different state entities to contract with SFEI and pay fees. The auditor noted, for the general audit, that it was a clean opinion, and there were no findings. Since SFEI is over the threshold for federal funds received, a single audit was also performed. The auditor found that accounting methods and finances were solid, the program they tested represented 72% of the federal awards, and they found no issues. Jen noted that the First Republic Bank is SFEI's bank and was going through financial issues. SFEI had above the FDIC insured amount, and the SFEI Board noted that this was something that should be reviewed. The RMP funds were not affected by this as they predominantly live in the LAIF account.

Jen Trudeau noted that the audit took a while to complete, and they will try to complete this quicker as the audit informs their federal rate. She mentioned that they want to speed up the audit process so they are not slowing down the process with the Department of Interior to negotiate their federal rate. Karin North asked for clarification on what the federal rate was and why the process of negotiations was so important. Jen Trudeau explained that when the projects are ongoing, they use a provisional rate, and then once the audit happens, they need to go back over the project finances and add the audited rate set by the Department of Interior. It becomes more challenging to redo the finances with the new rate later. Jen wanted to know if she presented the right level of information or if more was needed. Karin North and Tom Mumley agreed there was enough information, and the audit was performed well and cleanly. Tom Mumley wanted to thank the team for a clean and thorough audit.

5. Information: Update on Fee Schedules and the MOU (42:00)

Before going on to the next topic, Karin North noted that due to the pandemic and team expansions, there are a lot of new people as well as old people who have not interacted that much at SFEI and it might be a good idea at the Annual Meeting to have some sort of introductions or mixer to get to know everyone. Kelly Moran noted that because of COVID, this may not be a feasible option because they can not mandate people to come in person to functions they may feel uncomfortable attending.

Tom Mumley continued the meeting and presented the RMP fees. He wanted to remind everyone of the 3-year scheduled fees; next year, they will have to consider and set the 3-year RMP fees for 2026-2028. He wanted to note the lack of sustainability of the dredger fee schedule. He asked Karin North and Eric Dunlavey if the municipal wastewater side wanted to restructure how the RMP fees were done. They said they did not want to restructure at this time and wanted to continue with the current fee structure. Tom wanted to bring this up to get this process rolling and that this could be something that needs to be worked on in 2024 and will bring this to John Coleman's attention as they plan for future meetings.

Karin North asked Adam Olivieri what the increases should be amongst the different municipalities. Adam noted that the RMP staff tend not to want to change the fee structure, and this keeps being moved around and the discussions delayed. Karin stated that in the archives, there are documents of the increases and progress for Amy Kleckner to look into and be able to justify any changes to the RMP fee structure. Tom Mumley talked about exploring if other parties should be included in the RMP. He noted that some North Bay municipalities are not contributing to the RMP that should be. He noted some future State Board requirements may force these municipalities to contribute to the RMP as new TMDLs and other monitoring requirements are implemented. Other non-traditional municipalities may contribute to the stormwater load that have their own treatment systems, such as universities, transportation entities, parks, etc. Tom Mumley asked if we wanted to consider adding other entities to the RMP, such as these non-traditional municipalities. Other entities that they may want to consider including in the RMP are the potential new discharges associated with advanced wastewater treatment, such as the current project between Palo Alto and Valley Water. They are building a new advanced wastewater treatment plant with reverse osmosis and planning on discharging into the Bay. Would this type of discharge make Valley Water contribute to the RMP based on other loading areas? Tom Mumley wanted to state that there should be a review of entities to include in the RMP. Adam Olivieri asked if Tom Mumley had formally asked the State Board about the TMDL language or requirements, and Tom confirmed that yes, the State Board is

working on TMDLs and other monitoring requirements, and the municipalities are aware of this, and these are being discussed.

Tom Mumley noted the MOU between SFEI and the Water Board should be amended every two years. However, this has not been amended in years. Tom Mumley said this should be put on the to-do list to trigger the Water Board to sign the amendment and update the document. The current amendment covers 2023-2024. A new amendment will need to be arranged in late 2024.

6. Approve Special Studies for 2024 and Review SEP list (59:00)

Before going into the list, Amy Kleckner wanted to address an issue that had come up. In the last TRC meeting, when they were approving the special studies, the strategy funds were not accounted for, and the strategy work needs \$140,000. Tom Mumley noted that the special projects were not rigorously ranked, and it may be difficult to designate what can be knocked off or cut back on as this had already been done on the workgroup level. Tom recommends that the Steering Committee consider the recommendation from the TRC and if funds from the undesignated reserve can be allocated for strategy. Tom Mumley wanted to emphasize that there is this \$140K issue and to carefully review the list of projects and see if something could be cut back on to fill this shortfall. There should be a more formal process for accounting for strategy funds in the future.

Amy Kleckner gave a broad overview of the special studies on the list and reviewed the match funds and the studies' backgrounds. There are 15 special studies proposed by the five workgroups and NMS for a total special studies budget of \$1,628,074. The funding for the special studies comes from core funding (\$1,188,568), alternative monitoring funds (CECs) (\$339,488), and stormwater CEC funds (\$100,000). Tom Mumley asked if we were able to follow up on the CEC stormwater funding. Amy Kleckner said that this funding issue was resolved, and the fees that were collected and invoiced for FY23 were already assumed in the RMP budget, and the same process will be repeated for FY24. Tom Mumley wanted to state that the funds for the CEC stormwater would be available at the beginning of the fiscal year 2023. Tom confirmed with Adam Olivieri that this was the correct information, and Adam confirmed that this was consistent with the stormwater letters that they had received.

Amy Kleckner continued to review the list of special studies and noted the column where they asked for the early release of funds or had a match for the funds for WQIF projects. The stormwater CEC stormwater monitoring has requested an early

release of funds since the water year 2024 starts in October. This will also be part of the proposal for match for the WQIF PFAS proposal. The PFAS synthesis and strategy has also been proposed as match for the WQIF PFAS proposal. The PFAS in Bay Water using TOP Assay leveraging the S&T cruise. The PFAS and nontarget analysis of marine mammal tissues is also proposed for inclusion in the WQIF PFAS proposal as a match. For the CECs, the size distribution of microplastic particles in SF Bay was added to the SEP list. Amy Kleckner summarized the studies and the TRC recommendations for funding.

Tom Mumley wanted to know if action should be taken in this meeting to fund the remote samplers and release funds early for this project. He confirmed with Kelly Moran that the remote sampler funding was critical for the next stormwater cycle. She confirmed that for the project to work, at least some of the funds are needed for the fall/winter of 2023. Funds are needed this year to get the kinks worked out for this sampling season. Tom Mumley stated that the issue of funds being approved would be resolved in the November meeting, and they wanted to know how much Kelly Moran needed right now to get this project going. Kelly Moran stated that half of the proposed budget would be sufficient, with the contingency that the rest would be released in November. Adam Olivieri asked if the project might need more than the proposed funding of \$180,000. Kelly stated that, at this moment, the proposed budget is their best estimate. Tom Mumley asked the Committee if anyone had problems partially funding the stormwater sampler equipment using undesignated funds. Karin North proposed authorizing the estimated amount shown now, which can be revised in November with more information. Adam Olivieri proposed a motion to approve the \$180,000 now as an upper bound with additional information to come this fall and for early release approve \$90,000. Maureen Dunn wanted to clarify that this was just for the cost of the samplers. Kelly Moran confirmed that this is just for the samplers. Adam Olivieri proposed the action item of approving the \$180,000 to purchase remote sampler equipment from the undesignated funds as an upper bound, to be vetted at the November meeting. \$90,000 of the proposed \$180,000 will be released early. Tom Mumley called for the motion to be approved, Eric Dunlavey moved to approve, and Maureen Dunn seconded the motion. The Committee passed the motion to release early funds for the remote sampler.

Tom Mumley motioned to approve the project list as recommended by the TRC, recognizing that the proposed list is \$140,000 short. Karin North approved the motion to approve the project list recommended by the TRC, Amanda Roa seconded the motion, and the list was approved by the Committee.

Amy Kleckner proposed the early release of funds for three projects: the stormwater CECs Monitoring and Modeling, PFAS in Bay Water using TOP, and the Tidal Area Remote Sampler Pilot. Tom Mumley reminded the Committee that they had enough funding buffer to do this, and this kind of early funds release has been done in the past for wet weather monitoring. Adam Olivieri moved to approve the motion, and Karin North seconded the motion. The early release of funds for the proposed projects was approved by the Committee.

Amy Kleckner reviewed the SEP list of projects that have been reviewed and modified based on the workgroup and TRC recommendations. Eric Dunlavey supported the motion to approve the updated list of SEP projects, and Adam Olivieri seconded the motion. The motion was approved by the Committee.

Decisions:

- Tom Mumley called for a motion to approve \$180,000 for the remote sampler equipment purchases from undesignated funds, with \$90,000 to be released early. Eric Dunlavey moved to approve the proposal, and Maureen Dunn seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members. (1:45:14)
- Tom Mumley called for a motion to approve the special studies project list as recommended by the TRC. Karin North moved to approve the list, and Amanda Roa seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members. (1:48:00)
- Adam Olivieri moved to approve the early release of funds for three special studies projects: Stormwater CECs Monitoring and Modeling, PFAS in Bay Water using TOP, and the Tidal Area Remote Sampler Pilot. Karin North seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.
- Eric Dunlavey moved to approve the updated list of SEP project proposals, and Adam Olivieri seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members. (1:53:00)

Action Items:

- Status report on the funding and timeline of the automated stormwater samplers for the Steering Committee at the November meeting. (Kelly Moran, 10/18/2023).
- Allocate early release funds (Beth Ebiner, 9/15/2023)

7. Discussion: Multi-Year Planning Workshop Agenda (2:06:00)

Amy Kleckner gave updates on the workgroups and their progress that happened before August 2023. While reviewing the Sediment Workgroup management questions, Tom Mumley wanted to note that the first two management questions were

grayed out as these focus more on contamination and not sediment movement, and the focus should be on the later management questions. Tom Mumley noted that all the workgroups are making progress, but all have much work still to do. He wanted to note that by November 2023, the workgroups will have an updated multi-year plan/project concept.

For the annual Multi-Year Planning Workshop, Tom Mumley asked Amy Kleckner if they had a set meeting agenda. Amy Kleckner clarified that they have some proposed items from previous agendas and listed possible agenda items for the next meeting. Tom Mumley wanted input on the proposed items and asked if anything of interest could be added to the list. Karin North noted that some time should be put towards inter-regulatory and policy drivers, which should be added to the list of possible agenda items. Karin North asked if Luisa Valiela and Tom Mumley could talk before the meeting to ensure alignment between the State and the EPA. Tom Mumley brought up that in the past, a small group of the TRC and Steering Committee members had met to develop the agenda. He asked the group if anyone wanted to volunteer to help develop the agenda. Adam Olivieri volunteered Chris Sommers (TRC) and himself to help with this effort over email. Luisa Valiela volunteered as well. Karin North wanted it noted that the TRC would be losing two of its reps from BACWA. Karin North proposed an agenda item for recognizing new participants to the RMP. Adam Olivieri asked if RMP staff would meet with members before the meeting, and Amy Kleckner confirmed that it is part of the plan to meet with members before November. Tom Mumley proposed creating a working draft of the updated regulatory drivers for the meeting, he will work with his team and also work with Luisa Valiela. He requested Amy Kleckner to remind him of this item and ask for progress before the November meeting. Luisa Valiela voiced her excitement and commitment to work with Tom Mumley on the new regulatory drivers and for the EPA to help vet this information. She wanted clarification on whether this will be in draft form for the Multi-year meeting and finalized there or if it needs to be finalized before the meeting. Tom Mumley (Water Board) wants to create an updated draft of the regulatory table with Luisa Valiela (EPA) before the stakeholder meeting so they can give their input on the draft and propose revisions before the Multi-year Planning meeting. At the Multi-year Planning meeting, they will agree and finalize the updated draft with input from other committee members.

Action Item:

- Set a meeting for a small group of TRC and Steering Committee members to complete the Multi-year Planning Workshop Agenda: Chris Sommers, Adam Olivieri, and Luisa Valiela (2:11:45) (Amy Kleckner, 10/1/2023)

- Tom Mumley, his team, and Luisa Valiela with the EPA will work together to create a working draft of updated regulatory drivers. (2:15:00) (Tom Mumley, 11/1/2023)

8. Decision: WQIF - Proposal and Use of RMP Funds for Match (2:20:50)

Tom Mumley wanted to clarify that the use of RMP funds for match is the commitment of future year's funds for matching. Amy Kleckner brought up that there are two proposals, in addition to the PFAS proposal, that have requested RMP match funding. Kelly Moran gave an overview of the PFAS WQIF monitoring proposal and how they are working to leverage RMP funds to match the funds they are hoping to obtain from the EPA to understand product sources of PFAS in wastewater and urban runoff. The Department of Toxic Substances Control, which has a consumer products regulatory program, does not have any research funds, and they have a gap in moving forward in PFAS monitoring even though it is a state and federal priority and a pollutant of high concern in the Bay. Kelly Moran reported to the TRC that she had a conversation with the DTSC head of the Safer Consumer Products program and that they are interested in partnering with SFEI for PFAS monitoring in the Bay. BACWA has long been partnered with SFEI regarding PFAS and has offered a substantial match regarding the PFAS monitoring. The bulk of the match is in the first task: Bay PFAS monitoring and load calculations. For task two: product Sources, product-pollution linkages, and solutions, SFEI is seeking funding, and it has been suggested they work with the University of Indiana as they have extensive experience testing products for different kinds of PFAS content. DTSC was really pushing to include task two: product sources, product-pollution linkages, and solutions at a substantial funding level, and now SFEI is looking to fund a postdoc for two years to do that kind of testing. Kelly Moran stated that she is not sure this will work but is optimistic as other chemicals that were thought to be ubiquitous had results for these kinds of studies. There are tasks for data gaps and putting forth a road map for lessons learned to guide future work in this area. DTSC is excited about this project and has provided a substantial match as well as doing product testing themselves to contribute labor and data to the project.

Tom Mumley wanted to know what PFAS analytes will be examined and what will be monitored for this project. Kelly Moran didn't want to rule anything out, and there are a lot of complexities with PFAS and challenges in analyzing the different types of PFAS and how to link them back to their sources. Tom Mumley wanted it known that this project has large DTSC buy-in partly because it will generate data he knows they will use. Adam Olivieri wanted to know if the EPA was not already doing some of the research related to Task 2. Luisa Valiela stated that the EPA is doing some of the research related to Task 2 but not product-related research; it is predominantly

treatment and methodology-related. Kelly Moran wanted it noted that the EPA has a PFAS action plan and supports the implementation of that action plan. Maureen Dunn wanted to know if SFEI will monitor municipal discharges related to Task 1 and wastewater and sewershed monitoring. Kelly Moran answered that BACWA is proposing a substantial match to cover the lab cost proposed with the increased monitoring and sampling. Karin North noted that the municipalities are funding and partnering with SFEI for the robust QA/QC. Amanda Roa noted that they are monitoring effluent and the collection system. Maureen Dunn noted that the refineries do not have PFAS monitoring yet, and this is a blind spot until refinery PFAS monitoring happens. Kelly Moran continued describing the project proposal, summarizing the third task, which involves a significant amount of science communication and collaboration with partners doing similar research in Canada and Europe. They will bring on science advisors who are knowledgeable in this field and fund community partners to do community outreach. Kelly Moran thanked all the agencies and contributors who made this proposal possible.

The total proposed RMP match for the WQIF-PFAS proposal is \$1,079,244. The match comes from two RMP areas: S&T PFAS sampling events in 2024-2026 (water, bird eggs, sportfish, marine mammals) and two special studies (PFAS synthesis and strategy and stormwater CECs). Tom Mumley wanted to know what level of funding detail they needed for the proposal. Amy Kleckner stated that when you adjust for the federal rate, it reduces the value the proposed costs. Lusía Valiela confirmed that the amount of the proposed match has to be exact, and the federal funds will only match the dollar amount proposed, and projects can be overmatched but not under matched as this would make them ineligible for EPA review. Adam Olivieri wanted to make sure that we know where the numbers that make up the \$1,079,244 proposed budget came from and to make sure we have these funds available and know exactly how much each project contributes. Tom Mumley proposed to commit the RMP matching funds for the WQIF-PFAS project. Adam Olivieri moved to approve the proposal, and Amanda Roa seconded this proposal. The proposal was approved by the Committee.

Amy Kleckner reviewed the Sediment Solutions and Beneficial Baylands RMP match funds requests. Tom Mumley wanted clarification because, as he sees it, Sediment Solutions is a 2022 project where funds have already been committed, and the project is underway. Amy Kleckner shared that originally, the plan was for the sediment projects to be used as match funds for Sediment Solutions. It has since been proposed that the match go to the Beneficial Baylands proposal. It should be noted that one of the Bay RMP sediment projects (Temporal Variability in Sediment Delivery to a North & Central SF Bay Salt Marsh \$130k) will likely be completely billed out before the Beneficial Baylands project gets started. The Sediment Workgroup project that would be

in play during the Beneficial Baylands project is a special study: Spatial variability of sediment accretion in San Francisco Bay restorations for \$200k. Karin North proposed supporting Amy Kleckner on the decisions for these match funds and making sure they are thoroughly documented to make sure no double counting is happening. Tom Mumley wanted to note the WRMP does not have funding for sediment monitoring. Adam Olivieri proposed approving the motion for the funding from the two projects listed to be used as match and also directing Amy Kleckner to decide which project gets assigned to the match funds. Eric Dunlavey seconded the motion, and the motion was approved by the Committee.

Action Item:

- Document which WQIF proposal the two RMP sediment projects will be applied to as match and assignment of RMP projects as match for the two proposals (Amy Kleckner, 9/1/2023)

Decisions:

- Commitment of RMP matching funds for the WQIF-PFAS proposal was approved. (2:50:00)
- The designation of the Sediment Solutions/Beneficial Baylands Match funding was approved with the direction that Amy Kleckner is responsible for the decision on how to use the match and to document how the matching funds were utilized. (3:00:00)

9. Break for Lunch

10. Decision: Nutrient Management Strategy WQIF Proposal RMP Match (3:06:00)

Tom Mumley brought up the Nutrient Management Strategy. This would not be the commitment of future dollars but dollars that have already been committed. Eric Dunlavey proposed an action to approve the use of RMP-committed funds to be used as a match for a WQIF proposal for nutrient-related monitoring work. These are already available funds in the RMP. Tom Mumley wanted to know at what level of formality this will undergo. Would he need to sign a letter authorizing the use of funds for match like he did with the other RMP match fund projects? Tom Mumley clarified that for the nutrient project, a proposal has been submitted to do nutrient monitoring above and beyond the scope of what had previously been proposed, and they were asking to get match funds from the RMP. Karin North noted that RMP does not oversee the nutrient-related projects but looks to Eric Dunlavey and Tom Mumley for guidance as they sit on

the NMS committees. Karin North proposed this motion, and Eric Dunlavey seconded the motion, this motion passed the committee.

Action Item:

- Record what RMP funds are being allocated and tracked. (Amy Kleckner, 9/8/2023)

Decisions:

- Approved the use of existing RMP committed funds to be used as a match for the WQIF proposal for nutrient monitoring.
(3:15:00)

11. Decision: Communications (3:16:00)

This part of the meeting focused on the upcoming RMP Annual Meeting. Amy Kleckner presented last year's Annual Meeting agenda and the different sessions that were presented. Amy Kleckner reviewed the list of noteworthy projects completed in the last year that may be possible to present on. Tom Mumley noted that the conceptual understanding of fine sediment transport in the SF Bay project was presented last year but only recently completed. This project will be removed from the list of possible projects to present.

Amy Kleckner showed the draft Annual Meeting agenda that was shared with the TRC. Tom Mumley wanted to know if the bolded items all have speakers associated with their topics, and they have confirmed that they'll be speaking. Amy Kleckner is pretty sure that all the possible speakers have confirmed that they will be speaking but will confirm with Jay. Tom Mumley objects to the changing climate effect on hydrology and water quality presentation being presented. He does not feel that the science behind this presentation is supported enough to be presented at the meeting. He and Karin North proposed other topics to fill the time, such as an extended Q&A session with Tom or structured networking time. Kelly Moran brought up that there is pressure to have topics that may be tangentially related to RMP but are of interest to the public or stakeholders. Climate change is a big topic of interest, and this presentation was proposed by Jay Davis to address these concerns. Karin North noted that Tom Mumley could touch on these topics in his presentation, then they aren't highlighting a speaker that is not directly related to an RMP study, and the agenda should be RMP-specific. Tom Mumley did not need a decision on these concerns at this meeting, but they will revisit it in the future. Tom Mumley approves of the two new topics that have been proposed, the nutrients and sediment presentations. Tom noted that Lester McKee recently completed a tangentially related sediment study about sand, however, he

would not be able to fly in from New Zealand to present the study and, therefore not a good candidate to present at the meeting.

Rebecca Sutton shared that she attended the PFAS in cosmetics presentation by Simona Balan (DTSC), at the most recent ACS conference and was able to give a summary of what this presentation would entail. Tom Mumley was intrigued that Simona Balan had a presentation ready, making her a reasonable candidate to present. Eric Dunlavey noted that her presentation should fit with the Phase 2 BACWA presentation reasonably well. Karin North proposed contacting Simona Balan first and Wendy Linck second to see who would be more interested in presenting. Tom Mumley was also unfamiliar with the Green Science Policy Institute and what kind of work they did. Rebecca Sutton is also unfamiliar with their work but fairly certain they have a presentation regarding PFAS as they had put out a report about it recently. Tom Mumley was hesitant to go forward with the Green Science Policy Institute PFAS presentation as he thinks this may be putting too much focus on PFAS building materials before the evidence has been collected.

Tom Mumley asked for other presentation ideas and Rebecca Sutton mentioned that another talk she suggested was Rob Budd at DPR and their overarching pesticides conceptual model that was presented at ACS. Karin North noted the sunscreen in wastewater study had just been finished, however, Kelly Moran did not think this topic was very exciting. Tom Mumley proposed presenting the bisphenol information, and Rebecca Sutton mentioned that Ezra Miller may be available to present this topic. Kelly Moran proposed the tire particle wash-off load estimate paper, which she could present or Ezra Miller. This presentation is ready to go and has received a good reception at the ACS conference. Karin North believes that the tire presentation would be of interest to many people who are not fully attuned to what the RMP does and it has wide applicability, Eric Dunlavey also thinks this is a good presentation topic. Tom Mumley moves to consider the bisphenol, pesticide, and tire presentations to replace the Green Science Policy Institute presentation. Another idea would be to sacrifice a talk during the meeting for more attendee interaction.

For the RMP Update the feature project will be the stormwater CECs and the updated draft will be distributed for review by the first week of September. Tom Mumley mentioned that in the upcoming CASQA conference, he'll be giving a presentation on the RMP.

Action Item:

- Confirm speakers for the Annual Meeting and finalize agenda (Amy Kleckner/Jay Davis 9/15/2023)

12. Deliverables and Action Items (3:59:11)

Amy Kleckner reviewed the items that have been completed or will be completed soon as well as the deliverables that are overdue or delayed. Tom Mumley asked if Tony Hale could CC him in the communications with MTC Bay area land use updates. Tom Mumley said we may have to reevaluate our selenium efforts based on the issues with these projects.

13. Discussion: Plan Agenda Items for Future Meetings (4:11:10)

Amy Kleckner opened with ideas for the November meeting. Maureen Dunn wanted to know when we talk about the Pulse or any publications, Tom Mumley mentioned that next year a Pulse will be released so they will start the discussions for the next meeting in November. For now, the proposed meeting topics are good enough for the next meeting.

14. Discussion: Plus/Delta (4:13:00)

No committee members or attendees had feedback on the meeting and the meeting was adjourned.