

## Bay RMP Steering Committee Meeting

January 22, 2024

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
- Beth Birmingham, SFEI
- Rebecca Sutton, SFEI
- Diana Lin, SFEI
- Kelly Moran, SFEI
- Luisa Valiela, EPA
- Alicia Chakrabarti, EBMUD
- Xavier Fernandez, SF Bay Regional WQCB

## 1. Introductions and Review Goals for the Meeting (00:00:00)

Following introductions from Steering Committee (SC) members, Tom Mumley briefly reviewed the meeting agenda. Key agenda items include financial updates, project status updates, workgroup strategy updates, an update on the EPA Program Office, and approval of the 2024 Multi-Year Plan and 2024 budget. Tom noted the importance of attendance from John Coleman and the USACE at the upcoming meetings.

## 2. Decision: Approve Meeting Summaries from MYP Workshop and SC Meeting on November 1, 2023; Confirm Dates for Future Meetings (00:04:39)

Tom Mumley asked the group for any final comments on the previous meeting's summary. Amanda Roa noticed there was a typo on page 2 of the Steering Committee summary. Receiving no other comments, he continued to confirm the dates for upcoming meetings. The SC meeting was confirmed for April 15, 2024, and the proposed dates of August 12, 2024 and November 4, 2024 were tentatively approved. The Technical Review Committee (TRC) will meet on March 26, 2024 and June 13, 2024. The RMP Annual Meeting has been confirmed for October 16, 2024.

### **Action Items:**

- Send out calendar invitations for the August 12, 2024 SC meeting (Martin Trinh, February 1, 2024)
- Follow up with John Coleman (BPC) and Tessa Beach (USACE) re: attendance at the next SC meeting (Amy Kleckner, April 15, 2024)

### **Decision:**

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

## 3. Information: TRC Meeting Summary (00:11:30)

The December 7th TRC meeting started off with the usual agenda items. Luisa presented an update on the EPA Program Office, which will also be covered later today in agenda item #10. The discussion mainly focused on the categories or buckets in the draft priority list and how to incorporate climate resiliency and equity into the existing priorities. Luisa shared that these new funds would mostly not be competitive grants and that the funds could be available later in 2024 so readiness is key. The conversation concluded with a discussion about the potential establishment of a PFAS workgroup, which Jay will speak to later.

Amy noted that at the TRC meeting, Chris Sommers raised concern about the increased workload this would bring to the RMP and cautioned the RMP to consider its ability to expand staff capacity to meet this demand. Becky Sutton's initial reaction to the formation of a dedicated PFAS workgroup was hesitant as PFAS is already so integrated into the Emerging Contaminants workgroup. There is already a big PFAS project being funded by the EPA. The group decided that there was no need for a dedicated PFAS workgroup now, but this could be reconsidered in the future if EPA continues to keep a big funding bucket just for PFAS work. Jay noted that preparing for future EPA funds will continue to be a priority topic for the SC today. Tom shared that he had previously had reservations about forming the Microplastic Workgroup but was eventually convinced by burgeoning statewide legislation and funding.

The next agenda item was to review the 2024 workplan with the TRC, and then Jay provided an update on the RMP's watershed modeling. At the time, SFEI was nearing the conclusion of the hiring of a new watershed modeler. That has now happened and Matt Heberger will be starting next month. He will be introduced formally at the next TRC and SC meetings. Additionally, exploring external consultant assistance in alleviating the backlog in projects that have been delayed was also discussed.

Next, Amy provided an update on S&T monitoring activities, starting with an update on the 2023 efforts. Results from the labs are continuing to trickle in. SFEI had a freezer failure over the Thanksgiving holiday weekend that resulted in the 2023 S&T sturgeon tissue samples for Se analysis being compromised. After some discussion, the TRC decided SFEI should no longer analyze those samples. SFEI still has them. Amy had a conversation with Robin Stewart last week and she concurred that the samples more than likely volatilized Se when they thawed out. Tom questioned if the RMP had insurance on these samples and its other samples. Amy shared plans to purchase new freezers and ensure freezer integrity by having temperature alerts and door latches. Jay reiterated how seriously SFEI is taking this with \$10K-100K of samples of samples in house.

As for 2024 S&T efforts, the RMP is hoping to collect our second and final set of water samples this week for the wet season near-field effort. The sport fish and bird egg monitoring efforts are actively in the planning and contracting stages. The marine mammal pilot is continuing as planned.

Jay led a discussion on event-based monitoring. A meeting will be scheduled with a small group including Dave, Richard, Amy, and Jay to start developing plans and matrices for event based monitoring.

Adam Wong, SFEI's Data Services manager, provided an informatics update, starting with datasets that were finalized in 2023. Those included Se in North Bay water and clams, PFAS in archived sport fish, stormwater CECs, ethoxylated surfactants, and North Bay margins samples. Adam noted that some finalized data are not yet public due to ongoing work on manuscripts and reports. He addressed challenges in completing the QA review process especially for multi-year datasets but highlighted Miguel Mendez being brought in to assist with some of the QA/QC as a positive development and his hopes that this will help expedite some QA of the more routine data sets. He also touched on lab timeliness resulting in slower reporting. Adam discussed budget allocations for data management and noted that the team is reserving some funds from 2023 for implementing CEDEN 2.0 which has been delayed but expected to happen in 2024. The Steering Committee weighed in, with Karin North requesting an organization chart to familiarize the SC with the Data Management team. The SC thought this would be a good addition to the website. Tom requested an informatics update from the Data Management team at the next SC meeting as he would like to better understand the challenges they were facing. Amy clarified that some of the delays in releasing data to the public were due to ongoing manuscript preparations.

In the communications update, Jay thanked all for their contributions to the 2023 RMP Update, and we now have hard copies to distribute. Jay also shared a summary of attendee feedback from the Annual meeting, most of which was very positive. The discussion then shifted to planning for the 2024 Pulse with a focus on CECs. The group discussed updating the management section from 2013 and that the updated tiered riskbased framework should be a centerpiece of the 2024 Pulse. Attendees were encouraged to provide additional feedback and the item concluded with a general consensus that the planning was on track.

Amy presented the update on the status of Deliverables and Action Items. Future agenda items requested were updates on the new watershed modeler, interlab comparison results from 2023, and decisions about the possibility of a PFAS workgroup.

**Action Item:**

- Prepare an org chart of SFEI employees that are key players in the RMP for the MYP meeting (Amy Kleckner, August 1, 2024)

#### 4. Information: RMP Financial Update for 2023 Quarter 4 (00:43:00)

Beth Ebner provided the financial update for Q4 of 2023. For 2023, 59% of funds have been expended on the year with 92% of invoiced RMP fees collected. SFEI will do another round of follow up for RMP invoice fees. There is a surplus of \$98k due to \$118,250 in SEP funds supporting part of task 45 Sediment Delivery to Marshes in C&N Bays. For 2022, 82% of funds have been expended on the year with 100% of invoiced RMP fees collected. There is a surplus of \$18k that has been reduced from \$138k in the previous quarter after funding for various projects was approved by the SC. For 2021, 80% of funds have been expended with 99% of invoiced fees collected. The final \$5,504 San Francisco Marina invoice to be paid in Jan 2024. For 2020, 94% of the budget has been expended and 100% of fees have been collected. For 2019, 95% of fees have been expended and all fees collected. For 2018, there is an outstanding Duke invoice outstanding, and the RMP in the process of a QC check to confirm that all associated deliverables have been received. We anticipate being able to unencumber the year next quarter. There are no requests for unencumberances this quarter. The undesignated funds balance has been increasing over the last few quarters and has not changed since the last meeting. The 2023 Q3 total interest at 3.59% was \$55,146. SFEI has not received the interest total for Q4 yet, but the rate has been reported at 4%. The S&T Set Aside fund has not changed since last quarter but will be updated for the next SC meeting. Beth introduced a funding request to complete the Integrated Watershed Modeling and Monitoring Strategy Special Study. The team requires \$10,800 to complete the project. Jay will discuss the request in further detail during agenda item 6.

##### **Action Item:**

- Include/highlight any unallocated MMP funds for the April meeting (Beth Birmingham, April 15, 2024)

#### 5. Information: Review the Status of Incomplete Projects from 2023 and Prior Years (00:53:00)

Amy Kleckner of SFEI provided a review of the status of incomplete projects from 2019 to 2023. Amy noted that incomplete projects also included those that were delayed or overdue. At the December TRC meeting, the TRC decided to forgo the analysis of the sturgeon muscle plug samples collected in 2023 for the 2019 Selenium in sturgeon muscle plug project. The freezer failure in Nov 2023 compromised the samples. The last effort was conducted in 2017. The follow-up had been delayed due to

COVID and complications with CDFW. SFEI has results from 2015, 2016, and 2017. Amy clarified that North Bay Se sampling is on hold this year. Costs to collect sturgeon samples will be higher than when the RMP piggybacked on CDFW and the RMP will take the year to review the data from previous years and reevaluate how best to continue this effort going forward. Future Se tissue analysis will be conducted by USGS. Amy noted the RMP could run the 2023 thawed/compromised samples later if desired - they were not disposed of.

Incomplete projects from 2020 include a report on the North Bay margins sediment sampling. The draft report resulted in a request for re-analyses on some ancillary vs. target analytes. Data Services has been asked to prioritize this timeline. 98% of the budget has been used and it is expected to conclude in March 2024. The Selenium in North Bay clams and water 2019-2020 report draft is currently in review with an expected completion date of March 2024 and has used 100% of its budget.

Incomplete projects from 2021 include the S&T program review report that will be completed in 2024. The draft is currently under review, waiting on comments from Tom Grieb. 63% of the budget has been used. The QA Summary for 2021 S&T Activities report is waiting on ancillary data to be QA'd by Data Services. Miguel Mendez of SFEI has been recruited to help with this effort and it is expected to be completed by March 2024. The draft report on the Impact of Remediation Actions on San Leandro Bay Recovery from PCB Contamination has completed internal review with Stanford leading revisions and is expected after PCBWG review in February, with a final report in April. The Integrated Watershed Modeling and Monitoring Implementation Strategy report is in progress and expected to be completed in April 2024. The CECs in Urban Stormwater manuscript and management summary is waiting on revisions from one partner and will be distributed for external review by the end of January. The management summary will be delivered after manuscript submission. The Nutrients Light Attenuation and moored sensors technical memo is expected to be completed in summer 2024. Enhancements to the DMMO database are being made, with templates being expected by the end of January. One of the Data Services team will be out on leave for 1.5 months so completion is expected at the end of the summer.

For 2022, the QA Summary for 2022 S&T Activities is awaiting the analysis of bird egg samples and is expected to be completed by Summer 2024. The Stormwater Monitoring Strategy for CECs has been delayed as it requires insights from ongoing modeling and data science special studies that have been delayed due to Tan's departure. The timeline for the Ethoxylated Surfactants in Ambient Water, Margin Sediment, and Wastewater report has been revised due to delays from the analytical laboratory to analyze remaining sediment and wastewater samples with final laboratory

results expected by the end of spring 2024. The May 2024 completion date for the PCB In-Bay Contaminant Modeling (SLB) was approved by the PCBWG in June 2023. The DMMO Database enhancements have been delayed to December 2024 as it waits on the 2021 enhancements. Lester is working on the Advanced Data Analysis update for the STLS WY21 POC Recon Monitoring. The WB and BAMSC are interested in providing input but time is needed to coordinate that effort which should wrap up by March 2024. A draft has been sent out for external review of the CEC Modeling Exploration Report, comments are requested by January 31, 2024. Finally, for 2022, Jessie Lacey and Karen Thorne at USGS are working on the report on Sediment Delivery to Marshes in Central and North Bay and are expected to complete the report in September 2024.

For 2023, the spreadsheet of results for the Nontargeted Data Mining project is in process and we anticipate including a summary of core findings in the CECs strategy document. It should conclude in the summer of 2024. The PFAS in Archived Sport Fish Draft manuscript is being finalized for submission in March 2024. Samples are still being collected for the STLS WY21 POC Recon Monitoring project. The timeline for the STLS Regional Model Development report is currently under revision. Reports on Suspended Sediment in Lower South Bay and Sediment Delivery to Marshes in Central and North Bays are in progress and expected to conclude in Spring and Fall of 2024 respectively. The Sediment Flux to Richmond Bridge data release has been delayed to WY2025 as part of a larger project with the possibility of increased funding from other groups per David Hart of USGS. The PCBs in Sediment and Fish SS/RC report is in progress and expected to conclude in Fall 2024 with fish data coming in slowly from AXYS.

For incomplete SEP projects, the North Bay Selenium Clam and Water draft report is in review and the data release is complete. Additional funding from NSF increased the scope of the QACs in Bay Area Wastewater report. The ECWG agreed to the suggested revised due dates of August 2024 for the deliverables so that the additional data can be included. The MTC Bay Area Land Use Update is still waiting for MTC to release data. Lester McKee has replaced Tan Zi as the lead author for the Integrated Watershed-Bay Modeling Strategy but the draft report is in progress and is expected to be completed in Summer 2024. The Regional Watershed Spreadsheet Model update is waiting on the land use update (Winter 2023). Jessie Lacey and Karen Thorne have presented the Sediment Deposition on South Bay Marsh (Whales Tail) draft report to the USGS to review which should be completed in January. Reports on PFAS and Chlorinated Paraffins in Bay Sediment and High Speed Mapping of Water Quality Parameters on the Eastern Shoal of SSFB are ongoing and expected to be completed in Spring and Summer of 2025 respectively. The technical report for the San Francisco Bay Sediment Transport and Fate Modeling is ongoing and is expected to complete in Fall 2025.

Revisions are being made to the PFAS in Archived Sport Fish manuscript and is expected to be completed in April 2024. The Analysis and Reporting of NTA Sediment Data Manuscript & Fact Sheet is also in preparation for April 2024. The Data Release and Technical Report for Investigating HABs in San Francisco Bay is ongoing and expected to be completed in Summer 2026. Finally, the Temporal Variability in Sediment Delivery to a North and Central San Francisco Bay Salt Marsh data release and final report are ongoing and expected to be completed by Spring 2025.

The Committee expressed approval of the timelines presented. Tom expressed doubt that the DMMO database will be updated. He questioned the value of these updates to the RMP and inquired as to why the RMP was funding this. In the future, the Committee advised Amy to not include projects that are not completed but on target to finish on schedule. The total budget (and changes) can be included, along with if there are any funding sources feeding into the project other than the RMP funds. Ongoing projects can be in an abbreviated list at the end.

**Action Items:**

- Develop a timeline/plan for 2025 Se to present to the TRC and SC (Amy Kleckner, March 15, 2024)
- Offline conversation to include Tom, Tony, Luisa and Caitlyn S., re: next steps in moving along MTC land use data layer update. (Amy Kleckner, March 15, 2024)
- Talk to Cristina Grosso re: DMMO database enhancements (Amy Kleckner, April 1, 2024)

## 6. Decision: Funding Request to Complete Integrated Watershed Modeling and Monitoring Strategy Special Study (02:01:40)

Jay Davis introduced the Integrated Watershed Modeling and Monitoring Strategy special study. This project was originally funded in 2021 at \$50K and led by Lester McKee. The RMP is making a request of \$10.8K in additional funds to get this report out for review and finalized. This work is feeding into the Stormwater CECs monitoring approach, developing a modeling plan along the way.

Jay showed the proposed timeline and budget from 2021, following with the revised timeline and budget, with a draft strategy internal review in February 2024, with a workgroup review later. A final strategy will be published in April 2024, followed by stakeholder outreach and presentations. The additional funds required for this total \$10,800.



This is not technically a request for funding because the funding request had already been approved. Amy realized that she had included the \$180k from the undesignated reserve for the remote sampler as revenue in the 2024 budget but forgot to include it as an expense. When the 2024 budget was drafted there was a large surplus. Amy then corrected for the assumed surplus by reducing the S&T reserve fund withdrawal from the forecasted \$650k to \$500k and added the model maintenance project to S&T. This caused the \$180k for the remote samplers to be inadvertently budgeted to S&T. Amy suggested that the most straightforward way to correct this error would be to increase the S&T reserve withdrawal for 2024. Instead of \$500k as it is showing now, the S&T set aside fund withdrawal would be increased to \$680k for 2024.

**Decision:**

- Eric Dunlavey motioned to approve the request for extra funds for the Integrated Watershed Modeling and Monitoring Strategy special study. Amanda Roa seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

**Action Items:**

- Alert Beth to increase the funding for this project using unallocated reserve funds or surplus from that year (Amy Kleckner, February 22, 2024)
- Update MYP and AWP to include the increased withdrawal from the S&T Set Aside. (Amy Kleckner, February 15, 2024)

## 7. Decision: Approve Final Multi Year Plan and Annual Workplan and Budget for 2024 (02:17:05)

Amy requested approval of the 2024 Multi-Year Plan. A draft had been shared last November and feedback from the SC and TRC has been received and incorporated. Latest revisions to the MYP include David Senn's edits to the Nutrient text page and incorporating comments received via email. Proposed revisions and edits for the MYP include updates to the S&T tables and figures to more accurately reflect the set aside funds used in 2024. Proposed revisions and edits for the Annual Workplan include updated revenues to more accurately reflect the set aside funds used in the 2024 workplan and updated expenses to include the remote sampler.

**Decision:**

- Karin North motioned to approve the final Multi-Year Plan and Annual Workplan and Budget for 2024 with the suggested revisions. Eric Dunlavey seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

## 8. Information/Decision: Review Current SEP Proposals List (02:19:15)

Jay began this item by asking the Committee to reaffirm the current SEP list, explaining to the Committee that it is useful for Tom to ensure the list is current and updated. The list is current as it stands.

### **Decision:**

- Karin North motioned to approve the current SEP Proposal List. Adam Olivieri seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all present members.

## 9. Break

## 10. Discussion: EPA Program Office Update (02:24:30) (03:32:45)

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. This moves the program from a strictly competitive grant program to a funding office like the ones established in the Great Lakes and Chesapeake Bay. 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 outlined the difference between appropriation and authorization of the program bill. Luisa highlighted the significant increase in funding, from approximately \$5 million per year to the new 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. This will allow grants to be committed to recipients addressing these priorities in Summer 2024. 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.

However, uncertainties regarding the final federal budget and temporary funding agreements pose challenges, including needing an exception to avoid another competition. Luisa noted the only way to avoid running a competition is to request an exception or exemption. Discussion also delved into the match requirement (75% EPA 25% Organization, which is a reduction in the match expectation) and the implications of multi-year funding for various projects, raising questions about readiness to handle potential funding influxes. Luisa clarified that funds need to be spent by Q2 of the next fiscal year.

The discussion resumed later with a focus on preparing for potential funding increases and ensuring effective allocation of resources. Jay emphasized the need for strategic planning and institutional readiness to manage increased funding effectively, with suggestions for further discussion and planning at upcoming workgroup meetings. Karin and Jay deliberated on the feasibility of scaling up quickly in response to potential increases in funding, highlighting the need for careful planning and coordination. Workgroups will be tasked with thinking how to make the best use of this potential influx of funds. Overall, the discussion underscored the complexities of managing funding changes and the importance of proactive planning and collaboration to maximize the impact of available resources.

## 11. Information: Science Update - In-Bay Modeling of Sediment and Contaminants (02:44:45)

The Science Update on In-Bay Modeling of Sediment and Contaminants, led by Craig Jones and Sam McWilliams, provided key insights into the progress and objectives of the project. The PCB Workgroup's multi-year workplan, with a significant funding boost from the EPA and a SEP, focuses on informing the PCB TMDL process. The modeling team, comprising Integral Consulting and SFEI, discussed their aim to develop a whole-Bay model for PCBs, sediment, and CECs. A draft report on in-Bay modeling is now under review. Sam McWilliams from Integral provided a progress overview, detailing refinements made to the watershed dynamic model to evaluate sediment loads into nine distinct subregions of the San Leandro Bay watershed. He highlighted the refinement of the model to a three-meter resolution for San Leandro Bay, focusing on sediment parameters and model evaluation.

Sam provided an overview of sediment transport modeling, which was the central focus of the work. Craig Jones emphasized the significance of using modeling as a tool

to address management questions, particularly concerning the recovery rate of segments and contaminated sites within the Bay. He underscored the importance of accurate boundary conditions and ongoing collaborative efforts to determine the most suitable methods for defining them. The team aims to use the modeling as a sandbox to explore management decisions, focusing on long-term sediment bed concentrations and the potential impact of management actions on PCB accumulation in the food chain.

Craig also highlighted ongoing work with the Sediment Workgroup to analyze sediment sources and loadings into the Bay, acknowledging the input from experts like Earl Hayter (science advisor for the PCBWG). The presentation moved on to modeling objectives, stressing the importance of developing models aligned with management goals and avoiding unnecessary complexity. The strategic approach aims to inform future monitoring strategies and integrate modeling as one tool among others to address management questions effectively.

Sam then delved into the progress overview, detailing refinements made to the watershed dynamic model to evaluate sediment loads into nine distinct subregions of the San Leandro Bay watershed. These refinements included improvements in grid resolution to capture intertidal regions and marshes more accurately. The model incorporates data on sediment loads from various input points, focusing on silt fractions associated with PCBs due to their dominance in PCB transport.

Sam focused on the northern and northeastern sections of San Leandro Bay, highlighting the distribution of sediment and its correlation with factors like PCB concentration and sediment input from different sources. Sam acknowledged the need for further quantitative analysis but emphasized the ongoing efforts to understand sediment deposition patterns. The presentation illustrated how sediment from different sources, such as San Leandro Creek and Peralta Creek, is distributed throughout San Leandro Bay, impacting areas like Arrowhead Marsh and the airport channel. Craig stated that the model did not account for background sediment at the moment, but will be included later. Jay noted the area by the airport was thought to be an isolated backwater, but may not be the reference area it was originally assumed to be.

Sam discussed using sediment data to estimate PCB transport, suggesting a method to weight tributary inputs based on PCB concentration. He also highlighted temporal trends in sediment deposition, showing how deposition patterns evolve over time and with different input events. Furthermore, the findings have implications for management decisions, including understanding recovery rates after removing sediment sources and sensitivity testing on sediment parameters. Sam addressed questions regarding the

model's ability to handle sediment layers and differentiation between sediment types, indicating ongoing efforts to incorporate such complexities into the model.

Discussion points included sediment deposition patterns, distribution comparisons, and next steps. Xavier asked how this would affect dredgers and sampling requirements for dredging, while Tom raised concerns about funding and project feasibility.

## **12. Break**

## **13. Discussion: Communications (04:04:45)**

Jay announced that there are copies of the RMP Update available. The discussion then shifted to the 2024 Pulse, where CECs (Contaminants of Emerging Concern) will be highlighted, similar to the 2013 edition. Work will begin on an updated guide to CECs in the Bay in early 2024, with additional text added to address Jay's suggestions for improvements. The TRC suggested the inclusion of a sidebar on challenges, followed by risk profiles. Tom volunteered someone at the Water Board to provide some input on the draft. Moreover, there is consideration for dedicating more than one session of the Annual Meeting to CECs, potentially tying it in with Pulse discussions.

## **14. Discussion: Status of RMP Deliverables and Action Items (04:16:30)**

Amy briefly reviewed the status of RMP deliverables and action items, which can be found in further detail in Agenda Item 5.

## **15. Discussion: Plan Agenda Items for Future Meetings (04:22:00)**

Jay and Amy will work with Tom and Karin to plan agenda items for the upcoming SC meeting on April 15, 2024. Items on the Data Services Report, Watershed Modeler update, new Selenium plan, updated S&T plan, and potential EPA funding will be on the docket. Amy noted the April meeting could be shorter if possible, as the Emerging Contaminant Workgroup Meetings will be held on April 16 & 17.

## **16. Discussion: Plus/Delta (04:24:00)**

The group commended the science work being done as well as Amy's work updating the MYP and Annual Workplan. The SC is looking forward to the workgroup season.

ADJOURN