

RMP Steering Committee Meeting

April 21, 2015 San Francisco Estuary Institute

Meeting Summary

Attendees

SC Member	Affiliation	Representing	Present
Jim Ervin	City of San Jose	POTW-Large	Yes
Dan Tafolla	Vallejo Sanitation and Flood Control District	POTW-Small	No
Karin North**	City of Palo Alto	POTW-Medium	Yes
Adam Olivieri	BASMAA / EOA, Inc.	Stormwater	Yes
Peter Carroll	Tesoro Golden Eagle Refinery	Refineries	Yes
John Coleman	Bay Planning Coalition	Dredgers	Yes
Rob Lawrence	US Army Corps of Engineers	USACE	Yes
VACANT		Industry	
David Frandsen	NRG Energy	Cooling Water	Yes
Tom Mumley*	SFB Regional Water Quality Control Board	Water Board	Yes

^{*} Chair, ** Vice Chair

Guests and Staff

- Phil Trowbridge (SFEI)
- Jay Davis (SFEI)
- Jennifer Sun (SFEI)
- Rebecca Sutton (SFEI)
- Don Yee (SFEI)
- Lester McKee (SFEI)
- Mike Connor (EBDA)
- Rich Wilson (CCP)

1. Introductions and Review Agenda

There were no questions regarding the agenda. Karin North and Mike Connor expressed approval of the level of detail and quality of the agenda.

2. Decision: Approve Meeting Summary from January 29, 2015 Steering Committee Meeting

At the January 2015 SC meeting, SFEI was asked to prepare a proposal for the RMP Program Review reserve funds. Phil Trowbridge requested to delay this agenda item to the fall 2015 SC meeting, and the group approved the request. No additional money is being adding to this fund in 2015.

Items for Approval:

Karin North moved that the January 29, 2015 Steering Committee Minutes be approved. Peter Carroll seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously by all present members.

Action Items:

- Post January 29, 2015 SC meeting summary to the website (Jennifer Sun).
- Add an action item to the fall 2015 SC meeting agenda to discuss the RMP Program Review and use of program review funds (Phil Trowbridge)

3. Information: TRC Meeting Summary

Phil Trowbridge gave a brief summary of the TRC Meeting held on March 11, 2015. The TRC endorsed the Bay Margins Sediment Study proposal and STLS workplan for unused funds, and reviewed the State of the Estuary Report, proposed State of the Estuary Conference speakers plan, and RMP charter. Most of these items were on the SC agenda so discussion was limited.

Mike Connor asked if the \$133k in unused stormwater monitoring funds was expected to increase with the continuing drought. Phil Trowbridge indicated that the \$133k includes left over funds from 2014. and Jay Davis indicated that a fair amount of sampling was conducted even under drought conditions.

4. Information: RMP Financial Update for 2015 Quarter 1

2015 RMP Budget Summary

Phil Trowbridge gave a summary of the status of the RMP budget for 2015. This financial memo newly includes a detailed line-item break down of expenditures. The budget is currently on track, and no tasks are over budget.

Mike Connor noted that the next step would be to show the expected expenditure schedule for each line item (similar to a Gantt chart) in Table 1. Peter Carroll suggested adding a column to Table 1 to show the percent complete for each line item, or adding notes to line items that are expected to go over budget.

Phil Trowbridge continued with a brief summary of the over \$1.152 million in carryover funds from 2012-2014 that remains to be spent, as well as items on the consent calendar relating to the status and withdrawal of various reserve funds. Tom Mumley noted that the Undesignated Funds pool is unlikely to

increase in the future, and these funds must be used sustainably over a long term period. Mike Connor suggested adding the monitoring contingency and other set-aside funds to Figure 3 bar graph.

Revenue

Phil Trowbridge provided an update indicating that SFEI will be able to collect outstanding fees from Treasure Island.

The group briefly discussed the collection of outstanding fees from small dredgers. Suggestions for more efficiently and effectively collecting fees from small dredgers included adding fees to property taxes or permits. The group agreed not to continue pursuing currently outstanding small dredgers fees (\$1,100.75) and have a discussion of strategies to collect future small dredgers fees at a future SC meeting.

Action Items:

• Add an agenda item to a future SC meeting to discuss how to efficiently collect fees from small dredgers. (Phil Trowbridge)

5. Decision: Approve Consent Calendar Items

- Request to establish a Monitoring Contingency Set-Aside Fund
- Request to merge various Set-Aside Funds
- Process for requesting Undesignated Funds

No questions regarding the consent calendar items were raised. Peter Carroll expressed appreciation of the level of detail included in the consent calendar item memos (including a purpose, recommendation, and explanation). Mike Connor suggested including meeting minutes on the consent calendar but the group decided to leave approval of the meeting summary as a separate agenda item..

Tom Mumley noted that voting members should recognize that they are obligated to come to meetings informed and ready to vote on consent calendar items.

Items for approval:

- Approve the transfer of \$50,000 unused monitoring contingency funds from the 2014 budget to a
 Designated Set-Aside Fund for Monitoring Contingency. Approve the purpose and process for the
 Monitoring Contingency Fund.
- Approve the merger of Designated Set-Aside Funds for water chemistry (\$110,700), bird egg monitoring (\$50,625), sediment benthos (\$30,900), and sediment toxicity (\$25,750) into a single Designated Set-Aside Fund for Status & Trends Monitoring with a balance of \$217,975.
- Approve process for allocating Undesignated Funds.

John Coleman moved that all three consent calendar items be approved. Karin North seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously by all present members.

Action Items:

- Transfer \$50,000 from the 2014 budget to a Set-Aside Fund for Monitoring Contingency. (Lawrence Leung)
- Merge Set-Aside funds as directed by the SC. (Lawrence Leung)
- Memorialize processes for allocating Monitoring Contingency and Undesignated Funds.
 (Lawrence Leung)

6. Decision: Approve Fee Schedule for Cooling Water Participants for 2016-2018

Tom Mumley outlined the proposed 2016-2018 fees for cooling water participants that were negotiated by the ad hoc subcommittee. The proposal was to reduce the RMP fees for the Pittsburg Power Plant from the current 4% of the RMP budget to 2% in 2016, 1.5% in 2017, 0.5% in 2018, and 0% in 2019 and thereafter, as long as the cooling water discharge from this facility ceases by December 31, 2017.

Items for Approval:

Peter Carroll made a motion to accept the negotiated fee reduction for cooling water participants. John Coleman seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously by all present members.

Phil Trowbridge highlighted the fact that the reduced fees for cooling water were part of a \$333,000 revenue shortfall that is forecast for 2016. The group discussed options for addressing the shortfall. One strategy is to reduce costs by prioritizing projects and spreading the work over a longer time period. Another strategy is to search for new revenue sources.

For cutting costs and prioritizing, the committee recommended asking the workgroups to prioritize special studies based on three different budget projections: 40% budget cut, 20% budget cut, and 0% budget cut. For Emerging Contaminants projects, the workgroup should develop priorities for \$60,000, \$100,000, and \$150,000. For PCB studies where the work is already defined, the workgroup should consider how the work can be phased over a longer time period. Workgroups should do multi-year planning of research projects.

For finding new revenue sources, an ad hoc subcommittee was formed consisting of: Tom Mumley, Adam Olivieri, Peter Carroll, Karin North, and Mike Connor. The group will consider the pros, cons, and viability of a variety of new funding sources and report back the full committee. Possible new revenue sources that were brainstormed at the meeting are listed below:

- Groundwater discharge permits
- State Water Board dedicated funding for SFEI and SCCWRP
- Penalty funds (e.g., fines)
- Prop 1 Funding
- Coastal Commission parcel tax (relevant to testing shoreline environments created using dredged material)
- Shipping fees (relating to any discharge, plumes)
- Revenue from any RB action (wetland permits, monitoring permits. cleanup and abatement orders)

- Increasing rates for industrial dischargers to POTWs
- Legacy marine yards, steel foundries and industrial sites along the edge of the Bay
- Sand mining (discharge of decant water)
- Hazardous waste site monitoring

The group was also in favor of accelerating the effort to recover dredging fees, including an evaluation of why dredgers revenue is decreasing and what it is expected to look like in the future. Tom Mumley warned of tapping funding sources that could expand the scope of the RMP, though most group members expressed interest in aggressively pursuing any and all new revenue sources.

Action Items:

- Convene a SC subcommittee for new revenue options. The group will prepare a position paper describing the pros, cons, and viability of the different revenue options for the July SC meeting. (Phil Trowbridge)
- Accelerate the effort to develop a new algorithm for dredgers fees through the Bay Planning Coalition. (Phil Trowbridge)
- Communicate the 2016 special study budget options to the Workgroups (i.e., prioritize for a 40%, 20%, or 0% cut from the Multi-Year Plan budgets). (Phil Trowbridge)

7. Decision: Approve Proposal for 2015-2016 Bay Margins Sediment Study and Request for \$86,370 of Undesignated Funds

Phil Trowbridge briefly described the proposed budget for the 2015-2016 study, explaining that the requested Undesignated Funds would be replaced in 2016. Don Yee gave a presentation describing the study proposal. The SC provided comments on the study design. Three main concerns arose among SC members regarding the study design:

- 1. Use of historical data will introduce error as the accuracy of the data is unknown. Mike Connor suggested not using historical data in the study because it would introduce uncertainty in the accuracy of the results.
- 2. Sampling of 14 sites along the Marin shoreline is of lower interest than sampling additional sites along the developed East Bay shoreline where PCB concentrations are expected to be higher and more variable. Options for modifying the sampling design included:
 - a. Manually moving 4-5 sites from Marin to Lower South Bay
 - b. Use a stratified design and improve coverage of East Bay margin areas. Weighting would be based on a relatively objective factor such as upland land use type or industrial development.
- 3. The study design and objectives must be motivated by RMP management questions. If margin sediments increase the estimates of the PCB reservoir in the Bay, how will that affect management decisions about stormwater PCB load reductions? How will the resulting data be used to improve management actions?

Several members expressed support for the existing unbiased sampling design, in order to ensure archived samples will be as useful as possible for future issues unrelated to PCBs. Phil Trowbridge noted that a similar discussion at a prior workgroup meeting resulted in a decision against biasing the sampling design. The group ultimately decided that RMP staff should reconsider the unweighted study design, discuss the SC concerns with the TRC subcommittee that has helped to design the study, and report back to the SC with the final design rationale.

Karin North noted that due to budgetary constraints, all future proposals are likely to receive a similar level of elevated scrutiny, and workgroups should take note when preparing proposals for the TRC and SC.

Items for approval:

Peter Carroll made a motion to approve the budget for the Bay Margins Sediment Study and the request for \$86,370 of Undesignated Funds, conditional upon a review of the study design. Jim Ervin seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously by all present members.

Action Items:

- Prepare a document to address the concerns raised by the group about the study design. The workgroup from the TRC that assisted with the study design should review the document before it is distributed to the SC by email. (Don Yee)
- Transfer \$87,370 from Undesignated Funds to the 2015 budget and update the budget tables. (Lawrence Leung)

8. Decision: Approve Workplan for Carryover Funds from the 2014 Stormwater Monitoring Budget

Due to time constraints, Lester McKee did not present an overview of the workplan items. No questions were raised. The workplan had been requested by the SC and had already been endorsed by the STLS Team and TRC.

Items for approval:

Adam Olivieri moved than the workplan for the carryover funds from the 2014 stormwater monitoring budget be approved. Karin North seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously by all present members.

9. Information: Update on the RMP Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CEC) Program

Becky Sutton gave a presentation on recent CEC results and future proposals.

Adam Olivieri recommended pursuing potential funding sources for CEC research from the State Board and Phil Trowbridge indicated that SFEI is keeping its eye on any funding that might be available from the State Board for CECs. Tom Mumley highlighted that the ECWG must engage in long-term budget

planning, including estimates of the budgets required to deal with high-priority emerging contaminants that may arise in the future. Lester McKee commented that the broadscan studies should be recurring, as broadscan techniques improve and new chemicals are released into the environment. There was one question about units on one of the slides.

Action Items:

• Confirm the units for perfluorinated compounds in POTW effluent. (Becky Sutton)

10. Decision: Approve the RMP Charter

Phil Trowbridge presented an overview of four major suggestions for changes to the charter:

- 1. One suggestion was to include overlapping representatives on both the SC and TRC to improve communication between the committees, but was felt to demand too much time of the volunteer committee members. This suggestion was not incorporated in the charter.
- 2. The suggestion to establish chairs for the workgroups was also felt to be unnecessary and was not incorporated in the charter. However, the charter text was updated to clearly describe the process currently used whereby RMP staff develop the agenda package and facilitates the meeting, and a workgroup member facilitates the "closed door" session.
- 3. The division of duties between the RMP and Nutrient Management Strategy (NMS) committees was outlined in greater detail. The RMP approves the total budget allocation for nutrient research but the NMS is independently responsible for deciding which research projects to complete using those funds.
- 4. An NGO seat will be added to the TRC. Criteria to focus what type of organization would be ideal for this seat was added to the charter. Initially, the seat will be offered to Baykeeper. However, if there are any other interested NGOs that meet the criteria in the charter, they can work among themselves to select the representative.

Peter Carroll noted that all new members of committees should receive a copy of the charter for review. John Coleman noted that Appendix B of the Charter should include a timestamp to indicate that the percent of total program cost allocated to the Cooling Water Discharges group was for 2015 only, and would change in future years.

Items for Approval:

John Coleman moved that the RMP charter be approved. Adam Olivieri seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

Action Items:

- Strike "Draft" from the final charter title and update header with the approval date. (Phil Trowbridge)
- Add a review and update of the charter to the annual schedule for SC agenda items. The review should occur at the same meeting at which the SC elects the chair and vice chair. (Phil Trowbridge)
- Post the charter on the RMP website in a prominent location. (Jennifer Sun)
- Distribute the charter in an RMP eNewsletter. (Jay Davis)

11. Discussion: Speakers and Topics for the RMP Annual Meeting and State of the Estuary Conferences

The group discussed ideas for plenary and concurrent session speakers for the State of the Estuary Conference. Speaker and topic suggestions are listed below:

Plenary speaker suggestions:

- Lois Wolk (CA Senate)
- Meredith Williams for the Green Chemistry talk
- Matt Rodriguez (Water Board, spoke at PPIC)
- Tony Atkins
- Felicia Marcus
- Diane Feinstein (Congress is in recess on the day of the conference)
- Tam Doduc

Multiple group members suggested focusing the "water quality in the estuary" session on an economic perspective, which was seen as underemphasized and one that may help identify and justify new funding sources. Suggested topics and speakers included:

Session #1: Water Quality in the Estuary

- Economic impact of water
- Economic value of beneficial uses, including recreation, aesthetics, property values, fisheries -Pacific Coast Fisheries, PMFC
- Broad overview of beneficial uses
- Speaker from the Packard Foundation regarding the economic value of fisheries (Karin North's contact)
- Speaker from the Chesapeake Bay how they are dealing with highlighting/using economic valuation of environmental services
- Speaker from "The Puget Sound Starts Here" campaign marketing, messaging related to economic value
- Burnett Mayor of Carmel
- Dick Luthy
- Jim Hobbs (UC Davis) water quality-organism interaction, though may be covered in other talks

Session #2: Water Quality Infrastructure Planning and Implementation

- SFPUC's Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Plans (reuse of non-potable water) Paula Kehoe
- LA/Riverside stormwater capture
- Recycled Water Beau Goldie or Jim Fiedler, Santa Clara Valley Water District
- Barrier Recycled Water Project Gary Darling
- San Mateo's Green Infrastructure Program Matt Fabry
- Stanford Green Infrastructure using pervious pavers and cisterns in shopping centers

- Sam Liccardo, Mayor of San Jose
- Dublin/San Ramon neighborhood pickup of recycled water Gallagher
- Desalination Bay Area Desalination Project in Phase 3 (suggestion to focus on this project rather than Santa Barbara or Carlsbad)
- Brine concentrate impacts to water quality (salinity, CECs); pros/cons of beneficial reuse
- DPR National Framework George Tchobanoglos (UCD), Jeff Mosher (NWRI)
- DPR Santa Clara Water District
- IPR links to groundwater recharge and surface water augmentation from the state perspective -- Adam Olivieri can recommend a couple speakers
- Implications of declining recycled water discharge (increased reuse) on the Lower South Bay

Other concurrent sessions will focus on: organisms; groundwater, drought, and water conservation; after the drought; integrated flood management; and restoration and species. A BPC conference on September 23 will focus on the Energy-Water Nexus. There will also be a seminar at UCB on the same day on recycled water. The final topics and speakers should not overlap with these or other topics at the SOTEC.

Multiple group members mentioned the need to keep aware of the gender distribution in the final speakers list. The group agreed to return this discussion to the ad-hoc group for additional refinement of the speakers list. Adam Olivieri and John Coleman were willing to be contacted for assistance in brainstorming and reaching out to potential speakers.

Action Items:

• Reconvene RMP subcommittee for conference planning to revise speakers lists. (Phil Trowbridge)

12. Discussion: Status of Deliverables, Action Items, and Upcoming Meetings

Phil Trowbridge briefly explained the status of all overdue deliverables on the RMP Deliverable Stoplight report and most overdue items on the Action Items report. Discussions on specific items are described below:

- Tom Mumley expressed dissatisfaction with the progress on the Nutrients Conceptual Model and Scenario Building Final Report, and indicated that last remaining tasks on the report should be wrapped up soon.
- Tom Mumley requested additional detail in the comments explaining the current status of each item, particularly for overdue items. Additional detail was specifically requested for the STLS Special Studies "Loading Monitoring in Representative Watersheds (WY 2014)" Task. Phil Trowbridge indicated that this report is currently going through the RMP scientific advisory review process with the Sources, Pathways, and Loadings Workgroup, which is an essential process.
- Phil Trowbridge explained that the 2015 S&T bird egg sampling event was mistakenly missed, and will be delayed to winter 2016.
- There was some discussion of outstanding action items for the Water Board and BACWA to discuss the need for continued CTR monitoring in the Bay and in effluent. There may be a way

for the RMP to play a role to perform this monitoring more cost-effectively than individual dischargers. There was general agreement that the Water Board and BACWA should discuss the issue in the next few months.

 Jay Davis presented a brief overview of the status of the Pulse. The draft report is scheduled to be distributed by April 30th, and the formatted version is scheduled to be completed two months afterwards.

Action Items:

- Jay Davis will review the draft Pulse article on Water Quality in 2065 and will share it with collaborators as soon as possible and then with reviewers within the next week after this meeting.
- Work with the RB and BACWA to convene a discussion of CTR monitoring requirements and how the RMP could assist. (Phil Trowbridge)
- Talk with Dave Senn about the deadlines for the Nutrient Conceptual Model report. (Phil Trowbridge)

13. Discussion: Planning Alternative Dates and Agenda Topics for the July and October Steering Committee Meetings.

The group decided to keep the next SC meeting date on July 21, 2015. The following SC meeting data was moved from October 20, 2015 to November 10, 2015.

The group agreed that the Program Update at the July SC meeting should focus on Selenium.

Action Items

• Change the RMP calendar for the fall SC meeting to 11/10/15 and send a new invitation to the SC. (Phil Trowbridge)

14. Discussion: Plus/Delta (Planning agenda topics for July meeting and Discuss Topics for Estuary News)

Jay Davis suggested that the next issue of the Estuary News focus on the CEC broadscan study results and the group agreed.