



## SAN FRANCISCO ESTUARY INSTITUTE

4911 Central Avenue, Richmond, CA 94804 • p 510-746-7334 • f 510-746-7300 [www.sfei.org](http://www.sfei.org)

### RMP Steering Committee Meeting

January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2014

San Francisco Estuary Institute

#### Draft Meeting Summary

##### Attendees:

Tom Mumley\*, SFB RWQCB  
 Jim Ervin (City of San Jose)  
 Adam Olivieri, Stormwater  
 (BASMAA/EOA Inc)  
 Karin North\*\*, MediumPOTWs (City of  
 Palo Alto)  
 Dan Tafolla, Small POTWs (Vallejo  
 Sanitation and Flood Control District)  
 Mike Connor (East Bay Dischargers  
 Authority)  
 Peter Carroll, Refineries (Tesoro Golden  
 Eagle Refinery)  
 Bridgette DeShields, Arcadis/WSPA

Meg Sedlak (SFEI)  
 Jay Davis (SFEI)  
 Ellen Willis-Norton (SFEI)  
 Lawrence Leung (SFEI)  
 Jim Kelly (SFEI)  
 Tony Hale (SFEI)  
 \*Chair  
 \*\*Vice-chair

##### Calling-In:

Rob Lawrence, US Army Corps of  
 Engineers

#### I. Approval of Agenda and Minutes [Tom Mumley]

Meg Sedlak reminded the SC that the brochure advertising the SFEI/ASC Executive Director position will be released in the upcoming week (*It is available from SFEI website [http://www.sfei.org/news\\_items/sfei-seeking-executive-director](http://www.sfei.org/news_items/sfei-seeking-executive-director)*). Tom noted there was a mistake in the TRC summary, the USACE transfers \$250,000 per year to USGS for Dave Schoellhamer's work, not CalTrans (*TRC minutes have been revised*).

##### Items to Approve:

Adam Olivieri motioned to approve the previous SC meeting summary. Karin North seconded; Tom Mumley asked if all members were in favor, and the summary was unanimously approved.

#### II. Information: Committee Member Updates [Group]

Adam Olivieri informed the SC that Tom Mumley, Meg Sedlak, and Naomi Feger prepared a summary table that relates the RMP's CEC strategy to the recommendations

from the State's CEC Advisory Panel report. This summary table has been provided to SCCWRP as part of the State-wide CEC planning effort.

### **III. Information: TRC Meeting Summary [Meg Sedlak]**

Meg Sedlak provided an overview of the December TRC meeting, which focused on changes to the Status and Trends (S&T) program to better meet stakeholder and regulatory needs. She shared a table that summarized the proposed changes in monitoring frequency for the S&T analytes. The table is a work in progress and will be discussed further at the March TRC meeting and then brought back to the SC in April. The reduction in the monitoring frequency will save approximately \$100,000 in analytical costs. Meg has not yet calculated the savings for reduced labor (e.g., field work and data management) and subcontractors (e.g., logistics and/or vessel).

Meg then summarized the proposed changes to the S&T program. Mercury and PCBs would continue to be analyzed at the present frequency in sport fish and bird eggs (five-year and three-year cycles, respectively), but the monitoring frequency for the two analytes in water and sediment would be reduced. Selenium, copper, and cyanide would continue to be analyzed biennially in water because there are regulatory drivers. The RMP is considering dropping the analysis of legacy pesticides in tissue and reducing the sampling frequency in water to every eight years. The sampling frequency for toxicity, benthos, and other CTR pollutants in water and sediment would also be reduced to every eight years. Dioxins and furans would be analyzed one more year in sport fish and bird eggs and monitored infrequently in sediment and water.

For CECs, the monitoring frequency would be determined on a case-by-case basis. PBDEs would be monitored biennially; however, significant declines are projected and sampling may eventually be phased out. PFOS will continue to be monitored in biota every sampling round. The RMP is currently examining DPR's pesticide database; based on pesticide use, toxicity, and environmental fate, the ECWG will choose CUPs to recommend for monitoring. Fipronil, ammonia and standard water quality parameters, other metals (in the case where analysis is free), and nonylphenol will continue to be monitored biennially in water. Nonylphenol will also be monitored in bivalve cruises for the near term.

Meg ended her review of the TRC meeting by stating that the funding for USGS continuous monitoring of suspended sediments in water (Dave Schoellhamer) has been reduced to a point where it is not feasible for the group to continue to maintain stations. The May SC meeting will include an agenda item to discuss the implications of the reductions and possible ways to fill the funding gap.

#### *Discussion:*

Mike Connor stated that the changes to the S&T program make sense, but at some point there needs to be a broader discussion about how the S&T program can better address regulatory needs. Mike wondered why we require monitoring for contaminants in discharge that aren't analyzed in the Bay, especially when those analytes are typically non-detects. Tom Mumley replied that he understands what Mike is trying to say, but

there are currently regulatory constraints. Tom added that he is amenable to using the information obtained by the RMP to advocate for a reduction in monitoring of some analytes in discharge if the RMP is monitoring for them in the Bay.

Tom indicated that the reduction in Dave Schoellhamer's funding is critical because the SSC data are important for understanding Bay processes. He maintained that there is a need for more SSC monitoring in the Bay, not less. Meg replied that she will work with Dave to discuss the status of and options for 2015 funding. Mike said it would be useful to increase coordination between agencies that have continuous monitoring stations in the Bay. He suggested a joint IEP/RMP/USGS strategy to address funding possibilities for monitoring stations. Meg replied that Dave Senn is already using the IEP's sensor data from the Delta for nutrient work. Tom agreed that there needs to be communication between monitoring efforts and a discussion of how the funding for beneficial monitoring can remain stable. Meg stated that she will set-up a meeting between Tom, Jay, and her and one of Schoellhamer's bosses up in Sacramento to discuss to the future of the program.

*Action Items:*

1. Meg Sedlak set-up a meeting between Tom, Jay, and her and Schoellhamer's bosses in Sacramento to discuss the future of the program.

**IV. Information/Decision: Status of 2013 Budget [Meg Sedlak, Jay Davis, Lawrence Leung]**

Lawrence sated that about \$1,000 was left in RMP 2011 labor for the Hg Synthesis report. (*The report was finished by the end of January and this has been billed out.*)

For RMP 2012, Allied Defense Recycling (ADR) missed the December payment and the RWQCB staff are reviewing how to proceed. Glen Clove Marina is still working on paying their dredging fee. Approximately \$50,000 remains in the RMP 2012 labor budget for completing the PFC report, modeling activities, and bird egg report. All of the 2012 subcontracts will be completed by the end of June.

For RMP 2013, 90% of the labor budget, 61% of the subcontractor budget, and 77% of the direct costs have been expended. There were two requests outlined in the budget memo including: 1) carryover \$9,077 in the 2013 subcontractor balance to 2014 for nutrients stormwater monitoring and 2) carryover \$15,677 of 2013 direct costs to 2014 for the nutrient sensor task.

Meg informed the SC that some RMP 2013 tasks were over-budget including the Pulse of the Bay and the RMP Website. In 2014, the RMP Website budget increased from \$5,000 to \$10,000 to account for the increase in website activity and updates. Meg indicated that overall the 2013 budget will be balanced because other labor tasks were under-budget such as Program Management and the 2012 Annual Monitoring Results report.

*Items to Approve:*

Adam Olivieri motioned to approve the carryover requests. Karin North seconded; Tom Mumley asked if all members were in favor, and the action was unanimously approved.

*Discussion:*

Tom Mumley informed the group that the Water Board already entered a settlement agreement with ADR and the Board could turn them over to a collection agency for not paying their fees; but if this happens, the RMP would not receive the fees (or penalty). Meg indicated that the \$45,000 is not included in the reserve budget as the funds had not been received.

Tom noted that the 2013 labor budget shows a deficit of \$24,261. Meg replied that the deficit will be covered by tasks she knows are under-budgeted such as Program Management and the 2012 Annual Monitoring Results.

**V. Discussion: Plus-Delta on Pulse and Annual Meeting; RMP Update, Annual Meeting 2014 [Jay Davis]**2013 Pulse Plus/Delta

Jay Davis provided an explanation as to the reasons why the 2013 Pulse was over-budget. Jay stated that the cost increase was a special case because of the format and a number of other extenuating circumstances. Additional printing costs, contractor work, and SFEI labor was incurred.

The format of multiple CEC articles resulted in a greater number of authors. In addition, each article was reviewed by at least two national CEC experts from the ECWG as well as stakeholders resulting in more edits than usual. Additionally, Linda Wanczyk raised the bar on the report's design. Jay estimated that the next Pulse of the Bay, published in 2015, will cost around \$100,000 in SFEI labor. In addition, this year, \$10,000 was spent on automating the generation of the maps that are included in the Pulse each year

Adam Olivieri indicated that he has used it frequently and has distributed it to a variety of groups including lawyers at a law symposium.

*Discussion:*

Mike Connor asked if the 2013 Pulse of the Bay has made a clear impact. Meg Sedlak responded that Meredith Williams and her staff at DTSC have used the report to help determine which chemicals to list for the Safer Consumer Product Program. Jay added that Kelly Moran also referenced the Pulse in meetings with DPR and their establishment of a plan for fipronil.

Tom asked about the Pulse's marketing strategy and wondered if the RMP should present the Pulse before the State Water Board. It was agreed that this would be a good idea. Jim Kelly asked if the Pulse had already been presented to the SFRWQCB. Tom responded that it had not, but a presentation at the Regional Board could be a useful way to prepare for a presentation at the State Board.

Adam stated that the original goal of alternating the production of the Pulse of the Bay and the RMP Update was to reduce costs. He is worried that the combined budgets for the reports are starting to look similar to when an annual Pulse of the Bay was produced. Jim stated that he is sympathetic to budget increases if it is because the quality and number of graphics is increasing. Jay responded that unless the next Pulse of the Bay is another high profile document with the same printing costs, the cost will be less. Tom noted that he is concerned that the Pulse takes up a substantial amount of Jay's time. He supported the use of contractors, including increased input from BACWA, to generate the report.

Jay ended the discussion by stating that for the next Pulse the RMP will be mindful of increasing costs. If the RMP is considering another high profile document, Jay will bring the idea to the SC to be scoped.

#### 2013 RMP Annual Meeting:

Jay reviewed the plus-delta of the 2013 RMP Annual Meeting's integration with the State of the Estuary (SOE) Conference. He stated that the meeting received a considerable amount of media coverage, there was a large audience for the morning plenary, and he received positive feedback on the afternoon RMP session. One delta was the concurrent session format resulted in fewer attendees as the standard RMP Annual Meeting. Meg Sedlak replied that approximately 75 people attended the RMP concurrent session. Tom reasoned that the audience was thin because people who were either familiar with CEC or nutrients work had the opportunity to attend other sessions. Although there was not a typical RMP audience, there was a benefit to integrating with other agencies and other subject areas.

Jay Davis noted that the SOE format did not allow for much discussion between RMP members as prior years. Tom responded that a lot of valuable discussions occurred during the poster session and there was value in being able to interact with non-RMP folks at one meeting. Tom suggested that the RMP could consider an interactive exhibit during the poster session.

Tom asked if the SC wanted to sustain the merge between the RMP Annual Meeting and the SOE Conference. Karin North said that the side conversations and opportunities for partnership are greater at the SOE conference. Additionally, it is a useful venue to inform the scientific community about the RMP. Tony Hale added that another benefit is the increased media attention from joining the two audiences together. Tom and Jay were both in favor of the merger. Tom and Mike recommended surveying the audience during future meetings to see how many attended and how many were RMP participants.

#### 2014 RMP Annual Meeting:

Jay Davis stated that the plan for the 2014 RMP Annual Meeting was to follow a similar format as the 2012 Annual Meeting, which was a general update on the RMP with a focus on a few priority topics. Jay asked the SC whether there should be a focus on a particular program area or if equal time should be given to each program area. Mike

Connor asked if there would be enough information on small tributaries loading to have a focused set of talks on the topic. Adam Olivieri responded that BASMAA is in the middle of finalizing the integrated monitoring reports. Tom Mumley added that there is enough information to present and the knowledge base is growing, but some of the material is beyond the focus of the RMP.

Jay noted that the 2010 RMP Annual Meeting focused on stormwater because the municipal regional permit (MRP) was released in 2009; he suggested a five-year cycle for a focus on stormwater loadings at the Annual Meeting to coincide with the five-year cycle for updating the MRP. Karin North stated that there needs to be a balance between stormwater and wastewater at the meeting to attract both types of RMP participants. Mike suggested that an update of the S&T program might be interesting, with a focus on what the RMP has learned over 20 years and an explanation of why the program is changing. Adam was in favor of focusing on the S&T program with one or two presentations on stormwater. Adam asked if Nancy Denslow could present the results of the bioanalytical tools study. Meg replied that the study will not be finished, but she could present the progress she has made. (*Dr. Denslow has confirmed her availability to speak.*) Jay and Adam will bring possible topics for 2014 RMP Annual Meeting to the SC in May.

Meg Sedlak presented a handout of possible venues and asked which facility the SC would prefer: the California Department of Public Health, the David Brower Center, the Oakland Museum, or the Oakland Marriott. The SC unanimously supported the David Brower Center because of its easy access to BART and the space for lunch interactions. The SC selected October 14th, 2014 as the date for the RMP Annual Meeting. Meg Sedlak will check to see if October 14 is available at the David Brower Center and will then send out a save the date notice. (*Brower Center is available and a Save the Date note has been sent.*)

#### **VI. Decision: Communications Strategy [Jay Davis]**

Jay Davis presented a table summarizing the RMP's external communications plan. Information products include: the Pulse, RMP Update, Annual Monitoring Result, Annual Meeting, Estuary News articles, the RMP web site, and email updates. Additionally, the RMP will occasionally produce fact sheets, workshops, and possibly webinars. Jay noted that SFEI is considering leading the production of the State of the Estuary Report in 2016 and the RMP may want to consider contributing funds. Finally, the Water Quality Monitoring Council has developed the California Estuary Portal, but it is focused on the Delta rather than the Bay.

Tom noted that there needs to be a longer discussion about the RMP's communication plan at the next meeting because the table Jay presented does not provide a sense of the effort or cost of generating the information products. Adam Olivieri added that the table is simply a summary of information products the SC has already approved. He noted that there should be another line item on the table for peer-reviewed publications.

*New SFEI Communication Tools – Tony Hale*

Tony Hale presented SFEI's updated communication strategy to the SC, which is focused on optimization and intensification. To optimize the communication strategy, SFEI is writing a proposal to hire a communications consultant. The consultant will help renew focus on SFEI's brand, convey SFEI's mission effectively, and align communication around the three program areas. Other optimization strategies include re-purposing SFEI's existing communication assets (e.g., putting staff posters on the RMP webpage with interactive graphics) and using new tools to enhance project management communication, such as Google sites, Confluence, and Smartsheet.

Tony reviewed the intensification efforts including increasing engagement, promoting SFEI highlights using multimedia, and using social media to draw new audiences to SFEI's work. Tony suggested that engagement with SFEI's programs can be increased by generating newsletters and e-books. E-books are reports that are published online that have interactive elements. For example, if the Pulse was published as an e-book the reader could download the data presented in a figure or disaggregate the data in a graphic.

*Discussion:*

Tom asked if SFEI's updated communication strategy will directly benefit the RMP. Tony responded that it will because of the assets that are being directed toward the Clean Water program area. Mike Connor asked if Tony could produce the Pulse/ Pulse Lite (RMP Update) as an e-book; Tony responded affirmatively. Mike stated that Tony's presentation is the future of communication efforts, but the budget currently does not support the additional effort. Tom asked Tony to report the cost of creating the RMP Update as an e-book at the May SC meeting. He noted that if an e-book is produced, the amount of hardcopies printed can be reduced.

Tom stated that he would like to know what is going to happen to the material at the Oakland Museum's *Above and Below: Stories from our Changing Bay* exhibit. (SFEI staff has been working with the museum curators to identify and retain materials that the museum does not want. Several of the exhibits will likely come to SFEI to become permanent exhibits at the Institute.)

*Action Items:*

2. Jay Davis will allocate a couple of hours at the May SC meeting to discuss the RMP Communications Plan.
3. Tony Hale will report the cost of creating the RMP Update as an e-book at the May SC meeting.

**VII. Information Process for Review of Documents [Meg Sedlak]**

Meg Sedlak briefly outlined the major points of the memorandum summarizing the review process. Once an RMP report is written it undergoes internal review by the RMP lead scientists; the report is then sent out to the appropriate workgroup for the experts to comment on the science, and also sent to the TRC and the SC. When special study proposals are developed, the proposal specifies whether the deliverable will be a report or a manuscript. The appropriate workgroup helps determine whether a technical report or

manuscript are appropriate. The special study proposal is then sent to the TRC and SC for approval.

*Discussion:*

Adam Olivieri stated that he wanted to make sure the SC had the ability to comment on whether a peer-reviewed manuscript would be a study's deliverable. Meg replied that the SC's opportunity to comment on the product is when the proposals are sent to them for comment. Tom replied that sometimes the choice to write a manuscript is made later in the process and the SC needs to be able to comment before the decision is made. He recommended checking in with the SC at the beginning, middle, and end of a study for which a manuscript is planned to determine if the results are worth publishing.

Adam noted that this agenda item was in response to the SFEI Board's question about the RMP's process for determining whether a peer-reviewed manuscript should be a study's deliverable. The Board also asked if the RMP's process can be applied across all three of SFEI's programs. Meg responded that the process is specific to the RMP because the other programs do not have scientific workgroups that provide peer-review on workplans. In response to a question regarding whether all SFEI staff are able to publish, Meg stated that the RMP is lucky that it has the budget to produce peer-reviewed publications, there are staff members at SFEI that would like to generate manuscripts, but the funding is unavailable and it can be a challenge for these individuals to complete this work at night and on weekends. Adam suggested asking Jim Kelly to let the Board know that the RMP does have a process for deciding whether to publish peer-reviewed articles.

*Action Items:*

4. Jim Kelly will inform the Board that the RMP has a process for reviewing documents and deciding whether to publish peer-reviewed articles.

**VIII. Approval of the Multi-Year Plan [Jay Davis]**

Jay Davis reviewed recent changes to the Multi-Year Plan. One change that still needs to be made includes adding the Nutrients Technical Team and Selenium Strategy Team to Figure 1. Tom Mumley stated that he is cautious about adding the Selenium Strategy Team to the figure because he is not sure how long it will be in existence. Tom added that the Nutrients technical Team will be the same team that is currently being formed to help establish a governance structure for the nutrient management in the Bay. Adam Olivieri asked what the definition of a strategy team; Jay responded that a strategy team is stakeholders and local scientists that meet to establish monitoring priorities. Adam expressed concern with adding strategy teams because there is the expectation that the team needs to meet often even if there is no new information to share. Jay replied that both the strategy teams and workgroups only meet when needed: the workgroups generally meet once or twice a year and the strategy teams may meet several times a year or only once every few years.

The final update to the Multi-Year Plan was the RMP Special Studies budget for 2012-2018. Jay noted that the 2012 through 2014 budget numbers are actual amounts, while



figures for 2015 through 2018 are projected. Tom stated that there should not be a deficit in 2014 if the numbers are actual amounts. Jay replied that the deficit indicates that the RMP spent more money than was available in revenue from 2014 fees, but that there are additional revenue sources such as set-asides. Adam suggested removing the last two rows from the special study budget table for 2012 through 2014 (the “annual total available special studies” and “remaining”) to avoid confusion. The SC agreed with removing the last two rows for 2012 through 2014. Karin North suggested including a footnote stating that funds from the RMP reserve are often transferred to the special studies budget, but the reserve funds are not included in the projected amounts for 2015 through 2018. Tom added that the Multi-Year Plan should state that the special studies budget is allocated based on the annual RMP budget.

*Items to Approve:*

Dan Tafolla motioned to approve the 2014 Multi-Year Plan pending the update to the RMP organizational chart (Figure 1) and the special studies budget table. Karin seconded the motion and the SC unanimously approved the Multi-Year Plan.

*Action Items:*

5. Jay Davis will update to the RMP organizational chart (Figure 1) and the special studies budget table in the 2014 Multi-Year Plan.

**IX. Decision: Developing a Selenium Strategy [Jay Davis]**

Jay Davis began the discussion of developing a Selenium (Se) Strategy, in response to the upcoming North Bay Se TMDL, by stating that there are two levels of effort possible. Option A is forming a strategy team with stakeholders and local and national experts, similar to one of the RMP workgroups. The objective of the effort would be to discuss some of the contentious technical issues and attempt to promote consensus. Another goal of option A would be to identify data gaps and determine if there are any monitoring studies or pilot studies that could be conducted. Option B would include creating a strategy team that does not include national experts and the sole objective would be to identify data gaps, rather than achieve consensus, and focusing on inexpensive additions to existing monitoring elements.

Jay noted that \$25,000 has been allotted in 2014 to create a Se Strategy and he is unsure that Option A is possible with only \$25,000 in funding. To achieve consensus there would need to be funding to run workshops and more multifaceted special studies. Option B is attractive since the data gaps can be identified in a relatively straight-forward manner for approximately \$10,000.

*Discussion:*

Tom Mumley stated that any option A Se special studies would likely take more time to complete than the current decision-making time frame. He was also concerned about the cost and the likelihood of success of the special studies that might be performed. Tom was in support of option B and was interested in developing a strategy that monitors Se to determine if the regulatory Se thresholds are appropriate. Another goal of the option B Se Strategy team is to coordinate with other monitoring programs and efforts, such as the

California Department of Fish and Wildlife's sturgeon sampling. Tom recommended an integrated monitoring approach for North and South Bay, even though the current Se TMDL is for North Bay. He noted that there are still Se impairment listings in South Bay that need to be addressed.

Tom added that he is interested in the consequence of pushing the regulatory threshold to 1 ppb. Mike responded that he would like to see 2 ppb as the threshold and if the number is lower he would like to spend the effort understanding the science. Tom replied that it would take a significant amount of funds to fully understand the science and he does not think special studies would support a particular regulatory threshold. Mike expressed his concern that Se concentrations will rise with increased water recycling; therefore Se levels in discharge will be above 1 ppb. Mike was worried that new Se thresholds will prevent the discharge of effluent into wetlands. Tom responded that the Se TMDL implementation plan will be released in June, but the plan would account for Mike's concerns regarding Se and water recycling efforts. Mike noted that the regulatory threshold will not be approved unless there is buy-in from the EPA and Sam Luoma. Tom replied that if there is no consensus on a reasonable threshold, then the Water Board can organize a scientific panel to facilitate this process.

Bridgette DeShields supported starting with option B (Se Strategy light) with the possibility of forming a more intensive strategy at a later time. Mike Connor wondered if the RMP should wait to form a strategy until later in the process, at least after the formation of the TMDL implementation plan. Jay replied that stakeholders are already asking for Se in sport fish data. Both Peter Carroll and Mike Connor expressed their disagreement with the fish tissue Se threshold. Despite the lack of scientific consensus on regulatory thresholds, there was general support for option B. The first Strategy team meeting will convene in late February or early March. Jay noted that it would be useful for Tom to meet with Sam Luoma before the first Strategy team meeting to discuss these topics.

*Items to Approve:*

Tom motioned to approve the creation of a Se Strategy that focused on solely on monitoring. Jim Ervin seconded the motion, and the Strategy's creation was unanimously approved.

*Action Items:*

6. Tom Mumley will meet with Sam Luoma before the first Strategy team meeting to discuss.
7. Jay Davis, Bridgette DeShields, and Karin North will meet to organize the Se Strategy team meeting.

**X. Action: RMP Sediment Organics: QA Update [Meg Sedlak]**

Meg Sedlak reviewed the results of the pro bono analysis completed by EBMUD to determine why there was a dip in PCB concentrations from 2004 to 2006. Meg stated that there were no routine QA/QC issues were identified by the lab (e.g., issues with certified reference materials (CRMs) or matrix spike (MS) recoveries). EBMUD subsequently

reviewed all of the data and found that the 2004- 2006 samples were analyzed prior to the re-analysis of 2002-2003 samples, which were analyzed alongside the 2010 samples. EBMUD determined that the most likely cause of the change was a more thorough sample-drying methodology implemented in 2007.

Currently, the sediment PCB data for 2004-2006 have been removed from the website (CD3) with a footnote explaining why. Other organics data for that time period (pesticides, PAHs, and PBDEs) were also analyzed by EBMUD using the same sample-drying methodology. A similar dip was observed in the DDT time series, but was not observed for PAHs or PBDEs. EBMUD is planning on reanalyzing the pesticide, PAH, and PBDE data for some extracts within the 2004-2006 time period to determine if the methodology change affected the results. The results should be available in June 2014.

#### **XI. Information: Member Attendance [Meg Sedlak]**

Meg Sedlak reviewed the member attendance tables provided in the SC agenda package. The tables list SC, TRC, and workgroup membership grouped by their affiliation with the regulatory, dredger, NGO, stormwater, wastewater, or industry community. She asked the SC to determine whether there is anyone missing from the tables and let her know which member is the official representative on the committees or workgroup. The SC agreed to email Meg within two weeks with a designated participant and alternate for the committees and workgroups. SC members will also suggest any additional players who may be interested in participating.

#### *Discussion:*

Tom recommended determining who the voting representatives are in case a contentious issue needs to be voted on. Meg replied that the TRC and SC meeting participation sheets indicate who the voting members are. Meg added that there are some data gaps in the membership sheets; for example, for USS-POSCO Dave Allen retired and his replacement, Todd McHugh, has only attended one meeting. Bridgette DeShields was concerned with the lack of participation from the dredging community and non-refinery industry sector. Mike suggested that the data gaps could be filled if RMP staff met with each of the sectors annually (e.g., BACWA, BASMAA, WSPA, etc.). Meg indicated that this was a great idea and she has been working on meeting with each of the sectors. Tom recommended creating a process for how to proceed when a voting member has not attended two meetings in a row.

Peter Carroll asked if there were bylaws for the voting procedure. Meg replied that there were not and Tom stated that it would be useful to codify the procedure. Peter then asked if the USEPA and NGO representatives are voting members of the TRC; Meg replied that USEPA is a voting member on the TRC, but not on the SC. Tom noted that the TRC POTW membership should be differentiated based on the size of the WWTP (small, medium, or large).

Tom wondered if all of the RMP workgroups continue to be relevant; Karin North added that it may be useful to meld some of the workgroups together. Jay responded that given

the RMP's current focus on CECs and Nutrients, some of the workgroups may go dormant and even disband at some point.

*Action Items:*

8. Meg Sedlak will send out a reminder email asking the SC to designate a participant and alternate for the committees and workgroups as well as any additional players who may be interested in participating.
9. Meg Sedlak will codify bylaws that explain the TRC, SC, and workgroup voting procedure.
10. Ellen Willis-Norton will differentiate the TRC membership based on POTW size.

## **XII. Deliverables Update [Meg Sedlak]**

Tom Mumley reviewed all of the RMP deliverables that were listed as red on the scorecard. He noted that the deliverables that are red should change color if the current due date was not met between SC meetings. Jay Davis then reviewed the status of the red deliverables for which he is the lead. The Hg Synthesis and Conceptual Model is completed and the PCB Conceptual Model will be completed in March. Jay explained that the PCB Conceptual Model is delayed because he had a hard time obtaining comments on the draft. Tom noted that an updated strategy for both PCBs and Hg has not been completed. Jay stated that updating the strategies is the next step after completing the reports. Mike Connor asked if there should be a procedure for how to handle outstanding reviewer comments. He recommended setting a date for when a comment should be received and if it is not, moving on in the review process.

Tom asked the status of the broadscan screening of biota study. Meg replied that she doesn't have much leverage regarding the timing of the report because the funding was provided in advance. She added that the quality of work is high, but there was a challenge with analyzing the muscle tissue. Tom also asked why there was a new ECWG deliverable, the pharmaceuticals and personal care products report. Meg responded that the RMP had an intern over the summer that worked on the report. Tom also asked about the status of the bioanalytical tools study. Meg stated that Nancy Denslow and Keith Maruya will be presenting their results at the April ECWG meeting. She added that second year of funding will not be released until the first year results are reported.

The one red deliverable for the EEWG is the benthic assessment for the mesohaline study. The delay is mainly because Ananda Ranasinghe retired from SCCWRP and his replacement David Gillett has had to come up to speed. Once the BPJ study results are released, the SC will be able to comment on whether the second year of funding should be provided. Tom stated that he is ready to end the funding for the study, unless the BPJ results are compelling. For the Status and Trends red deliverables, the S&T bird egg report is close to being completing and Jay just needs to review the USGS factsheet before it is published.

*Action Items:*

11. Ellen Willis-Norton will change the color of the red deliverables if the current due date was not met between two SC meetings.

**XIII. Plus/Delta and Set next meeting date and Agenda topics [Tom Mumley]**

The next SC meeting will be held on May 6th, 2014. Agenda items for the meeting include continuing the RMP communications strategy discussion and the implications of Dave Schoellhamer's funding cuts. Jim Kelly noted that the SFEI/ASC Board asked the RMP to switch the annual budget from the calendar year to the fiscal year. Tom Mumley stated that the transition will be difficult; Jim replied that the transition could happen over a six month time period or within two years.