



SAN FRANCISCO ESTUARY INSTITUTE

4911 Central Avenue, Richmond, CA 94804 • p 510-746-7334 • f 510-746-7300 www.sfei.org

RMP Steering Committee Meeting

May 6th, 2014

San Francisco Estuary Institute

Draft Meeting Summary

Attendees:

Tom Mumley*, SFBRWQCB

Jim Ervin (City of San Jose)

Adam Olivieri, Stormwater
(BASMAA/EOA Inc)

Karin North**, Medium POTWs (City of
Palo Alto)

Dan Tafolla, Small POTWs (Vallejo
Sanitation and Flood Control District)

Peter Carroll, Refineries (Tesoro Golden
Eagle Refinery)

Jay Davis (SFEI)

Jim Kelly (SFEI)

Meg Sedlak (SFEI)

Ellen Willis-Norton (SFEI)

Lawrence Leung (SFEI)

Tony Hale (SFEI)

David Senn (SFEI)

Dave Ceppos (Center for Collaborative
Policy)

I. Approval of Agenda and Minutes [Tom Mumley]

Tom Mumley questioned the need for such detailed meeting summaries, stating that it may be enough to include key discussion pieces and a clear statement of what was agreed upon. Peter Carroll agreed stating that the Se Strategy Team summary was an example of a too detailed summary. Meg Sedlak stated that she would edit the Se Strategy Team summary in both the TRC and SC summaries and send them to Tom for approval. Tom suggested that the level of detail for meeting summaries should be included as part of the RMP's program review. Adam Olivieri suggested that Ellen Willis-Norton write the meeting summary in the same way as in the past and Tom and Adam will subsequently edit it to the appropriate length to be posted on the website.

Items to Approve:

Adam Olivieri motioned to approve the previous SC meeting summary with edits to the Se Strategy Team summary; Karin seconded and the summary was unanimously approved.

II. Committee Member Updates [Group]

Adam Olivieri stated that the State's Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CEC) expert panel met to discuss filling data gaps. He mentioned that the RMP may be able to request funds from the State to fill CEC data gaps in the Bay.

III. Information: TRC Meeting Summary [Meg Sedlak]

Jay Davis provided the SC an update on the Selenium (Se) Strategy. The first Se Strategy Team meeting was held on April 22nd and had good participation and stakeholder representation. The focus of the Strategy will be on Se concentrations in sturgeon. Jay stated that the team recommended isotope analysis of the sturgeon muscle tissue to understand where the sturgeon are foraging. Tom noted that understanding the difference between North Bay and South Bay Se concentrations in sturgeon will be valuable for the TMDL's implementation.

The RMP's 2014 sport fish sampling effort will also collect muscle plugs as well as muscle fillets to develop a correlation between the concentrations. Once a relationship is established, the RMP can join the CA Department of Fish and Wildlife's sturgeon population sampling cruises and collect muscle plugs, increasing the sturgeon sample size. Ideally, sturgeon eggs will also be collected because they are the most sensitive to Se contamination; however, the team is unlikely to find gravid females. The Se Strategy Team stated they are interested in SFEI being the repository for Se data. The next Se Strategy Team meeting will be held on June 3.

IV. Action: Update on 2014 Budget [Lawrence Leung, Jen Hunt, Jay Davis]

Lawrence Leung stated that the Water Board had identified anew RMP participant, the Treasure Island Wastewater Treatment facility. Five invoices were sent to them for Water Year (WY) 2010 through 2014 and the funds will be added to the reserve. Treasure Island will be included in future years' POTWs starting in WY2015 and will contribute \$5,000 a year. Karin North noted that the Treasure Island facility is also becoming a BACWA member.

Lawrence stated that 87% of the participant fees have been received for 2014 and that all invoices will be sent out by May. The America's Cup mitigation fees that have been allocated to a 2014 special study evaluating benthic communities have also been received. Lawrence noted that there is \$12,000 in interest estimated for 2014, but only \$2,169 was received in Q1; therefore, the interest budget may need to be lower. Allied Defense Recycling (ADR) paid \$40,000 of their \$45,000 in fees. Therefore, the \$5,000 will be taken out of the dredger reserve. Tom Mumley noted that Dyan Whyte deserves the majority of the credit for ADR paying their fees.

Lawrence requested an extension of the 2013 labor budget from June 2014 to September 2014. Meg Sedlak stated that the additional time will be used to complete work associated with nutrient studies, modeling efforts, the mesohaline study, and bioanalytical tools study. Tom noted that the SC has still not decided if the second year of the study to develop benthic indices for the mesohaline environment will be funded. Meg agreed, stating that the second year of the mesohaline study is earmarked at \$90,000, but the SC can decide in July whether they would rather put the \$90,000 back into the RMP reserve.

Lawrence stated that SFEI is changing from a calendar year to the State's fiscal year in July 2014. Tom Mumley asked if the RMP should also consider moving to the fiscal year. Meg replied that she would like to reflect and check-in during the July SC meeting.

Items for Approval:

Adam Olivieri motioned to approve the extension of the 2013 labor budget to September 2014. Karin North seconded the motion and the extension was unanimously approved.

Karin North motioned to approve additional funding for Selenium in sportfish work for 2014, which will cost \$10,680. Adam seconded the motion and the additional funding was unanimously approved.

The third item for approval was reallocate the remaining 2013 and 2014 funds that were dedicated to developing Event Mean Concentration (EMC) for watershed models. The unexpended funds would be used to synthesize monitoring information collected to date. Meg stated that the Small Tributaries Loading Strategy team strongly supported the reallocation. The team is only requesting \$58,000 of the \$90,000 available for EMC development; the remaining funds will enter the reserve. Adam and Tom agreed that the remaining funds should not enter the reserve, but remain as unencumbered funds within the project. Adam motioned to approve the reallocation, Dan Tafolla seconded, and the reallocation was unanimously approved.

Action Items:

1. Meg Sedlak will add a check-in about the RMP switching to a fiscal year at the July SC meeting.

V. Decision: Communications Strategy – Part II [Jay Davis]

RMP Communications Strategy

Tom Mumley stated that he thought the purpose of the agenda item was to outline the RMP's communication strategy and how the communications portfolio achieves the strategy. Tom added that the communication products should match the mission and goals of the RMP.

Karin North noted that the RMP's communications strategy should fit into SFEI's communication strategy.

Tony Hale stated that SFEI has contracted a communications consultant, the Kos-Read Group, to 1) increase funding, 2) encourage effective policy, and 3) increase recognition of SFEI. The official communications plan, which will have embedded in it a communications strategy, will be rolled-out this May. To start addressing SFEI's communications goals staff are creating an institutional one-pager that details what SFEI does; the SFEI webpage is changing; and a quarterly newsletter that features the RMP will be created. Karin North asked the cost of the consultant; Tony responded the Kos-Read Group is under a \$15,000 contract with the Institute.

Tom Mumley stated that the RMP communications strategy should be focused on informing people who have an interest in Water Board decisions. He stated that it was unclear what use informing the general public was and stated that it would require considerable funding. Jay replied that the RMP has had discussions on who they are trying to reach, primarily RMP participants.

RMP One-Pager

Karin stated that it would be useful to develop a one-pager about the RMP to give to new staff members from agencies that are RMP participants. Tom stated that the one-pager should make clear that dischargers would need to individually monitor their receiving waters without the RMP, which costs more money than contributing to the RMP. Peter Carroll thought that the one-pager should focus on different aspects of the RMP depending on the type of participant it is given to. Karin and Adam Olivieri agreed that a standard one-pager would be sufficient.

Current RMP Communication Products

Jay Davis quickly ran through the RMP's current communications products including:

1. Pulse
2. Estuary News articles
3. RMP Web Site
4. RMP Update
5. Technical Reports
6. Journal Publications
7. Annual Meeting
8. Email Updates NEW
9. SFEI Newsletter NEW
10. Social Media NEW
11. Annual Monitoring Results
12. Invited Presentations
13. Workshops
14. Fact Sheets
15. Seminars/Webinars
16. Estuary Portal
17. State of the Estuary Report

Jay stated that The Pulse of the Bay is the central part of the RMP's communication strategy. Jay stated that the RMP Update will be turned into an e-book this year and if successful the same will be done with the Pulse. Tom asked that Jay revisit pursuing a 2015 Pulse of the Bay at the July SC meeting since a State of the Bay report may be produced simultaneously.

Jay stated that the next round of the Estuary Newsletter is coming out in June. He proposed that the article focus on the Small Tributaries Integrated Report. Tom stated that he was concerned about being able to gather the material in time; Jay replied that RMP staff outline the article, but the SFEP staff writes the article and conducts the interviews. Adam stated that he would provide Jay with names of people to interview for the article. Jay suggested that the themes for each quarterly newsletter be recycled (e.g., every September the article would be about PCBs). The schedule would be as follows:

1. June – Small Tributaries Loading
2. September – PCBs
3. December – CECs
4. March – Nutrients

Meg stated that other studies might be interesting to highlight in the Newsletter, such as Copper and the Olfactory Nerve in Salmon. Tom also liked the idea of having Copper as the issue for the September article; the SC agreed that Copper instead of PCBs should be the focus of the article.

Jay stated that the RMP web site is also being updated, including the Contaminant Data Display & Download page, with funding from the State Board. Jay noted that he will continue his presentation of RMP communication products at the next SC meeting and will also provide the SC with a draft communications strategy. Karin and Peter Carroll volunteered to help Jay with the strategy.

RMP Update E-Book

Tony Hale reviewed plans for turning the RMP Update into an e-book. The benefits of an e-book are that documents/information external to the Update can be linked to pages within the e-book, pages within the e-book itself can be linked, and analytics for what people are reading will be available. Additionally, the data can be disaggregated in interactive graphics allowing the reader to interact with the data in new ways. The software is open source and works on any browser that uses html5. Tony noted that a regular pdf version will also be available

The total cost of the e-book is \$50,000. The cost of building the infrastructure is \$15,000, the interactive design costs \$6,000, the interactive maps and charts cost \$8,000 each, video footage to add to the e-book would cost \$10,000, and social media promotion would be \$3,000. Creating the first e-book would cost more than subsequent e-books. Karin noted that with the creation of an e-book the cost of the RMP Update would be similar to that of the Pulse of the Bay. Tony replied that the video portion of the e-book could be removed. Adam asked if the printing costs could be cut by reducing the number of hard copies. Jay replied that fewer copies are printed for the Update (versus the Pulse) and that there is a relative steep printing set up fee and that the cost to order additional copies is not particularly large.

Tom stated that the videos would not impact management decisions. Jay and Jim Ervin replied that it may get more managers to look at the documents or inform stakeholders who don't know about the sampling process. Meg Sedlak added that it may interest the public. Tom stated that he finds adding more interactive charts as a better way to spend the funds than a video. However, he agreed with Jay and Karin that the video could be a pilot to see whether the graphs or the video was more popular.

Tom stated that the funds would have to be taken from the reserve, but he thinks the e-book is a worthwhile investment because it may make a big impact in how the RMP communicates. Meg asked Tony if he could have the e-book ready by the Annual Meeting if the graphics are sent to him in advance; Tony replied affirmatively.

Items to Approve:

Karin North motioned to approve the creation of the e-book, Jim Ervin seconded, and the e-book for the RMP update was unanimously approved.

Action Items:

2. Jay Davis will revisit pursuing a 2015 Pulse of the Bay at the July SC meeting.

3. Adam Olivieri will send Jay Davis names of people to interview for the Small Tributaries Integrated Report article in the Estuary Newsletter.
4. Jay Davis, Karin North, and Peter Carroll will draft a RMP Communications Strategy before the July SC meeting.
5. Jay Davis will email the SC the SurveyMonkey results from the RMP Annual Meeting.

VI. Decision: Optimizing S&T and Request for Funding Margins Planning [Meg Sedlak]

Optimizing S&T

Meg Sedlak stated that the goals for the agenda item were to confirm changes to the S&T program and decide whether to include margins sampling. In water, copper and cyanide will still be sampled biennially because they have site specific objectives. Selenium will also be sampled because of the upcoming TMDL as well as MeHg and ancillary parameters. Every eight years PCBs, PAHs, Pesticides, and total Hg will be sampled. PBDEs will no longer be analyzed in water.

In sediment, the number of sites is dropping from 47 to 27 in the dry season. Sediment would be sampled on a four-year rather than two-year cycle. Every four years, MeHg, toxicity, PBDEs, and ancillary parameter will be measured. Every eight years PAHs, PCBs, Hg, other metals, Se/As, pesticides, and benthos will be measured. Meg noted that she needs to confirm with Brian Anderson and Beth Christian that sampling PAHs, PCBs, and Hg on an eight-year cycle is acceptable. Tom asked why PBDEs and toxicity would be sampled more frequently. Meg replied that the RMP wanted to sample toxicity every four years to sample during both the dry and wet season and that the RMP wanted to catch the decline in PBDEs. Tom and Meg agreed that MeHg and Hg should be sampled together.

The revised S&T includes reducing the number of bivalve stations from 11 to six. Every two years PAHs and PBDEs will be sampled. Every four years PCBs will be sampled to continue to monitor the concentration decline. Legacy pesticides and metals will no longer be sampled in bivalves. The RMP is still deciding how often to include CEC and Se sampling.

Margins Sampling

Meg Sedlak noted that margins sampling is being considered in parallel with changes to the S&T program. The recommendation from the TRC was to monitor the margins biennially at 20 sites starting in 2015. The RMP is requesting \$20,000 from the reserve to begin planning for margins sampling.

Tom Mumley stated that the TRC did not make a formal recommendation to monitor 20 sites biennially. The group decided that sampling should at least consider 20 sites biennially, but wanted to consider sampling more sites and/or more frequently. Meg replied that she will come back to the SC in July with a more detailed margins sampling plan. Tom noted that the margins area is larger than the one in the map Meg presented because the RMP cannot reach some of the stations that are included in the current sampling plan. Jay stated that the RMP can map areas that they have not been able to sample.

After reviewing the MOU, Peter Carroll asked if the RMP is fulfilling its mission of running a baseline program of monitoring trace substances in the Bay. Tom replied affirmatively, the new S&T program does not violate the RMP's MOU. Now that the RMP has learned about the Bay proper, it is time to begin understanding the concentrations in the Bay margins.

Items to Approve:

Jim Ervin motioned to approve moving \$20,000 from the reserve to being margins sampling planning and to reduce the number of sediment stations from 47 to 27 in the dry season, Dan Tafolla seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

Action Items:

6. Meg Sedlak will come back to the SC in July with a more detailed margins sampling plan.
7. RMP staff will map stations that they have had to skip sampling during the current S&T program.

VII. Action Program review [Dave Ceppos]

Before the Program Review (Ceppos) presentation, Jim Ervin asked if the RMP will need to evolve and begin to look directly at beneficial uses of the Bay (e.g., simple presence/absence of fish and other species). Meg Sedlak replied that the RMP works with partners who evaluate biological condition in the estuary such as CDFW and USGS. Tom Mumley replied that the RMP has typically been contaminant-focused and thinks that looking at other indicators of Bay health may be beyond the current scope of the program. However, Tom stated that Jim's point was valid and the RMP should begin thinking about how it will evolve. Tom stated that the work on nutrients has made the RMP think about and understand the entire Bay ecosystem.

Meg began the discussion on the MOU by stating that when Jim Kelly came on board in January, he found that there were discrepancies between what the RMP MOU said the RMP was doing and what it actually was accomplishing. The MOU is has not been significantly revised since 1996 and much has changed. Every two years, the MOU signing page is revised and signed by the Executive Officer of the Water Board and the Executive Director of the Institute. The RMP is currently in the process of having the signing page signed. As such, it seems like an appropriate time to take a detailed look at the MOU and determine what new information needs to be included. Meg reminded the SC that \$125,000 has been set aside for program review and that these funds could be tapped for revision of the MOU and development of foundational documents. Dave Ceppos, Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) at the California State University Sacramento, presented a proposal to complete a \$38,000 RMP program review. Tom noted that the goal of the program review was to generate clear foundational documents for the RMP.

Dave Ceppos stated that the program review will be an opportunity to check on the status and management of the RMP in a confidential manner. RMP stakeholders will be asked about the RMP's strengths and weaknesses. Based on the information obtained during the interviews Dave and his team will develop recommendations for the RMP. He noted that he is sensitive to the fact that the RMP is an established program that is successful and will not develop a governance tool

that shifts the group's tone. Dave added that he has staff that specializes in water quality that will be assigned to the RMP.

Discussion:

Peter Carroll noted that Dave Ceppos' proposal includes preparing a draft charter and asked if that is necessary. Dave responded that it is up to the RMP; the charter will lay out a more defined structure and will help answer questions like who is a member, what happens if a member is not attending, or how to replace a member. Tom added that the charter could be a package of documents that would likely be revised at some future point to reflect changes in the program. Dave indicated that the type of product depends on the objective of the program review.

Tom stated that it would be useful to document how the RMP has done business and reflect on how it could be done better. He noted that the program review will also need to include reviewing SFEI's role in context of the RMP since the RMP is a fundamental reason the Institute exists. As SFEI grows, the funds allocated to the RMP have not changed.

Peter asked how detailed the minutes of the various meetings have to be; Dave replied that Peter's question was a legal counsel question, but he stated that an elected body can hold a closed door session with minimal minutes and maybe the RMP could agree to something similar.

Karin North asked if Dave will also look at RMP workgroups; Dave replied that he will not look at them in detail. Adam Olivieri noted that workgroups are an essential part of the program that help decide what special studies move forward to the SC. Adam replied that interviewing 20 RMP participants should cover the SC, TRC, and the workgroups and strategy teams. Tom stated that direct participants, Institute staff, other participating stakeholders (e.g., USEPA and nonprofits such as Baykeeper), and the science advisors should be included in the interviews.

Dave responded that he can address the workgroups, but it may increase the cost of the program review. Tom stated that he was in support of allocating more funds to the review if there is value in digging deeper. He noted that it would be useful to review who is leading the workgroups since the scientists are often running the workgroup and bringing content forward. Tom stated that the RMP's response to a former science advisor's critique of the workgroups would be a useful document to share with Dave since it explains how the workgroups conduct their business.

Jay Davis stated that even though many procedures aren't documented, the RMP does follow specific procedures. He stated that he will write down and share the RMP procedures with Dave. He will also share the names of the SC, TRC, and workgroup and strategy team members. Jay was unsure he could complete the tasks by the next SC meeting. Jim Kelly said he could start it with Phil Trowbridge, the new RMP Program Manager, and give it to Jay to review. Meg suggested that Jim Kelly sit on a committee with Tom and Jay to help move the program review forward because Jim has the unique experience of having been a stakeholder for 15 years and now is the Institute's Interim Executive Director.

The SC agreed to move forward with the program review and approved of the scope of work Dave provided. He noted that the scope of work can change during the process with the SC's approval. Karin North suggested that the three-person committee could allocate \$50,000 to the

program review without needing the SC's approval, as long as SFEI and the Water Board approved of the allocation.

Items to Approve:

Karin North motioned to approve the ability of the RMP to allocate \$50,000 to the program review without coming back to the SC, Peter Carroll seconded the motion, and the motion was unanimously approved.

Action Items:

8. Jim Kelly and Phil Trowbridge will write down and share the RMP procedures with Jay Davis.

VIII. Update on Annual Meeting 2014 and "Pulse Lite" [Jay Davis]

RMP Annual Meeting

The RMP Annual Meeting will have four sections:

1. *Status and Trends*: Barbara Baginska will present on Selenium, Jay Davis on PCBs, and Don Yee on the revised S&T program.
2. *Small Tributary Loads*: Chris Sommers will present on the integrated stormwater monitoring report, Lester Mckee or Alicia Gilbreath will present on the STLS strategy Phase 2, and Jing Wu or Lester will present on green infrastructure.
3. *Nutrients*: Dave Senn will provide a nutrient strategy update, Raph Kudela will present on algal toxins, and Emily Novick on moored sensor work
4. *Contaminants of Emerging Concern*: Becky Sutton will provide a CEC strategy update, Nancy Denslow will present on Bioanalytical tool development, and Ellen Willis-Norton on Fipronil.

Jay Davis stated that other potential talks include Anthony Malkassian presenting on historical nutrient data, Jim Cloern talking about phytoplankton assemblages in the Bay, Dan Schlenk providing a broader discussion on bioanalytical tools, or a Keith Maruya discussing the statewide CEC plan.

Discussion:

Tom Mumley asked why there wasn't a keynote speaker. Jay responded that without a keynote there was more time available for each section. Peter Carroll asked if there was much more information to present about the Small Tributaries Loading Strategy (STLS) or if the update at the last RMP Annual Meeting was sufficient. Jay stated that the talk would focus on Phase 2 of the STLS work. Karin North suggested that Richard Looker lead the Small Tributary Loads Discussion if Chris Sommers is a presenter.

Jim Ervin thought that green infrastructure did not fit in with the Small Tributary Loads section. Tom and Peter said that green infrastructure directly affects loadings to the Bay; Adam Olivieri added that if flow is minimized or eliminated then loads to the Bay are reduced. Adam supported having Matt Fabry present on green infrastructure.

Tom asked if there was enough data to report on the moored sensor work. Karin stated that the Dumbarton sensor has been out in the Bay for eight months. Jay stated that the moored sensor work could be included in Dave's presentation about the nutrient strategy and Anthony could talk about historic data monitoring and associated assessment framework.

Tom asked why Fipronil was being highlighted; he suggested a talk on current use pesticides and highlighting Fipronil as a pesticide of concern. Tom also noted that he did not support a talk on the statewide CEC plan. The group agreed that Dave Senn and Naomi Feger could work together and decide on which speakers they would like to invite.

IX. Deliverables Update [Dave Senn, Meg Sedlak]

Nutrients Update

Moored Sensor

Dave Senn informed the SC that the moored sensor is running at the Dumbarton Bridge and the data correlates with the USGS data. He noted that a summary of year one results is due in May, but another update was accidentally scheduled for June 2014. Only one update will be generated and Dave asked if in the future the SC would like a six month or annual progress report. Jim Ervin stated that an annual update was adequate. Adam Olivieri asked if the materials used to brief BACWA could also be used to brief the RMP. Dave noted that now that the Nutrient SC has formed, moored sensor updates will no longer be sent through BACWA. Karin North suggested that the updates be sent to both the RMP SC and the Nutrient SC.

Modeling

Dave stated that the proposed collaboration with USGS on hydrodynamic and bloom models will begin in June 2014 alongside water quality modeling. Dave noted that, at the nutrient modeling workplan meeting, the focus was translating the science/management questions into modeling relevant questions. From there, a workplan can be developed. The major components of the workplan include 1) proceeding with the Deltares suite of models, 2) partnering with USGS to develop the base hydrodynamic model and basic biological model, and 3) the RMP will focus on the simple water quality models to have ready for the completion of the hydrodynamic model.

The nutrient modeling budget is current \$270,000 for water quality modeling, \$100,000 for the USGS collaboration, \$65,000 for technical collaborators, and \$65,000 for the Deltares models and support. The RMP has provided \$400,000 to date, but funding will be shifting to the Nutrient SC.

Stormwater Technical Report

The final stormwater technical report is near completion and should be released by the end of May.

PCB Conceptual Model

Tom Mumley noted that the original due date of the PCB Conceptual Model Report was March 2012. The report is a critical project that needs to be completed. Jay Davis stated that it took a long time to receive comments and he has been booked since the comments came in. He is going

to try to finalize the report by early June. Adam Olivieri asked Jay to pick a date when the final draft will be received, give the group two weeks to review, and then finalize.

Action Items:

9. Jay Davis will send Adam Olivieri and Tom Mumley the date when the final PCB Conceptual Model draft will be completed.

X. Set next meeting date and Agenda topics [Thomas Mumley]

Meg Sedlak is taking a leave of absence after 10 years working with the RMP. Phil Trowbridge from the New Hampshire Department of the Environment Services and Piscataqua Region Estuaries Partnership will serve as the new RMP Program Manager. He will start full-time on June 23rd.

Karin North suggested increasing the meeting time from 9:30-3:30 pm so the meeting ends on time. The next SC meeting will be held on July 15, 2014.