

**REGIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM FOR WATER QUALITY
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
DRAFT MINUTES
May 9th, 2008**

Members Present:

Dave Allen, USS POSCO/Industry
Kevin Buchan, WSPA/Refineries
Bob Hale, Alameda County Clean Water Program
Ellen Johnck, Bay Planning Coalition
Dan Tafolla, Vallejo Sanitation and Flood Control District/Med. WWTPs
Dave Tucker, City of San Jose/Large WWTPs
Tom Mumley, SFB RWQCB

Others Present:

Mike Connor, SFEI
Jay Davis, SFEI
Susan Klosterhaus, SFEI
Lawrence Leung, SFEI
Meg Sedlak, SFEI

Via telephone

Paul Salop, Applied Marine Sciences

1. Approval of Agenda and Minutes

Kevin Buchan opened the meeting and asked for comments on the January 2008 minutes. Kevin Buchan motioned that the minutes be approved; Tom Mumley seconded and the minutes were approved unanimously. Dave Tucker requested that there be a multi-year plan for the Pulse. Jay Davis indicated that a plan had been prepared and would be presented as part of the day's meeting.

2. Committee Member Updates

There were no committee member updates.

3. Discussion of Chair and Representation of each Industry Sector

Ms. Sedlak indicated that with the election of Bridgette DeShields as head of the TRC, one industry sector (the refineries) will chair both the SC and TRC. Ms. Sedlak indicated that there were no by-laws regarding the representation of industry sectors as chairs and asked whether staff should develop a protocol for chair terms, replacements, and industry representation.

The group discussed this issue and noted that the chair carries no additional authority or power. The committee operates through consensus and collaboration. The role of the chair is a facilitator to move the meeting along in an efficient manner. Several members stated that they did not perceive this as an issue that needed to be addressed. Several members indicated that

being a chair was a thankless task without any additional benefits and then they promptly thanked Kevin for being chair. Kevin suggested that SFEI staff write up a short description of the role of the chair. Tom Mumley agreed and suggested that the description be simple and short.

Dave Tucker suggested that the SC and TRC chairs be reaffirmed every year and that the chair be elected every year in January with the budget. Dave Tucker recommended that Kevin continue as chair this year provided the members approved; this recommendation was unanimously approved by the group.

Action item: Meg Sedlak prepare a simple description of the role of the chair including the following points: all committee members have equal power (the chair has no special power), the chair is responsible for leading the meeting, the chair should be reaffirmed every year, and the process of selecting the chair is up to the Committee.

4. Information: Technical Review Committee (TRC) Meeting Summary

Ms. Sedlak summarized the March meeting and noted that several of the March TRC items were included on today's agenda (e.g., Pulse, agenda for Annual Meeting, RMP Management Questions, and dioxin).

Ms. Sedlak indicated that the TRC had recommended including PAHs in the water analyses slated for this year. Ms. Sedlak gave background information to this issue by explaining that as part of the redesign process, the TRC had recommended that organics be analyzed every other year. The reason for this is that concentrations of many organics in water remain relatively constant and are likely to only change over the long term (e.g., the concentration of PCBs in water). Ms. Sedlak explained that as a result of the oil spill, there was an interest in seeing whether the PAH water concentrations were appreciably different. Tom Mumley indicated that he thought it was exceedingly unlikely that there would be any difference in the concentrations and recommended against doing these analyses. Bob Hale stated that sometime it is important to show the null hypothesis (no change) to alleviate concerns. Ellen Johnck concurred. It was agreed that if there was no change in PAH concentrations then PAHs would not be analyzed in 2009.

A motion was made by Kevin Buchan and seconded by Dave Tucker to move the analysis of PAHs in water from 2009 to 2008. The motion passed unanimously.

Xx hey meg: one note on this. With the smoke in the air, I would expect PAH concentrations to be higher this year, but they should be the pyrogenic ones and not the petrogenic ones. With our poor performance on LPAHs we might have problems telling the difference though.

5. Information: Budget Status

Ms. Sedlak reviewed the RMP budget summary memorandum. Ellen Johnck requested that SFEI also consider presenting the budget information in a standard format accounting sheet showing ledgers, and PLP. Kevin Buchan indicated that he preferred the current format with short written summaries as he could easily ascertain the status of the budget. Dave Tucker offered to share a one page reporting format that BACWA uses.

Ms. Sedlak presented the budget memorandum and budget. She indicated that approximately 95 percent of the 2008 revenue has been received. Outstanding participant fees included a quarterly payment from EBDA and Caltrans stormwater fees. Ms. Sedlak indicated that she is continuing to work with the RWQCB to obtain the RMP fees for prior years. At present, approximately \$175,717 is outstanding from prior years.

Ms. Sedlak indicated that expenditures (labor and direct costs) were largely on track with approximate 20 percent of the budget expended for labor and 16 percent expended for direct costs. Ms. Sedlak indicated that approximately \$350,000 of subcontracts had been written and that the remaining contracts to be written included: USGS contracts; Status and Trends contracts and Exposure and Effects Pilot Study contracts.

5. Action: Boat for RMP Water and Sediment Cruises

Ms. Sedlak explained that the R/V Endeavor would be unavailable to support RMP summer sampling because the US Bureau of Reclamation's second boat (R/V San Carlos) was being dry-docked for maintenance. As a result, the Endeavor will be used full time by DWR and the Bureau for the field season.

As summarized in a memo that was sent to the Committee, Paul Salop has conducted an extensive search to identify an alternate vessel. Ms. Sedlak and Mr. Salop led the Committee through a table of potential research vessels. The optimal vessel choice was composed of the use of the John Martin for the water cruise (approximately \$3,000 per day) and the Lakota for the sediment cruise (approximately \$2,300 per day). The cost for these two vessels was estimated to be approximately \$40,000. Paul Salop indicated that he would need to contact the agencies to confirm availability and the initial quotes.

A motion was made by Tom Mumley and seconded by Dave Tucker to use approximately \$45,000 from contingency funds for the rental of boat(s) for the 2008 RMP Status and Trends water and sediment cruises given that the Bureau of Reclamation's boat the R/V Endeavor is unavailable. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Action: 2008 Pulse

Jay Davis distributed an outline for the 2008 Pulse. The TRC had recommended that the SC consider two possible outlines for the Pulse: 1) each stakeholder group would contribute an article or 2) a themed Pulse. Possible themes are: climate change; wetland restoration; loading (e.g., MRP, stormwater, BMPs, etc.); PAHs (diesel emissions from Ports, oil spill atmospheric inputs); and mercury or other pollutants.

Jay Davis distributed a multi-year table of past and potential future Pulse themes (2006 through 2011). The group felt that the multi-year planning was very important. It was suggested that the RMP Master Plan be included in 2009. Anticipated major projects in 2009 include Petaluma and South Bay Salt Ponds. Dave Tucker noted that San Jose has conducted 15 years of monitoring of endangered species if we pursue and article on the SBSP restoration. Anticipated regulatory developments in 2009 include a selenium TMDL for the North Bay and the Sediment Quality

Objectives. Ellen Johnck noted that there were a number of science studies coming out of the LTMS/Environmental Windows Program, and a \$3 million funding request was submitted to Congress for 2009. Dave Tucker suggested that the theme of the Pulse rotate through the various industry stakeholders (e.g., dredgers, stormwater, industry, POTWs, etc) on a five year cycle. We could also highlight state and federal programs on a periodic basis (e.g., USGS). Mike Connor mentioned that endangered species haven't really been covered in the Pulse. He also noted that the current NOAA study of the Mothball Fleet would be ready for the 2009 or 2010 Pulse. Tom Mumley recommended selecting stories that are ripe for picking, and allocating resources for authors if needed. Dave Tucker indicated that there are currently a lot of restoration activities going on and that a study of the restoration activities and effects on water quality would be of interest, and that water reclamation was another topic of interest. Ellen Johnck suggested that an article focusing on the reduction of creosote in maritime construction materials and the use of other potential pollutants (e.g., ACZA) in these materials might be of interest. It was noted that Chris Werme is working on a project evaluating creosote in pilings and potential impacts. Tom Mumley suggested an article summarizing Bay modeling efforts and perhaps the Guadalupe River TMDL. Tom encouraged Jay Davis to solicit ideas from RMP stakeholders to populate the table of themes for the Pulse.

The group then discussed specific topics for the 2009 Pulse. Jay Davis indicated that the Pulse typically consists of three management articles and three feature articles. Tom Mumley, Kevin Buchanan, and Dave Tucker agreed that it was too early to do an article on the MRP; they suggested waiting until next year and reevaluating. An article on Beneficial Uses of the Bay – Contact Recreation is under way. The group discussed the possibility of an article next year on fishing in the Bay. Where are fish being caught? On boats? From Piers? What are people eating? Herring? Shrimp? An outline for an article on fishing, including authorship, should be prepared for the next SC meeting. Cost information in the Pulse should also be brought to the next meeting.

Tom Mumley asked who would write the articles. Jay Davis indicated that SFEI staff frequently write the articles and that outside scientists also have been tapped. Kevin Buchan said it would be helpful to know if we need to allocate funds for writing articles.

The committee directed Jay Davis to develop the outline further based on this discussion and to then distribute the outline to the group via email for further discussion.

7. Information: Agenda for Annual Meeting

Jay Davis outlined the current ideas of speakers for the Annual Meeting. Dave Tucker suggested that the speakers should address three ideas: What do we know (what have we accomplished?); What do we need to know?; and Where are we going? Having a keynote speaker was recommended.

Dave Tucker raised the question of whether we should meet every year. The committee agreed that we should.

Mike Connor indicated that there have been a lot of accomplishments on the mercury front (e.g., the WERF study, air deposition, stormwater, etc.). Jay Davis indicated that there is a substantial

amount of information to prepare technical presentations; however, SFEI struggles somewhat with appropriate presentations for the management section.

Tom Mumley asked whether the municipalities attended the Annual Meeting. It was acknowledged for some of the smaller municipalities it may be difficult to allocate the resources to attend the annual meeting. Kevin Buchan indicated that it was a great opportunity to show case all of the work that has been done. SFEI should bring attendance data to the next SC meeting. Kevin Buchan stated that the meetings are well attended, and that he liked the interactive elements included in the past few meetings.

The committee directed Jay Davis to develop the agenda further based on this discussion and to then distribute the outline to the group via email for further discussion. The committee also directed Jay to distribute a letter requesting statements of information needs (for incorporation into the RMP Master Plan) to the SC and TRC, and to allow 4 weeks for a response.

Next year the Annual Meeting agenda should be discussed at the January SC meeting.

8. Information: Prioritizing Dioxin Data Gaps

Mike Connor indicated that there was a fair amount of information about dioxin in air; however, very little information exists on other pathways. He noted that the results of the 2006 sport fish monitoring indicate that dioxin levels continue to remain above the OEHHA screening value for human consumption. Susan Klosterhaus outlined potential areas for further dioxin work. She began her presentation by outlining some of the potential pathways to the Bay including stormwater, air deposition, wastewater effluents, and refinery discharges. At present, stormwater appears to be one of the major pathways; however, there is a great deal of uncertainty associated with this estimate. It is based on runoff from two storm events. Susan presented existing municipal effluent surveys for dioxin.

Tom Mumley noted that the cost of the analyses had dropped substantially (formerly the cost for dioxin analyses was on the order of \$2,000 per sample). In the past, this has been a significant obstacle to collecting information on dioxin. The lower cost (\$700 per sample) in the memo is for analysis of dioxins and furans only (not coplanar PCBs), but merits reconsidering analyte lists.

Dave Tucker noted that the Bay was listed based on sport fish data and as a result, information on sportfish is very important to his sector.

Tom Mumley indicated that at the present, there was not enough information on dioxins to develop a TMDL and indicated that his highest priority was obtaining more information on the pool of dioxin available to biota through sediment analyses. A dioxin TMDL is next in line for the Water Board. BACWA is also very interested because effluent limits are coming soon that will have to be met in 10 years.

A discussion of the collection of sediment data ensued. Shallow grab samples will indicate current conditions; cores will provide an indication of concentration trends over time and a

prediction of future loads should the Bay become erosional. There was a motion to analyze the current cores for dioxin (\$35,000 based on the memo prepared for the meeting). The \$35,000 would be deducted from the current reserves. The group emphasized though that a dioxin strategy needed to be developed and that this funding allocation needed to be placed in context with the strategy.

Ellen Johnck indicated that the Maritime industry is conducting a dioxin inventory for ports and terminal activities and that she would check to see what type of information might be available to share with the group.

Action item: Development of a dioxin strategy. RMP should archive sufficient surface sediments for dioxin analysis.

9. Update: Revised Management Questions

Jay Davis updated the Committee on the status of revising the management questions and objectives. The SC motioned for approval of the new management questions and designed. The motion passed unanimously

10. Information: Annual Monitoring Results

John Oram gave an update on the Annual Monitoring Results report. It is envisioned that this would be an interactive report where the user would be able to specify contaminants, statistics, and mapping features.

11. Information: Program Updates

Meg Sedlak gave a brief update on workgroup activities.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05. Next Steering Committee meeting will be August 5th.