

Delta RMP Steering Committee Meeting

November 20, 2012

9:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District Building

Sunset Maple Room

10060 Goethe Road, Sacramento, CA 95827

Summary

Attendees:

Steering Committee members present¹:

Casey Wichert, Alternate-POTWs (City of Brentwood)

Dave Tamayo, Alternate-Stormwater, Phase I Communities (City of Sacramento)

Delia McGrath, Stormwater, Phase I Communities (City of Sacramento)

Erich Delmas, Alternate-POTWs (City of Tracy)

Gregg Erickson, Coordinated Monitoring (IEP)

Kenneth Landau, Regulatory – State (Central Valley Regional Water Board)

Linda Dorn, POTWs (SRCSD)

Lynda Smith, Alternate-Water Supply (MWD)

Mike Wackman, Agriculture (Delta & San Joaquin County Water Quality Coalition)

Stephanie Fong, Regulatory – State (Central Valley Regional Water Board)

Tony Pirondini, POTWs (City of Vacaville)

On phone:

Valentina Cabrera, Alternate-Regulatory – Federal (U.S. EPA)

Others present:

Brian Laurenson, LWA

Brock Bernstein, Facilitator

¹ Name, Representation (Affiliation)

Bruce Houdesheldt, SVWQC

Cathy Johnson, FWS

Mike Johnson, MLJ-LLC

Jason Lofton, SRCSD

Rainer Hoenicke, ASC

Steve Blecker, DSP

Thomas Jabusch, ASC

Tom Grovhoug, LWA

Vyomini Pandya, SRCSD

On phone:

Anke Mueller-Solger, IEP/DSC

Debbie Webster, CVCWA

Nader Shareghi, Mountain House CSD

<p>1.</p>	<p>Approval of Agenda and Minutes Introduction, established quorum. Notes and minutes were approved.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Categories of SC members Participants discussed and clarified the categories represented by SC members and, in particular, how resource agencies and water purveyors are currently being represented. Linda Dorn noted that the main concern was whether the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) is realistically represented based on the current definition of categories.</p> <p><u>Decisions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1. Revisit the question of adding a “Resource Agency” category, once DFG participation is clarified (see Action Item 8.1). 2.2. Categories for SFWCA and IEP to be named “Water Supply” and “Coordinated Monitoring” 2.3. Identify additional partners once the monitoring questions have been identified

<p>3.</p>	<p>Steering Committee Representatives Represented parties confirmed their Steering Committee representatives and alternates, with the following changes: Erwin van Nieuwenhuyse (IEP-USBR) will be first alternate and Stephani Spaar (IEP-DWR) will remain second alternate for “Coordinated Monitoring”. The alternate for Stormwater, Phase II still needs to be confirmed.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>SC Core Responsibilities and Authorities/ Structure and Roles of the Stakeholder and Technical Advisory Committees Participants discussed a draft paper on the roles of the Steering Committee and the Stakeholder and Technical Advisory Committees. SC members suggested a number of changes, including clarification that a fiscal agent/operating entity, not the SC itself, would fulfill functions such as contracting and payments. Mike Wackman also requested more clarity how the TAC would be staffed. Linda Dorn suggested identifying the core management questions first and then deciding how to staff the TAC. Mike Wackman clarified that he is not so much interested in discussing who’s on the TAC but in how to decide its membership. Rainer Hoenicke suggested that it might be helpful to develop a list of criteria reflecting the desired qualities TAC members can be expected to bring to the table. Brock Bernstein reframed Mike Wackman’s concern as making sure the SC has final authority on TAC membership. Thus, there would be a need to select a TAC chair and alternate chair that are trusted by the SC. A further consideration is the benefits of forming impromptu TACs based on the specific technical issues at hand (appointed through SC and adding more administrative effort) vs. giving the TAC chair and co-chair some more flexibility in organizing the TAC. Delia McGrath suggested as a compromise that the SC could approve a set of core TAC members. She further suggested erring on the side of caution and going with a well-defined structure in the initial phase while trust is being established. Overall, there was agreement to have a balance between a well-defined structure and operational flexibility.</p> <p><u>Decisions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1. First approve the management questions, then form the TAC 4.2. The SC will chose TAC chair and co-chair and select the TAC 4.3. The TAC chair and co-chair will select candidates for the TAC and report back suggestions to the SC
<p>5.</p>	

	<p>Mission Statement SC members discussed a draft mission statement and provided a number of changes. Linda Dorn noted that the statement is missing mentions of “beneficial uses” and “water quality”</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Management Questions</p> <p>Ken Landau identified the biggest concern of the Regional Board as “Are we focusing on the right things? Are we getting the biggest bang for the buck [in terms of implementing policies and control measures]?” Toxicity and pollution effects on the aquatic ecosystem are the priority issues, but this has larger ramifications than just keeping fish healthy. The priority extends to the entire ecosystem and includes nutrients. There is a need for data to inform upcoming decisions, including whether nutrient levels are increasing or decreasing, their impacts on organisms, <i>Microcystis</i> and other blue-green algae, other nutrient impacts on the ecosystem (Delta and beyond), drinking water, and recreation. THMs are also a priority concern.</p> <p>Tony Pirondini requested clarification about whether the Regional Board wants the Delta RMP to focus only on the aquatic ecosystem or also on other issues. Ken Landau replied that in his opinion the Delta RMP should consider other issues and prioritize based on overall importance. Brock Bernstein noted that the task for the SC is to figure out what is important and of interest to start. Ken Landau confirmed that it was Pamela Creedon’s intention to try to have an independent multi-stakeholder group identify the priority issues.</p> <p>Linda Dorn asked SC members and other agencies present to state their interests. FWS is interested in nutrients and pesticides (Cathy Johnson). Steve Blecker (DSC), Brian Laurenson (LWA, stormwater programs), Stephanie Fong (Central Valley Regional Board), Casey Wichert (City of Brentwood), Mike Wackman (DSJWQC), and Erich Delmas (City of Tracy) confirmed interest by their agencies and organizations in nutrients and pesticides. Delia McGrath (City of Sacramento) indicated no strong preference either way on nutrients and pesticides but noted that she wants to see some progress in solving the conundrum of identifying priorities. She further noted that the Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership (SSQP) handles pesticides rather effectively, but that prioritizing pesticides would be a rather good first step and excellent study priority for the RMP. She also noted that there is value in knowing the overall impact of contaminants and figuring out the role of various constituents (Cu, etc.), since the information would be helpful for determining how to change programs to solve an identified problem. Tony Pirondini noted that the Delta RMP would need to be able to leverage sampling that is already being done. Delia McGrath confirmed that efficiency is important. Gregg Erickson confirmed IEP’s interest in nutrients and</p>

	<p>contaminants, and particularly in the multiple stressors aspect of better understanding these issues. He also noted is important to see status and trends being addressed, but also to understand mechanisms. Dave Tamayo noted the challenge to narrow down a long list of potential chemical analytes to those that are truly causing a known impact. Valentina Cabrera commented that toxicity would be a great integrator. Tony Pirondini noted that there are other things that can be captured in the framework such as hardness, salinity, and pH. Stephanie Fong noted that toxicity monitoring would capture all those parameters by necessity. Delia McGrath commented she was not a huge fan of toxicity testing but that management questions from the San Francisco Bay Nutrient Management Strategy would be a good starting point and to add pesticides. The Delta RMP SC could add other things as desired. Jason Lofton suggested that it would be a good idea to align the development of management questions with the San Francisco Bay Nutrient Management Strategy for mutual benefit. Mike Wackman expressed concern over coordination with the San Francisco Bay Nutrient Management Strategy. He added that it would be great if the parallel effort of developing a monitoring strategy gels into a coordinated effort, but Delta stakeholders need to meet compliance requirements and therefore need to make sure that the Delta RMP meets their own management questions. Brock Bernstein suggested that reviewing the meeting notes would provide perspective on what aspects various groups are interested in, when SC are developing recommendations (see Item 8. Action items).</p> <p><u>Decisions</u></p> <p>6.1. Use process of developing management questions from San Francisco Bay Nutrient Management Strategy as an example (take out “nutrients)</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Plus/Delta² on today’s meeting</p> <p>Plus: went better than expected; facilitation; good venue to meet; good open discussion; clear outcomes; half-day; good communication; openness (good for trust-building); beginning of some continuity; opportunity for calling-in</p> <p>Delta: teleconferencing necessary evil; not schedule meeting in week when there’s holidays; discussion got lost in what are our roles/need to bring it back to developing</p>

² A *Plus/Delta* allows a team, group, or committee quickly to gather feedback from its participants on what it has been doing well and what it could do better. The name, intentionally more positive than Plus/Minus would be, uses delta, the Greek letter that symbolizes change in mathematics, to highlight the team's opportunities for improving how it does its work. The process can take as few as five minutes, i.e. going around the table asking, “What was good/went well in this meeting?” “What can we improve?”

	RMP; not developing grandiose themes; need to be well prepared and organized for next meeting; didn't talk about funding
8.	<p>Action items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8.1. Gregg Erickson will bring back a response from DFG as to whether they are interested in participating in the SC and RMP and, if so, who their representative would be (due: January 16, 2013) 8.2. ASC staff to change sign-in sheet to add a column identifying SC and the designated alternates that will have a vote at the meeting (due: January 16, 2013) 8.3. ASC staff to amend SC and TAC roles document according to the discussion under item 4 (due: January 16, 2013) 8.4. ASC staff to edit mission statement according to the discussion under item 5 (due: January 16, 2013) 8.5. Based on example management questions and notes, SC members to discuss internally with their represented groups to provide recommendations and figure out how to go forward at the next meeting (due: January 16, 2013) 8.6. SC to wrap-up management questions over the next 2-3 meetings (due: April 1, 2013) 8.7. SC members to provide suggestions for potential TAC members (due: January 16, 2013) 8.8. Regional Board staff to reserve Water Board room (Cal/EAP bldg. or R5, TBD; due: January 16, 2013)