

## **Delta RMP Steering Committee Meeting**

**March 4, 2014**

**9:00 – 11:00 AM**

**Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District Building**

**Sunset Maple Room**

**10060 Goethe Road, Sacramento, CA 95827**

### **Draft Summary**

#### **Attendees:**

*Voting Steering Committee (and/or Alternate) members present<sup>1</sup>:*

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

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

Casey Wichert, POTWs (City of Brentwood)

Dave Tamayo, Stormwater, Phase I Communities (Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership)

Tim Vendlinski, Regulatory – Federal (USEPA)

Linda Dorn, POTWs (SRCSD)

Erich Delmas, POTWs (City of Tracy)

Gregg Erickson, Coordinated Monitoring (Interagency Ecological Program)

*By phone:*

Stephanie Reyna-Hiestand, Stormwater, Phase II Communities (City of Tracy)

Val Connor, Water Supply (SFCWA)

*Others present:*

Brock Bernstein, Facilitator

Thomas Jabusch, SFEI-ASC

Brian Laurensen, LWA/Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership

---

<sup>1</sup> Name, Representation (Affiliation)

- Meghan Sullivan, Central Valley Water Board
- Joe Domagalski, USGS
- Dalia Fadl, City of Sacramento
- Vyomini Upadhyay, SRCSD
- Rachel Kubiak, Western Plant Health Association
- Karen Ashby, LWA
- Claus Suverkropp, LWA
- Stephen McCord, MEI
- On phone:*
- Stephanie Fong, SFCWA
- Mike Mosley, Reclamation
- Stephen Clark, Pacific EcoRisk
- Tessa Fojut, Central Valley Water Board
- Tom Grovhoug, LWA
- Tony Pirondini, City of Vacaville
- Betsy Elzufon, LWA
- Nader Shareghi, Mountain House Community Services District

<b>1.</b>	<b>Introductions</b> A quorum was established.
<b>2.</b>	<b>Announcements from Committee Members</b> Gregg Erickson announced that IEP is searching a new Lead Scientist. Anke Mueller Solger is leaving for USGS.
<b>3.</b>	<b>Approve Agenda and Summary</b> The agenda was approved. The summary was approved pending a small edit.
<b>4.</b>	<b>Decision: Approval of Edits to Assessment Questions</b> The edits to the assessment questions were approved.
<b>5.</b>	<b>Update: TAC Meeting and Next Steps</b> Stephen McCord and Joe Domagalski, the TAC co-chairs who are taking turns

facilitating the TAC meetings, provided an update on the outcomes from the first TAC meeting and next steps.

Stephen described the “How to estimate cost?” question as a major challenge for the TAC and asked the SC for input on range finding options. Discussion participants indicated their preferred approach would be to start with a monitoring design to address the assessment questions and then estimate the funding needed to implement the monitoring design. The required level of effort could be informed with statistical power analyses, for which USGS has resources that could potentially be used. Brock Bernstein suggested setting up a phone call with the panel participants from the October 10 SC meeting to help the TAC with the experience from other RMPs.

The discussion participants also agreed on the need to dovetail with other efforts. Val Connor advised to use sampling and quality protocols of the Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) and follow data quality and management standards and procedures of the California Environmental Data Exchange Network (CEDEN), such that “apples can be compared with apples”.

Tim Vendlinski picked up on the conflict of interest discussion described in the TAC meeting summary, asking for clarification on who would be in charge of ensuring conflict avoidance. Brock Bernstein responded that there are two ways how it works in other RMPs: 1) if someone is going to bid on work resulting from a recommendation, they recuse themselves from the decision, and 2) implicitly by incorporating enough layers of review. For example, as Meghan Sullivan added, a recommendation by a TAC subgroup still goes to the TAC for discussion and then to the SC for a decision. Val recommended looking into the Delta Science Plan for language, saying the RMP would want to be legitimate, credible, and provide fair hearing of everybody’s ideas and input. Dave Tamayo suggested adapting the pertaining section in the Delta Science Plan as part of the operating principles. Brock Bernstein added that National Science Foundation (NSF) panelists are required to fill out a form to disclose any possible conflicts of interest so that they are out in the open. Stephen suggested adding some language in the monitoring design outline provided to the TAC subgroup members. Thomas Jabusch added that laying out a well thought out program planning and review cycle will help ensure that the appropriate checks and balances are in place.

	<p>Meghan Sullivan remarked that it would take some effort getting the subgroups up to speed. Dave requested to ensure that SC decisions are communicated.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p><b>Updates</b></p> <p>1. <i>Regional background characterization:</i> Linda Dorn gave an update on the monitoring design planning for NPDES ambient background characterizations. One of the ongoing discussions revolves around the required locations for monitoring stations. Ken Landau added that Regional Board staff is moving along with permit changes for POTWs to enable the participation in a regional monitoring plan including the needed stations. Ken also drafted up some language for stormwater permits that has already been approved by the Regional Board’s management team. He added that he was hesitant to dictate what participating means in terms of money. He suggested to form a small group to address this questions and would prefer to be part of this group rather than writing down his thoughts, i.e. quasi-dictating the answer. Meghan Sullivan added that ideally the final permit language would be in place when the program is being implemented. She described the permit language development as a “ chicken and egg thing”, i.e. the final permit language would need details that people haven't figured out yet. Stormwater permittees raised additional issues related to transitioning to a regional stormwater permit. Stephanie Reyna-Hiestand commented that the new permits need language for what constitutes active participation. Ken replied that the goal is to keep the language as minimalistic as possible, i.e. less and clearer would be better than lots of words. Dave Tamayo commented that stormwater permittees could be settling on the proposed permit language for the traditional permit as an anchor but would need to see the issue of participation more fully addressed with the regional permit. He suggested that the SC could provide recommendations.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p><b>Action: Delta RMP Development Schedule</b></p> <p>Thomas Jabusch reviewed the Delta RMP development schedule, which places deliverables and milestones within the context of the existing and pending ASC contracts and in relation to the IEP budget cycle. The main elements of the monitoring plan are due in August. Tim Vendlinski responded that he appreciated the provided context but wondered how the schedule would fit together with the Delta Science Plan. Gregg Erickson suggested contacting Lauren Hastings to find out more information about the Delta Science Plan implementation schedule. Linda Dorn suggested that it would be helpful to show the Delta RMP schedule in relation</p>

	<p>to those of the IEP, the Delta Science Plan, and the Municipal Water Quality Investigations (MWQI) program. Meghan Sullivan explained the schedule as based on funding availability and shown in relation to the timing of the ASC contracts, because the program would need to be in place by the time the current funding ends. However, she agreed with Linda that the other program schedules would be good to know.</p> <p>The discussion also turned to the need for strategic alignment with other programmatic efforts. The take-home from this discussion was that the RMP would have a better platform for reaching out to other programs, once its monitoring and implementation plans are getting more complete. The participants further agreed that Thomas and Meghan would plan on submitting an abstract for the Bay-Delta Science Conference. Gregg Erickson added the IEP is going through the process of working with the Delta Science Program.</p> <p><u>Outcome:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Keep development schedule table up to date and include other programs' schedules.</li> <li>- Push for the current schedule</li> </ul>
<p>8.</p>	<p><b>Next meeting</b>                  The next meetings will be on April 16 (9am-12pm) at the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District and on May 19 (9am-12pm), location TBD. Meeting topics for the April 16 meeting will include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Criteria for participation</li> <li>2) Science Conference discussion</li> <li>3) Timeline/coordination with other programs</li> <li>4) Conflict of interest principles</li> <li>5) Ambient background update</li> <li>6) Discuss timing of interacting with Delta Science Program</li> </ol>
<p>8.</p>	<p><b>Action items:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7.1. Provide National Research Council conflict of interest language (Brock Bernstein, by March 26)</li> <li>7.2. Send Delta Science Plan language (three words) to Meghan Sullivan (Val Connor, by March 26)</li> <li>7.3. Check in with Delta Science Program if there are already events planned for the Delta Science Conference that deal with coordination (Thomas Jabusch</li> </ol>

	<p>and Meghan Sullivan, by April 16).</p> <p>7.4. Recommendations for who to interact with at the Delta Science Program (Thomas Jabusch and Meghan Sullivan, by April 16)</p>
--	---