

Delta RMP Steering Committee Meeting

July 14, 2014

9:30 AM – 3:30 PM

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 present¹:

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

Tim Vendlinski, Regulatory – Federal (USEPA)

Gregg Erickson, Coordinated Monitoring (Interagency Ecological Program)

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

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

Linda Dorn, POTWs (SRCSD)

Josie Tellers, POTWs (City of Davis)

Margaret Orr, POTWs (City of Stockton)

Stephanie Fong, Water Supply (SFCWA)

Others present:

Brock Bernstein, Facilitator

Thomas Jabusch, SFEI-ASC

Jay Davis, SFEI-ASC

Philip Trowbridge, SFEI-ASC

Brian Laurensen, LWA/Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership

¹ Name, Representation (Affiliation)

Meghan Sullivan, Central Valley Water Board

Dalia Fadl, City of Sacramento

Vyomini Upadhyay, SRCSD

Karen Ashby, LWA

Joe Domagalski, USGS

<p>1.</p>	<p>Introductions A quorum was established.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Announcements from Committee Members Jay Davis provided an update to the Steering Committee about the 2015 State of the Estuary report that is currently underway. He suggested that the TAC should play at least an advisory or review role with the water quality portion of the document because it is an important information product and it is crucial to make sure it presents an accurate picture of the system. This type of product becomes even more powerful if there is consensus amongst those involved and coordinating to support the findings. Stephanie Fong relayed the connection between the State of the Estuary report and the Monitoring Council’s Estuaries Workgroup Portal and reiterated that Meghan Sullivan regularly participates in the Estuaries Workgroup.</p> <p>Gregg Erickson announced that IEP is undertaking a Director’s review to consider the various requirements for monitoring and it would be useful to get input from the Delta RMP TAC about what monitoring is useful and will aid the information needs.</p> <p>Ken Landau confirmed that he is retiring in November and that the Water Board plans to hire his replacement soon to allow for a few months of overlap before Ken’s departure.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Approve Agenda and Summary There were no comments on the agenda or the 19 May meeting summary.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>TAC Update: Status of Monitoring Design Joe Domagalski provided progress updates from the TAC and its four subcommittees and the near-term plans. Tables designed to capture the subcommittee’s decisions and progress in relation to answering the management questions were distributed to Steering Committee members in hard copy. The subcommittees are working towards constituent-specific monitoring designs but</p>

are looking for linkages between sites. The consolidation of the design and the proposed core sites will be discussed at the next TAC meeting.

In general, the initial monitoring plan will focus on a core monitoring design for each priority constituent but also identify special studies needed to answer initial questions, with the proposed pathogen study being much more targeted than the other elements and somewhere in-between. Finalizing the monitoring plan will involve negotiating the needs of the Steering Committee, the needs identified by the technical subgroups, and the interests of additional partners. Overall, the monitoring interests and regulatory drivers for each of the subgroups are considerably different.

Mercury – For the mercury subgroup, the monitoring design will link with the TMDL process and needs as well as support the development of a mercury model based on DSM2. Work is in progress to refine proposed sites that relate to historic fish tissue monitoring sites and to connect fish monitoring with water monitoring.

Nutrients – There is no clear regulatory driver to inform the nutrient monitoring design development. However, nutrients are implied as a factor involved in various undesirable conditions (macrophytes, species shifts, low DO). The nutrient element would build heavily on on-going work by others (e.g. ongoing SFEI and USGS studies as well as Regional Board studies) in order to put information and future actions in context. As such, the subcommittee is proposing to spend resources on a synthesis and analysis, including a station analysis, rather than create a new monitoring design plan for nutrients. However, if there is a strong rationale for “piggy-backing” nutrients or nutrient-associated parameters to the proposed new monitoring or continuing efforts, such “no-regret actions” would be included as part of the ultimate design plan that is brought back to the Steering Committee. Some members of the SC suggested a full literature review may be helpful in addition to an analysis of existing information and the work currently underway.

Pesticides – the current use pesticides subcommittee is developing a toxicity-based monitoring element, corresponding to the need to understand how the combination of pesticide active ingredients (AIs) + AI degradates + formulation “inert” ingredient(s) + their degradation products + any other potential toxicants overlying in the water and sediment (e.g., heavy metals) contribute to toxicity. The initial design plan would vary based on the ultimate amount of funding available,

	<p>but the plan is to include sampling at least five times a year (at key events – dry, wet, etc.) at sites there are mostly consistent with those proposed by the discharger community for ambient monitoring stations. The proposal includes a mix of initial screening followed by some chemical analyses as well as sites with chemical analysis at the start. For water column testing, the design proposes the traditional three toxicity test species plus Hyalella. For sediment testing, the design proposes coordination with the SWAMP SPoT program, which uses Hyalella and Chironomus.</p> <p>The SC expressed concern about the expansion of the scope of the design from tracking the status and trends of current use pesticides to a broader tracking of the status and trends of toxicity as well as about the inclusion of TIEs in the program. The pesticide subcommittee has some additional meetings planned to refine the design.</p> <p>Pathogens – the main purpose of the proposed monitoring element for pathogens would be confirming that there would be no increase in <i>Cryptosporidium</i> and <i>Giardia lamblia</i> numbers in drinking water supplies due to changes in source water. The proposed RMP contribution would be to fund pathogen analyses for the proposed work plus coordination of any subsequent special studies, as MWQI would be doing the majority of the sampling. The first year of the proposed study would primarily be a status and trends study, while the second year would look further into potential impacts and perform detailed sampling at locations where problems were identified. The pathogens subcommittee was looking to get feedback on the amount of detail in the design. The SC agreed that brevity is key but more detail is suggested in relation to budget needs and the specific questions to be answered.</p> <p>The current plan is that the TAC and SFEI-ASC would report back by October with an initial design of a consolidated initial “no regrets” monitoring plan that would be expected to hold up in a peer review.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Decision: TAC Roles and Responsibilities</p> <p>A revised version of the roles and responsibilities document was present that included additional clarification on the roles of the TAC Co-Chairs and information on the roles and responsibilities of the implementing entity (which is ASC at this point). Staff clarified that the TAC Co-Chairs have considerably more work to do</p>

	<p>now then they will in the future just due to the developing nature of the monitoring design.</p> <p>Steering Committee members suggested further revisions to the document, including language articulating the need to facilitate decisions and not just document them and explicitly referring to the development of meeting agenda and materials. SC members also suggested a clearer link to the organization of the RMP and suggested a roster be included, which would provide consistent naming of groups involved. Discussion about the liaison between committees indicated a need to further clarify the roles and the overlap between the TAC Co-Chairs and the implementing entity and revisit the need for TAC Co-Chairs after the design period is completed.</p> <p>Staff also presented a scorecard used in the Bay RMP as a tool to track progress in terms of goals and deliverables. The Bay RMP SC has found the card to be an efficient way to stay on track and it is quickly reviewed at the end of each meeting. The color-coding provides focus for what needs more discussion. The SC supported the concept of improved tracking.</p> <p><u>Outcomes/recommendations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implement a dashboard type tracking tool to improve tracking of deliverables and timelines - Revise and refine the roles and responsibilities document further - Revisit the TAC Co-Chair role and who fills that role
<p>6.</p>	<p>Action: Funding for Stephen McCord</p> <p>Stephen’s funding for serving as a TAC co-Chair has ended. Joe Domagalski (USGS) is salaried and currently not receiving additional funding to serve as a TAC co-Chair. Thus, a discussion was sought about the additional funding required for Stephen (~\$25K) to continue as a TAC co-Chair.</p> <p>The SC agreed that the hours and tasks presented in a scope of work were reasonable, but the costs clearly indicate the need to transfer the role once the design phase is completed. Regional San has agreed to pay half of the proposed costs for the scope of work and to reevaluate the situation in October, wherein if progress is satisfactory, Regional San would likely fund the remaining portion of the tasks in the scope of work.</p>

	<p>The SC asked to agendize a discussion about the TAC Co-Chairs and whether that role should be filled by agency or in-kind staff and/or be a position staffed by the ASC. The discussion needs to also better define the liaison voice both up to the SC and down to the TAC. As part of this, meeting decisions need to be more clearly documented and confirmed both in the moment and in the meeting summaries.</p> <p><u>Outcomes/decisions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Staff will clarify and specify the job descriptions of the TAC co-chairs and staff - The terms of the initial TAC co-Chairs and TAC will end upon completion of the initial monitoring plan. - Decisions and directives will be more clearly identified - Agendize further discussion and a decision of who will fill the TAC Co-Chair role after the design phase
<p>7.</p>	<p>Lunch</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Discussion: ASC Contract</p> <p>Staff provided an overview of the workplan for the current ASC contract and a roadmap for RMP development. The workplan included some very preliminary cost estimates for various tasks to give SC members a better understanding of the larger picture and seek input for tasks that should be prioritized with the current funding.</p> <p>The contract requires completion of two key products, the monitoring design and the multi-year program plan. With these products and the current meeting frequency, there isn't much money for other tasks included in the workplan. Discussion centered on the range of budget costs for the program and some of the tasks, such as data management and peer review that would be slightly more phased. The variety of issues related to data management indicated a potential need for an additional TAC subcommittee to explore these issues in more detail and to agendize a discussion about data management and QA/QC protocols for the program.</p> <p>The key message was detailing the variety and extent of tasks, bring to attention to projected funding required to start up the program vis-à-vis funds presently committed and available, as well as highlighting some of the key deliverables and potential opportunities to leverage certain tasks for the program.</p> <p><u>Outcome/recommendation:</u></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provided a clearer picture of the costs of the program and a mutual understanding of the scope and duration of the existing funding - Document the contributions that have already been made - Review the report from the data summit, when available, to get direction for the process of data management within the context of the Delta RMP
9.	<p>Discussion: Program Funding</p> <p>Staff provided an overview of the potential funding models for the program, detailed in a previously prepared strawman that was distributed prior to the meeting. As the program has developed, it has become clear that the simplest option to fully fund the program through efficiencies across existing monitoring programs is not feasible in the Delta, even though it could provide some program funding.</p> <p>Characterizing the costs of the minimum ambient monitoring required to fulfill current permit requirements is a complicated and ongoing task. The plan is to look at costs in aggregate and to identify benefits to participants. Staff noted that regardless of the monitoring, the program would have a certain amount of “overhead” related to administration, data management, analysis and reporting.</p> <p>As discussion turned to how different sectors would contribute (i.e. cash or in-kind contributions), the decision was made to set a budget number for planning purposes. Participants agreed \$1.5 Million was a good number for the first-year budget of the program. Participants agreed to have more discussion within each represented sector to see how close to the \$1.5 Million we can reasonably get with contributions. The next meeting will continue discussion about program funding and begin discussion how to allocate the costs of the program across the represented sectors.</p> <p><u>Outcome/recommendation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For planning purposes, the group will plan on a \$1.5 Million budget for the first year of the program - Participants are tasked with speaking with various Boards and representatives to see how much money would be available as potential contributions to the program - Explore participation from other sectors not currently represented (dredgers, CalTrans)

<p>10.</p>	<p>Action: Criteria for Participation</p> <p>The concept of adequate participation only comes into play where permit requirements mandate program participation. The group discussed the Central Valley Salinity Coalition as a potential model but felt more specificity should be included than in the CVSALTS document provided for review. Active program participation can potentially consist of funding, in-kind contributions, and constructively engaged Committee participants that are making the program run more efficiently by being prepared, bringing in ideas, etc.</p> <p>The Steering Committee questioned how participation would be measured in terms of accounting for in-kind contributions versus cash contributions.</p> <p>Jay Davis explained that in the SF RMP, really it’s about the fees that come in to the program. Not all groups participate in meetings regularly but they make their contributions. The theory is that there is incentive for participants to be actively involved in the program to ensure the program addresses their interest and thus increases the value of their contributions. A suggestion was made to look at the two-sentence definition of participation detailed in the Mercury Exposure Reduction Program. There was also a suggestion to set a minimum dollar amount and then acknowledge different types of contributions that would support that amount, within a guiding structure established by the SC.</p> <p>There was agreement in principle about how to monitor participation – by trying to monetize program activities based on tasks in a program workplan and that each sector (and participant in each sector) would be assessed a monetary contribution. In-kind contributions would be costed out to dollar amounts and credited to a sector by the amount of money saved to the RMP. Staff will draft the proposed criteria for participation to present to the SC.</p> <p><u>Outcome/recommendations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish a monetary amount for each sector required as an active participant in the program. - Develop written criteria for adequate participation
<p>11.</p>	<p>Action: SC Transition to Co-Chairs</p> <p>Funding for Brock Bernstein’s facilitation allows for up to three additional meetings. The major programmatic decisions (related to program design, funding, and participation) should be made or at least well structured within this time frame. As such, the SC will need to transition to elected Co-Chairs. The SC agreed to target an</p>

	<p>election of co-chairs two meetings from now and discuss the procedure for that election at the next meeting. Staff will prepare more detailed responsibilities for the SC Co-Chairs.</p> <p><u>Outcome/recommendations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarify the roles and tasks of the co-chairs - Establish a process for the election of co-chairs - Select co-chairs within the next two meetings
<p>12.</p>	<p>Plus/Delta</p> <p>Delta: Clearly and explicitly note the agreements along the way in real time. More introduction for the new people</p> <p>Plus: Everyone has been super positive Meeting materials in advance and nicely embedded in agenda</p>
<p>13.</p>	<p>Next meeting</p> <p>The next meeting has been tentatively scheduled for September 29 (9:30 am -3:30 pm at the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District). Meeting topics will include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) TAC update 2) Roles and Responsibilities 3) Criteria for active participation 4) Election and transition to SC co-chairs 5) Program Funding
<p>14.</p>	<p>Action items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1. Distribute the subgroup design tables electronically to SC members 7.2. Revise and refine the roles and responsibilities document based on SC comments 7.3. Develop tracking tool (based on Bay RMP scorecard) for use with the Delta RMP 7.4. Develop a clearer picture of the costs of various program administration tasks, including data management 7.5. Develop accounting of contributions to date 7.6. Distribute data summit reports, once available, to the SC for review and discuss need for a data management subcommittee 7.7. Draft 'Criteria for Participation' document 7.8. Develop responsibilities for the SC Co-Chairs and a procedure for election of

	Chairs
--	--------