

Delta RMP Steering Committee Meeting

October 23, 2015

9:30 AM – 3:45 PM

Central Valley Regional Board, 11020 Sun Center Drive #200, Rancho Cordova, CA

Board Room

Summary

Attendees:

Voting Steering Committee (and/or Alternate) members present¹:

Tim Vendlinski (USEPA), Regulatory – Federal

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

Linda Dorn* (Regional San), POTWs

Josie Tellers (City of Davis), POTWs

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

Adam Laputz* (Central Valley Water Board), Regulatory – State

Dave Tamayo (Sacramento County), Stormwater, Phase I Communities

Erich Delmas (City of Tracy), POTWs

Val Connor (SFCWA), Water Supply

Gregg Erickson (Interagency Ecological Program), Coordinated Monitoring

David Cory (Westside San Joaquin River Watershed Coalition), Agriculture

*Co-Chairs

Others present:

Brock Bernstein, Facilitator

Thomas Jabusch, SFEI-ASC

Brian Laurenson, LWA (TAC)

Joe Domagalski, USGS (TAC co-Chair)

¹ Name, Representation (Affiliation)

Phil Trowbridge, SFEI-ASC

Tom Grovhoug, LWA

Michael Johnson, MLJ-LLC (TAC)

Debbie Webster, CVCWA (Alternate, POTWs)

Stephen McCord, MEI (TAC co-Chair)

Paul Bedore, RBI

Parry Klassen, ESJWQC (Alternate, Agriculture)

Sherill Huun, City of Sacramento

Rachel Kubiak, WPHA

Laura McLellan, Central Valley Water Board

Pamela Creedon, Central Valley Water Board (Alternate, Regulatory – State)

Sue McConnell, Central Valley Water Board

On phone:

Stephen Clark, Pacific EcoRisk

1.	<p>Introductions and Review Agenda A quorum was established.</p>
2.	<p>Decision: Request for Second Seat for Agriculture on Steering Committee This item was moved up front (Item #9 in the Agenda). The SC unanimously approved a second seat for Agriculture. David Cory will be the primary representative. Parry Klassen will be the alternate.</p> <p>OUTCOMES</p> <p>→ Decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Add a second seat for Agriculture to the Steering Committee. Moved: Val Connor. Seconded: Josie Tellers. Approved: 10-0. <p>→ Action Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Update SC roster (Thomas Jabusch, by November 30). ⇒ Put an item on the next agenda to discuss the requests for additional Steering Committee seats for Phase I and Phase II stormwater and the State Board and the overall balance and composition of the committee (Phil Trowbridge, by December 18). ⇒ Provide a list of appropriate candidates from fisheries agencies for the vacant Resource Agencies seat (Tim Vendlinski to tag –team with Gregg

	Erickson, by December 18).
3.	<p>Decision: Approve Meeting Summary from June 16, 2015 The SC voted to approve the June 16 Meeting Summary with a couple of minor edits required by Val Connor. All voted in favor except David Corey, who abstained since he was not at the last meeting.</p> <p><i>OUTCOMES</i></p> <p>→ <u>Decisions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Approve minutes from June 16, 2015, as amended. Moved: Val Connor. Seconded: Josie Tellers. Approved: 10-0-1. <p>→ <u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Update minutes with edits requested by Val and post to Regional Board website (Thomas Jabusch, by October 30).
4.	<p>Information/Decision: TAC Meeting Summary and Monitoring Update Stephen McCord gave an update from the September 24 TAC Meeting. In addition, updates were provided on each of the four priority constituents.</p> <p><i>Pathogens:</i> Brian Laurenson provided an update on the pathogen monitoring. The DWR MWQI program provides ambient sampling for pathogen analyses as a no cost in-kind service to the RMP. The monitoring effort follows the USEPA LT2 sampling method and had to grapple with low recoveries caused by a reagent supply issue. Because of the importance of the data to the drinking water agencies, the monitoring was modified to tackle the recovery issue rather than halted. The recovery issue is now resolved and the 2-year “special study” is continuing according to the original work plan. The original work plan also included Year 2 follow-up studies that are not included in the FY15/16 budget. An estimated \$30K is needed for these studies, either in the form of additional funds or by reducing the scope of the ambient monitoring and shifting budgeted funds to the follow-up studies. Issues that are still to be decided are the format of the final report, and how LT2 data collected by drinking water agencies will be compiled.</p> <p><i>Pesticides:</i> Joe Domagalski provided an update on the pesticide sampling. There are concerns over the sampling at Buckley Cove that will be discussed at the next TAC meeting. Samples at Buckley Cove have higher concentrations of pesticides than the other sites but they are also collected directly from the shore, since there is no bridge or pier that would allow mid-stream sampling. Some participants expressed concern over the detection of insecticides in the samples. Insecticides detected</p>

during the initial three sampling events include bifenthrin, albeit at a very low concentration. Gregg Erickson commented that detected concentrations should be compared against thresholds to determine whether there is a problem. Brock Bernstein agreed and added that it is important to first answer the questions about which pesticides are present and then tackle the questions of potential impacts. Josie Tellers commented that historical datasets (e.g., Sacramento River @ Freeport) provide an opportunity for comparison, to evaluate what has changed over time. Joe cautioned that the data collected by the NAWQA program at Freeport may not be entirely comparable with data collected by the RMP at Hood.

Toxicity: Stephen McCord provided an update on initial results from the toxicity testing. He reminded the SC that for each site and event, one additional sample is sent to the UC Davis Aquatic Health Program Laboratory (AHPL) for toxicity testing with three species: an alga (representing the base of the foodchain), *Ceriodaphnia* (primary consumer), and a fish (secondary consumer). There were temporary problems with the *Ceriodaphnia* test and AHPL outsourced the *Ceriodaphnia* test to another lab (Aqua Science) for the September event. The toxicity test results have not yet triggered any Toxicity Identification Evaluations (TIEs). The TIE subcommittee is convening on an as-needed basis. TIE subcommittee meetings have been focusing on the TIE guidance and recommended treatments. Josie Tellers commented that the guidance developed by the Delta RMP TIE subcommittee might also be useful to other groups at some future point.

Nutrients: several white papers will be completed in late 2015, including a synthesis of high-frequency data funded by the Delta RMP. ASC will convene a nutrient workgroup that will include members of the TAC, the former nutrient subcommittee, and additional external experts. The main charge of the workgroup will be to recommend high priority monitoring for the RMP to be implemented starting in the next fiscal year. Brock commented that the white papers coming out of the Central Valley Water Board's nutrient strategy effort would contain many specific details to be harvested by the Delta RMP. Adam Laputz explained that the workgroups from the Regional Board's effort are reviewing information with the purpose of developing a research plan. Many of the recommendations from the workgroups are about monitoring and highly relevant to the RMP. Linda Dorn emphasized the need for coordination of the RMP with the other ongoing efforts (such as the San Francisco Bay Nutrient Management Strategy).

Communications Plan. The TAC recommended removing appendices that were previously included and were showing a) a flowchart describing the proposed interaction of the Delta RMP with the Regional Board in data evaluation and follow-up and b) analyses needed to answer prioritized management and assessment questions. The TAC also suggested to add language that provisional data and a collaboration space would be provided for the TAC. Phil Trowbridge commented that all received pathogens data have been uploaded on the TAC Google site.

External Panel. The TAC recommends review of the Monitoring Design by an expert panel. The main requests from the TAC to the SC are to 1) allocate funding for an external review, and 2) approve the charge to the expert panel, once developed, and 3) approve the panelists, once selected. The proposed objective is to obtain targeted answers to the overarching questions guiding the review:

- 1) “Are the indicators correct?” and
- 2) “Is the study design for each indicator sufficient?”

Overall, the SC was supportive of the concept of the review but also requested that the TAC and ASC would further investigate the option of getting a no-cost detailed review by the Delta Science Program (DSP). There was some discussion about whether the DSP would be appropriate as a convener or whether there would be any perceived bias. Tim Vendlinski remarked that whereas the DSP has a very definitive mission, it is a new agency and suggested the Delta RMP and DSP should aim to reinforce each other.

SC members also supported the concept of a review by the Independent Science Board (ISB), which would focus on the niche of the Delta RMP and how it is filling it in relation to the other players and programs in the Delta.

OUTCOMES

→ *Action Items:*

- ⇒ Update TAC summary with the correct station name for the Mokelumne on page 4 (New Hope Road)(Thomas Jabusch, by October 30).
- ⇒ Get provisional pesticide data from USGS and post with the rest of the provisional data on the TAC website (Thomas, by October 30).
- ⇒ Request results from the first round of the *Hyaella* interlab study (Stephen Clark, by October 30) – *done*. SCCWRP will not release these data until the study is complete.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Get information on the DSP peer review process from Val Connor and share it with the Steering Committee. (Phil, by October 30) ⇒ Talk to the Delta Science Program about getting an external review of the Monitoring Design. Coordinate with Val and Gregg on this item (Phil, by December 18).
<p>5.</p>	<p>Information: Delta RMP Financial Update</p> <p><i>Budgets.</i> Phil Trowbridge projected an optimistic outlook on FY15/16. The total projected revenue for FY15/16 is \$1,123K dollars, which is more than what is budgeted in the workplan. The revenue is expected to arrive at ASC on time such that implementation of the FY15/16 workplan can proceed without interruption. He suggested to put the surplus into a reserve, as is done in the Bay RMP. He explained that building a reserve is important because it gives flexibility to the program. Several program participants expressed concerns over high “overhead” (tasks that are not generating data) of 35% and the need to increase the revenue overall. Phil agreed that now that money is coming the RMP could examine how it could become more effective but also cautioned the group to consider that the RMP is a stakeholder program with significant governance costs. Val Connor suggested the formation of a subcommittee that would look at ways for “growing the pot” and better leveraging the data generation. Participants also suggested to include Hg monitoring as a budget item in future budget presentation, even if it is currently unfunded, to make clear that it is part of the program.</p> <p><i>In-kind support from Bay RMP.</i> Phil relayed the request of Contra Costa Phase IIs located in Region 5 to stay in the Bay RMP rather than joining the Delta RMP. The Bay RMP would in return leverage the Delta RMP at an adequate level, for example, by sharing infrastructure and tools for data management and visualization.</p> <p><i>Prop 1 application.</i> ASC has submitted a Prop 1 proposal to support the currently unfunded monitoring of mercury by the Delta RMP. Val Connor commented that the Prop 1 RFP is very competitive and that it may take longer than with other RFPs to hear back with a decision. Phil replied that he is cautiously optimistic. The proposal has been submitted in response to the DFW solicitation, which has listed the Delta RMP as a funding priority. Val Connor said she would expect another call for proposals to come out by the Delta Science Program, also with the Delta RMP as a funding priority. She said she would like to get the proposed subcommittee together shortly and get prepared for future Prop 1 solicitations, because the turnaround is expected to be short. She further said that the “funding group” she</p>

had recommended earlier would need to look at both how to “grow the pot” and how the RMP is spending its money.

Meeting participants supported the idea of having a Finance subcommittee. There was an extended discussion and disagreements about the charge for the Finance subcommittee and the timing and objectives of an initial financial review. Overall, participants agreed that there is need for “growing the pot” and that there are efficiencies that could be looked at by April, which is when the FY16/17 Workplan is to be completed. Mike Wackman suggested two connected but slightly different motions: 1) establishing a Finance committee to consist of one representative each from water supply, POTWs (Regional San), stormwater, and agriculture; and 2) establishing a Revenue committee that would start out by looking into grant funding. The Finance committee was tasked to look for cost savings that could be implemented in the next workplan. The Revenue committee was tasked with identifying new and sustainable sources of funding.

OUTCOMES

→ **Decisions:**

- ⇒ Establish a Finance Subcommittee to review Program budgets and look for cost savings that could be implemented in the next workplan. The committee will have one representative each from water supply, agriculture, wastewater, and stormwater. Moved: Mike Wackman. Seconded: Adam Laputz. Approved: 11-0-0.
- ⇒ Establish a Revenue Subcommittee to identify new sources of funding for the Program, especially grants. The committee will consist of Val Connor, Linda Dorn, and Gregg Erickson. Moved: Mike Wackman. Seconded: Adam Laputz. Approved: 11-0-0.

→ **Action Items:**

- ⇒ Convene the Finance and Revenue Subcommittees for kick-off meetings (Val, by December 18).
- ⇒ Put an item on the agenda for the fall 2016 SC meeting to review the Program expenses compared to other similar programs, the goals of the Program, and the multi-year trajectory of the Program (Phil Trowbridge, by October 30).
- ⇒ Follow up with Val and Mike about the Finance Subcommittee to find out what assistance they need from ASC (Phil, by October 30).

<p>6.</p>	<p>Discussion: Supplemental Budget Request for Pesticide Laboratory Confirmation Study</p> <p>Participants discussed a request by POTWs to split 5% of pesticide samples (3 samples) for analysis by a second laboratory but the discussion was inconclusive, partly because the objectives were not clear to the group. Joe Domagalski mentioned that USGS is participating in a round-table lab study on neonicotinoids. Val Connor brought up the idea of taking advantage of Ulatris Creek sampling by SFCWA. Mike Wackman suggested that POTWs bring a more succinct proposal for what needs to be done and why to the TAC for review.</p> <p><i>OUTCOMES</i></p> <p>→ Action Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Develop a proposal for an interlaboratory comparison study for pesticides for the TAC to review (Josie Tellers, by November 9)
<p>7.</p>	<p>Lunch break</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Discussion: Communications Plan</p> <p>Thomas Jabusch provided a brief overview of the draft Communications Plan and an outline for a Foundational Documents report. This agenda item had two objectives: 1) obtain feedback on the draft Communications Plan and 2) get SC approval of the outline for the Foundational Documents report.</p> <p>The outline for the Foundational Documents report was supported by the SC. The report would be 15-20 pages long and mostly compiled from existing documents. Val Connor was supportive of the idea of pulling all the foundational documents into one but also brought up the idea that the RMP needs a brochure that can be used for the “elevator speech”. Tim Vendlinski commented that the brochure to be used by the Revenue Committee, when completed, could be rolled into the Foundational Document report. Val Connor supported the modular formatting of the report. Dave Tamayo commented that the report shouldn't try to capture all details and be updated only when there are fundamental changes. He suggested that the most meaningful aspect of the report would be a half-page or page-long summary documenting the evolution of the RMP.</p> <p>Participants provided several comments on the draft Communications Plan. There were no major concerns over the products and review process. There was some discussion about the scope and concept of synthesis. Participants agreed on the idea of synthesis as pulling together information and data for the purpose of</p>

	<p>addressing the management questions. There were also several specific questions about the reporting of QA information (such as flags in CEDEN data), how it would be communicated to the TAC, and whether the QA reporting has been budgeted. Phil Trowbridge confirmed that the Annual Monitoring Reports are already in the budget and would summarize QA information.</p> <p><i>OUTCOMES</i></p> <p>→ <u>Decisions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ The Steering Committee endorsed the outline for the Delta RMP Foundations document (consensus). <p>→ <u>Action Items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Review and provide comments on the draft Communications Plan (SC, by November 6). ⇒ Develop ideas for a fact sheet to support fundraising efforts (Val Connor and Finance Subcommittee, by December 18).
<p>9.</p>	<p>Discussion: Program Planning documents</p> <p>The discussion started with a very short presentation by staff of the proposed content of the Draft Program Planning Overview and the concept of a Multi-Year Planning Workshop. The long-term plans and priorities of regulatory agencies are “key ingredients” for the multi-year planning. Adam Laputz commented that the nutrient research plan development process would provide some of the needed information but is still a bit of a moving target. For pesticides, Dave Tamayo commented that management is largely driven by DPR. Adam added that DPR should participate in the planning discussions on some level. Phil reported that people from key agencies that are not regular participants are coming to the planning meetings of the Bay RMP. The group agreed that it would make sense for the Delta RMP to take a similar approach. A large portion of the December SC will be devoted to Multi-Year Planning.</p> <p>The group then discussed the flowchart initially developed by POTWs that illustrated the proposed interaction of the Delta RMP with the Regional Board in data evaluation and follow-up. There were no substantial comments on the flowchart (other than using the original 7/7/14 version) and SC members agreed that it should be added into the Foundational Document report, because it was fundamental for agreeing to the permit change for POTWs. Dave Tamayo suggested that the language from the POTWs’ permits should also be included as an example. The permit language states that Delta RMP data are not used directly to determine</p>

	<p>compliance. However, there could be instances where dischargers may choose to use Delta RMP data to demonstrate compliance.</p> <p><i>OUTCOMES</i></p> <p>→ Action Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Review and provide comments on the draft Program Planning Overview (SC, by November 6) ⇒ Add the July 7, 2014, version of the RMP-RB Interaction Flow Chart to the RMP Foundations document with an introduction that explains that this flow chart was a foundational document and the basis for language that was added to permits. The introduction should also explain that the purpose of the flow chart is to show mutual expectations that the RMP will be used to collaboratively study issues as much as possible to avoid additional study requests from the Water Board on top of the RMP (Thomas Jabusch, by December 18)
<p>10.</p>	<p>Discussion: Approve Policies for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate Participation • Conflict of Interest • Request for Proposals Guidance <p><i>Adequate Participation.</i> Adam Laputz walked the group through the Draft Criteria for Adequate Participation. The three main items considered for determining adequate participation would be</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Exchange of existing individual monitoring, 2. Approved program budget, and 3. Whether additional funds are expected throughout the year. <p>Linda Dorn commented that language should be added to also describe how to evaluate adequate participation if the permittee does not have any monitoring exchange. This would apply to most Phase IIs. In this context, Stephanie Reyna-Hiestand brought up an issue encountered in deciding adequate participation for Phase IIs. She relayed perceived equity issues amongst Phase IIs with no exchange and those that have previously joined Phase I monitoring and are subject to exchange. Adam responded that the adequate participation criteria would be flexible enough to deal with such issues. Stephanie also advised that the RMP would need to think about how to deal with the proportions of various groups in case there are large changes to the overall budget and pointed to the need for some</p>

	<p>stability in the budget. Phil commented that the Bay RMP sets its overall budget in three-year increments for stability.</p> <p>The discussions about Conflict of Interest and Request for Proposal Guidance were postponed to another meeting.</p> <p><i>OUTCOMES</i></p> <p>→ <i>Action Items:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Revise adequate participation language and work with co-chairs on edits (Phil Trowbridge, by December 18)
<p>11.</p>	<p>Discussion: Status of Deliverables, Action Items and Upcoming Meetings</p> <p>Phil Trowbridge reviewed the status of deliverables and summarized the action items from the meeting. There were no comments.</p>
<p>12.</p>	<p>Plus/Delta, set dates and agenda topics for upcoming meetings</p> <p><i>OUTCOMES</i></p> <p>→ <i>Action items:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Set next meeting date for December 18, reserve room, and send invitations to the SC (Thomas Jabusch, by October 30)