



Delta RMP Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee

Joint Meeting

October 18, 2016

9:30 AM – 4:30 PM

Delta Stewardship Council Building, 980 9th Street, 2nd Floor, Room A, Sacramento, CA

Summary

Attendees:

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

Linda Dorn* (Regional San), POTWs

Josie Tellers (City of Davis), POTWs

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

Dave Tamayo (Sacramento County), Stormwater Phase I

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

Greg Gearheart (State Water Board), Regulatory – State

Brendan Ferry (El Dorado County), Stormwater Phase II

Bruce Houdesheldt (SVWQC), Agriculture

Melanie Okoro (NMFS), Resource Agencies

Debbie Webster (CVCWA), POTWs (SC Alternate)

*Co-Chairs

By phone

Deedee Antypas (City of Stockton), POTWs

¹ Name, (Affiliation), Representation

Val Connor (GEI), Water Supply

TAC (and/or Alternate) members present:

Brian Laurenson (Larry Walker Associates), Stormwater – Phase I

Michael Johnson (MLJ-LLC), Agriculture

Melissa Turner (MLJ-LLC), Agriculture

Stephen McCord (MEI), TAC co-Chair

Joe Domagalski, (USGS), TAC co-Chair

Tony Pirondini (City of Vacaville), POTWs

Karen Ashby (LWA), Stormwater – Phase II

Tessa Fojut (Central Valley Water Board), Regulatory – State

Rich Breuer (State Water Board), Regulatory – State

Debra Denton (U.S. EPA Region 9), Regulatory – Federal

Tim Mussen (Regional San), POTWs

Lisa Thompson (Regional San), POTWs

Amy Phillips (El Dorado County), Stormwater – Phase II

Stephanie Fong (State and Federal Contractors Water Agency), Water Supply

Erwin Van Nieuwenhuysse (Bureau of Reclamation), Coordinated Monitoring

Others present:

Brock Bernstein, Facilitator

Thomas Jabusch, SFEI-ASC

Phil Trowbridge, SFEI-ASC

Rachel Kubiak, WPHA

Patrick Morris, Central Valley Water Board

Selina Cole, Central Valley Water Board

Yumiko Henneberry, DSP

Dalia Fadl (City of Sacramento), Stormwater Phase I (SC Alternate)

Jim Orlando, USGS

Sam Harader, DSP

Tom Grovhoug (LWA), POTWs (SC Alternate)

Cam Irvine, CH2M

Rainer Hoenicke, DSP

Nicole Stern, DSP

Janis Cooke (Central Valley Water Board), Regulatory – State (TAC Alternate)

On phone

Paul Bedore, RBI

Sam Safi (Regional San), POTWs (SC Alternate)

Hamid Parsa (Mountain House CSD), POTWs (SC Alternate)

| | |
|----|---|
| 1. | <p>Introductions and Review Agenda A quorum was established.</p> |
| 2. | <p>Decision: Approve Meeting Summary from July 20, 2016 and Confirm/Set Next Meeting Dates The 7/20 Meeting Summary was approved. There were no comments. The next SC meeting dates are January 26, 2017 and May 3, 2017. The next TAC meeting is on December 13, 2016.</p> <p>OUTCOMES → <u>Decision:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ The 7/20 Meeting Summary was approved ⇒ The date for the spring SC meeting was set for May 3, 2017. </p> |
| 3. | <p>Informational: Celebrating the success of the DRMP - a historical timeline and achievements to date The co-chairs acknowledged progress made to-date and program accomplishments. They also emphasized the continuing need to increase the number of program participants and coordination.</p> |
| 4. | <p>Discussion: TAC feedback on the approved Charter Overall, the meeting participants agreed that the Charter is a living document that would be continually reviewed (once or twice a year). The agenda item resulted in discussion of the following main issues: <i>TAC co-Chair Update.</i> At the spring SC meeting the TAC co-chairs were tasked with</p> |

| |
|---|
| <p>preparing a bullet-style summary of “Delta RMP Monitoring Highlights” for the SC Meetings. This update seems to have run its course and can be stopped, because it is somewhat duplicative to the TAC summary in its new and shorter format. Monitoring highlights are usually discussed at the TAC meeting and covered in the TAC summary.</p> <p><i>Flowchart illustrating the proposed interaction of the Delta RMP with the Regional Board in data evaluation and follow-up.</i> Debra Denton expressed concerns over technical and legal implications of the flowchart. POTWs and Regional Board staff developed this flowchart independently of the Delta RMP decision-making process, to facilitate discussions about program participation by POTWs. Adam Laputz explained that the flowchart was not legally binding. However, he agreed that Regional Board staff would review the flowchart again as needed to ensure it truly represents what the Delta RMP tries to accomplish. Meeting participants agreed to form a small group that would clarify the issues with the flowchart and report back to the SC with a proposal for resolving them. This group would include Regional Board staff (Adam Laputz), State Board staff (Greg Gearheart, Rich Breuer), USEPA (Debra Denton), and representatives of POTWs (Debbie Webster), stormwater (Karen Ashby), and agriculture (Bruce Houdesheldt as placeholder pending follow-up discussion within the group).</p> <p><i>Membership.</i> Melanie Okoro suggested bringing other resource agencies into the program. NMFS is currently the only resource agency at the table and may not be in a position to represent other resource agencies with a stake in the issues, e.g. USFWS.</p> <p><i>Terms.</i> SC and TAC members have 2-year terms per the Charter. However, it is unclear when those terms started and end. ASC will work with the Coordinating Committee to establish when terms will start and end for SC members, TAC members, and TAC co-chairs.</p> <p><i>TAC co-Chairs.</i> The TAC co-Chairs were selected by the SC. At a future meeting, the SC should discuss the big picture question of whether the TAC should have two appointed co-chairs.</p> <p>OUTCOMES → <u>Decisions:</u></p> |
|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Stop producing the “Delta RMP Monitoring Highlights” document, but include similar content in the TAC summaries (i.e., Status of Monitoring Activities, Preliminary Monitoring Results, and Upcoming Activities) ⇒ Conduct a review of the Charter each year at the joint SC and TAC meeting. <p>→ Action Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Schedule call to discuss flowchart (Regional Board staff, by January 26, 2017) ⇒ Work with the Coordinating Committee to establish when terms will start and end for SC members, TAC members, and TAC co-chairs (Phil Trowbridge, by January 26) ⇒ Schedule a SC agenda item to discuss whether the TAC should continue to have two appointed co-chairs (Phil Trowbridge, by January 26) ⇒ Distribute Word version of the SC-approved Charter document to the TAC (Phil Trowbridge, by October 21) ⇒ Send additional specific changes and edits to the charter to Phil Trowbridge (SC and TAC, by November 18) ⇒ Bring Charter with additional edits to the SC for approval (Phil, by January 26) |
| <p>Begin Multi-Year Planning Session</p> | |
| <p>5.</p> | <p>Information: Overview of Multi-Year Planning Process Phil Trowbridge explained the purpose of the MYP for providing direction over the next 3-5 years.</p> |
| <p>6.</p> | <p>Discussion: Report Out of Major Findings from DSP External Review The external review panel convened by the Delta Science Program (DSP) has provided a report with their initial comments. The Delta RMP now has the opportunity to respond to these comments. Sam Harader (DSP) introduced the agenda item by describing the process moving forward. Another public meeting will be convened, once the response has been worked out. Generally, meeting participants appreciated the feedback received as an opportunity for improving the program. It was suggested that any future reviews should be done in 5-year or longer intervals. Meeting participants generally agreed that the response should be two-fold: 1) identifying and responding to questions that can be addressed by providing missing background information that was not previously communicated and/or available to the panel; 2) adjusting the monitoring design to deal with fundamental issues identified by the panel. This may require the implementation of specific changes that would improve the usefulness of Delta RMP data for informing management decisions. Some comments may be addressed quickly, while others may need to be acknowledged and addressed over time. There was agreement that the response would need to be well thought out, that the various committees of</p> |

| | |
|------------|---|
| | <p>the Delta RMP should all be involved in appropriate roles, and that ASC should function as the “hub” for coordinating the response. Large portions of the December 13 TAC meeting and the January 26 SC meeting should be devoted to the discussion of the response. Discussion participants agreed that the response and pesticide prioritization should be done sequentially because a) there should be clarity first about how the outcomes of the review would affect the pesticide monitoring; and 2) the response will be a non-trivial effort and there are bandwidth concerns for committee members and staff. The acknowledged downside is that the prioritization may not be completed in time for the FY1718 workplan. (NOTE: see additional direction given in Item #11).</p> <p>→ <u>Decision:</u></p> <p>⇒ ASC to coordinate and draft a response to the External Review Panel, through the Planning Subcommittee, with a not-to-exceed budget of \$10,000 of funds from Reserve. ASC to also coordinate discussions about prioritizing pesticides at the same time if there is overlap with the response to the External Review Panel. Moved by Linda Dorn. Seconded by Bruce Houdesheldt. Approved: 10-0-0.</p> |
| <p>7.</p> | <p>Decision: Agree on Strategic Revisions to the Monitoring Design, if any This item was not discussed. It was superseded by the discussion of the External Review response.</p> |
| <p>8.</p> | <p>Discussion: Report Out on Outcomes from Nutrient Monitoring Workshop The September 30 Nutrient Monitoring Workshop had good turnout, was well received by participants, and resulted in a report that lays out options for “no regrets” activities the Delta RMP could take on, in the context of the existing monitoring. Some key discussion points were that a) the report is a step in the right direction of linking activities to management questions, 2) agreement with the need for additional and continued synthesis of the data that are already being collected by other programs, and 3) the need for more detail on the no regrets options to inform workplan decisions.</p> |
| <p>9.</p> | <p>Discussion: Goals and Process for Revising the List of Pesticides This item was not discussed. It was superseded by the discussion of the review response.</p> |
| <p>10.</p> | <p>Discussion: Review and Update Table of Upcoming Management Decisions The purpose of this item was to agree on a list of management decisions to determine if there are critical data that the Delta RMP could generate to inform them. A number of participants commented that the list of 20-some programs is too extensive. The general feedback was that there should only be a few delta-</p> |

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| | <p>centric core decisions for the Delta RMP to focus on. These include the Central Valley Pyrethroids TMDL, the Delta Nutrient Research Plan (NRP), and the Delta Methylmercury TMDL. Participants suggested that there is an opportunity for the Delta RMP nutrient element and the Delta Nutrient Research plan to be moving forward together. Melanie Okoro suggested that restoration activities could be another management driver for the Program.</p> <p><i>OUTCOMES</i></p> <p>→ Action Item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Develop a matrix that shows the intersect between the 3 major drivers (NRP, Pyrethroids TMDL, MeHg TMDL) and the Delta RMP assessment questions (Phil Trowbridge by January 26, 2017) |
| <p>11.</p> | <p>Decision: Agree on Planning Budgets for FY17/18 and Out-Years</p> <p>Participants used a budget spreadsheet to develop “ball park” funding allocations for FY17/18 for the different focus areas. The expected revenue for the year is approximately \$1M. The following planning budgets and guidance were established by consensus (no vote taken).</p> <p>Pesticides/Toxicity: \$200-\$250k total, including RMP funds and SWAMP funds. This amount should include the technical synthesis report of the first two years of data. Pyrethroids should be the priority for monitoring; however, keep in mind that the Ag coalitions need certain other pesticides monitored for ILRP compliance and that their agreements with the Regional Board for the monitoring swap may need to be renegotiated. Likewise, the Regional Board’s SWAMP funding (~\$200k+) will continue to be used for a contract with UC Davis-AHPL for toxicity testing. The SC also discussed the need to spend time in FY17/18 to develop a comprehensive, long-term monitoring design for pesticides/toxicity, taking into consideration the comments from the External Review, results from the first two years, and the goals of the Program.</p> <p>Nutrients: \$250k. The Nutrients Subcommittee and TAC should consider and flesh out the options presented in the Nutrient Monitoring Workshop Report and any other options. Priority options discussed were: Coordination workshops, adding nutrient parameters to existing monitoring programs, adding parameters needed for modeling to existing programs, and continued data analysis (as long as the work helps to answer Delta RMP assessment questions).</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>Mercury: \$250k. Mercury monitoring tasks depend on the outcome of the Prop 1 proposal.</p> <p>Pathogens: \$0</p> <p>Contaminants of Emerging Concern: \$100k. A placeholder budget for CEC work was set. The Water Board expressed that CEC work could not carve into the planned budgets on the other focus areas. However, Prop 1 funds for mercury and contributions from new participants may make it possible to achieve all of the planned objectives plus some CEC work.</p> <p>The TAC and its subcommittees will work with the ballpark dollar amounts to identify the best technical options for each program element to address the Delta RMP assessment questions. Based on TAC recommendations, ASC will present options for the FY17/18 workplan to the SC. The Financial Subcommittee will review the draft workplan starting in March. The FY17/18 workplan and budget approval is scheduled for May 3, 2017.</p> |
| <p>End Multi-Year Planning Session</p> | |
| <p>12.</p> | <p>Decision: Approve List of “Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEP) Eligible” Projects</p> <p>Regional Board and ASC staff presented for approval: 1) a memo describing proposed program fees associated with any SEP that would be administered by the Delta RMP and 2) a proposed list of “SEP Eligible “ projects. Regional Board staff will be in charge of SEP negotiations and ASC will be in charge of project administration and oversight. The current list of “SEP Eligible “ projects includes unfunded elements of the pesticides, mercury, and nutrient monitoring designs and ranges from \$75 -\$150K in cost. Settlements are often smaller than the proposed projects. Regional Board staff agreed to look into “pooling” multiple smaller settlements into a larger project.</p> <p><i>OUTCOMES</i></p> <p>→ Decision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Accept memo on SEP Process and Projects. Motion: Debbie Webster. Seconded by Adam Laputz. Approved: 6-0-1. <p>→ Action Item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Look into “pooling” multiple settlements into one larger Supplemental |

| | |
|-----|--|
| | Environmental Project (Regional Board staff, by January 26) |
| 13. | <p>Planning for How to Use Up the Balance of SWAMP Contract Funds Regional Water Board staff estimate that there will be a balance left at the end of FY16/17 when its SWAMP contract ends. This money should be spent on an unfunded need so that future SWAMP allocations to the Central Valley Regional Board do not get reduced. The remaining funds can only be spent on toxicity testing applied to monitoring and assessment. The group ultimately agreed on using the funds for <i>Hyaella</i> toxicity testing at the Delta RMP pesticide/toxicity monitoring stations for the remaining 8 months of FY16/17. However, the discussion also came back to the disagreement over whether the <i>Hyaella</i> method needed further testing to understand reliability in results, and whether the Delta RMP should be taking it on. In any case, SWAMP funds would not be eligible for method validation testing. The discussion was ended but not resolved.</p> <p><i>OUTCOMES</i> → Decision: ⇒ Use expected leftover SWAMP funds (\$28,000) to analyze pesticide samples at the Delta RMP stations for <i>Hyaella</i> toxicity from November 2016 through June 2017. Motion: Dave Tamayo. Seconded: Bruce Houdesheldt. Approved: 8-0-0.</p> |
| 14. | <p>Plus/Delta and Plan Science Update for Next Meeting The next SC meeting will feature a science update on nutrients.</p> <p>There was no time on the agenda to discuss the USGS sensor synthesis reports and SC participants requested more time for review prior to giving an approval. The draft reports will be considered approved, if no comments will be received by November 1.</p> <p><i>OUTCOMES</i> → Action Item: ⇒ Send comments on USGS report to Joe Domagalski (SC, by November 1).</p> |
| 15. | Adjourn |