



RMP Contaminant Fate Work Group Meeting

January 15, 2008

San Francisco Estuary Institute

First Floor Conference Room

7770 Pardee Lane, Oakland

10:00 AM – 5:00 PM

Lunch will be provided.

AGENDA

1.	Introductions and Review of Agenda	10:00 Jay Davis
2.	Information: Review of September 2007 Meeting (Attachment)	10:10 Jay Davis
3.	Action: Review of Reports on the Multi-box PCB Model (Attachments 1 and 2) Desired Outcomes: Obtain and discuss review comments on the two draft reports. Agreement on plans for completion of the report. Discussion of next steps for PCB modeling to be considered for inclusion in the Five-year Plan.	10:20 John Oram
	Lunch Break	12:00
4.	Action: Review of Five-Year Workplan for the CFWG (Attachments: Five-Year Plan, Multi-box Screening Study Scope) The Five-Year Plan has been revised in response to comments received on the draft. Desired Outcome: Approval of Five-Year Plan, or agreement on plan for completion. If time allows, discussion and approval of the Multi-box Screening Study.	12:20 Don Yee
5.	Action: Food Web Uptake Study (Attachment) One major element of the RMP being implemented in response to the RMP Mercury Strategy is an intensive study of spatial and temporal patterns in food web uptake. A draft plan for the study will be presented and discussed. Desired Outcome: Obtain feedback on the draft plan.	1:30 Ben Greenfield

6.	<p>Action: Closed Session: Decision on Mercury Proposals (Attachments: RFP, 8 proposals) Invited peer reviewers (Baker, Gobas, Mason, Stolzenbach) and stakeholders to discuss proposals submitted in response to the RFP. We ask that workgroup members read and rate the proposals prior to the meeting by rating each on a scale of 1 to 5 (5 being strongest, 1 being weakest) against the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. applicability to management needs as articulated in the RMP mercury strategy 2. technical feasibility (are the tools experimental or well-established?) 3. likelihood to achieve stated objectives with the proposed experimental or sampling design 4. cost-effectiveness (bang for the buck) 5. qualifications of the proposing team <p>Desired Outcome: Selection of a proposal for funding, or a agreeing on a plan for completing the selection process.</p>	2:30 Facilitated by SFEI
7.	Adjourn	5:00