



SAN FRANCISCO ESTUARY INSTITUTE

4911 Central Avenue, Richmond, CA 94804 • p 510-746-7334 • f 510-746-7300 www.sfei.org

RMP Multi-Year Planning Workshop

November 1, 2016

San Francisco Estuary Institute

Meeting Summary

Attendees

SC Member	Affiliation	Representing	Present
Jim Ervin	City of San Jose	POTW-Large	Yes
Dan Tafolla	Vallejo Sanitation and Flood Control District	POTW-Small	Yes
Karin North**	City of Palo Alto	POTW-Medium	Yes
Adam Olivieri	BASMAA / EOA, Inc.	Stormwater	Yes
Peter Carroll	Tesoro Golden Eagle Refinery	Refineries	No (Mike Armour was Alternate)
John Coleman	Bay Planning Coalition	Dredgers	Yes
Jessica Burton Evans	US Army Corps of Engineers	USACE	Yes
VACANT		Industry	
David Frandsen	NRG Energy	Cooling Water	No
Tom Mumley*	SFB Regional Water Quality Control Board	Water Board	Yes

* Chair, ** Vice Chair

Guests and Staff

- Luisa Valiela - USEPA Region 9
- Chris Sommers - BASMAA
- Bridgette DeShields - Integral Consulting
- Shannon Alford - Port of SF
- Mike Connor - EBDA
- Mike Armour - Shell
- Samantha Engelage - City of Palo Alto
- Amy Chastain - SFPUC
- Chuck Striplen - Region 1 Water Board
- Colleen Hunt - Region 1 Water Board
- David Kuzmar - Region 1 Water Board
- Susan Higgins - County Water Agency
- Andy Rodgers - West Yost Assoc.
- Richard Looker - Water board
- Phil Trowbridge - SFEI
- Jay Davis -SFEI
- Rebecca Sutton -SFEI - phone
- Jennifer Sun -SFEI
- Ila Shimabuku -SFEI

1. Goals, ground rules

There were no changes made to the agenda.

2. Discussion: Anticipated management decisions and policies, and related information needs

3. Discussion: Summary of stakeholder priorities and internal review outcomes

Items 2 and 3 were merged.

Mike Connor expressed the desire for the Steering Committee to identify their biggest management drivers and to focus on issues that are “hypothesis driven.” Beneficial reuse of sediment and information relative to the in-Bay disposal limits was raised as a topic that could be explored more by the RMP. The group also discussed the broader issue of measuring beneficial use attainment. This discussion focused on possible ideas for RMP work: how to coordinate priorities, efforts, and resources; identification of possible stressors and quantification of possible data needs; and whether or not beneficial use attainment is a high enough priority to warrant effort from the RMP. The group also discussed a potential wetlands regional monitoring program to monitor habitat restoration more efficiently than site-specific studies. Some information on how beneficial reuse studies could intersect with wetlands may come from the EPA’s workshop surrounding future work and permitting related to Measure AA. This workshop will take place on January 5, 2017.

Action Items

- Hold a meeting of a small group to discuss the issue of monitoring beneficial uses attainment. This group is to include Jim Ervin, Jay Davis, Mike Connor, and Richard Looker. (Jay Davis, 1/31/17)

4. Discussion: Specific program priorities for 2018 and general priorities for 2019-2020

Phil Trowbridge gave an overview of the Bay RMP’s projected revenues and expenses for now through 2020. It was recommended that the planning budget for the RMP be around 150% of the actual likely budget so that there are proposals to choose from if more funding were to come in. Multi-year plans for each of the program areas of the RMP were presented. The following notes describe sections of the plans that were discussed in detail.

S&T Margins: The priority of the RMP margins studies was questioned as to whether or not it could affect stormwater management decisions. Phil and some participants pointed out that margins work is not only relevant to stormwater management, but is also relevant to contaminant hotspot identification and

management, PCB management, dredging, and a general understanding of status and trends in the Bay. It was recommended that the utility of margins studies for dredgers be described more clearly.

PCBs: The data set from the Dredged Material Management Office (DMMO) was identified as a possible “treasure trove” that could be used to characterize sediment concentrations of several contaminants, evaluate disposal management and load reductions, and assist with mass calculations of contaminants in the Bay. It was proposed that the RMP use a small amount of funds for a preliminary assessment of the DMMO data set before narrowing down possibilities for data synthesis.

Selenium: Additional proposed monitoring for selenium in 2017 was left in the plan pending discussion of a funding request later in the day. Karin North recommended that selenium data collected by Palo Alto and USGS be included in the South Bay Synthesis work when that study is conducted.

Dioxin: The DMMO data set could also be used to study dioxins at the same time as the 2017 synthesis of RMP dioxin data.

Emerging Contaminants: The group expressed a desire to have more than one management question for the EC studies. It was noted that the updated CEC Strategy will have more questions.

Microplastics: The Committee discussed the large, \$350k budget for microplastics work in 2018 and expressed concern that sufficient funds would be available from the RMP. It was suggested that sediment samples in 2018 could be archived to reduce costs.

Small Tributaries Loading Strategy (STLS): There were no comments on the proposed plan.

Nutrients: It was suggested that new monitoring for ocean acidification parameters should be part of the nutrients budget.

Exposure & Effects (EE): A few members of the committee expressed concern that bioanalytical monitoring is too complicated and this effort not a high enough priority. Should the RMP be sustaining its own bioanalytical tool development effort or should we combine our efforts with a larger, possibly state or federal effort? It was agreed to postpone starting work on any new bioanalytical tools until 2019.

Sediment: The group suggested revisions to the priority questions to have a better connection to the beneficial reuse and in-Bay disposal questions. Allocations to support LTMS studies were also reduced because the timing of those studies are uncertain.

Action Items

- Send out Multi-Year Plan to SC and TRC again and ask for comments by 12/1/16. (Ila Shimabuku, 11/5/16)
- Update the Multi-Year Plan by 1/10/17 with:
 - Management Drivers: Add a short summary about potential future drivers for the RMP.
 - Status and Trends: Update table with correct budgets for margins sediment monitoring and the objectives of the margins sampling (including a nexus with dredging questions).

- EC: Plans for nonylphenol in margins sediment need to be in either 2017 or 2019. There will not be margins sampling in 2018.
- Microplastic: Clarify whether the \$150k in 2018 for methods development is a critical need or a placeholder in case a need develops. Add a lower cost effort for 2018 sediment sampling that would just archive the samples for later analysis.
- EE: Push-out GC bioassay work until 2019-2020. Cross reference the bioassay work on the EC multi-year plan.
- Sediment Strategy: Reduce budget for contributing to LTMS studies to \$50k in 2019 and 2020. Combine initial discussions about hosting the DMMO database with the dioxin/PCB initial tasks. Edits priority question #3 to be “where, how, and how much...” Add the USGS suspended sediment monitoring to the bottom half of the table.
- Selenium: Update table with estimates for long-term monitoring of sturgeon.
- Scope out the cost to analyze the dioxin data in the DMMO database at the same time as the synthesis of RMP dioxin data scheduled for 2017, and evaluate whether there are cost savings from combining these projects and with inclusion of other parameters such as PCBs. (Phil Trowbridge, 1/10/17)

5. Summary, Action Items, Adjourn Planning Session

The meeting was adjourned at 12:20 pm.

Lunch