Final

Urban Pesticides Coordinated Monitoring Program (UPCMP)
Interim Steering Committee Meeting

September 18, 2019
10:00 AM – 3:00 PM

Meeting Summary

Attendees

SC Member	Affiliation	Representing	Present
Chris Crompton*	Orange County Public Works	MS4	**Yes**
Jayne Joy	Regional Water Board 8	RWQCB 8	**Yes**
Jim Scanlin*	Alameda County Clean Water Program	MS4	**Yes**
Marleigh Wood	State Water Board	SWRCB	**Yes**
Nan Singhasemanon	Department of Pesticide Regulation	DPR	**Yes**
Dave Tamayo*	Sacramento County	MS4	**Yes**
Patti Tenbrook	EPA Region 9	EPA	**Yes**
Phillip Crader	State Water Board	SWRCB	**No**
Greg Gearheart	State Water Board	SWRCB	**No**
Jennifer Teerlink	Department of Pesticide Regulation	DPR	**No**
Claire Waggoner	State Water Board	SWRCB	**Yes**
Jeffrey Albrecht	State Water Board	SWRCB	**No**
Melissa Morris	State Water Board	SWRCB	**Yes**
Sahand Rastegarpour	State Water Board	SWRCB	**Yes**
Thomas Mumley	Regional Water Board 2	RWQCB 2	**Yes**
Annelisa Moe#	Heal the Bay	NGO	**No**

*Interim representatives from CASQA
#Likely to recommend an alternative for her seat because she is too busy

Guests and Staff

- Melissa Foley - SFEI/ASC
- Nina Buzby - SFEI/ASC
- Becky Sutton -SFEI/ASC
- Liz Miller - SFEI/ASC
- Kelly Moran - TDC Environmental, LLC

- Matt Freese, SWRCB
- Daniel Delgado, SWRCB
- Sarah Huber, SWRCB

1. Welcome, introductions, review agenda

Melissa Foley began the meeting by asking attendees to introduce themselves. To help establish relationships and instill group trust, attendees were also asked to provide information on their affiliation and what they hope to accomplish during the planning grant phase of the project. During introductions, attendees also spoke about their background and involvement with urban pesticide topics.

2. Update on State Water Quality Control Plan Amendments

Matt Freese began the item by thanking everyone for coming to the Water Board building in Sacramento. Matt reported to the group that onboarding new management has slowed the timeline for approval, but updates and draft products will be shared with the group soon.

Tom Mumley is on the Executive Management team for the amendments and he thinks the process will be moving forward by the end of 2019. There was no concern about this effort (UPCMP) getting out ahead of the Amendments process.

3. Update on Planning Grant to Interim Steering Committee

Melissa Foley provided an overview of the tasks required in the planning grant to the meeting attendees. The overview was at a high level, as later agenda items would involve discussion of each task in more detail. Melissa Foley communicated the general timeline and key deliverables of the grant project work. Melissa Foley brought up one qualifying comment to the interim committee, noting that the QAPP document would only be held to a draft. This is due to the fact that specific details such as analytical contractors may not be entirely worked out.

4. Discussion on Task 1 - Convene two advisory groups

<u>Technical Group</u>
In order to finalize the Technical Group and Steering Committee lists, Melissa Foley encouraged discussion on the process of determining committee members. Melissa Foley reminded the meeting participants of the representative groups that should be included, according to the charter. These are the State Water Board, Regional Water Board, CA Department of Pesticide

Regulation (DPR), MS4 stormwater permittees, US EPA Region 9. There is also room for adding others based on needed expertise.

The group first discussed the goals and roles of the Technical Group, and specified possible criteria for membership consideration. Ideas that were brought up include: continuity, to reduce the amount of time spent bringing new members up to speed; willingness to be informed and participate; unique technical expertise or knowledge that brings something different to the table; varied geographic representation that captures the differences in pest pressures, pesticide use, and hydrology; and staff that need to learn about such topics or grow into such a role.

From these conversations the group moved on to determine the expertise needs of the Technical Group. More topics will likely be added, though the main areas discussed were pesticide use patterns, chemistry (e.g., biodegradation, transport and fate), toxicology, monitoring, hydrology, quality assurance, and statistics. Additionally the meeting participants agreed that the number of representatives from the regional board and stormwater permittees (MS4s) should be three each. This would likely provide sufficient geographic representation, though the option to add more people would remain open. Other group membership would mirror the Steering Committee: two people from DPR and one from US EPA Region 9. Inviting someone from the University of California Cooperative Extension to participate was also suggested, possibly Darren Haver. Bryn Phillips from UC Davis and the Granite Canyon Lab (also part of the Stream Pollution Trends Monitoring Program - SPoT) was also put forward as a possible member. It was also suggested that there was a STORMS technical group assembled previously that we could tap for Technical Group members.

Looking at the San Francisco Bay's Regional Monitoring Program (RMP) as an example, it was noted that the current UPCMP plan did not include an NGO representative on the Technical Group. Heal the Bay was brought up as a possibility, though Tom Mumley noted that it has been difficult to find someone willing to participate. The practical role of an NGO presence on the Technical Group would likely be someone able to at least observe and report back to stakeholders about the efforts.

Melissa Foley concluded the Technical Group discussions by planning to send a list of expectations for Technical Group members and ideal areas of expertise to interim Steering Committee members. The next step would involve Steering Committee members sending in personnel suggestions for Technical Group members from each of their respective groups/agencies, ideally by the end of October.

<u>Steering Committee</u>

The conversation then transitioned to a discussion of Steering Committee membership. After providing a brief summary of the committee's roles, Melissa Foley noted the potential that many of the day's meeting participants would make up this group. Similar to the Technical Group, representation on the Steering Committee would include State and Regional Water Boards, DPR, MS4 Permittees, and the US EPA. Heal the Bay has been a part of prior discussions.

Chris Crompton and Dave Tamayo noted that the current MS4 representatives are serving as interim members in coordination with CASQA and its Board. CASQA does not have a current process to formally select representatives. Setting up this governance structure will likely take some time - potentially nine months. Matt Freese reminded everyone that the UPCMP Steering Committee is only working on developing the program, and not making any decisions on behalf of the State Water Board. Patti Tenbrook also commented that the committee's US EPA representative would not be a voting member because it would be inappropriate for a federal government representative to vote on matters of how state funds are spent. While this would leave an even number of people as voting representatives, there is little concern about a tie when voting on actions because the goal is to reach consensus among the group before taking a vote.

Melissa Foley then directed the meeting participants to confirm the interim Steering Committee members as actual members, with official confirmation of MS4 representatives in approximately nine months. Group consensus on this decision was reached. Kelly Moran noted that the interim group lacks a representative from the Division of Water Quality at the Water Board. Phil Crader, the Assistant Deputy Director of the Surface Water/Regulatory Branch, was on the invitee list.

For upcoming meetings, Melissa Foley suggested that the Interim Steering Committee would meet after the Technical Group when decisions need to be made on project components. The number of meetings needed and their timing will be based on product timelines.

Action Items:

- Set up email list for the Steering Committee and Technical Group (when members are selected) (Nina Buzby and Melissa Foley, October 31, 2019)
- Propose Technical Group representatives (Steering Committee, October 31, 2019)

5. Discussion on Task 2 - Finalize Priority Management Questions

Kelly Moran introduced the item by informing meeting participants of the previous efforts to determine a list of management questions. The previous extensive list was narrowed down to four *priority* management questions potentially relevant to the first year(s) of the program, with the next step to determine a way to finalize such questions. The process steps to come out of the group discussion were an initial review by the Steering Committee for red flags, followed by a Technical Group review to ensure that monitoring efforts will be able to address these questions. The Steering Committee will then finalize and approve the Priority Management Questions.

After breaking for lunch the meeting participants began to review each of the priority management questions (see end of minutes). Various concerns were brought up by meeting participants, with the majority focused on improving question specificity. After coming up with edits to the first three questions, the group decided to subsume the final question into the third. This fourth question was initially focused on identifying trends in pesticide management actions. Since the third question aimed to assess the effectiveness of management practices, it would be reasonable to use trend analysis as a metric.

Melissa Foley agreed to send revised questions to the Steering Committee, with possible variants. She also noted that there would be more specific management questions associated with special studies, adding an additional layer to the program's scope.

Action Items:

- Provide revisions to Priority Management Questions to SC (Melissa Foley, October 31, 2019)

6. Discussion on Task 3 - Funding Plan

After Melissa Foley went over the timeline for developing the funding plan, the conversation transitioned to the topic of program funding sources. Specifically, the MS4 permittees have been communicating that costs will be around five cents per capita for monitoring plus an additional one cent for regulation (for municipalities with over 50,000 people). Any additional funding needs would need to be communicated early to allow enough time for reporting to permittees and planning.

The Funding Plan and Workplan will need to be developed in tandem because there needs to be enough funding for sampling to collect the necessary number and types of samples. Existing pesticide and toxicity monitoring will be reviewed to ensure the UPCMP Funding Plan and Workplan overlaps and expands pesticide sampling throughout the State. It will be important to communicate why changes to the existing monitoring program are needed and why the UPCMP Funding Plan and Workplan meet the needs of the State. Kelly Moran noted that the program size and scope will not only depend on funding but also analytical laboratory capacity. Many attendees were in agreement that reaching out to labs and developing a robust understanding of other state programs will be key in the initial stages of program development.

7. Discussion on Task 4 - Year 1 Workplan

When presenting the timeline and process for developing the Year 1 Workplan, Melissa Foley noted that this task would go hand in hand with the development of the Funding Plan and build off existing toxicity and pesticide sampling. Given the Funding Plan will be largely discussed at Steering Committee meetings and the Workplan will be the focus of the Technical Group,

Melissa Foley's job as project manager will be ensuring cross reporting between the groups and keeping both efforts in lock step with one another.

When discussing the general structure for the program (half covering regular toxicity monitoring, and half focused on monitoring specific pesticides and special studies), Patti Tenbrook noted that the regular monitoring aspect of the program should have a different name - as it is not exactly status and trend work, nor entirely toxicity monitoring. Specifically, toxicity will need to be conducted concurrently with chemistry efforts, while chemistry efforts won't necessarily require toxicity testing. Nan Singhasemanon of DPR added that one of the agency's greatest needs is further toxicity data, and toxicity testing should remain a top priority for the program. The Workplan should build on sampling already being conducted by DPR and SWAMP SPoT.

Additional discussion focused on what questions and definitions are yet to be determined. For example, amendment language references that at least one water sample will be taken from each "area" per permit cycle. However, the definition of "area" is not yet clear; it could refer to stormwater permittees or municipalities. Establishing such a definition would also touch on a data quality question: whether more data from a small number of watersheds is more or less valuable than less data from a greater number of watersheds. With so many choices, Kelly Moran commented on the importance of convening of staff from both the State and Regional Water Boards to define "area."

Becky Sutton brought up a sampling challenge for the program that will need to be incorporated into the Year 1 Workplan. Not all of the funding will be available at once, so the Workplan will need to be structured so that work can be phased in as money becomes available. Chris Crompton noted another challenge for consideration - in-kind services. For example, some agencies may be interested in collecting or analyzing samples themselves, providing an in-kind contribution to UPCMP monitoring activities. It will be important for the program to properly balance collaboration opportunities with maintaining scientific integrity and consistency.

Other key features of the Workplan that were discussed included identifying data gaps, building in sample adaptability over time, balancing the data needs of DPR and the Water Boards, and identifying the appropriate temporal and spatial scales of monitoring to answer the Priority Management Questions.

8. Discussion on Task 5 - Draft Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP)

Melissa Morris, the Quality Assurance (QA) representative from the State Water Board, communicated that a first step would involve developing program data quality objectives. These would be dependent on the finalized priority management questions. Melissa Morris informed the group of a seven question survey that, when answered by the Technical Group, should help

identify data quality objectives. Such objectives will also help contribute to program data quality questions. Nan suggested we include DPR in these efforts.

9. Action Items and Future Agenda Items

Melissa Foley thanked all the meeting participants for taking the time to participate in the meeting. After acknowledging that most action items fell under her responsibility, Melissa Foley reiterated the two most pressing needs from the group members, including developing a list of Technical Group representatives and looking over the revised Priority Management Questions.

Kelly Moran also extended thanks to Melissa Foley for organizing the agenda and to the Water Board for handling meeting logistics.

ADJOURN

Final

Priority Management Questions

Original versions:

1. Is pesticide-related toxicity in urban receiving waters receiving urban runoff achieving the target in the Urban Pesticides Plan Amendments (TMDL target)?

2. Are any pesticide/degradate concentrations approaching or above benchmarks, criteria, objectives, or toxicity thresholds in surface waters receiving urban runoff?

3. Are management practices effective in reducing [insert name of specific pesticide] concentration/loads in runoff and aquatic toxicity objectives associated with this pesticide amendment or TMDL?

4. What are the spatial and temporal distributions and frequencies of pesticide detections in receiving water?

Edited versions:

1. Is pesticide-related toxicity in urban surface waters receiving substantial urban runoff achieving targets in the Urban Pesticides Plan Amendments (TMDL target)?

For urban surface waters receiving substantial urban runoff, are pesticide-related toxicity TMDL targets being met per the Urban Pesticide Plan Amendments?

2. Are any pesticide/degradate concentrations approaching or above benchmarks, criteria, objectives, or toxicity thresholds in surface waters receiving substantial urban runoff?

3. What are the spatial and temporal trends in [insert name of specific pesticide] concentrations, runoff loads, and aquatic toxicity? Are toxicity and pesticide concentration in surface waters declining with the current suite of management practices?

~~4. What are the spatial and temporal distributions and frequencies of pesticide detections in receiving water?~~ [combined with question 3]