

**RMP Technical Review Committee Meeting  
July 9th, 2009  
San Francisco Estuary Institute  
Draft Meeting Minutes**

**Attendees:**

Mike Connor (EBDA)	Rod Miller (SFPUC)
Bridgette DeShields (Arcadis/WSPA)	Trish Mulvey (SFEI Board of Directors)
Tom Hall (South Bay Dischargers (EOA))	Jay Davis (SFEI)
Mike Kellogg (CCSF)	Rainer Hoenicke (SFEI)
John Prall (Port of Oakland)	Jennifer Hunt (SFEI)
Francois Rodigari (EBMUD/BACWA)	Lester McKee (SFEI)
Chris Sommers (Stormwater Agencies (EOA))	Aroon Melwani (SFEI)
Karen Taberski (RWQCB)	Meg Sedlak (SFEI)
	Don Yee (SFEI)

By telephone:

Richard Looker (RWQCB)  
Luisa Valliela (USEPA)

**1. Introductions and Approval of Agenda and Minutes**

The Chair asked for comments on the minutes; no comments were received and a motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes.

Meg Sedlak gave a quick update on the financial status of the Institute. A small profit was made in June (*and July*) as a result of several cost-cutting measures (deferring 403 (b) contributions and salary adjustments) and revenue enhancements. Ms. Sedlak stated that Rainer Hoenicke had been appointed by the Board to the position of Executive Director.

Ms. Sedlak also presented a staff recommendation that the Data Integration task be incorporated into the pilot and special study element and that a number of the projects that formerly would have been funded under this element were now included in the pilot and special study pool (e.g., modeling exercises and the SQO assessments). The Committee approved of this change.

Ms. Sedlak indicated that a number of the action items had been addressed or were part of the day's agenda (e.g., presentation on nutrients and the wet weather statistical design). The Dioxin QAPP and the PAH memorandum are complete and will be sent out to the TRC. The sediment coring project was discussed in the Contaminant Fate workgroup meeting and that group recommended waiting on doing further coring work.

## **2. Information: Steering Committee Report**

Ms. Sedlak indicated that the budget was largely on track. The major change in the budget was the use of contingency funds to pay for vessels for the 2009 S&T water and sediment cruises. Ms. Sedlak indicated that she was hopeful that SFEI can work with the Bureau of Reclamation to use the R/V Endeavor for next year. It is expected that approximately \$45,000 will be needed from this year's contingency fund to pay for the R/V Questuary (sediment) and R/V Shanae Rae (water).

## **3. Information: Workgroup Updates**

Ms. Sedlak indicated that pilot/special studies for 2010 were mainly suggested either by the dischargers or Regional Board (RB). There are a few exceptions. An effort was made to ensure that all pilot/special studies are explicit about whether their study is answering management questions or fulfilling a permit requirement. It was suggested that the RMP might also want to consider adding proposal rationale in terms of workgroup strategies that have been developed.

Each of the workgroup leads presented the pilot and special studies reviewed by the workgroup and the context for the rankings by the workgroup.

- Exposure and Effects Workgroup (presented by Meg Sedlak)
  - PBDE egg injection in tern eggs: proposed by USGS (East coast). Solicited by SFEI and RB (Karen Taberski and Naomi Feger).
  - Effect of copper on olfactory systems in salmonids: proposed by NOAA. A freshwater olfactory threshold exists. This work would lay the foundation for developing a saltwater effect of copper on salmonids. Solicited by SFEI and RB (Richard Looker).
  - Gene expression for use in sediment TIEs: proposed by SCCWRP from the joint CTAG/RMP meeting and the Causes of Sediment Toxicity workgroup. The study will attempt to determine if genomics can be used to identify contaminants causing toxicity. This project will advance Sediment Quality Objectives (SQO) assessment techniques.
- Dioxin Strategy (presented by Meg Sedlak)
  - This is part of a five-year strategy to better understand dioxin loads to the Bay. The money slated for 2010 is for tributary loading work augmenting the Mallard Island and Guadalupe River projects.
  - Dioxin modeling studies scheduled for 2010 were postponed (\$20,000) due to the dearth of data.
- Emerging Contaminants workgroup (presented by Meg Sedlak)
  - A joint project between the RMP and NIST would screen mussel and seal tissues for emerging contaminants using state of the art techniques (proposed by NIST and SFEI). NIST will review chromatograms and identify the largest peaks using the currently available libraries of compounds. By looking at both mussel and seal tissues, the project would evaluate contaminants in different parts of the food web and in species

with different metabolic capabilities. This screening technique is similar to the Oros study which identified PBDEs in the Bay in early 2000, only the NIST technique is much more powerful. Chris Sommers asked how are we partnering with other agencies for financial support since others will benefit from this study? Ms. Sedlak indicated that no additional partners had been identified but that she would explore this issue with SCCWRP. Chris Sommers suggested following up with NOAA and SCCWRP to see if they can contribute funding and to work on building partnerships and see what other agencies can provide in kind support.

- Contaminant Fate workgroup (presented by John Oram)
  - Milestones – The workgroup met in early June to discuss the draft modeling strategy among other items.
    - Development of draft modeling strategy. The next steps are to refine the strategy and to develop a more detailed multi-year workplan and rationale.
    - Sediment coring project. All of the analyses are complete (organics and inorganics) and Don Yee has drafted an article for the Pulse.
    - Completion of the draft methyl mercury mass balance manuscript.
  - Next steps
    - PCB homologue model
    - Finalize modeling strategy
    - Expanded justification and multi-year workplan
    - Prepare coring manuscript
    - Complete Bay margins conceptual model
- Pilot and special study proposals
  - Sediment transport and biota model

This study idea was a response to workgroup requests. The workgroup recommended that the modelers think about biota early and often – and think about how biota fit into models. Originally it was envisioned as two separate elements (sediment and biota) and then was later staff thought it would be best to incorporate the sediment transport review into the margins conceptual model for 2009. The biota conceptual model remains a separate task for 2010. John explained that there would be no additional cost for incorporating the sediment transport model into the 2009 work.
  - South Bay water/sediment model

This project would build upon the substantial effort that UC-Berkeley and Stanford have undertaken to develop a particle-tracking 3D hydrodynamic model of the South Bay as part of the South Bay Salt Pond project. Several TRC members wondered whether the model would meet RMP needs in addition to SBSP restoration work? John Oram assured the group that we would work to make sure RMP is represented. There were several questions as to how this fit in with future modeling – how does this work help? John indicated that once the model had been developed, SFEI would retain the code and would be able to develop other tributary and Bay margin models.

- Benthic Workgroup (presented by Aroon Melwani)

Aroon gave an update on the activities of the benthic workgroup which is developing and refining tools to assess benthos in San Francisco Bay. The workgroup held a workshop on June 3<sup>rd</sup> to evaluate the data collected to date and to see whether taxonomic groupings could be made. This project is a collaboration between RMP and SCCWRP to further develop the Sediment Quality Objective (SQO) assessments. The long term goal is to revise/develop benthic assessment methods for several San Francisco estuary and Delta assemblages. More immediately, the workgroup is reviewing the spatial and temporal extent of benthic assemblages in the San Francisco estuary and is working to develop a mesohaline benthic index.

SCCWRP and RMP staff have categorized the Bay into four different benthic habitats. The workgroup is planning a best professional judgment exercise to identify benthic response gradients. This will occur on August 24<sup>th</sup>.

The workgroup has submitted a proposal to finalize the mesohaline index, develop the chemistry score index (CSI) for SF Bay, and improve RMP capabilities to perform SQO assessments.

- Sources Pathways and Loading workgroup (presented by Lester McKee)

Lester McKee presented recent activities for the Sources Pathways and Loading workgroup. The main effort has been to develop the small tributaries loading strategy. Lester indicated that the group is focused on finalizing small tributary study activities for 2009 totaling \$80,000. Remaining 2009 tasks include ranking watersheds, optimizing sampling methods, and developing a multi-year sampling plan consistent with MRP and RMP. It is unlikely these will be completed by December 2009 as there will be considerable review and input from the Strategy team needed. At this time, it is anticipated that drafts will be ready in February/March in preparation for the April SPLWG meeting.

- Lester McKee explained the rationale for the four pilot and special study proposals for 2010:

- Update and develop spreadsheet model

This study was requested by Small Tributary Strategy team to develop a GIS model to improve estimate of contaminant loading on a regional scale, assess BMPs, and estimate trends.

- Reconnaissance of potential representative watersheds for loads monitoring

This study was requested by the Small Tributary Strategy team to conduct reconnaissance of high ranking watersheds. Purpose of the reconnaissance work is to evaluate whether there are logistical constraints such as channel form or safety that may prevent the small tributary team from conducting monitoring at a site.

- POC loads monitoring -- Scoping needs for land use specific monitoring

This study was requested by Small Tributary Strategy team. The objective of the study is to collect land use data to calibrate models to estimate regional loads. In southern California, eight representative land use classes based on management needs have been identified.

- Air deposition study

Lester McKee explained that this study was recommended by the workgroup to defer until next year. It was ranked high but one committee member did not recommend the study. However, it was seen as a priority by other members. The TRC requested that this study be included in the studies proposed for 2010 for several reasons. This would be a good opportunity to collect mercury deposition data from cement plants pre EPA regulation. A localized study would be very important. Don Yee and Chris Sommers will work on revising and submitting this proposal for TRC consideration.

Lester McKee then touched upon some of the tributary work that is being conducted in 2010 under the Status and Trends element of the program.

- POC loads monitoring -- As part of the Status and Trends element, continued monitoring at Zone 4 Line A will occur.
- Reduction in load monitoring at Mallard Island for 2010 to allow monitoring of Guadalupe River in 2010. Lester McKee explained that based on the redesign plan, Mallard Island had been scheduled to be monitored in 2010 and Guadalupe River in 2011. Dr. McKee explained that he had received supplemental funding to monitor the Guadalupe River in 2010 for mercury from SCVWD and suggested moving up the Guadalupe River monitoring to 2010 to augment the SCVWD project. The SPLWG recommended reducing the effort at Mallard Island from \$140,000 to \$100,000 and using the remaining funds to conduct organics monitoring at Guadalupe. The TRC agreed that this made sense to coordinate with SCVWD activities.
- POC loads monitoring -- Organics monitoring at Guadalupe. The Guadalupe River is a tributary identified as a longer term monitoring site in the MRP. As described above, by moving the sampling forward a year, the RMP will be able to monitor for both organics and inorganics. It was noted that the

sampling design allows for land use specific monitoring with upstream and downstream sites.

- PCB Strategy (Jay Davis)

Jay Davis commented that small fish PCB analysis was yielding interesting results. The preliminary PCB data collected in 2008 suggested that some small fish have concentrations of PCBs in the range of much higher trophic level sport fish. He also indicated that there was a lack of connection between PCBs in small fish and sources and explicit linkages of sediment and sport fish. Jay Davis then described the two pilot studies proposed for 2010.

- Determining PCB spatial patterns in biosentinel forage fish.

Small fish are a useful indicator for wildlife exposure to pollutants. There is an urgency to piggyback off of the existing small fish work as next year is the last year of a three-year extensive design. The PCB Strategy Team thought that a bioaccumulation conceptual model needs to be developed but is not an immediate priority (consider for 2011?). However, the Fate Workgroup considered development of a conceptual model for bioaccumulation to be a very high priority for 2010.

- Further development of the PCB conceptual model

Jay Davis indicated that the PCB conceptual model needed to incorporate the recent RMP sediment data which was showing lower concentrations in the Bay compared to historical concentrations observed ten years ago; this is particularly true for the northern portions of the estuary. He also suggested that a spatial analysis of RMP sediment data be conducted to obtain a better estimate of near shore average sediment contamination. The model is very sensitive to the degradation rate used and the PCB Team recommended that a literature review be conducted to obtain more up to date degradation rates as well as using the extensive congener data to evaluate potential sources and transport mechanisms.

#### **4. Action: Master Plan**

Jay Davis gave an update on the status of the RMP Master Plan that will tie the workgroup plans and strategies together with the management questions. He noted that in developing the outline for the Master Plan, he realized that the causes of toxicity element was not covered by any of the existing management questions (e.g., what contaminants are responsible for observed toxic responses?). A revision to address this will be presented to the TRC at a later meeting. Chris Sommers suggested using the word stressor associated with impacts.

Jay Davis thanked the Regional Board for the development of a table of information needs and explained that he was looking for something similar from each of

the major TRC representatives (e.g., stormwater, wastewater, etc.). Trish Mulvey asked how environmental justice groups might be brought in to comment on the Master Plan and information needs statements. Jay Davis suggested that this be reviewed by the TRC and SC and then passed on to the Board as there are environmental organizations participating in the Board meetings. Trish Mulvey asked that this be an action item.

Jay Davis presented an outline of the document. Section 1 includes a compilation of all of the management questions. Section 2 will provide information on management context for water quality plan and will include the regulatory framework and relevant management initiatives such as tidal marsh restoration or LTMS. This will be presented in bullet/tabular form. Section 3 will cover stakeholder priorities such as the table developed by the Regional Board and a plan for addressing these priorities. It will also identify data gaps. Stakeholder groups include Regional Board, Wastewater, Stormwater, Dredgers, and Industry sectors. Trish Mulvey asked how information needs for environmental justice groups will be incorporated. Jay Davis indicated that the Plan will be publicly available and distributed to the SFEI Board and other interested environmental groups when it is completed.

Section 4 describes the priority questions (level III) and study plans for the next five years. Jay Davis indicated that there was some redundancy in strategies and work groups and recommended that the RMP shift to strategies as planning documents and not have stand alone five-year work group plans. He also indicated that cross referencing between strategies will eliminate redundancy. Under this new format, “workplans” developed by the emerging contaminant workgroup and the exposure and effects workgroup will now be referred to as “strategies”. Jay indicated that the documents will need to explicitly state anticipated management decisions that the strategies will address.

A question was raised about how often the Master Plan would be revised and how this would tie into the Program Review. Jay indicated that parts of it would be updated every couple of years.

This raised a question about the external review of the program. Jay indicated that the last five-year review was conducted in 2003 and most likely the next review will probably be in 2011 or later. It was recommended that the program review be discussed with the Steering Committee, laying out pros and cons of different options. Ms. Sedlak indicated that funding had been set aside for the program review and she believed that approximately \$100,000 had been set aside to date. It was agreed that it would be best if the review occurred after the final master plan has been approved. The review process will take approximately a year to set up and identify the appropriate panelists. A timeline for planning and implementing the review process will be developed. It will also be important to decide what level review is required. It was noted that the last reviewers comments were not as helpful as they could have been. Some of the TRC members felt that the panel missed some of the key details of the program. We will need to have review on what RMP is, not what it should be. The RMP is running more efficiently due to past reviews. Next review will be different from past reviews.

**Action item:** Ensure that environmental justice groups might be brought in to comment on the Master Plan and information needs statements. Develop a process and schedule for the external review of the program.

## **5. Action: Ranking of Pilot and Special studies for 2010**

Meg Sedlak outlined the funding for 2010. Because the RMP is leasing vessels for the cruise this year, the contingency reserve will be expended and will not be carried over. Ms. Sedlak will ask the SC for \$50,000 from reserve to replenish this funding source for 2010. Meg Sedlak also explained that the funding for the data integration work (\$90,000) was moved from the Program Management budget into pilot and special studies. Therefore data integration work will come out of pilot/special studies funding.

As discussed by Lester McKee earlier in the day, the 2010 large tributary monitoring for Mallard will be reduced by \$40,000 to enable monitoring of the Guadalupe River in 2010 (originally planned to monitor Guadalupe in 2011 - \$65,000 allocated). Ms. Sedlak indicated that the RMP staff was requesting that the planned Mallard Island effort be reduced by \$40,000 and that this money supports PCB and PBDE analysis for the Guadalupe samples.

Ms. Sedlak noted that approximately \$60,000 was allocated for 2010 for the Causes of Toxicity element and that the Exposure and Effects workgroup had just approved the scope of work for 2009. As a result, the scope of work for 2010 has not been developed. The TRC recommended that the Toxicity workgroup consider using this funding for the molecular TIE work. If approved, the molecular TIE project would be move out of pilot study/special study pool. Several TRC members asked why the toxicity workgroup have an existing dedicated line item in Status and Trends (e.g., Causes of Toxicity)? Jay Davis explained that this was an outgrowth of the episodic toxic element and had funding set aside for studies every other year as part of the redesign. The issue of recurring sediment toxicity was deemed to be important by the TRC.

The TRC questioned whether the toxicity work should be in the annual S&T program or if it might be more appropriate to evaluate this element as part of the pilot study/special study pool. The TRC requested that the sediment toxicity workgroup develop a multi-year strategy. We need to decide whether a workgroup has dedicated funding or if they have to compete with others for pilot/special studies funding. Jay Davis indicated that the dedicated funding is not set in concrete – it can be reallocated elsewhere if the TRC requests. Hopefully the strategy documents can help refine the number of pilot/special studies in the future and show how studies fit in with strategies. A motion was made to send Molecular TIEs back to the toxicity workgroup and have them decide if this proposal is a priority to fund out of the existing tox workgroup allocation. Karen Taberski requested that an attempt be made to resolve this via email.

Ms. Sedlak indicated after the meeting that the total funds available was \$480,000 and that the proposals should be ranked high, medium and low. Ms. Sedlak would include a table with a column for comments. The group then discussed the proposals.

- a. Exposure and Effects
  - i. PBDE effects work in terns is important. Developing an effects threshold is a good way to look at existing Bay data to see if egg levels are at threshold levels. This is a starting point for looking at thresholds.



- ii. Copper and salmonids: the Regional Board considers this to be an information need. This proposal could be postponed until next year but then it will be a high priority. According to the permit, there needs to be a Copper strategy in place by Sept 2010. Does the RMP need to do this research since it is a national issue? What about speciation of Copper and effects? Several members indicated the importance of replicating Bay area conditions and understanding the speciation of copper. Meg will explore the speciation issue with NOAA. The Regional Board has put the Cu effects issue into the permit for a strategy by Sept 2010 to see if site specific Cu objectives are protective. Does this study comply with MRP requirements? Some follow up may be necessary but this is unknown at this time.
- b. SQO – No questions
- c. SPLWG - No questions
- d. Emerging Contaminants
  - i. Can other people help pay for the NIST project? NOAA? Do we have to look at legacy compounds for this? Legacy contaminants are a very small part of the budget. Can Chris Sommers help out requesting SCCWRP financial assistance?
  - ii. Fipronil Proposal: Another fipronil creeks project will start in Spring 2011 (led by Chris Sommers). Other efforts will be going on in creeks that will provide similar information. What is the benefit of this proposal if a similar study will start soon? Can we add fipronil analysis to RMP sediment work? East Bay MUD may be able to analyze for fipronil but they do not have a validated method yet. It may be possible to quantify fipronil through existing pesticide methods and is probably cheaper. The TRC ranked this project low. If methodology would provide methods for other pollutants it would be more beneficial.
- e. Modeling
  - i. Modeling: what will RMP get out of the models? These models will help begin the process for developing better models for the Bay. SFEI needs to get involved in larger modeling efforts. Also provides an in house model to look at other parts of the Bay.
- f. PCB strategy
  - i. Small fish: we will need to consider how to set up a statistical design to answer PCB management questions.
- g. Dioxin Strategy
  - i. The Guadalupe River should be considered for small tributary dioxin loading.

**Action:** The TRC recommended sending the molecular TIE proposal to the sediment toxicity work group for them to vote on using existing work group funds for this proposal. It was suggested to query the toxicity group by e-mail. Motion was seconded and approved.

## **6. Information: Pulse and Annual Meeting Update**

Jay Davis indicated that to date he had received relatively few comments on the Pulse. Several TRC members indicated that they had read the articles and did not have any comments. Jay requested that final comments be submitted by Wednesday July 14<sup>th</sup>.

With regard to the Annual Meeting, Jay Davis is working on developing a good draft agenda by the September Steering Committee meeting. Jay indicated that we could either have a keynote speaker or a panel of sediment experts (to include climate change). Jay suggested that we have a panel consisting of sediment experts such as Dave Schoellhamer, Jim McGrath, Bruce Jaffee, and Ellen Johnck. Jay asked whether there should be a Regional Board staff person on the panel and if there were any recommendations. It was suggested that Dave Schoellhammer could also do a broader sediment talk and be the keynote speaker. Another suggestion was having someone from the USGS office discuss the CASCaDE project (Computational Assessments of Scenarios of Change for the Delta Ecosystem) as a result of climate change.

Jay also announced that American Association of Academy of Science's Pacific Division will be having a symposium on August 17<sup>th</sup>. Jay will give a presentation on water quality that will build off of his water quality summary presented last year at the Annual Meeting. It was also noted that a Delta Ammonia summit is planned for August 18 and 19<sup>th</sup>.

## **7. Information: Coast vs Estuary Report**

Aroon Melwani gave a summary of the 2008 data integration task comparing San Francisco Bay data to coastal data acquired by the City of San Francisco and the Coastal Fish Contamination Program (CFCP). The results indicated that the mercury concentrations in fish were relatively low (although they exceed the mercury human health concentrations) and no statistical differences were observed in fish mercury concentrations between coast and Bay. There are no fish mercury trends over time. This study showed that total mercury was high in Bay sediments and low in coastal sediments while fish mercury levels were the same. Mike Connor suggested that this finding suggests that the sediment goals will not necessarily reduce fish mercury levels.

White croaker PCB levels were two orders of magnitude higher in the Bay compared to the coast. Bay fish much higher in lipid (analyzed skin on) vs. coast fish analyzed skin off. Tissue preparation does not account for all of the difference. Bay fish may be fattier since there is a better food source. Both RMP and coast fish exceeding PCB human health levels. No temporal trends in fish PCBs in coast or Bay

In summary, PCBs in sport fish and Hg in sediments from San Francisco Bay were relatively high compared to the coast. PCBs and mercury in sport fish on the coast appear to still be at levels for concern to human health. CCSF data not useful for human health evaluation but good for trends

## **8. Information: Nutrients in SF Bay**

Lester McKee gave a brief overview of a project that SCCWRP is funding to develop nutrient numeric endpoints for freshwater, lacustrine, and now marine systems. A nutrient numeric endpoint is the systems response to the addition of nutrients. Lester

McKee will be identifying endpoints for the San Francisco Bay. It was noted that the Bay does have a variable amount of algal blooms.

EPA in 2008 identified a need to better summarize the state of the existing science in SF Bay, identify data gaps, and propose a specific suite of work elements required to address these data gap. The objective of the study is to review the information to determine the validity (sensitivity and data availability) of each indicator variable for tracking water quality.

#### **9. Action: Redesigning the sediment sampling**

Sarah Lowe presented the proposal for revising the sediment sampling, changing from five-year panels to six-year panels to encompass the alternating wet-dry seasons. Currently sites are resampled on annual, five-year or ten-year basis which results in oversampling wet conditions in comparison to dry conditions. The new design proposed by Don Stevens of Oregon State University will remove this bias. The sediment redesign report will be sent out to the TRC for review and approval of switching from a five-year panel to a six-year panel.

**Action item:** Send out Don Stevens report to the TRC and obtain approval for new statistical design.

#### **10. Information: Program update and lab data status**

Meg Sedlak indicated that the new high resolution MRES pesticide method that AXYS is using does not include oxadiazon. There have been no trends seen in the RMP data for oxadiazon and concentrations are not in effects range. Ms. Sedlak asked the group for approval to removal this chemical from the parameter list. Karen Taberski indicated that a SWAMP study found that this pesticide was found to bioaccumulate in bivalves from creeks. Is this contaminant currently analyzed in RMP bivalves? Meg will look into this (*it was formerly analyzed for and not found in bivalves*). The TRC requested that this information be sent by e-mail and then committee would decide. Chris Sommers indicated that it had never been detected in any of the urban creeks that BASMAA sampled.

Meg Sedlak gave a short summary from CTAG/TRC meeting. The TRC members who had attended indicated that it had been a very successful meeting. Meg Sedlak provided a table with ideas from the meeting and the status of follow-up. For example, SCCWRP is working with NOAA to redesign the national Mussel Watch program to include emerging contaminants. SCCWRP will hold a conference and SFEI will be involved.

The TRC recommended that keeping a running tally on next steps and possible collaboration and attend each other's planning meetings to grow collaborations. The TRC supported the joint meetings and recommended that the next meeting focus on stormwater.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00. The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 22<sup>nd</sup>.

<b>ACTION</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>STATUS</b>
Develop Master Plan for review by TRC and SC. Send to the SFEI Board for comment and inclusion of potential environmental justice issues.	Jay Davis	
Revise air deposition pilot study and send to TRC	Don Yee and Chris Sommers	Completed
Send Dioxin QAPP to TRC for review	Don Yee	Completed
Send PAH memorandum to the TRC for review	Susan Klosterhaus	Completed
Contact NOAA and SCCWRP to see if they can contribute funding to the Emerging Contaminant pilot study and work on building partnerships.	Meg Sedlak	Call into SCCWRP
Develop a timeline for planning and implementing the next five-year review	Meg Sedlak	Will discuss at August SC meeting
Send Molecular TIEs back to the toxicity workgroup to decide if this proposal is a priority to fund out of the existing toxicity workgroup allocation for 2010 (\$60,000). A request was made that this be made to resolve this via email.	Meg Sedlak	
Outline a method for the review and dissemination of SEP projects for September TRC meeting	Meg Sedlak	
Present RMP SEP projects to BACWA at their annual meeting or to the Executive Board	Meg Sedlak	
Keep a running tally on next steps and possible collaboration with SCCWRP's CTAG group and attend each other's planning meetings to grow collaborations	Meg Sedlak	Will present at the August SC meeting
Develop pollutant-specific links on the website. Include management questions and reports of interest.	John Oram / Meg Sedlak	To be considered as part of the RMP redesign of the website
Discuss incorporation of factsheets at next TRC meeting	Meg Sedlak	
Get feedback on the factsheets from the Steering Committee	Meg Sedlak	