



SAN FRANCISCO ESTUARY INSTITUTE

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

RMP Steering Committee Meeting

October 29th, 2012

San Francisco Estuary Institute

Draft Meeting Summary

Tom Mumley*, SFB RWQCB
Mike Connor, EBDA
Luisa Valiela, US EPA
Ariel Stevens, Dredgers (Bay Planning Coalition)
James Downing, Large POTW (City of San Jose)
Jim Ervin, Large POTW (City of San Jose)
Daniel Tafolla, Medium POTWs (Vallejo Sanitation)
Karin North, Small POTWs (City of Palo Alto)
Adam Olivieri, Stormwater (EOA/BASMAA)
Peter Carroll, Refineries (Tesoro)
Dave Allen, Industry (USS POSCO)

Jay Davis (SFEI)
Meg Sedlak (SFEI)
Ellen Willis-Norton (SFEI)
Lawrence Leung (SFEI)
Emily Novick (SFEI)

*denotes chair

1. Approval of agenda and minutes [Tom Mumley]

Tom Mumley asked the group if there were any changes to the agenda or to the minutes from the August 6th, 2012 Steering Committee (SC) meeting. There were none. Tom wanted to ensure there is time to review the annual planning cycle so everyone is clear on next steps going into 2013 and 2014. Adam Oliveri motioned to approve, Dan Tafolla seconded and all attendees voted in favor of approving the agenda and the minutes.

2. Annual decision on Committee chair and vice chair

Meg Sedlak explained that the SC chair and vice chair get reaffirmed at every October SC Meeting. Adam Olivieri said that nobody else is currently volunteering for the role and motioned to keep the same candidates. Peter Carroll seconded, and all attendees voted in favor of confirming Tom Mumley as chair and Karin North as vice chair.

3. Technical Review Committee (TRC) meeting summary [Meg Sedlak]

Meg Sedlak reviewed the proceedings from the September 18th, 2012 TRC meeting. She said that a fair amount the meeting was spent preparing for the Annual Meeting, including preview of and feedback on several presentations. Jay Davis, David Senn and Don Yee gave an update on RMP modeling activities. Jay discussed the recently completed Bioaccumulation Conceptual Model, Don discussed the also recently completed Margins Conceptual Model and David gave an update on plans for modeling nutrients and contaminants in the Bay. David also gave an update on the nutrients loading study that will be completed early next year, and Jay also updated the group on the results of the 2010 National Mussel Watch study for emerging contaminants.

Discussion

Tom Mumley proposed a correction to the meeting summary. On page 7, the following quote appears: “According to Tom Mumley, pyrethroids are not a concern for the Bay, although they may be a concern for the watersheds”. He would like to be corrected as saying they are a “low concern”, not a “no concern”. Jay shared a few more details about the bioaccumulation conceptual model. This report is part of a long-term workplan for RMP forecasting, combined with the margins conceptual model. The report discusses the following topics: (1) selected contaminants and uptake mechanisms; (2) indicator species, including biological characteristics and exposure pathways; and (3) recommendations for future studies. There are data to that suggest good correlation between PCBs in water column and PCBs in sediment and small fish, suggesting PCBs can be modeled well (unlike mercury). Jay noted that he received good review from the workgroup on the draft report.

4. Budget status and confirmation of 2014 fees [Lawrence Leung]

Lawrence Leung gave an update of the 2012 budget, and asked for confirmation of the 2% RMP budget increase (which was approved at the January 24, 2012 SC Meeting). At the request of the SC at the August 6, 2012 meeting, Lawrence added a dredger surplus line item to the summary budget spreadsheet. The dredger reserve is currently \$100,000, and when outstanding dredger fees are paid, the surplus will be approximately \$200,000. There is currently a shortfall in dredger fees for 2013 of about \$8,000, and staff requested the SC approve use of the dredger reserve to cover this. Lawrence added that several dredgers which have not paid the full fees are on payment plans.

Discussion

Tom Mumley said he didn't think it was necessary to obtain SC approval for use of the dredger reserve to cover the \$8,000 shortfall, and suggested that the use of funds could just be noted in the SC minutes. There was considerable discussion about the amount of RMP labor funds yet to be spent this year (53% of labor unspent). Meg noted that there are some projects that will start late in the year (such as forecasting/modeling). Meg also mentioned several key staff absences/vacancies have contributed to lower RMP labor billing for this year. Meg also clarified that subcontractors can take as long as a year or two to invoice the program. Adam Olivieri suggested that if a project is not going to start until the end of a calendar year, it might be possible to stretch those projects out into the

next year. This would help with scheduling deliverables and might alleviate the current projected shortfall for 2013. Tom added that it is important to distinguish between money that is yet to be spent, but will be spent (e.g. forecasting/modeling) and money that will be saved. Meg responded that there are some savings this year (e.g., the effort to produce a Pulse Lite was approximately half of a typical Pulse). Jay Davis added that he and Meg would perform an analysis of tasks that are not completed (including whether they can be shifted to 2013 to alleviate the budget shortfall) and report back to the group. Karin North agreed this was important, and would like to see a snapshot of each project along with a true expectation of what will be spent by the end of 2012. Adam noted that approval of 2013 budget is tentative given the fate of the 2012 budget, and Jay agreed that activities in the remainder of 2012 could affect 2013 projects. There was another lengthy discussion about whether the budget should be closed out every year or not. Meg said that the RMP had conducted this in prior years with labor carryovers for incomplete projects. Ms. Sedlak indicated that subcontracts remain open in the year that they are initiated. Mike Connor asked why the balances on labor, direct costs and set-asides aren't moved to the reserves, and Lawrence explained that they were already. Adam pointed out that this was confusing (how some balances are in the reserves and some are not), and asked that subcontractors retain a balance but everything else be zeroed at the end of the year. Mike said there could be a "funds encumbered" column added to this, and Adam added that there could be notes about how much and where these funds came from. Karin also suggested showing only the current year and taking out previous years (since budgeting decisions on these years have already been approved). Meg proposed that Lawrence, Tom and Adam meet to discuss how to display and annotate the information presented on the budget summary.

Action Item

1. Move funds from dredger reserve to cover dredger shortfall in 2013.
 2. Determine how much of the unused 2012 funds will realistically be spent for each project, and also close out completed tasks and report savings.
 3. Lawrence, Tom and Adam to discuss how to display and annotate the information presented on the budget summary.
- 4. Approval of the 2013 program plan and line-item budget [Meg Sedlak]**
Jay Davis pointed out that the new SFEI multiplier (now 2.95) has been approved by the SFEI Board and is incorporated in 2013 SFEI labor budget. It has been a long time since this multiplier had been changed and it was necessary to cover increases in such things as rent and health care.

Meg Sedlak presented highlights of the 2013 Program Plan, which summarizes activities planned for the upcoming year

I. Program Management

Program management includes a number of activities: (1) internal coordination among RMP participants, such as TRC, SC and work group meetings and preparation for such meetings; (2) workshops; (3) financial management, including invoices, contracts and audits; (4) external

coordination, such as meeting with Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Water Boards) or NorCal Society of Environmental Toxicologists and Chemists (SETAC), and BASMAA, and; (5) program planning, including creating the multi-year plan and the program plan.

Discussion

Jay Davis suggested that workshop planning could occur during the October SC meeting, and he requested input from the group on potential topics. Meg Sedlak proposed the effect of marsh restoration on mercury concentrations or current understanding of selenium in the Bay as two potential topics. Adam Olivieri proposed a workshop on the nature of the PCB problem and potential management actions might be good, in light of the upcoming PCB synthesis report. Mike Connor suggested a workshop on margins or on pesticides, particularly on upcoming pyrethroid data from dischargers. Meg said that she thought that the pesticide discussion might be better in a smaller group with a few scientists. Tom Mumley wondered whether responsibility for planning workshops really lies within the RMP purview. Mike responded that he thought it did, and 2-3 workshops per year seemed reasonable. Unless workshops were being planned for early 2013, Tom proposed revisiting this discussion when the group was more prepared to recommend a workshop topic, and Mike agreed this would be a good recurring agenda item. Another RMP program management activity is coordinating with external partners, and Mike suggested that RMP staff meet annually with the various stakeholders such as BASMAA, BACWA, refineries, etc. Peter Carroll expressed some concerns about whether this was a good use of time, but Karin North and Tom agreed this might be a good connection to make. Tom thought a lot of the municipalities in BASMAA might not be aware of all that the RMP does.

Action Items

1. Revisit workshop topics at future SC meetings
2. Meet annually with BASMAA, BACWA, LTMS and refineries.

II. Information management

This element of the RMP includes the following activities: (1) data formatting, maintenance and efficiencies of nearly 900,000 data entries and 1,600 web queries on the RMP website; (2) information dissemination to CEDEN as the SF Bay regional data center; (3) publications, including the Pulse, Annual Monitoring Results, Estuary Insert, RMP technical reports and journal manuscripts; (4) organization of the RMP Annual Meeting, and; (5) participation in important regional and national conferences (e.g. SETAC).

III. Status & Trends for 2013

Due to recent changes in the Status & Trends program structure, 2013 RMP monitoring will be limited to trace elements in water at 22 sites, and we will be able to make use again of the USGS Turning Tides boat. The RMP will

also continue to fund USGS water and sediment monitoring efforts (lead by Jim Cloern and Dave Schoellhamer).

Discussion

Tom Mumley noted that Jim Cloern current monitors monthly at 36 stations throughout the Bay. He questioned whether RMP absorbing this entire program is feasible. The program structure (once transferred to the RMP) would probably be a hybrid of boat and moored sensors.

IV. Special Studies

a. Emerging contaminants (EC)

\$35,000 is allocated for the PBDE summary report, which will summarize ten years of data and document the dramatic decline in PBDE in SF Bay biota. An additional \$20,000 is allocated for updating the EC strategy document, including funds to review literature and engage in discussions with experts in the field. Lastly, \$15,000 is allocated to evaluate current use pesticides (CUPs) and make recommendations for incorporating CUPs into status and trends monitoring. The EC work group submitted a joint proposal for a bioanalytical tools project with the Exposure and Effects work group, and this is discussed in greater detail below.

b. Exposure and effects

The largest project for Exposure and Effects is a 2-year (2013-2014), \$126,000 study to develop bioanalytical tools that will evaluate the effects of emerging contaminants in fish. Additionally, 2013 is the second year of a 2-year study for developing benthic indices for mesohaline environments. There is \$76,000 allocated for this project for 2013.

Discussion

Tom Mumley does not expect there will be development of a useful benthic index from this project. He also wonders whether the deliverable for this project will be a manuscript or a report. Jay Davis says that the TRC and SC approved this project with a manuscript. James Downing said that if the project is not entirely successful, this can better be addressed by a report than in a manuscript.

c. Modeling

During the 4th quarter of 2012, Meg Sedlak expects that a road map for the joint Nutrient and Contaminant Fate forecasting/modeling project will be fleshed out, including what model will be used and what nutrient /contaminant questions will be answered. One proposal is to use the Delft3D model and make use of existing USGS grids.

Discussion

Adam Olivieri expressed concern that \$100,000 does not stretch very far for 3D models, and wondered if 3D was really necessary. Tom Mumley

agreed, and estimated that a sustained modeling effort to meet our needs would be more like \$1 million per year. Meg Sedlak said that she thought a 3D model was necessary, particularly for issues such as light penetration and phytoplankton bloom development. Adam asked what the funding situation is for this project in the future, and Meg responded that this would be addressed by the scope development in the next quarter. Adam continued to say that the SC was not on board with using Delft3D yet, and asked whether the proposed scope would be brought back to the SC. Jay Davis said there would be check-ins along the way.

d. Small tributary loading strategy (STLS)

In 2013, load monitoring in representative watersheds will continue for 4 storms in each of 6 watersheds across the Bay Area, with SFEI being directly responsible for sampling in 2 of the sites (East Sunnyvale Channel and North Richmond Pump Station) and other contractors responsible for the other 4. RMP will contribute \$343,000 to this project, with an additional contribution coming from BASMAA. The STLS group will also continue work on Year 4 of the Regional Spreadsheet Model. Meg said that work is currently underway for the copper model, and mercury and PCBs will be the focus of 2013 work. RMP has allocated \$25,000 for this project in 2013. In order to run the spreadsheet model for specific compounds such as copper, the STLS team needs to generate land-use specific mean concentrations. The RMP has allocated \$80,000 for the development of these concentrations, including collecting additional field data, for copper, mercury and PCBs. Lastly, the RMP has allocated \$20,000 for management support for the STLS.

Discussion

Peter Carroll asked if there would be a report written for each specific compound as modeling is completed, or one large report would be completed at the end of model development for all compounds. Meg said that reports would be completed for each specific compound as they are completed, and said the progress report for the copper model was completed just last week. Mike Connor suggested adding the spreadsheet model estimates as a regular Pulse graphic, in particular how these compare to previous TMDL loading estimates. Peter asked whether labs with whom the RMP contracts use EPA method 1668c for PCB analysis. Jay said all 209 congeners get reported, and Peter concluded this was most likely method 1668c.

e. Nutrients

The Nutrients team will be piloting a moored sensor on Dumbarton Bridge. The sensor can provide continuous data on conductivity, temperature, depth, dissolved oxygen, chlorophyll-a, turbidity and nitrate.

RMP has allocated \$200,000 for purchase, installation, calibration and maintenance of the sensor, as well as management of the data. A second nutrients project is the solid phase adsorption toxin tracking (SPATT) project, in conjunction with Dr. Raphe Kudela at UCSC. The project will involve deploying SPATT passive samplers at fixed and mobile locations throughout the Bay, as well as calibrating the results. The RMP has allocated \$65,000 for this project. Additionally, the RMP has allocated \$40,000 for adding NH₄, TKN and possible NO₂ to STLS stormwater monitoring at 6 watersheds. The RMP also allocated \$30,000 for completion of a nutrient loads study, which will estimate nutrient loads from POTWs, stormwater, the Delta, ocean exchange and atmospheric flux for each subembayment. Lastly, RMP has allocated \$20,000 for nutrients project management.

f. Copper and salmon

Meg Sedlak explained that based on Dave Baldwin's (of NOAA) preliminary results, the copper site specific objectives that were developed in 2007 (<http://www.sfei.org/content/copper-site-specific-objective-3-year-rolling-averages>) are very protective of salmon. Meg added that Dave plans to repeat his study in low salinity environments next year.

Discussion

Adam Olivieri asked who is funding this study, and Meg said the funds were coming from the Copper Development Association. Adam asked for this to be clearer in the budget.

Action Item

1. Add a note to the budget that explains who is funding the Cu Olfactory Nerve Study

Discussion

As Meg concluded a review of all 2013 program activities, Jay wanted to note a change to the budget that is not reflected in the version being discussed today. David Senn is requesting an addition \$50,000 to finish the Nutrient Conceptual model report. Tom Mumley said he agrees this project is very large, but he wants to know what is causing the additional cost. Mike Connor said he believes the extra cost may be to trying to coordinate many different stakeholders in the project, which may slow down progress. Tom responded that he isn't opposed to the idea, but he just wonders if the RMP should bear the cost given that the overall budget is already showing a deficit of \$119,000 for 2013 and he doesn't want to spend RMP reserves on this project. Karin North said she doesn't think that deficit will be realized in full, and Adam Olivieri added that this is why it is important to complete the budget analysis for the last quarter of 2012. Tom wondered if it was possible to say no to increases in RMP contributions to Jim Cloern's USGS work, and Mike thought it would be useful to have a discussion with USGS, EPA and Jim Cloern. Adam motioned to tentatively approve the 2013 budget, but to readdress it at the

next SC meeting following additional information on 2012 budget (per action items). Karin seconded the motion, and all voted in favor to approve the 2013 budget.

Action Items

1. Arrange a meeting with USGS, including Jim Cloern, EPA and RMP to discuss proposed increases in RMP contribution to USGS monthly monitoring.
2. Review tentative approval of 2013 budget at next SC meeting in light of additional information about 4th quarter RMP activity and final 2012 budget.

5. Pulse 2013 and Annual Meeting [Jay Davis, Meg Sedlak]

Jay Davis requested approval on the Pulse 2013 outline. He indicated that he was beginning the process a quarter earlier to assure on time delivery of the Pulse in 2013. Jay explained that there are 6 articles proposed: (1) Water Board management of ECs (Mumley, Feger, Larsen?); (2) Green chemistry to prevent water pollution (Raphael, Sedlak, Werme, Klosterhaus); (3) RMP EC synthesis highlights (Werme); (4) National Mussel Watch EC study (Dodder, Maruya, Davis); (5) PFOS in SF Bay (Sedlak), and; (6) Broadscan screening for ECs (Kucklick, Werme). Jay said the EC synthesis and mussel watch articles are the most ready to be drafted, and that the Water Board may want more time to develop their policy before writing their article. Jay also mentioned that the 2012 Communications Survey had been sent out and has provided good feedback on the Pulse, Annual Meeting and RMP website. Karin North mentioned she didn't think the survey had gone out to BACWA, and asked that the survey be sent directly to Alexandra Gunnell to be sent to the BACWA mailing list.

Discussion

Karin North suggested Kelly Moran could be another good author for the Water Board EC article. Tom Mumley added that Gina Solomon, the Deputy Secretary of CalEPA, is also very interested in this issue and might be another option. Tom suggested that those involved in the management articles meet to discuss the outline, and Karin volunteered to coordinate this meeting. Tom told Jay that the outline was approved and work could begin on articles.

Action Items

1. Send link to RMP Communications Survey to Alexandra Gunnell for distribution to BACWA
2. Karin North will organize a meeting between relevant management representatives to draft an outline of the Pulse management articles

6. Deliverables and Workgroup Updates [Meg Sedlak]

The group reviewed the RMP Deliverables scorecard. There was not sufficient time to discuss the workgroup updates in detail.

Discussion

Tom Mumley pointed out that some deliverables with the red icon are not adequately accounted for. Item #1 (“Spatial Trends of Hg in Forage Fish”) is 17 months overdue, but has no revised due date. He said that all deliverables that are overdue should have a revised due date (e.g. PCF sources report, EC strategy). Adam Olivieri added that even all completed deliverables should have a revised due date, and Karin North clarified that this applies only to projects that were completed after the original due date. Tom expressed concern about the PBDE report that was approved for 2013, given the amount of deliverables that Meg is already accountable for. Meg said she plans to get the new organic chemist hire involved in this report. Peter Carroll and Jay Davis acknowledged the amount of work that Meg has on her plate and recognized how hard she is working.

Action Items

1. All deliverables with a red icon need a supporting comment and an updated due date
- 7. Plus/Delta, set meeting date and agenda topics**
- Meg Sedlak asked if the group was clear on the next steps of the MYP planning process. Jay Davis said that comments on the MYP should be completed within two weeks, and it will be revised for review and approval at the January SC meeting. Tom Mumley asked what else would be on the agenda, and Jay suggested updating the group on the progress of incomplete projects. Peter Carroll suggested an update from one of the workgroups, and Karin North suggested a presentation on the Cu, mercury and PCB modules of the spreadsheet model. The next meeting was scheduled for January 28th, 2013. When asked about positives from today’s meeting, Peter said he was happy that Adam was going to revise the budget memo and Karin said she liked all the summary documents that were presented at both the SC morning and the morning MYP meeting.

Action Items

1. Comments on the MYP will be received by 11/12/2012. A revised version will be reviewed/approved by the SC at the January 2013 meeting.