

**REGIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM FOR TRACE SUBSTANCES
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
April 18, 2005**

Members Present:

Dave Allan, USSPOSCO Industries
Kevin Buchan, Western States Petroleum Association
David Dwinell, US Army Corps of Engineers
Dan Tafolla, Vallejo Sanitation and Flood Control
Chuck Weir, East Bay Dischargers Authority
Dyan Whyte, SFB RWQCB
Ken Kaufman, SBSA
Andy Gunther, AMS

Others Present:

Mike Connor, SFEI
Jennifer Hunt, SFEI
Meg Sedlak, SFEI

1. Introductions and Approval of Agenda and Minutes

After introductions, Meg Sedlak went through the Action Items from the 1/25/2005 meeting:

- 1) The EEPS presentation scheduled for this meeting by Jay Davis would be postponed until the next SC meeting. The EEPS Science Advisory Panel met on April 4, 2005 and there is \$70k remaining in the EEPS budget for 2005.
- 2) CEP and RMP will be having a joint meeting.
- 3) Past SC meeting information has been posted on the SFEI web site. As requested by the SC, Leo O'Brien and Dan Cloak were notified of the SC meeting schedule.

Kevin Buchan asked for comments on the January 24, 2005 minutes. No comments were made and the minutes were approved.

2. Information: Committee Member Updates

No updates.

3. Information: Technical Review Committee (TRC) Meeting Summary

Meg Sedlak gave a review of the March 2005 TRC meeting.

- 1) Eight proposals for Pilot and Special Studies for 2006 were submitted to the TRC. The proposals were discussed and the RWQCB is currently reviewing and

prioritizing these proposals. At this point, there is no funding in 2006 for Pilot and Special Studies.

- 2) John Oram gave a presentation on the status of the PCB multi-box model which is jointly funded by CEP/RMP. The model was revised to incorporate the USGS sediment model. The model is currently being validated by Tetra Tech. Don Yee is in the process of developing a coring sampling plan to assist in the verification/validation of the model. It is anticipated that field work will commence this summer.
- 3) The RMP Annual Meeting will be moved to the Fall beginning in 2006. This move was approved by the TRC and SC.

4. Information: Budget Status

Meg Sedlak presented an updated summary for the RMP Budget (Years 2003 – 2005) (Item 4 Attachment 1). Ms. Sedlak noted that the outstanding fees from the January summary remained unpaid (notably Loch Lomand Marina). Based on a review of the 2004 budget summary, Ms. Sedlak noted that there was an approximately \$30,000 labor surplus and approximately \$30,000 subcontract surplus; however, not all the fees have been paid so the total surplus for the year is approximately \$40,000. This surplus will be confirmed as part of the annual financial audit that SFEI and RMP undergo. In general, Ms. Sedlak commented that the Program was currently on target for 2005.

Approximately \$550,000 in subcontracts has been issued (major beneficiaries USGS and UCSC). Direct costs accrued to date are \$9,400 in part due to the Annual Meeting, which costs \$3,000 this year (up from last year \$300). Payment by dredgers is reasonably on track. Dyan Whyte noted that she anticipates Caltrans being late paying fees as a result of contract negotiations.

5. Action: Approve Revised Management Questions

Meg Sedlak highlighted a minor editorial change to the revised management question #5. The TRC has approved the change. No objections were voiced by the SC members present.

6. Action: Management Review of the Pulse and Summary Sheet

SC member provided feedback on the Pulse:

- 1) The graphics are good and are user friendly.
- 2) Some members questioned how much input is required at this time – some were not sure as to the extent of the comments requested.
- 3) The Pulse is growing in the number of pages since its inception. How much is just RMP and how much is other projects (CalFed) – what is the balance?
- 4) There's not a lot of benefit to polishing it more.
- 5) As it gets longer are the production costs increasing? Mike Connor and Meg Sedlak answered no – that costs are similar to smaller Pulses.
- 6) Meg Sedlak asked if the glossy format was ok. No objections from the SC.
- 7) What about adding a section with links to other, relative articles?

- 8) There will be a link in the Pulse to the SFEI annual report on line.
- 9) Might not get as high a readership when the document is 80 pages long.
- 10) Dyan Whyte distributes the Pulse to the Water Board Directors. There are 3 new perspective board members.

Upon the TRC's recommendation, Ariel Rubison-Okamoto was hired to prepare a short summary of the Pulse for wider distribution. The summary could be a 2 or a 4 page document. SC member feedback on the short Pulse summary:

- 1) Seems inflammatory – the context is missing in the summary.
- 2) The summary seems to have a Jane Kay style to it in order to hook the media.
- 3) The press is not a target audience of the Pulse.
- 4) The summary is very readable.
- 5) From page 4 onwards the summary improves.
- 6) SFEI is a neutral organization so any publications need to be fact based not inflammatory.
- 7) Who is the target audience of the summary? What will be the final length?
- 8) A shorter version would be more of an executive summary.
- 9) The Pulse summary could be organized around the management questions.
- 10) The summary will not be embedded within the Pulse – it is a stand alone document.
- 11) The summary highlights many of the problems but not the successes.

Action item: A revised version of the summary will be sent to the SC for their review. Plan a more in-depth discussion of next year's Pulse for the next SC meeting.

7. Action Review Memorandum on RMP Planning and Decision Making Process

The RMP Program Review Panel recommended development of a policy document that describes the process for resolving with conflict in committees. The document will outline how to resolve with conflict when a consensus cannot be reached. A preliminary document was drafted and distributed to the SC members. The proposed policy would be that when conflict arises the Committee Chair will work with the group to reach consensus, if a consensus still cannot be reached then the Chair will work with the SFEI Executive Director to resolve the conflict. If consensus cannot be reached within the meeting, then the Chair and Executive Director will summarize the issue and propose alternatives in a document that will be distributed to the group. If consensus cannot be achieved, then a process of unanimity would be implemented whereby the group would vote on issues.

Discussion of the Policy:

Some of the members questioned whether a policy was necessary because consensus has worked very well to date. There was a concern that by creating a policy, it may create more conflict and gridlock. The current process is that if a member dissents from the majority then the dissenter(s) votes approval of the recommendation but voices opposition which is kept on record. There is concern that a voting policy could increase

leveraging of votes and members using their weight to influence decisions. A new policy has the potential to change how the RMP works. Consensus is still working and everyone's voice is equal. The consensus was that the draft policy would be revised and presented at the next SC meeting.

Action item: Meg Sedlak will write up a draft policy and will send it to the SC for review. This will be taken up at the next SC meeting.

8. Discussion: Process for Determining the Budget and Program for 2007 and beyond

Mike Connor led the discussion on how to determine stakeholder fee increases. The options are: cap fee increases at CPI up until three percent OR cap at ½ the rate of CPI. The SC members reached consensus that the increase would be set at 2% for the next 3 years. After that point, the fees will be reconsidered.

9. Discussion: Joint Meeting of the RMP SC and the CEP EMB

Andy Gunther wrote a memo to interested members regarding the upcoming May 30th joint CEP/RMP meeting. There has been a push from RMP/CEP participants to coordinate special/pilot studies between the two programs. The RMP Program Review Panel also recommended better coordination between the two programs. The meeting will focus on:

- 1) The big picture including the Regional Board's management questions.
- 2) Addressing concerns regarding overlap between the two programs.
- 3) BASMAA and BAQWA have both bought into the joint meeting.
- 4) Need to put all special/pilot studies on paper and show how they relate to management questions.
- 5) RMP and CEP should focus on TMDL science and TMDL pollutants.
- 6) Need to discuss how to address emerging contaminants such as PBDEs?
- 7) Need to get TMDLs completed. Can funnel 'fines' money into this and link CEP and RMP into this.
- 8) Mike Connor asked if Andy's proposal made sense? It is thought provoking but needs a little more fleshing out.
- 9) There is a long history of using SEP monies to fund studies. Fines want to pay the money and be done – they don't want to be responsible for the studies. The Regional Board recognizes the importance in dealing with SEP money – they have been meeting to discuss this.
- 10) The outcome of the meeting will hopefully mean that the CEP and RMP will be better organized.

10. Information: Annual Meeting

The agenda has been set and the speakers confirmed for the Annual Meeting with the exception of Herb Frederickson of the US Army Corps of Engineers. Suggested adding a summary talk to the end of the day to tie all of the talks together.

Action item: Dave Dwinelle will look into funding options for Herb Frederickson for speaking at the annual meeting. Mike Connor to present a summary talk at end of day.

11. Information: Program Update

Meg Sedlak gave an update on the RMP deliverables. The February 23rd Mercury Coordination meeting was well attended – all presentations are on the RMP web site. There were very good discussions at the Contaminant Fate Workgroup meeting on April 4th. Sediment cores may be the future method of sediment collection in the RMP. The RMP is continuing to coordinate with the CEP. The Prop 13 program (BMPs and storm water) will work to coordinate with other storm water agencies. This program will be presented at the 2006 RMP Annual Meeting.

12. Schedule for Next Meeting and Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm. The next meeting is scheduled for July 18th at 12:30 pm.