



## **SAN FRANCISCO ESTUARY INSTITUTE**

4911 Central Avenue, Richmond, CA 94804 • p 510-746-7334 • f 510-746-7300 [www.sfei.org](http://www.sfei.org)

### **RMP Steering Committee Meeting**

**August 6<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

**San Francisco Estuary Institute**

### **Draft Meeting Summary**

#### **Attendees:**

Adam Olivieri, BASMAA (EOA)  
Peter Carroll, Refineries (Tesoro Golden Eagle Refinery)  
Mike Connor, EBDA  
Karin North, Small POTWs (City of Palo Alto)  
Tom Mumley, SFB RWQCB  
Todd McHugh, Industry (USS POSCO) (for Dave Allen)

Jay Davis, SFEI  
Meg Sedlak, SFEI  
Lawrence Leung, SFEI  
Emily Novick, SFEI

#### **1. Approval of SC Agenda and minutes**

Tom Mumley asked for any changes or questions on the agenda. He noticed that there are several absences from the meeting, and suggested that there should be discussion later in the meeting about the procedure for decision making with so few members. Otherwise, he has no changes. Adam Olivieri motioned to approve and Karin North seconded.

#### **2. Committee member updates**

First, Meg Sedlak reviewed the action items from the previous SC meeting.

- Action item #2: Training for SFEI on meeting management. Rainer Hoenicke and Meredith Williams are looking it and SFEI was the funds to spend on it.
- Action item #4: Benthic Index report. Based on the comments received on the draft, this project will not happen, especially given the Benthic Assessment report scheduled for 2013.
- Action item #6: Bird Egg report. Meg Sedlak said it is moving forward, and Tom Mumley asked if it will be on today's agenda since the action items indicated it would be. Meg said it will not be discussed in length today but she just wanted to update people on its status. The task is moving forward as agreed at the last meeting: an outline has been prepared, and a draft report will be distributed in October, and a final report in January.
- Action item #8: Data formatting for POTW data. Cristina Grosso is in touch with the group and the Water Board to make sure the data are submitted in a useful way. Karin

North said BACWA made a template for all its dischargers in Excel format, and agreed to forward it to Cristina to take a look at. Peter Carroll said Tesoro uses the same template as BACWA.

- Action item #12: Communications survey. Tom Mumley asked about this action item in particular, and Jay Davis said it will be discussed later in the meeting.

#### Discussion

Mike Connor mentioned an upcoming State Water Board hearing on August 21<sup>st</sup> on the State's Toxicity Policy. A hearing on flows is also being planned - he suggested David Senn as a speaker on nutrients. Peter Carroll said that toxicity is also an issue of concern to him. Karin North asked about filling the position recently vacated by Susan Klosterhaus. Meg Sedlak said she is currently advertising that position through a number of outlets including academic institutions, a posting on SETAC, and a green chemistry newsletter. She has received about 25 resumes so far, 1 or 2 that are of interest. She emphasized that filling this position is a high priority and she wants to get someone of a high caliber on organic chemistry, and as soon as possible.

#### Action Items

1. Karin North to forward out BACWA template for effluent data

### **3. Confirmation of the Vice-chair**

Tom Mumley motioned that Karin North be named vice-chair of the RMP steering committee and Adam Olivieri seconded. All members voted in favor.

### **4. TRC meeting summary**

Meg Sedlak summarized the June 29<sup>th</sup>, 2012 TRC meeting. She said that David Senn gave a progress report on the nutrients project. In his summary, he touch on modeling efforts, and there will be a draft of the Conceptual Model in September 2012 and a final in December 2012. Work on quantifying nutrient loads is moving forward, especially with incoming data from the WB 13267 request, and a draft of that report is due in February 2013. Stormwater monitoring for nutrients also was completed, and there is a proposal to continue this work in 2013. Next, Meg mentioned a presentation that Rachel Allen gave on a 2011 sampling campaign for mercury in small fish and also that there are 3 manuscripts in progress on small fish. One manuscript was sent to Chemosphere and came back as accepted with revisions, one on temporal trends is planned for completion by Summer 2012 and one on spatial trends could be completed in Fall 2012 or later. Ben Greenfield is the lead author on both of the latter two manuscripts.

#### Discussion

Karin North noticed that there were comments from Chris Sommers at 6/29/2012 TRC meeting about the balance between nutrients and contaminants in the modeling proposal. Tom Mumley said the CFWG and the modeling team is the forum to address that issue and it is already being dealt with adequately. Karin North then asked if the minutes could be clearer that the issues will be addressed by the CFWG, and Adam Olivieri said that the SC and the TRC should still be informed about that issue being addressed by the CFWG. Jay Davis mentioned this item is on the agenda as a special study so there is time allotted for feedback on this under agenda item 7. Mike

Connor said this is a difficult decision and the discussion should be pushed off until agenda item #7.

### **5. Budget status**

Lawrence Leung said that the website that he and Jeff Mueller developed for calculation of fees is up and running. Mike Connor pointed out clients who had not yet paid and Lawrence said they are mainly dredgers. Meg Sedlak wanted to recognize the efforts of Naomi Feger and Karen Taberski for getting in touch with one of the smaller dredgers regarding payment. Mike Connor asked if there was a better way to manage these smaller dredgers, like if there was some information on their permit form. Meg Sedlak said there is a letter sent out with each invoice, but it is worth following up with Beth Christian. Mike suggested asking them to pay up front so that it is accounted for in their project budgets. Tom Mumley agreed that it mostly works but the smaller dredgers are a challenge. He asked to be included on any e-mail communication regarding this issue.

#### Discussion

Tom had a few clarifications on some of the items in the budget. He first pointed out \$35,000 of unused funds from Jim Cloern at USGS. He noted that there is a recommendation for that money that will be discussed later in the agenda, but for now it could be considered as \$35,000 of unencumbered funds. Next, he asked if the \$50,000 of carryover from 2011 contingency funds was already included in the 2012 budget, and Meg Sedlak said it was. Lastly, Tom asked if windfalls from dredgers are added into the dredger reserve. Lawrence Leung said yes, and Tom said the dredger reserve table shows where the reserves come from. Adam Olivieri said that the budget summary handout and the budget memo don't seem to add up and the two pages need to be connected. Mike Connor said it might be worth redoing the accounting strategy, such as closing out the books every year and then reinitiating the contracts for work that carries over. He suggested that Lawrence Leung look into ways that other companies do their budgets. Adam said that his company closes out contracts every year, carries them over and reinitiates them, and puts a footnote in the budget explaining the source of the funds. Any unencumbered funds from the previous year move into the unencumbered column for the next year and there are footnotes explaining the original source. Meg Sedlak said SFEI's current method is easier because only a few contracts stay open every year. Tom said he agrees that it is hard to see how the numbers add up. Mike said it wasn't necessary to make any decisions now, but that Lawrence will look into it.

Meg Sedlak talked next about the request for \$3,000 to contribute to a seal workshop organized by Moss Landing scientists. She said she believes given that the Marine Mammal Center (MMC) has been such a great partner for the RMP, it is appropriate for the RMP to fund this. Mike Connor asked if there was a procedure for deciding how to fund smaller things like this, since he didn't think it was a high enough priority. Karin North asked if there was a certain amount of money that the RMP manager could decide how to spend, and if not, whether this discussion could be added to the October 2012 SC meeting. Mike said that if this fits into the budget, then he supports it. Karin North added that the MMC has given more the \$3,000 in in-kind labor and samples, and that she also supports this. Mike asked where the money should come from, and Adam Olivieri suggested the communications budget. Peter Carroll noted that the MMC says the cost of this could range from \$3,000 to \$10,000. Meg said she was thinking of contributing \$3,000. Mike asked if it is normal for the SC to approve every aspect of the budget, and Meg

said that even small things come before the SC to inform them, although she may not be seeking approval for proposals under \$5,000.

As a sidenote to this discussion, it was noted by Tom Mumley and Karin North, among others, that the procedure for sending out the agenda package was confusing. It was requested that any additional agenda package items, sent out after the original, be included as part of an updated master agenda package, rather than as individual documents. It was also requested that a link to the website, where items are posted individually and as a complete package, be included in any e-mail about the agenda package.

#### Action Items

1. Meg Sedlak to follow up with Beth Christian about how intermittent dredgers factor the permit into the budget. CC Tom Mumley on any e-mails regarding this
2. Meg and Lawrence connect the two pages of the budget so the numbers add up. Lawrence will look at the way other companies do it (i.e. close out every year)
3. Meg and Emily send master pdf for agenda package items (everytime there is an update), include link to meeting web page in e-mails about agenda package

#### **6. Workgroup update – Emerging Contaminants**

Meg Sedlak said that at each SC meeting, there would be an update on an RMP workgroup, and today would be Emerging Contaminants. She said there is a wide universe of chemicals that we could be monitoring for, and the RMP only does 107. Challenges include lack of analytical methods, proprietary information about chemicals in commerce, and lack of relevant toxicity information (especially information specifically applicable to San Francisco Bay). In response to these challenges, the ECWG has taken a 3-pronged approach. First, they use existing information for chemicals with known toxicity or produced in high volumes that have been detected in other regions and look for these chemicals in San Francisco Bay. As an example, the ECWG sampled for triclosan, a chemical with known toxicity that is present in other regions. Fortunately, it was not found in high concentrations in San Francisco Bay and it is not necessary to monitor for it at the present time. The second approach is to use biological samples or chemical fate predictions to evaluate the occurrence of emerging contaminants in the environment. As an example, a recent study of Harbor seals and mussels in San Francisco Bay, analyzed with a non-targeted analysis, indicated the occurrence of many identified chemicals but also many unidentified chemicals, whose overall concentrations were low. Meg added that Derek Muir at Environment Canada has created a list of 600 chemicals that he believes should be targeted because their chemical properties and uses indicate they are likely to be present in the environment. The third approach is to use bioanalytic tools to screen for biologically active classes of chemicals. This links exposure to the common mode of action and is great for evaluating mixtures and synergistic effects. Meg followed this presentation with a discussion of special study proposal #4, for the development of a bioanalytical tool for estrogenic compounds per the recommendation by the state CEC panel. The proposal is for a 2-year study with a \$42,000 match from SCCWRP. Four chemicals would be studied in year 1 of the study, looking at early life stage and juvenile development and linking 5 biomarkers to response endpoints. Meg said there are many commercially available bioassays for measuring estrogenic compounds in water,

but this project links bioassay results to cellular endpoints. Next, Meg compared the RMP approach to CECs to the CEC panel recommendations. She said SFEI is in Phase 3, “Reassessment of monitoring efforts and updating the list of target CECs”, and gives the RMP CEC Synthesis and Strategy Report as an example. Tom Mumley commented that we are also in Phase 4, “Develop Action Plans to Minimize Impacts”, because there have been management actions from RMP participants. Meg then shared a slide of CECs identified by the State Panel for monitoring in coastal embayments, and she said the ECWG has put these chemicals in Tiers (I-V, V being the greatest concern). The next steps of the CEC strategy are looking at the CECs in these upper tiers, evaluating advisory panel recommendations for estuaries, and identifying new CECs. Lastly, the PFC Special Study is currently underway to sample seals, small fish, bird eggs and sediment. Meg concluded by saying the new organic chemist hired by SFEI could be a session chair for SETAC’s upcoming CEC conference in Long Beach.

### Discussion

Mike Connor asked why the bioassay project wasn’t fully supported by the ECWG or TRC, referring to previous meetings where there was lack of consensus on this project. Meg Sedlak said those groups were very supportive of the science, but thought the project was too research-focused and would take too long to yield a usable tool. However, since Nancy Denslow, the principal investigator, will be doing San Francisco Bay sites and an estuarine fish, we lose the chance to control some of the work if we choose not to support it. Meg said she views it as another tool to determine if a sample is estrogenic and to determine what the effects will be in the Bay. Adam Olivieri said that the recommendations from the CEC are to the State Board, not to SFEI or to any particular discharger. He said that these decisions have been sent up to the state, and there is a balance that has to occur - deciding to fund at the same time that the State Board is deciding if they agree. Tom Mumley said it is always better to be the lead on these issues, as this region often does, since we are the main estuary in the state. He said we need a project that gives us tools to detect CECs but we have to keep in mind we want smart analytical tools. Karin North asked if Nancy has looked to the EPA for funding, and Meg said they have looked at WERF and at EPA. Adam said he believes Nancy is capable of doing this and it is worth funding, but he wonders what the timeline is. He wondered if the project could be put off for a while to try to get SWAMP funds or wait for a decision from the State Board.

Tom Mumley commented on the ECWG’s tiering exercise, saying that he and Naomi Feger think there is no need for the “very high concern” tier. Pyrethroids are the only thing in this tier, and although they are in the Bay, we have no indication that they are a problem in the Bay itself. Chemicals in this tier should have corrective actions and go on 303(d) list, and he doesn’t see this happening for pyrethroids. He also thinks the lowest tier should be differentiated between chemicals of low concern vs. chemicals with little information. Karin North asked how we use these data to make management decisions. She suggested a subgroup of the ECWG that is responsible for communicating information on CECs to management groups and pollution prevention groups. Tom recommended that the next Pulse on CECs should capture past and continuing efforts to manage CECs, including public education efforts. Adam Olivieri wanted to make clear that a lot of these things are precautionary and you don’t want to unnecessarily alarm people.

## 7. Special Study Proposals

Meg Sedlak began by informing the SC that there is a \$95,000 shortfall for funding the special studies projects. She said there are unencumbered funds, and Tom Mumley clarified there were \$305,000 of unencumbered funds. Meg gave a brief overview of each of the 12 proposals. Tom Mumley noted that the RMP could afford to fund all projects, if the SC decides they are all worth doing.

### I. PDBE Summary Report

This project is proposed for \$35,000 and has been ECWG reviewed and approved. The objective is to summarize 2002-2012 PDBE data for sediment, water, bivalves and birds eggs, and provide context by comparing to OEHHA and tern thresholds. This work will be completed by March 2013.

### II. Update EC strategy

This project is proposed for \$20,000 and is ECWG workgroup reviewed and approved. The purpose is to provide billable time for SFEI staff to track new EC information and revise/update the EC strategy by reading current literature, updated tiered risk-management table and adding/removing chemicals from the “unmonitored CEC list”

### *Discussion*

Peter Carroll asked if there as a deliverable for this project. Meg Sedlak said there wasn't, and that this proposal was in order to update the group. Previously, this work had been done using unbillable hours, and the RMP and SFEI can't sustain this. Mike Connor asked if we could make a few-page Pulse piece as the deliverable, and Meg said she wasn't sure if this was appropriate for the Pulse. Tom Mumley then suggested an annual memo to the group, something that isn't high cost, and Meg said she would get feedback from the group on this idea.

### III. Current Use Pesticides (CUPs)

This project is proposed for \$15,000 and is ECWG reviewed and approved. The purpose is to evaluate and organize a focus meeting with key individuals in the field because a number for CUPs are not being monitored and there is a recommendation from the state CEC panel to monitor (i.e., bifenthrin and permethrin in surface water)

### IV. Bioanalytical Tools

This project is proposed for \$70,000 in 2013 and \$56,000 in 2014, pending acceptable progress in 2013. The project is EEWG and ECWG reviewed, but there were concerns about the timeline and the research orientation of the project. The objective is to identify CECs through common cellular modes of action. There are no studies to date on estuarine organisms. This project would evaluate four endocrine disrupters (estrone, BPA, 4NP and galaxolide) in inland silversides, an estuarine fish species.

### V. Development of a Mesohaline Index

This project is proposed for \$75,800 in 2013 and \$50,000 was already allocated in 2012. This project is EEWG reviewed and approved. The objective is to develop and calibrate a mesohaline index for San Francisco Bay, similar to the polyhaline index already developed for Central Bay.

### Discussion

Karin North noted that this was only for Lower South Bay and San Pablo Bay, and Jay Davis clarified this work wasn't for Suisun Bay. Mike Connor asked how this index would be used and how useful it is. Tom Mumley added that he didn't think that this will produce something that will help us manage the Bay. He said the index for the Central Bay hasn't been used, and wonders if this will really trigger management decisions. Meg Sedlak said the point of this project is that there are currently data being collected but there are not funds to interpret them. She said an SQO number assessment is being required for EBMUD, and SFEI has collected data for EBMUD. Jay Davis added that on the one hand SQOs are enforceable state policy, so we should continue with this project, but if managers really won't change anything based on this information, then we shouldn't waste the money. Tom responded that there have been resources invested thus far in collecting data, and this project will allow us to interpret them. Dropping the project now would leave a question mark on the data. Even though he doesn't see a regulatory consequence, Tom doesn't think the project can be dropped. Jay said that while the benthic data are hard to interpret, the toxicity data are more compelling. Tom asked about whether the project was supposed to begin in 2012 or 2013. Jay said \$50,000 was allocated in 2012, but then Eric Stein wrote a larger proposal so it is being proposed for more money this year. Tom asked if it will get done in a timely manner, since the \$50,000 allocated in 2012 has not been spent yet. Adam Olivieri asked if it had already been scoped out or whether the project will require more money in 2014. Mike asked who the local biological players are who are involved, such as Mike Kellogg. Meg said that Don Weston supports it, and Jay Davis added that the EEWG approved it. Karin North asked if we had talked to Jan Thompson at USGS, and if we could link this to the research she is doing in the South Bay.

### VI. Follow up to Moderate Toxicity Workshop

This is a placeholder for a project to be developed following a workshop in November in 2012. It is believed that a study idea will come out of that meeting, so there is a \$50,000 placeholder to fund that project.

### Discussion

Mike Connor said that given where toxicity is going, it might be worth it to spend more money on toxicity. He suggested exploring a toxicity database, but Tom Mumley reminded him that he was talking about an unproposed project. Mike said this proposal is undefined because we don't know what it is until the workshop occurs. Jay said it is defined in the sense that it will focus on moderate sediment toxicity, rather than other toxicity issues. Tom said that any new policy adopted by the state would be complete before any project that comes out of the workshop, so the work done by the RMP would not affect what the state does. He said that if a real need occurs and this becomes a high priority for BACWA, then there could be a special project request outside of this process. He didn't think that this money would get spent for this project.

### VII. Shared Modeling Proposal

This project is proposed for \$100,000 in 2013 and was already funded for \$100,000 in 2012. This project is endorsed by the Nutrient Stakeholders Advisory Group and is in accordance with CFWG direction. The purpose is to develop a tactical plan for modeling nutrients and contaminants, establish a modeling team, develop a hydrodynamic model and a phytoplankton water quality model for Suisun and South Bay.

### VIII. Stormwater Monitoring

This project is proposed for \$343,000 and was reviewed and approved by SPLWG/STLS. The purpose is to monitor 6 watersheds in 2013, two of them (Pulgas and Richmond) by the RMP and four by BASMAA.

### IX. Update Spreadsheet Model – Year 4

This project is proposed for \$25,000 and was reviewed and approved by SPLWG/STLS. The purpose is to develop and refine mass emissions of mercury and PCBs using single watersheds for calibration and verification. This builds upon prior tool development (Year 1 – Hydrology, Year 2- Additional watersheds, Year 3 – Cu test case for model).

### X. Land Use/ Source Specific EMC

This project is proposed for \$80,000 and was reviewed and approved by SPLWG/STLS. The purpose is to generate even meant concentration data for use in the regional watershed spreadsheet model.

### XI. Managements Support for Spreadsheet Model Outreach

This project is proposed for \$20,000 and the purpose is to provide project management and outreach funds for the Spreadsheet Model project.

### XII. Nutrients

This project is proposed for \$355,000 and is Nutrient SAG approved. There are multiple components to this proposal:

- Install, maintain and interpret data from a moored sensor
- Develop Solid Phase Adsorption Tracking as a tool for monitoring harmful algal blooms
- Monitoring nutrients in stormwater in 6 watersheds
- Continue to develop nutrient load estimates for Central and North Bay

Meg said that at the June 2012 TRC meeting, there was some discussion about how to cover the \$95,000 shortfall. Some ideas were using unencumbered funds, spreading the cost of purchasing over several years, finding other funding, or shifting funds from other projects. She said there was also concern about the data management budget, and David Senn had reworked the proposal to reflect this. She said people generally supported the idea, but were concerned about the funding.

### Discussion

Tom Mumley noticed that the stormwater projects had been split into individual proposals, whereas the nutrients had been combined into one. He added that the RMP could afford to approve them all and asked if there were any that the group didn't want to take on (to which there were no responses). He said that there is a need for institutional, rather than piecemeal, funding for nutrient work and this should be discussed at the annual planning meeting.

### Voting

Meg Sedlak informed the group that both Rob Lawrence and Dan Tafolla approved all the studies even with the \$95,000 shortfall. Adam Olivieri proposed to remove study #6 and defer the money to nutrients, leaving only \$5,460 to be taken from unencumbered funds (once the



\$35,000 from USGS is applied). Tom Mumley said that at some point there needs to be a synthesis and there could be a review of sediment work at the multi-year planning meeting, including how much has been spent and the idea of doing a synthesis. Mike Connor agreed that could be a focus topic for the multi-year planning meeting. Adam motioned to approve his proposal, and Karin North seconded the motion. All committee members then voted in favor.

#### Action Items

1. Meg to ask the ECWG about creating a memo to the group as part of Special Study proposal #2 (Updating EC strategy)
2. Institutional Nutrient funding – need to discuss at annual planning meeting

### **8. 2012 Annual Meeting**

Jay Davis said he sent out the proposed agenda a few weeks ago but didn't receive much feedback. He said some of the speakers are confirmed and some are not. Kathy Hieb has been invited to present with a focus on fish and the pelagic organism decline in the upper Estuary, and this will be followed with a talk on the effects of copper on salmon. David Senn was scheduled to talk, but he had a conflict so this slot will be filled with more discussion time. Moderators of these discussion periods will bring a management focus to the meeting.

#### Discussion

Mike Connor said it would be difficult for the moderators of the discussion to elicit and manage audience participation, and it might be better to have a panel of 3 people from the management community to direct the discussion. Jay said this could be done formally or informally, and Mike said it should be done formally because it would be hard to find those people in the audience. Tom said he liked that suggested but we didn't have to decide on that today. Mike then suggested replacing Stephen Monismith, who has a lot of projects at the moment, with Mark Stacey or Ed Gross, and Tom added that you want someone who really knows the Bay. Jay said the Mark Stacey's research is very fine-grained and you would have to direct him to speak at a larger scale and in a non-technical manner, to which Tom responded that you will probably have to ask all of these speakers to speak to a broader level. Mike also suggested getting someone from the Bay Conservation and Development Commission to speak about about biology. Karin North asked if the current agenda had a good balance between stormwater and wastewater, and Adam Olivieri said he thought it did. Mike asked if the lunchtime activity could solicit feedback from the audience about the next steps of the RMP. Jay said he liked that idea, but Tom said he wasn't sure that would add much. Jay said the main goal is to get people involved and thinking about the RMP, even if the feedback isn't scientific. Karin suggested facilitating discussions at lunch, maybe by grouping people by focus area or letting people give feedback about 2013. There was some concern that this might limit the ability of attendees to network with people who might not necessarily be within their focus group. Adam Olivieri suggested giving different color dots to different organizations (dredgers, industrial, etc), and then letting them give feedback on 2013 Special Study projects. Meg Sedlak wondered how you address that feedback, if the funding decision has already been made.

### **9. 2013 Annual Meeting**

Meg Sedlak informed the group that the focus for the 2013 Annual Meeting would be on CECs. She also said there was an opportunity for the RMP meeting to combine with the biannual State

of the Estuary (SOE) meeting hosted by the San Francisco Estuary Partnership (SFEP). Meg said there were three options:

- Option 1: have concurrent session with the SOE which would result in some savings for the RMP
- Option 2: be the third day of the SOE meeting, which wouldn't really result in any savings
- Option 3: have an entirely separate meeting

At this point, two representatives from SFEP joined the meeting, Judy Kelly (Director) and Karen McDowell (Environmental Planner), as did Rainer Hoenicke (Executive Director for SFEI). Judy said this would be the 11<sup>th</sup> biannual SOE meeting. No date has been set yet, but it would likely be October 2013 at the Oakland Marriott. The purpose of partnering with the RMP is that these two events usually compete for audience and for speakers. Karen proposed that there could be a plenary session in the morning (which all attendees would attend) and a concurrent session in the afternoon (which attendees would have the choice of attending).

### *Discussion*

Peter Carroll asked if the SFEP and SFEI have similar visions. Tom said SFEI is like the science arm to support SFEP. Judy added that she and Rainer Hoenicke have been talking for several years about how to better integrate the two organizations, and Rainer added that he thought the two organizations have complementary skill sets. Mike Connor asked Tom Mumley if, as the chair of both meetings, he supported this idea. Tom said he does, but that there were some logistical issues. The top focus of the RMP meeting is CECs, and he didn't think the SOE meeting would support a full day for that. He didn't think all of the water quality time at the SOE meeting could be devoted to CECs, but that there maybe 2 sessions on the topic. Jay Davis said that he thinks the RMP could fill a full day with CECs, if they were doing the meeting on their own. Jay said there are three things he would like to still include in the RMP portion (1) getting workgroup advisors involved in the meeting, similar to the 2012 meeting, (2) reporting on RMP projects wrapping up at that time, and (3) having a meaningful discussion of policy issues. Karin North said that if there was a concurrent session in the afternoon on CECs you could be competing with other sessions for attendees. She thought it was feasible if there was a plenary session on water quality. Tom said you have to respect the planning committee of SFEP and that we can't lock in programming right now. He said the win-win situation is making water quality a theme and focus of the plenary, and added there were some money challenges to be aware of. Karen McDowell said that the amount that people usually pay to register for the RMP meeting would only cover one day of their attendance to the meeting, not two. Meg Sedlak said the SFEI budget is usually about \$15,000 for the facility with about 160 people attending (10-20 of which are non-RMP members), and Karen said that the SFEP budget is about \$200,000 with about 750-850 people attending. Karen suggested that 1-day of registration could be free for RMP members, and then they could pay if they chose to attend both days. Tom asked if there was a recommendation from the group to merge the two meetings, knowing there are logistical details to work out. Karin North motioned to merge the meetings and Adam Olivieri seconded. Karin noted it should be considered how to keep these meetings merged if Tom stops being on the committee for both. Meg Sedlak asked if there were any dates they should avoid, and Mike Connor said the BACWA annual conference is usually the 3<sup>rd</sup> week of September. Judy asked if the group has talked about collaborating on the 2015 State of the Bay report, and Jay Davis said

that hadn't been discussed yet. Tom said that in light of that the potential integrated State of the Bay report, combining the meetings makes even more sense. All members voted in favor.

### **10. Pulse Lite 2012**

Jay took input he received on the draft and made revisions. Mike Connor said that it needs to be completed by the annual meeting in October. Jay then moved on to discuss the communications survey, which will be sent to Pulse readers for feedback on the Pulse. The current survey has already undergone revisions. He asked the group for help deciding who the survey should be distributed to by revising a contact list he distributed to the group.

#### Discussion

Karin North asked where the list of contacts came from because some of the names are outdated. Jay said it started with the Annual Meeting mailing list and names he and Meg Sedlak thought of. Meg said they are open to suggestion of how to change the contact list. Karin said BACWA has newsletter and they could link to the survey from there. Meg said she wanted the survey to go out to a few people whom she could actually follow up with. People don't always respond to survey e-mail blasts. Mike Connor said he could give Meg BACWA's full mailing list, and Adam Olivieri said he could give the same thing for BASMAA. Jay Davis said he should also follow up with dredgers for a similar list from them. Mike Connor these lists should be sent by August 15<sup>th</sup>. Jay asked Tom Mumley about the new e-mail addresses for state employees (Firstname.Lastname or FLastname), and Tom didn't think they had changed. Mike said when the survey goes out, it should be advertised as a 2-3 minute survey in an easy format, and Jay said it would be Survey Monkey.

#### Action Items

1. Contact lists (by Aug 15<sup>th</sup>)
  - a. Mike Connor – BACWA list
  - b. Adam – BASMAA list
  - c. Need to follow up with dredgers to get their list

### **11. Oct 29<sup>th</sup> Multi-Year Planning Meeting**

The date of the meeting was set for October 29<sup>th</sup>. The SC discussed several issues which could be on the agenda:

#### I. Toxicity

Meg Sedlak revisited the idea of adding toxicity to the agenda, an idea discussed previously in the meeting. Tom Mumley said that there is a lot of money being spent on this and toxicity might not even exist. Peter Carroll thought it was important to have increased frequency and number of sampling locations for aquatic toxicity. Right now, there are data collected every 5 years (through the RMP) at 9 locations. Peter said that depending on how the state policy comes out, they might have to monitor anyway, but would like to know if the data and science shows that there isn't a toxicity problem. Tom says that testing for ambient toxicity is tricky because it might end up hurting you if it shows you have a problem. Mike Connor said if we believe it's a real issue, we should spend the money. If not, we shouldn't. However, if it comes up in his permits, then they are going to ask how BACWA is dealing with it. Mike said it's hard for him to

think the RMP should be involved, but Tom says it is a little off task but maybe worth scoping out a toxicity project for the RMP.

## II. Nutrients

Peter Carroll asked where the algal biotoxins fit into the multi-year plan, and Karin North said it was nutrients. Mike Connor said there needs to be a link between RMP science and policy decisions. There is some lack of correlation between RMP funding and what we are demanding out of it. Tom Mumley thought the nutrient-related monitoring projects are huge, but the effort needed to answer nutrient questions is beyond what we have been doing so far. Karin North asked what the tipping point is for nutrients where management actions need to occur. Tom stated that the efforts to develop the Nutrient Strategy are addressing that exact question. Mike Connor commented that the Suisun Bay issue is taking a lot of money.

## III. STLS

Tom Mumley thinks that STLS is a continuing need for the RMP.

## IV. EC

Tom Mumley thinks that EC is a growing need in the RMP.

## V. Legacy Pollutants

Tom Mumley asked what efforts are needed for legacy pollutants like mercury, PCBs and dioxins. How much effort should the RMP continue to put into effects work, since it seems to be driven by EC and nutrients. Meg Sedlak said that the issue with the legacy pollutants is to continue to evaluate if management is focusing on the right thresholds.

Mike Connor summarized that the dilemma for everyone is that money is getting tighter and we need to make sure we are using resources appropriately. Mike said that participating organizations could spend more money on issues they are concerned with, rather than the RMP. Tom Mumley said it seems like the group agrees with the structure of the meeting, that most of the detailed discussion occurs in the 3-hour block of agenda item #5. Mike suggested skipping #2 or combining it with #3. Karin North asked if when a Special Study is discussed, whether it could include a summary of the project, including the amount of money that has been spent in the past and outcomes. Jay Davis said this is included in the multi-year plan, but it could be a good idea to include it as a refresher. Tom said that an update of the Multi-Year Plan should be sent out in advance, and Mike recommended that people new to the SC could be briefed ahead of time, maybe even with a phone call. He added that you could even call everyone prior to the meeting to get feedback on the agenda package and pass that feedback along to Tom and Karin. Karin asked about the procedure for voting on decisions when members are absent. Jay said the procedure is that you need at least 5 members for a quorum, and if you have less, than all decisions are tentative until additional input is received from absent members. Karin asked about who should be included in the meeting who might not be on the SC. Mike mentioned Ian Wren, Meg added Amy Chastain, and Adam Olivieri suggested Chris Sommers. Mike suggested someone from BCDC and Karin suggested someone from USGS, and Tom responded that this wouldn't be a good meeting for scientist. Jay added that you don't want to invite people who aren't familiar with the RMP and you don't want the meeting to be too large. Jay agreed to revise the agenda and send it to Tom and Karin.

Action Items

1. At next SC meeting, when we talk about each of the special study projects, give a little bit of history and the budget spent in the past
2. Meg and Jay brief new people prior to the meeting
3. Jay revise next SC meeting agenda and send to Tom and Karin
4. Meg and Emily send save-the-date for next SC meeting with additional invites – follow up with Jay/Meg

**12. Program Updates**

Meg Sedlak began with the CFWG. She said the Bioaccumulation Conceptual model is complete, and Jay Davis said he could update the group about this at the next meeting. Meg continued that the Margins Conceptual Model report is in progress, and that Don Yee will address Jim Hunt's comments in mid August. David Senn is working on a modeling plan. With regards to the SPLWG, Meg said that there is a meeting set for October 24<sup>th</sup>. Lester McKee will bring the complete 16 Watersheds report to that meeting. With regards to the ECWG, Meg said the Alternate Flame Retardants paper was accepted, the APE report has been submitted to Environment International and she had completed a draft of the PFC sources paper. She said there were some other special topics of interest. With regards to the Delta RMP, Meg said Thomas Jabusch has put together a draft monitoring program design and there is a planning meeting on October 15<sup>th</sup>. Tom Mumley commented that he doesn't think the Delta RMP has enough money, but they are doing well with limited resources. He asked what IEP was doing, and Mike Connor said they are doing well and spending at \$30M a year. Tom asked how the Delta RMP can get some of that money, and Mike Connor said Rainer Hoenicke and Thomas are working to do so.

Action Items

1. Jay will give brief BCM update at the next meeting during the Program Update.

**13. Planning next SC meeting**

Tom Mumley repeated that the next meeting is on October 29<sup>th</sup> with the multi-year planning meeting in the morning and a brief SC meeting in the afternoon. Karin North added that if additional topics for discussion occur to anyone, they should e-mail Tom or hers. The meeting was adjourned.

Action Items

1. Make next SC meeting the second half of the planning meeting