



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 July 17th, 2013 San Francisco Estuary Institute

Draft meeting summary

Attendees:

Tom Mumley*, SFB RWQCB
Jim Ervin (City of San Jose)
Adam Olivieri, Stormwater (BASMAA/EOA Inc)
Karin North**, Small POTWs (City of Palo Alto)
Ariel Stephens, Dredgers (Bay Planning Coalition)
Rob Lawrence, US Army Corps of Engineers
Bridgette DeShields, Refineries (Integral Consulting Inc.)
Judy Kelly (SFEP)
Ariel Rubissow Okamoto (SFEP)

Lawrence Leung (SFEI)
Meg Sedlak (SFEI)
Rebecca Sutton (SFEI)
Ellen Willis-Norton (SFEI)
Dave Senn (SFEI)
Emily Novick (SFEI)
Meredith Williams (SFEI)
Jay Davis (SFEI)
Thomas Jabusch (SFEI)
Lester McKee (SFEI)
Jing Wu (SFEI)
*Chair
**Vice-chair

I. Approval of Agenda and Minutes [Tom Mumley]

Adam Olivieri motioned to approve the previous SC meeting summary. Karin North seconded; Tom Mumley asked if all members were in favor, and the summary was unanimously approved.

II. Information: TRC Meeting Summary [Meg Sedlak]

Meg Sedlak informed the SC that the June TRC meeting focused on the approval of 2014 special studies proposals. In addition, the TRC discussed possible changes to the S&T

program related to sediment sampling, primarily the inclusion of margins sampling. The September TRC meeting will discuss the S&T sediment sampling design in more detail.

III. Action: Status of 2013 Budget and Expenditures [Lawrence Leung, Meg Sedlak]

Lawrence Leung stated that almost all of the participant fees have been received for 2013. Lawrence is working with Beth Christian at the Water Board to obtain the Marina Vista Homeowners Association's and Allied Defense Recycling's dredging fees. Tom Mumley asked about the outstanding CalTrans participant fee. Lawrence responded that the 2012 fee has been received; the RMP is waiting to receive the 2013 fee, which is expected by November 15th.

Lawrence stated that all prior year labor and subcontracts have been closed. The RMP's unencumbered reserve remains at \$200,000 and, including the 2011 and 2012 closed out tasks, the unencumbered funds are now at \$461,317. Meg Sedlak requested approval of extending 2011 and 2012 carryover labor tasks (equal to \$122,231) to September 30th. Adam Olivieri motioned; Karin North seconded and the SC unanimously approved extending the 2011 and 2012 carryover tasks until the beginning of October.

IV. Action: Special Studies for 2014 [Meg Sedlak]

Funding Decisions on the Horizon

Meg Sedlak began the discussion on 2014 special study proposals by stating that the budget for the TRC approved special studies was only \$3,000 over the planned Pilot and Special Studies budget. She also noted that there are on-going discussions regarding the sediment portion of the S&T program that will have substantial budgetary impacts. If benthos and toxicity sampling is not included in the 2014 cruise, there will be an extra \$110,000 in the budget.

Tom Mumley added that the recently completed PCB synthesis included recommendations to conduct monitoring and modeling work that is not currently in the 2014 special studies budget. Thus, there is a potential need for PCB work in 2014 that may need to come from the RMP reserve. He noted that margins sampling would account for a substantial portion of the PCB information needs, if margins sampling became a part of the S&T program. Tom stated that he is willing to advocate for resources to complete PCB analyses that will help improve knowledge of the Bay and inform future permit requirements. Adam Olivieri asked Tom about the timeline for finalizing the PCB synthesis. Tom responded that Jay will address the comments from the PCB Strategy team within the next couple of weeks; once the new version is approved by the team, it will be sent out to the TRC and SC. The PCB Strategy Team is also planning a follow-up meeting to discuss the details of future PCB work. Bridgette DeShields noted that there is also the potential that Se studies will need funding in 2014, but there are currently no specific proposals.

The following studies were brought forward and approved by SC with the approved budget in the corresponding parentheses.

1. *Alternative Flame Retardants (\$83,000)*: The study idea is based on observed decreases in PBDE concentrations; which may result in increased detections of PBDE alternatives in the Bay. The flame retardants the RMP is targeting include: phosphates (which may be found in water), compounds that are part of Firemaster 550, and compounds listed on Howard and Muir (2010) top 10 lists. The TRC supported a budget of \$83,000 instead of the original \$137,000 proposal. The TRC decided to not fund the analysis of seal sample archives for PBDEs or an inter-lab comparison study between Dr. Da Chen laboratory at Southern Illinois University and AXYS Analytical.

2. *Updating EC Strategy (\$20,000)*: The 2014 EC Strategy budget is dedicated to staying informed of the latest CEC toxicity, effects, and occurrence studies.

3. *Bioanalytical Tools (\$56,000)*: The bioanalytical tools study, led by Dr. Nancy Denslow, is in its second year of funding. The overarching goal of the study is to identify endocrine disruptor effects at the molecular level and correlate those effects to organism level effects. The study is relevant because it is examining estuarine organisms and endocrine disruptors that the State recommended monitoring in the 2009 EC Panel report.

4. *Assessing Dredging Impacts on Benthos (\$50,000)*: The dredging impacts on the benthos study will evaluate whether dredging adversely impacts fish foraging by disturbing the benthic community. The total budget for the study is \$150,000, but \$100,000 will likely be obtained from LTMS/BCDC as a result of mitigation measures from America's Cup. In the MYP, \$50,000 of RMP funding was set aside for the study. The study is a high priority for the Long Term Management Strategy for Dredging (LTMS) and the National Marine Fisheries Service. However, the EEWG and TRC were concerned that the proposal authors have not yet identified a technical lead. RMP staff members do not have the expertise to lead the project. Therefore, the TRC approved the study contingent on the identification of a lead, the approval of the study design by the EEWG, and successfully obtaining the America's Cup funds.

Tom Mumley stated that he questions the likelihood of study's success, but supported committing RMP resources to meet dredger needs. Additionally, he thinks the literature review on fish habitat and diet in the Bay will be useful knowledge.

5. *Reference Sites for Bioassays (\$0)*: The LTMS also proposed a smaller study that seeks to find a reference site to compare to dredged materials. The proposal includes conducting four toxicity tests at one or two previously sampled RMP stations to determine if the site could become a reference site. This study is of lower priority than the study assessing dredging impacts on the benthos. The TRC recommended conducting the study only if the previous study (Assessing Dredging Impacts on Benthos) does not move forward.

6. *Moderate Toxicity Follow up (\$30,000)*: This study proposal was the result of the 2012 workshop at which approximately 30 experts met to discuss the possible causes of moderate toxicity in the Bay. The study, proposed by Brian Anderson and Steve Bay, analyzes the correlation between particle shape and size and amphipod mortality.

Amphipod health would be analyzed simultaneously, using lipids as a proxy. The TRC supported the study as long as the proposal authors consider a more advanced methodology for analyzing particle shape. Additionally, the TRC recommended only conducting summer sampling (the original proposal included both winter and summer) to reduce costs. The total cost of the study is \$80,000, but Chris Beegan will contribute \$50,000 of State Board money to complete the study.

7-10. Stormwater Projects(\$487,000):

There are four SPLWG related proposals that are part of an overall three-year plan. The proposals are related to stormwater monitoring at two sites, continuing to develop the Regional Watershed Spreadsheet Model, to develop event mean concentrations (EMC) data, and to conduct project management to run the monthly Small Tributaries Loading meetings.

Nutrients Funding

Dave Senn began his presentation by stating that the nutrient conceptual model highlighted priority knowledge gaps and science questions related to nutrients in the Bay. From those priority questions, the technical team developed a Nutrient Science Plan. Special study ideas are driven by the Science Plan, which includes modeling, monitoring and synthesis, and process studies to address the highest priority issues and goals. There are many agencies that are funding nutrient work in the Bay including BACWA, RMP, IEP, USGS, SFWCA, and the SWRCB. Tom Mumley noted that by next year, the governance structure for nutrients work in the Bay will be solidified. Dave then provided a brief overview of the three RMP funded nutrient studies proposals.

11. Combined Nutrients Proposals: Monitoring and Program Management (\$320,000):

The study proposal includes monitoring program development, moored sensor network expansion, continuation of stormwater monitoring, and program management.

12. Hydrodynamic and WQ modeling (\$150,000): This study proposal was based on the recommendation by the SC to move forward on a nutrients model. The study includes drafting a modeling white paper, developing a work plan, and developing the hydrodynamics and water quality model. The modeling work could begin as early as November 2013 because SFEI has recently hired an experienced hydrological modeler.

13. Stormwater Load Estimates (\$50,000): The nutrient loading study indicated that stormwater loads are not insignificant in some regions during certain portions of the year. The goal of this study is to improve load estimates and conduct an uncertainty analysis (for either Napa or Sonoma).

Dave added that he has also requested \$675,000 from BACWA for 2014 nutrient studies. Dave described the studies that will be funded by BACWA, which are listed below (bold indicates studies that overlap with the RMP funded studies):

1. Synthesis and science plan
- 2. Moored sensor program development**

3. **Nutrient monitoring program development**
4. **Science oversight and coordination**
5. Coordinate technical review

The proposal for the second year of the moored sensor study is to add two additional stations. Jim Ervin suggested that a sensor should be placed in Alviso because the parameters will correlate with the time of day rather than with the tide.

14. Dioxin in Sportfish (\$24,000): The study objective is to continue to evaluate dioxins in shiner surfperch and white croaker because concentrations in the sportfish are exceeding Water Board targets.

Discussion:

Tom Mumley stated he conditionally approves proposal number one, alternative flame retardant monitoring. Tom's conditional approval is based on including monitoring sources (WWTPs and stormwater) rather than just in-Bay sampling. He noted that the State's CEC Panel Report directs agencies to include source sampling when screening for emerging contaminants. Tom wants source sampling to be part of a collaborative monitoring effort, rather than becoming a part of permit requirements. To obtain funds for source sampling, the RMP could reduce the amount of in-Bay sampling or obtain source samples from RMP participants, such as the City of Palo Alto or the City of San Jose. Additionally, the amount of PBDE monitoring could be reduced to release funds for additional alternative flame retardant monitoring.

Karin North asked if Tom was thinking about sampling direct sources, such as manufacturing plants. Tom replied that he is focused on sampling conduit sources, but direct sources could also be sampled. Meg noted that so few samples are already being collected for the alternative flame retardants proposal (10 sites) that it would be difficult to reduce the number of samples to include other sources. She is interested conducting source sampling; however, stakeholders will need to come forward with the samples. Meg will talk to BASMAA and BACWA to see if they will provide samples. Karin replied that the City of San Jose and Palo Alto are always willing to help the RMP with sample collection. Meg agreed and said that Mike Connor of EBDA would likely be willing to provide samples as well. In addition, it was noted that 2 of the 6 storm water sites are being monitored by the RMP and storm water could be collected at these sites for the alternative flame retardants study.

Adam Olivieri stated that the RMP should inform the Statewide CEC panel and Keith Maruya (who works on CECs in Southern California (SCCWRP)) about current EC sampling efforts. Meg indicated that SFEI had recently been contacted by SCCWRP to assist with the state-wide efforts. Additionally, Adam suggested examining the CEC Panel report, determining which portions of the RMP's CEC monitoring plans that do not currently overlap with their suggestions, and adjusting the RMP monitoring strategy accordingly. Tom stated that the RMP CEC strategy needs to be in sync with and also one step ahead of the State's panel report. Tom noted that the updating CEC Strategy (\$20,000) should be a part of RMP Program Management, rather than a special study. Adam noted that the CEC Strategy still needed closure; Tom responded that the draft

strategy is complete, and now the feedback that Becky Sutton has received needs to be incorporated.

Both Tom and Karin voiced their approval of the TRC recommendations regarding the funding for the two dredging studies. Tom also said he had no questions or comments regarding the stormwater studies. However, Tom had concerns regarding the moderate toxicity proposal. Even if the cause of moderate toxicity in the Bay is discovered, Tom argued that the result will not affect management decisions. Jim Ervin replied that physical causes of toxicity have to be ruled out and the result may cause the RMP to modify the toxicity test. Jim gave an example of activated carbon being ingested by daphnia and causing the daphnia to die in the test (i.e., activated carbon not contaminants was causing the mortality). Tom added that this study may determine if the test should even be used by the RMP. Therefore, Tom said he supports the study because it is relatively inexpensive and because it may cause the RMP to reconsider using the toxicity test, which will further reduce costs. However, his support is conditional on the RMP supporting regular discussions on sediment monitoring program's priorities for the Bay, including dialogue on how SQOs will be used in the future. He also was interested in supporting studies that would follow up on known hotspots in the Bay (303 (d) listed sites).

Adam noted that it wasn't clear if a portion of the nutrient funding was coming from 2011 and 2012 carryover. Meg responded that \$20,000 of carryover funds, in addition to proposed budget of \$150,000, will be used to complete Hydrodynamic and WQ modeling study. Meg Sedlak ended the discussion by asking the SC to approve the TRC recommended 2014 special studies, which would remove \$3,000 from RMP reserves. Rob Lawrence motioned to approve, Karin seconded, and the SC unanimously approved the 2014 special study proposals.

Action Items:

1. Meg will talk to BASMAA and BACWA about obtaining alternative flame retardant samples from WWTPs and stormwater.

V. Action: Budget for 2015 [Meg Sedlak]

Meg Sedlak informed the SC that the 2015 fees will increase by 2%. The SC unanimously approved the change and agreed to revisit the fee increase in 2015.

VI. Update: Quarterly Program Feature – Small Tributaries Loading [Lester McKee]

Lester McKee presented an update on the Small Tributaries Loading strategy (STLS), which includes the Regional Watershed Spreadsheet Model (RWSM), loading studies at six locations, and the development of technical reports related to the two projects. He noted that the STLS provides essential information for other studies, including the Dioxins, EC, and Nutrient strategies.

RWSM

The objective of the model is to improve regional average estimates of suspended sediment and pollutant loads to prioritize high leverage watersheds and provide input into mass balance and food web models of the Bay. In 2013, a robust sediment model will be completed followed by PCB and Hg model runs. The models have already been run once and are now being improved by adding additional source areas and source specific EMC. Once the Hg and PCB model is completed, versions of the model can be run for Se, OC pesticides, and PBDES. The completed model will provide estimates of loads to the margins areas, most likely on the subembayment scale.

Discussion:

Adam Olivieri asked if variability and uncertainty was being carried through the estimates. Lester responded yes, uncertainty has been a component of the model and is relatively high.

Pollutants of Concern Loads Monitoring Field Studies

Lester discussed the POC loads monitoring study, where the RMP is responsible for monitoring two out of six sites, the Richmond pump station and the Sunnyvale east channel. Lester stressed that the last two years have been very dry and the RMP could not collect enough samples; therefore, assuming that there is sufficient rainfall, the RMP will try to collect the remaining balance in Water Year 2014. Lester summarized the results and found that the PCBs and Hg were consistent with the reconnaissance study findings. San Leandro Creek exhibited the highest Hg concentration and the second highest PCB concentration. Lester ended the presentation by noting the Water Year 2013 report is due in September 2012 and the PBDE and OC pesticides factsheets will be available at the end of this month.

Discussion:

Tom Mumley asked if both funds and time had been allocated to robustly modify the existing multi-year strategy this coming year. Lester replied that additional RMP funds were not obtained to modify the strategy; but, BASMAA and the Regional Water Board will be in charge of writing the new multi-year plan with the RMP's assistance. Adam asked if the funds allocated for external and internal review could be used to have a dialogue on the multi-year strategy. Meg responded that STLS can come back to the SC to ask for additional funds to complete the multi-year strategy if needed.

Adam noted that a document like the multi-year strategy will need a significant amount of peer review. He requested that the RMP make clear how the internal and external review process works; for examples, how does the RMP decide whether to publish a manuscript or a report? How do we get closure on the CEC and PCB strategy? Tom agreed that the existing review process should be discussed; Adam suggested writing a two to three page memo clearly explaining the process. Meg replied that she will pull something together for the next SC meeting.

Action Items:

2. Meg Sedlak will put together a two to three page memo on the RMPs internal and external review process for the October 2013 SC meeting.

VII. Action: RMP Sediment Monitoring [Meg Sedlak, Ellen Willis-Norton]

Ellen Willis-Norton presented the SQO assessment results from 125 S&T stations, sampled from 2008 through 2012 (the river stations were not included because the assessment method was not calibrated for freshwater). The study's goal was to evaluate the spatial and temporal trends of sediment quality in the Bay using the narrative objectives. A prior SQO study, a 2000 USEPA WEMAP survey, determined that 77 percent of the Bay was listed as Possibly Impacted. Similarly, the majority of the Bay (40%) was Possibly Impacted from 2008 through 2012. The only year where over a third of the Bay was not listed as Possibly Impacted was in 2009; in 2009 46% of the Bay was listed as Unimpacted. None of the sites were listed as Clearly Impacted during all five years, indicating that severe impacts on the benthic community were not observed. Additionally, Ellen noted that sediment quality may have improved over time, with the percent of the Bay listed Likely Impacted sites decreasing in 2011 and 2012.

Sediment quality was driven by biological effects (primarily toxicity) rather than chemical exposure. The entire Bay was characterized by moderate toxicity; moderate or high toxicity was observed in 60% of the Bay from 2008 through 2012. Spatially, sediment quality differed between subembayments. San Pablo Bay possessed the best sediment quality, 80% of the Bay was Likely Unimpacted or Unimpacted. In contrast, 88% and 80% South Bay and Suisun Bay were Possibly or Likely Impacted, respectively.

Discussion:

Tom Mumley noted that the benthic indices used for SQOs had not been calibrated for the mesohaline environment. Ellen responded that the indices applied to samples from the mesohaline and oligohaline environments differed from the indices used for the polyhaline environment (a modified RBI, IBI, and the AMBI index were used instead). Tom also asked if the moderate and high toxicity categorizations were due to *Eohaustorius estuaries* toxicity. Ellen responded that excluding the *Eohaustorius estuaries* test would change the results, but there would still be locations with moderate or high toxicity. Jim Ervin suggested that the areas with good sediment quality may be due to scouring. Additionally, Jim wondered if normalizing for fines would reduce the percent area listed as moderately toxic.

Tom noted that results did not reveal any red flags and that there are no management actions that can change what is being observed. He suggested removing the benthos and toxicity component from the 2014 sediment cruise. Jim Ervin noted that the SQO data is useful to get a sense of sediment quality trends, he suggested conducting SQOs at some frequency. Tom agreed that SQOs cannot be disregarded, since are part of the regulatory framework, but the frequency of sampling can be reduced.

Adam Olivieri motioned to approve the TRCs suggestion to exclude the toxicity and benthos component of the 2014 sediment cruise, as long as the TRC holds an in-depth discussion about margins sampling, the PCB strategy, and SQO monitoring. Karin North seconded the motion, and the motion was unanimously approved by the SC.

VIII. RMP Communications

VIII a. Action: Sponsoring Estuary News [Judy Kelly and Ariel Rubissow Okamoto]

Due to the sequester, federal funding for *Estuary News* is threatened. *Estuary News* is attempting to diversify their funding sources. Therefore, Judy Kelly and Ariel Rubissow Okamoto gave a presentation about *Estuary News* to see if the RMP would be interested in providing \$10,000 of funding to the newsletter for the next two years, beginning in January. The 12-page magazine style newsletter comes out five times a year, online and in print. *Estuary News* fulfills the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan mandate, its readership is 3,000 and growing. Judy noted that of the 3,000 readers, many are decision makers; for example, every elected official on the ABAG mailing list receives *Estuary News*. An award winning team of journalists covers science stories from many agencies and the newsletter is featured prominently on the SFEP webpage.

Ariel stated that getting funding from the RMP would increase coverage of RMP priorities and activities. The RMP could have a regular column, one or two larger stories, or a “contaminant of the month”. Additionally, as a funder, the RMP could have a presence on the editorial board. Other agencies have responded to the funding gap including the Delta Stewardship Council, Cal LLC, USGS, NMFS, and ESA-PWA and others.

Discussion:

Jay Davis asked who would be writing the articles. Ariel responded that the team of journalists at *Estuary News* would be writing the pieces, but would work closely with RMP staff. Ariel added that *Estuary News* can create three to four forms of a story, a feature story can be turned into a couple paragraph summary. Adam Olivieri noted that the shorter pieces could be featured as the text of the News & Notables section of the RMP page. Adam and Tom Mumley agreed that contributing to *Estuary News* would reduce the amount of staff time dedicated to RMP communications. Additionally, the Estuary Insert could be written and formatted by *Estuary News* journalists as a part of the partnership, reducing the cost of creating the Insert each year. Karin North added that RMP material in *Estuary News* would fulfill one of the RMP’s main goals of providing concise and accurate scientific information to managers. Tom noted that the partnership between *Estuary News* and the RMP would strengthen the relationship between SFEP and the RMP. *Estuary News* readers would become aware of the RMP, and adding the RMP mailing list to *Estuary News*’ distribution list would expand their readership.

Adam is interested in how funding *Estuary News* fits into the RMP’s larger communication strategy. Tom agreed that discussing the RMP’s communication strategy is useful, but is a longer discussion. Jay added that the RMP will need to formalize a communication strategy in the near future. The SC agreed to review the RMP’s communication strategy at the October 2013 meeting. Karin North motioned to approve contributing \$10,000 to *Estuary News* for two years, Adam seconded the motion, and the SC unanimously approved funding *Estuary News*.

Action Items:

3. Meg Sedlak will include a discussion of the RMP communication strategy in the October 2013 SC/MYP agenda.

IXb. Action: Decision on Topic for the *Estuary News* Insert [Jay Davis]

Jay Davis presented his idea for the 2013 Estuary Insert: a look at the RMP 20 years previously and 20 years into the future (following this year's SOE conference theme). Both Karin North and Tom Mumley supported Jay's idea, agreeing that it would be a good opportunity to publicize how long the RMP has been in existence. Karin encouraged including a management section in the insert to explain why the RMP receives funding. Karin added that instead of an RMP staff member writing the story, the RMP could subcontract with *Estuary News*. Jay Davis will send the draft insert to the SC once it is completed, it will be published in advance of the SOE conference. Karin motioned to approve the recommendation of using the *Estuary News* staff to write the Insert, the SC were all in favor of the motion.

Karin asked if the RMP could hire a public relations firm to create a press release for the Estuary Insert. Tom noted that the success of the stormwater outreach program is because of the public support for fees. Meg Sedlak noted that the RMP is establishing a relationship with Stephanie Lee, an environmental reporter at the SF Chronicle.

Action Items:

4. Jay Davis will reach out to *Estuary News* to see if they could subcontract with the RMP to write the Estuary Insert.
5. Jay Davis will send the SC the draft Estuary Insert when it is completed.

IXc. Information: Draft of RMP E-Update [Jay Davis]

Jay Davis presented a draft RMP E-update, modeled on the Delta E-newsletter. The update will include a list of RMP products and events with a short description of each item. A list of reports, articles, and presentations could be provided at the bottom. Jay suggested producing an E-update quarterly.

Discussion:

Karin North asked if RMP staff members are available to create the E-update. Jay responded that he will write the newsletter at first and then pass it on to other staff. Meg Sedlak added that content could be taken from the RMP workgroup updates. Tom suggested also including in external events and products that were of interest to RMP participants. Karin noted that Google analytics could be used to find out what content readers are clicking on most often. Additionally, Karin supported using an e-mail marketing program that provided newsletter templates, such as Vertical Response. Karin noted that both Alexander Gunnell and Amy Chastain have experience with the programs. Ariel Stephens indicated that BPC also used Vertical Response.

IXd. Information: 2013 Pulse & the RMP/SOE Meeting [Jay Davis, Meg Sedlak]
2015 SOE Report

Judy Kelly informed the SC that she is still committed to producing a State of the Estuary (SOE) report for 2015. She will use funds efficiently, the report will be more web-based

and interactive and the information will be available on the Estuary portal and the SFEP webpage. Adam Olivieri suggested approaching BASMAA or BACWA for funding.

Pulse of the Bay

Jay Davis noted that Linda is working on the art for the 2013 Pulse and that a layout version of the Pulse should be available in 2 weeks. The decision that needs to be made today is whether to do a full Pulse of the Bay in 2014 or in 2016 since the SOE report will be completed in 2015. Jay came up with a list of possible themes including: beneficial use, costs and benefits of the RMP, climate change, pollution prevention and source control, PCBs (lots of information from the synthesis), 20 years of the RMP, POTWs or another major source pathway, pollutant pathways, human uses of the Bay and water quality issues, and nutrients. Jay's list of ideas suggests that there is a lot of information the RMP could report.

Discussion:

Adam Olivieri noted that the human use of the Bay is a topic that has been covered in recent years. Adam suggested that a lead up to a Pulse about nutrients would be interesting, a couple of articles could be written in *Estuary News* before the nutrients Pulse was released. Tom noted that a Pulse about nutrients would not be ready in 2014. Tom thinks that although the topics Jay suggested are worthwhile, nothing will be ready to be published by next year. Jay wondered if PCBs were a viable topic. Tom responded that we need new mass balance and PCB monitoring information before the RMP is ready to publish a Pulse. Karin suggested writing an *Estuary News* article about PCBs instead. She also suggested that Jay create a draft list of possible topics for *Estuary News*, one of which should be aging infrastructure for POTWs and stormwater.

Tom is averse to publishing a Pulse every year because of the time it demands from RMP staff, particularly Jay. Adam agreed, stating that producing a Pulse every year take away resources for producing original research. Meg Sedlak noted that the Pulse is a well-reviewed report; for example, the Oakland Museum staff was very excited about all of the Pulses the RMP has produced and plans to feature them in their upcoming exhibit on the Bay. Jay added that if a partnership is developed between the RMP and SFEP, SFEP staff could begin writing content for the Pulse. Karin countered that *Estuary News* could be seen as an alternative to producing a Pulse in 2014.

Adam asked why the Pulse of the Bay couldn't be completed during the same year as the SOE report. Jay responded that the last time both reports were published simultaneously, there was competition for readership. Karin suggested merging the two documents. Jay replied that the SOE only reserves around six pages about water quality. Tom noted that the SOE report will be shorter this year because of budget cuts; therefore, the competition between the two documents may be less. Tom suggests continuing with a Pulse of the Bay in 2015. Karin supported Tom's suggestion, saying that by 2015 the Pulse of the Bay could focus on nutrient work.

Action Items:

6. Jay Davis will create a list of possible *Estuary News* topics to send to the SC.

IX. Action: RMP MYP

Jay Davis led a discussion about the October multi-year plan (MYP) meeting. The day will start with management needs, decisions, and policies, followed by an overview of the budget, and finally an overview of the RMP program areas. Jay noted that a lot of the budget for 2015 still needs to be determined. Additionally, the total amount available for special studies will experience a large drop in 2015 and continue to fall because of the funds that need to be reallocated to complete Jim Cloern's USGS work. Karin North noted that the budget is based on the assumption that RMP will continue with the same research program that Jim Cloern is currently overseeing. Tom made clear that the RMP cannot fund Jim's work in its entirety and noted that nutrients monitoring will overlap with Jim's work.

Tom noted that decisions on future PCB work will need to be made before the meeting to ensure that PCB needs are accounted for in the 2015 budget. Jay responded that the PCB Strategy team will meet before the MYP meeting. Adam Olivieri said that he has been prioritizing PCB information needs and will meet with Jay to discuss his list.

Tom made clear that the MYP meeting this year will be more challenging than in previous years because the RMP is in a state of transition. He assumes that information needs will be larger than what the RMP can afford. Jay responded that he has scheduled a call with Karin North and Tom to discuss the agenda. Adam reminded Jay to add the RMP communications strategy to the agenda. Tom added that the sediment portion of the S&T program will also need to be discussed. Jay replied that the TRC will take a comprehensive look at the S&T program before the MYP meeting, including margins sediment sampling. Bridgette DeShields asked if more power analysis was needed; Meg Sedlak replied that a power analysis could be completed in the future, but the switch to sampling every other year only began in 2011.

Before the MYP meeting, Jay will update the budget table. Tom noted that the regulatory decisions table also needs to be updated. Jay suggested discussing the regulatory decision table changes at the workshop.

X. Action: Coordination with the Delta RMP [Thomas Jabusch]

Thomas Jabusch presented an update on the Delta RMP, stating that progress is slow, but healthy. The Delta RMP development was initiated five years ago and sampling will begin in 2015 at the latest. The Delta RMP SC includes POTWs, stormwater, water suppliers, and agriculture. The SC has agreed on a mission, core management goals, and principles of operation. They are now discussing potential assessment targets. The Delta RMP's Permit Workgroup is interested in hosting a panel in September or October that includes Bay RMP participants to discuss what works well in other monitoring programs. The questions that the panel will be asked still need to be developed and approved by the Delta SC. Thomas noted that the panel would be an opportunity to build a relationship between the two RMPs. He asked if anyone from the SC committee would be willing to travel to Sacramento to be a part of the panel. Meredith Williams mentioned that the Delta RMP still needs to cultivate trust between stakeholders; therefore, the panel's goal

would be to show the benefit of a collaborative monitoring program. Thomas added that Steering Committee members are working well together even though some participating groups remain very skeptical about the benefits of an RMP.

Discussion:

Karin North suggested that Adam Olivieri attend the discussion; he is a good representative for stormwater. She also suggested sending someone from the Central Contra Costa or Delta Diablo Sanitary District because they have connections to the Delta. Tom Mumley responded that he would support sending Jim Kelly, who used to be from Central Contra Costa and knows how the RMP functions. The SC agreed that Jim Ervin and Mike Connor would also be good representatives. Tom asked if anyone from the dredging community could participate. Ariel Stephens said she would talk to John Coleman to see if anyone from the dredging community could attend. Karin suggested including Peter Carroll to represent industry. Tom also suggested Kevin Buchanan as a good industry representative. Jim Ervin and Karin agreed that the panel participants need to stress the power of data and how regional monitoring data can benefit their agency.

Adam asked if the people who are representatives on the Delta SC are working with their constituency. Thomas responded that they will work with each other; for example, the POTWs will coordinate before a Delta RMP SC meeting. Karin asked if the Delta is experiencing the same problems that encouraged the formation of the Bay RMP 20 years ago. Adam responded that all three POTWs in the regions have on-going permit regulations and lawsuits. Tom ended the discussions by stating that the SC is willing to participate.

XI. Information: Deliverables/Workgroup Update [Meg Sedlak]

The only question Tom Mumley had regarding the deliverables was about the timeline for the 2006/2009 Bird Egg report. Jay responded that the report is on schedule for completion in August. Tom also said that the Benthic Assessment for the Mesohaline will not be finished by December 2013 since the study is on hold. Meg Sedlak responded that the BPJ portion of the study is being worked on; the funding for year 2 is what is on hold until the results of the BPJ are released. The BPJ should be finished by December 2013.

Meg asked the SC to send comments on the USGS South Bay Sediment Budget factsheet by July 29th. Tom responded that pictures of the equipment used were not helpful; a cartoon that illustrates what the device does would have been more useful. Jim Ervin noted that during dry years, sediment deposits in South Bay; but, during wet years the sediment flushes out. Data are showing that turbidity has increased in Lower South Bay because of the fines that are washing into the subembayment. Ariel Stephens ended the discussion on South Bay sediment by stating that the Bay Planning Coalition is hosting a workshop on the South Bay Salt Ponds.

XII. Plus/Delta, Set next meeting date and Agenda topics [Tom Mumley]

Tom Mumley noted that the next meeting will primarily focus on the multi-year plan. The date for the next meeting is October 15th at 9 a.m.