



RMP Steering Committee Meeting

August 11th, 2011

**San Francisco Estuary Institute
Second Floor Conference Room
7770 Pardee Lane, Oakland, CA
DRAFT MINUTES**

Meeting Participants

Kevin Buchan, Western States Petroleum Association
Amy Chastain, BACWA
John Coleman, Bay Planning Coalition
Brian Hubinger, Chevron Richmond Refinery
Rob Lawrence, US Army Corps of Engineers
Adam Olivieri, BASMAA/EOA
Trish Mulvey, SFEI Board
Tom Mumley, SFRWQCB
Karin North, City of Palo Alto
Kirsten Struve, City of San Jose

Rachel Allen, SFEI
Jay Davis, SFEI
Rainer Hoenicke, SFEI
Jen Hunt, SFEI
Lawrence Leung, SFEI
Lester McKee, SFEI
Meg Sedlak, SFEI

1) Review of Action Items and Steering Committee Minutes

Meg Sedlak reviewed the action items from the previous Steering Committee (SC) meetings. Amy Chastain noted that she had a discussion with Trish Mulvey regarding the potential use of SEP funding to support RMP special studies. Meg Sedlak will work with Amy Chastain to put together a list of RMP studies that would be good candidates for this funding source. Tom Mumley will commence discussions with SFEP, however he noted that this pathway is not worth a lot of effort, because there is only limited funding available. The SC will discuss this pathway as an agenda item (rather than an action item) at the next SC meeting.

Amy Chastain asked about the web tool for uploading POTW metals loading data. Tom Mumley noted that the agencies are moving towards an electronic reporting system, and that it may be more worthwhile to work with the developers of this tool to enable the RMP to pull data off of it, rather than creating a tool specifically for the RMP.

Kevin Buchan made a revision to the minutes from the April 2011 SC meeting. *This correction has been made, and the minutes posted to the RMP website.* Tom Mumley motioned to approve the minutes, Karin North seconded, and the minutes were approved.

Action Items:

- Discuss using SEP funding for specific RMP Special Studies, including a prioritized list of potential special studies.

2) Committee Member Updates

There were no committee member updates.

3) Technical Review Committee Meeting Summary

Meg Sedlak noted that at the June Technical Review Committee (TRC) meeting, the TRC discussed the utility of continuing the annual joint RMP TRC and Southern California Coastal Water Research Project (SCCWRP) Commission's Technical Advisory Group meetings. The most recent meeting, in May 2011, was poorly attended by the TRC in part due to scheduling conflicts and in part due to a lack of interest in this year's topics. Meg Sedlak stated that SFEI staff find the interactions beneficial, and asked if the forum is still useful for the RMP, either for the TRC or the SC. Kevin Buchan noted that it is generally a good idea for SFEI and SCCWRP to interact, but it is unclear if it is still beneficial to the RMP. Tom Mumley noted that meetings that involve larger groups than the RMP have spun off from this interaction, including the stormwater meeting between BASMAA and SCCWRP. Adam Olivieri suggested discussing the pros and cons of this meeting as well as the benefits to SFEI and the RMP in more detail at the Master Planning meeting.

Action Items:

- Discuss the pros and cons of continuing to hold joint TRC/ CTAG meetings at the Master Planning meeting. Elaborate on the SFEI interest in the meeting with respect to the RMP interest in it. Evaluate whether this interaction should be undertaken by SFEI.

4) Budget Status

Lawrence Leung stated that the 2011 RMP budget was on track, with 98% of the participant fees received and interest revenue on track. He noted that some funding has been drawn from the reserve in 2011, including support for Dr. Craig Jones of Sea Engineering to assist with the preparation of the Margins Conceptual Model. In addition,

he noted that there was a request from the reserve on today's agenda for \$25,000 for coordination support for the Small Tributaries Loading Strategy (STLS). Lawrence indicated that 94% of the funds allocated to labor from the 2010 budget have been spent, with the remaining tasks expected to be completed in the 3rd quarter of 2011. All contracts from 2010 have been written. Of the 2009 subcontractor fees, about 94% have been billed. Paradise Cay continues to pay their invoice balance with sporadic checks. Lawrence indicated that the books for 2004 and 2008 are now closed (i.e., all subcontracts, direct costs, and labor have been paid).

5) Request for Reserve Funding for Continued 2011 STLS Activities

Meg Sedlak reminded the SC that \$16,000 had been set aside for coordination of STLS activities in 2011. However, the scope of work has been larger than anticipated and the available funds have been spent, with a substantial amount of work that needs to be completed in the remainder of the year. She requested that the SC approve \$25,000 for the remainder of this work in 2011, and she anticipated that lower levels of funding would be required in future years as this year's effort is part of a planning effort for three years..

Tom Mumley suggested that while it is possible that the workload will decrease in future years, because the projects are still being designed, it is difficult to project the hours and effort that will be required in the future. Lester McKee reiterated the intent of planning, noting that with \$1.2 million being spent on STLS and planning occurring for the next three years of effort, there is great interest in planning correctly up front, in order to assure that the programs are well coordinated, efficient, and technically sound.

Meg Sedlak noted that the 2012 STLS budget has allocated \$20,000 for these activities. The TRC, at its June 2011 meeting, asked the project to decrease the reporting budget by \$20,000, but project staff require this funding for interim reporting and communications. The funding level for the project has been decreased by \$20,000 thanks to assistance from Alameda County with equipment purchases.

Kirsten Struve noted that based on previous discussions, BACWA agencies may be concerned about allocating more funding to stormwater monitoring. However, Karin North pointed out that the additional data will show the loading contributions of sources other than wastewater, which will be of benefit to stormwater and wastewater permit holders alike.

The SC unanimously approved the request for additional funding.

6) Approval of Special Studies for 2012

Meg Sedlak and Jay Davis informed the SC that the TRC recommended approval of the proposed special studies, and approval of nutrients and modeling work contingent upon further development of studies in these areas and finding funding from savings in the Status and Trends (S&T) program, the reserve, or other funding sources.

Jay Davis noted that the Nutrients Strategy has been making progress this summer, with a workshop in June and a recent meeting between Naomi Feger, Martha Sutula, and David Senn, in which they drafted a strawman strategy document. Another Nutrient Strategy meeting is set for September 15th. Based on the discussions so far, Jay anticipates that the recommended studies for 2012, coming out of the Nutrients Strategy, will focus on a synthesis of existing information. To date, the water quality work that includes some basic nutrient indicators has been partially funded by the RMP (\$110,000 from the S&T funds), with the remainder of the funds coming from USGS. Jim Cloern is doubtful that the funding will continue after his retirement in a few years, so the RMP plans on ramping up funding for nutrients work (\$100,000 in 2012, \$200,000 in 2013, and \$300,000 in 2014), and working with partners to fund a monitoring program.

The Contaminant Fate Workgroup met in May of 2011, and did not recommend any studies at that point. Jay Davis plans to convene the modeling team during August in order to develop plans for work in 2012. He noted that in the future, the Modeling Strategy and the Nutrients Strategy will need to coordinate and overlap their information needs and goals. Currently, the Margins Conceptual Model and the Bioaccumulation Conceptual Model reports are being finalized. It is currently unclear where the modeling work will head in 2012, but Jay anticipates developing proposals for modeling as well as nutrients work. Amy Chastain indicated that she is optimistic about the possibilities of finding supplementary funding, and Rainer Hoenicke confirmed that the RMP would not be the only entity supporting the nutrients work.

Meg Sedlak clarified that the TRC will consider the revised S&T strategy, including potential cost savings, at the September TRC meeting, and then send a recommendation to the SC at the Oct/Nov meeting. Any available funds from these revisions can be applied to Nutrients and Modeling work.

Amy Chastain asked how the Steering Committee typically decides whether to fund work from the reserve. Tom Mumley indicated that the primary driver is urgent need – that the reserve funding is available for responding to unforeseen requests or opportunities, and that he would be reluctant to fund a long-term effort, such as Nutrients work, from the reserve. He indicated that there was likely to be a number of program needs from the emerging contaminant, mercury and PCB syntheses which will be developed this year.

Amy Chastain noted that reserve funding could help bridge a temporal gap between work needed now and savings from S&T that will be available in 2012, without diminishing the reserve below the target of \$200,000. Kevin Buchan asked that the S&T trends evaluation be based on what elements should be incorporated in monitoring, rather than focused on cutting to make up for a budget shortfall. Adam Olivieri asked that the S&T strategy be discussed at the fall SC meeting.

Tom Mumley made a motion to accept the recommendation by the TRC. He noted that the Special Studies funding decisions have been streamlined this year thanks to the

planning efforts. Rob Lawrence seconded the motion, and the Special Studies for 2012 were approved.

Action Items

- Discuss the updated S&T strategy at the Master Planning meeting.

7) Discussion of New SC Chair

Meg Sedlak asked for nominations for the new chair (Kevin Buchan will resign as chair at the end of 2011). The election will occur at the next SC meeting.

Karin North nominated Adam Olivieri and Tom Mumley.

Meg Sedlak noted that SC members can continue to nominate candidates via email, and she will distribute the list of nominees prior to the next SC meeting.

8) Program Review, Coordination with SFEI Board

Jay Davis informed the SC that the SFEI Board has requested that the RMP consider the need for a Program Review. Currently, \$125,000 has been set aside (ie. not included in the reserve) for this purpose. Ultimately, he asked the SC to consider how the RMP and SFEI planning processes should be coordinated. A memo was distributed outlining three options for program review, (1) a broad based program review bringing in external reviewers, (2) an external review focused on specific areas of the program, and (3) on-going internal and external review and modifications.

Adam Olivieri approved of the 3rd option, as the program seems to function quite well. He suggested that the master planning team identify when the next broad external review should take place.

Trish Mulvey noted that some RMP documentation specifies a commitment to a 5 year review process, and noted that an external review has not occurred since 2003. She suggested that with the SFEI and ASC strategic planning efforts ongoing, now would be an ideal time to also conduct a review of the RMP, being mindful of the “moving parts” within SFEI and the ASC. She is interested in how a review of the RMP can benefit the Bay. Meg Sedlak clarified that she was unaware of a memorandum requiring a 5-year review, so no documentation needs to be changed if the SC decides not to perform a review at this time.

Tom Mumley highlighted the benefits from the previous RMP program reviews. He considered the first review (in 1997) highly productive, as it increased the integrity of the program and pushed the program drivers from characterization to management questions. The RMP received recommendations on how to improve the program, including changing the sampling design. The second review (2003) was less productive, as it focused on the details in the program rather than providing confirmation or suggestions on the overall structure and focus. It primarily recommended doing more effects work.

Adam Olivieri noted that external committees exist for reviewing specific components of the program, such as Modeling. Rainer Hoenicke noted that the second review also served to validate the work done after the first review.

Trish Mulvey suggested that the lessons learned from monitoring of the Chesapeake Bay could be helpful in directing the RMP review. She thinks the RMP review could be focused on the larger picture of how the world is changing, and if the program is looking at the right things for the right reasons. What management actions will be taken as a result of RMP work? Will we make the Bay more fishable, swimmable? What would be lost by dropping components of S&T? What difference does the work conducted by the RMP make?

Tom Mumley noted that a number of these questions are being addressed, and that the Master Planning effort can consider if there are things that we should be doing that are not being done. He indicated that it was the role of the Water Board to translate the scientific findings of the RMP into management actions which would improve Bay water quality (e.g., making the Bay more fishable, swimmable). He also stated that he was hard pressed to think of anything critical that the program was missing. He stated that the purpose of the Master Planning meeting is to review the priority questions and information needs. He recommended that the Master Planning team consider if there is a need for an external review now, and discuss when to reevaluate this question in the future. The meeting will also evaluate whether to continue to reserve the \$125,000 for a future review or reallocate these funds.

Meg Sedlak noted that the program receives external review on an on-going basis through the workgroups. Expert panel members review special studies and program elements to ensure the rigor of the science. As an example, Meg stated Walter Boynton is very interested in participating in the nutrients strategy, and the RMP will be able to benefit from lessons learned in the Chesapeake via this interaction.

Adam Olivieri suggested that Rainer Hoenicke take the Program Review memo to the SFEI board, and explain that the SC is recommending option 3, with further discussion of needs and funding at the Master Planning meeting.

Action Items

- Evaluate whether the \$125K set aside for program review should be released and reallocated.
- Discuss Program Review at the Master Planning meeting.

9) Fact Sheet Plan

Jay Davis distributed the completed RMP fact sheet on Triclosan, as well as the first in a series of broad, less technical fact sheets created by SCCWRP. He noted that fact sheets are deceptively labor intensive, and estimated \$5 to \$10,000 of SFEI staff time for fact sheet development. Tom Mumley suggested that the figure could be much larger, although Amy Chastain considered that some of the broader issues such as length,

audience, and tone were addressed in the production of this first version, and would need to be reconsidered for subsequent fact sheets.

The RMP fact sheets are targeted at agency staff, and reporters, and are technically detailed. The SCCWRP fact sheets are targeted at their commission members and the public at large. They plan on developing one each quarter, with the next one focused on emerging contaminants. The RMP and the TRC will review the SCCWRP fact sheets, and SCCWRP will provide feedback on those from the RMP.

Jay Davis also noted that Dave Schoellhamer may be interested in working with the RMP to produce fact sheets or similar documents as a means of releasing information from his flux work in an easier more accessible format. He would write the document, leaving it to the RMP to finalize and release it.

Kirsten Struve asked about the distribution plan for the Triclosan fact sheet. Jay Davis indicated that it is not intensive – it is currently spotlighted on the RMP/ SFEI website.

Karin North noted that the impetus for this work came partially from Palo Alto, as they were getting a number of phone calls 5 years ago about Triclosan, and they needed a coherent message to pass along. The fact sheet and contaminant review produced a useful sound bite for their purposes; however the document itself is not immediately useful. She indicated that she will send out the fact sheet to various groups that may be interested in this information, such as other POTW and stormwater groups, and will update Meg Sedlak with the list of groups contacted. Amy Chastain will also report back regarding which of her contacts looked at the fact sheet when she emailed it along. John Coleman indicated that he would post this document on the Bay Planning Coalition website. He suggested that the Emerging Contaminants strategy should identify whether there is a need for this sort of product, and if so, what the list of contaminants should be.

Kevin Buchan indicated that this effort was valuable in that a new information dissemination approach was attempted, and we now understand the effort required to produce this sort of product.

Tom Mumley suggested that the RMP continue to work with SFEP, which is more experienced at outreach. The RMP could generate technical knowledge, and then pass it along to SFEP for communication and distribution. He will follow up with SFEP to discuss how SFEP can tap the scientific knowledge being generated by the RMP. Kirsten Struve suggested that the fact sheet be distributed as the RMP insert in the Estuary News.

Adam Olivieri summarized three potential goals in producing a fact sheet:

- 1) Create a 50-200 word blurb for executives
- 2) Summarize scientific knowledge
- 3) Broadcast and put on display the RMP and its products

He suggested that the next fact sheets focus on the first and third goals.

Kirsten Struve suggested an additional purpose of fact sheets:

- 4) Behavior change

which could be used as a criterion for selecting topics for future fact sheets.

Amy Chastain suggested passing along the fact sheet as well as the Triclosan summary to the Environmental Working Group.

Tom Mumley suggested that future fact sheets could come out of the Master Plan, which currently contains brief summaries of the program elements.

Tom Mumley noted that Dave Schoellhamer is looking for a vehicle to publish his results. This will require minimal effort on the part of the RMP. Adam Olivieri cautioned that USGS has a rigorous publication process, and the details will need to be discussed once a request is received. Tom Mumley made a motion that the SC be open to reviewing proposals from Dave Schoellhamer.

Action Items:

- Include the Triclosan factsheet as the RMP contribution to the Estuary newsletter.
- Initiate discussions with SFEP to more broadly distribute technical information generated by the RMP.
- Distribute the Triclosan factsheet to other agencies, and update the SC with where it was distributed and what they are doing with it.
- Discuss factsheets as a platform for information dissemination with Dave Schoellhamer, and let him know the SC is open to proposals on this front.

10) RMP Annual Meeting and Pulse

Jay Davis distributed a draft agenda for the Annual Meeting, which needs to be finalized. It is close to full, but some speaking slots are still open. The TRC was questioning whether to include a talk on “Safe to Swim”, as it may open an area of questions that the RMP is not interested in discussing. He also proposed including a talk on Small Fish, as the multi-year project report is coming to closure, and that an additional keynote speaker could be included.

Karin North suggested that Kelly Moran could give a keynote talk on pesticides, however she noted that this topic may not fit the theme for the meeting.

Adam Olivieri indicated that as long as the Beach Water talk does not expand its scope beyond exposure, it would make an appropriate talk. Tom Mumley agreed, noting that the theme of “Effects” has already been stretched to include the sport fish work. While the RMP meeting may have some overlap with the State of the Estuary meeting, they will attract different audiences so the redundancy is acceptable.

Jay Davis suggested that the proposed sport fish talk by Aroon Melwani could be incorporated into the safe eating guidelines talk by Margy Gassel.

Karin North noted that Dan Schlenk will address the coordination between north and south in his talk, as will Chris Vulpe and Steve Bay.

Jay Davis suggested adding talks on small fish, pyrethroid toxicity in tributaries, and a north/south overview to the existing proposed agenda, while dropping the Sport fish in the Bay talk. Tom Mumley made a motion to accept this version of the agenda for the RMP Annual Meeting.

Jay Davis noted that the Pulse may not be ready in hard copy for the Annual Meeting this year, however the electronic copy will be available on the internet.

11) Program Update

The SC agreed to hold the next SC meeting on November 15. The Master Planning meeting will be held in October 2011, with the exact date to be decided by a poll of the SC members.

Meg Sedlak noted that a number of products will be finished during August, as indicated on the workgroup update.