Delta RMP Steering Committee Meeting

February 27, 2013
9:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District Building
Sunset Maple Room
10060 Goethe Road, Sacramento, CA 95827

Call-In Number: 916-227-1132

Draft Agenda

1.	**Introduce the meeting** Manage expectations: review the agenda and expected outcomes		**9:00** **Brock Bernstein**
2.	**Approve Agenda and Minutes (Attachment)** Review and agree on agenda and action items and approve meeting minutes	DRAFT SC Meeting Mummary 1-23-13.do	**9:05** **Brock Bernstein**
3.	**Information Update** Update SC on outcomes from the Feb 1 Board meeting 1. State Board requested an information item		**9:10** **Meghan Sullivan**
4.	**Finalize SC Materials (Attachment)** Several materials were revised based on discussions at the 23 January 2012 meeting and are pending final approval. 1. SC and TAC committee roles 2. Mission statement 3. Management questions	DRAFT Delta RMP Committee Roles 02-(Mission statement draft 02-02-13.docx DRAFT core management questior	**9:20** **Brock Bernstein**

5.	**Review criteria for selecting initial focus areas** Provide input to finalize the criteria before the next meeting	Delta RMP Constituent Criteria D Core Monitoring Constituents.xlsx	**10:10** **Brock Bernstein**
6.	**Update on R5 nutrient study plan and opportunities for coordination, timing** Chris will provide the SC with an update on R5's nutrient study plan and ideas for working with the Delta RMP	Draft Distributed to SC Members	**10:30** **Chris Foe**
7.	**Develop recommendations for how the Delta RMP will coordinate with the R5 nutrient study plan** Ideas on the table for discussion are 1. Form a TAC for the nutrient study plan that is coordinated through the Delta RMP, and 2. Use development of a nutrient strategy for Delta Plan as an opportunity to implement a process for developing pilot monitoring questions over the next two months, by following the approach of the SF Bay Nutrient Management Strategy as a model. **Desired Outcome:** 1. Agree on a process for developing the monitoring questions over the next two months. 2. Agree on establishing a TAC and next steps		**10:40** **Brock Bernstein**
8.	**Plus/Delta[1] on today's meeting**		**11:55** **Brock Bernstein**

[1] A *Plus/Delta* allows a team, group, or committee quickly to gather feedback from its participants on what it has been doing well and what it could do better. The name, intentionally more positive than Plus/Minus would be, uses delta, the Greek letter that symbolizes change in mathematics, to highlight the team's opportunities for improving how it does its work. The process can take as few as five minutes, i.e. going around the table asking, "What was good/went well in this meeting?" "What can we improve?"

9.	**Confirm date for March SC meeting (March 27th)**		**11:59** **Brock Bernstein**
10.	**Adjourn**		**12:00**

Delta RMP Steering Committee Meeting

January 23, 2013

9:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Central Valley Regional Water Board

Training Room

11020 Sun Center Drive, #200, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Draft Summary

Attendees:

Steering Committee members present[1]*:*

Dave Tamayo, Alternate-Stormwater, Phase I Communities (City of Sacramento)

Gregg Erickson, Coordinated Monitoring (IEP/CDFW)

Kenneth Landau, Regulatory – State (Central Valley Regional Water Board)

Linda Dorn, POTWs (SRCSD)

Mike Wackman, Agriculture (Delta & San Joaquin County Water Quality Coalition)

Tony Pirondini, POTWs (City of Vacaville)

Tim Vendlinski, Regulatory – Federal (U.S. EPA)

Brandon Nakagawa, Stormwater, Phase II Communities (San Joaquin County)

Jeff Willett, POTWs (City of Stockton)

On phone:

Stephanie Fong, Alternate-Water Supply (SFCWA)

Others present:

Brock Bernstein, Facilitator

Cathy Johnson, FWS

Mike Johnson, MLJ-LLC

[1] *Name, Representation (Affiliation)*

Jason Lofton, SRCSD

Thomas Jabusch, ASC

Tom Grovhoug, LWA

Vyomini Pandya, SRCSD

Anke Mueller-Solger, IEP/DSC

Casey Wichert, City of Brentwood

Stephen McCord, MEI

Karen Ashby, LWA

Lori Gabriel, Veolia Water – Town of Discovery Bay CSD

Jim Orlando, USGS

Brian Exberger, Veolia Water – City of Rio Vista

David Melilli, City of Rio Vista

On phone:

Brian Laurenson, LWA

1.	**Approval of Agenda and Minutes** Introduction, established quorum. Notes and minutes were approved.
2.	**Information Updates** 1. <u>Sacramento River RMP (Stephen McCord):</u> the Sacramento River Watershed Program (SRWP) got funding from SRCSD to do follow-up work over the next few months on developing an RMP. Stephen McCord and Holly Jorgensen and Dennis Bowker from SRWP are the key personnel involved. There is no program in place yet, but the new funding is a step forward and focuses on communication with stakeholders, and its purpose is to interview stakeholders. Stephen suggested interviewing Meghan Sullivan and Tim Vendlinski. 2. Steering Committee updates: a. <u>EPA:</u> Tim Vendlinski is going to take over the Bay-Delta portfolio from Karen Schwinn. He will be the new SC representative for EPA. b. <u>Water Supply</u>: Stephanie Fong is taking over as the alternate for Val Connor.

3.	**Decision: Resource Agency Representation** After discussions with Gregg Erickson there were two decisions to make: 1) whether to add Resource Agencies to vote on the Steering Committee separate from the Coordinated Monitoring seat (currently represented by IEP), and 2) whether to add Gregg could sit as the designated representative for both seats. There was additional discussion that if additional resource agencies wanted to join the SC, they would be represented by the Resource Agency seat. There was concern that the original members, balanced among several different categories, could be completely outnumbered by a large number of separate resource agency seats. If/when additional resource agencies want to join the SC, they can choose their representative as other stakeholder groups have done. *Decisions* 3.1. Add Resource Agency seat 3.2. Resource Agency seat must be held by a representative not currently seated on the Steering Committee (effectively adding one person to the SC) 3.3. The seat will be filled initially by the agency that stepped forward, i.e. CDFW. If other resource agencies step forward, one representative must represent all.
4.	**Action: Delta RMP Information Item at Regional Board Meeting** SC members decided to participate in Meghan's presentation to the Regional Board by providing various perspectives (3-4) and that co-presenters who would prepare PowerPoint slides (1-2- slides) would send these to Meghan in advance. Potential co-presenters included Linda Dorn, Dave Tamayo or Delia McGrath, Tim Vendlinski, Mike Wackman, and Gregg Erickson.
5.	**Action: Approval of SC Materials** There was some discussion of whether information synthesis should be part of the Delta RMP's mission or if its function is just to produce the data. Ken Landau indicated that the Water Board sees the value of the program in providing an evaluation of the data but also agreed that the mission statement needs to avoid bogging this group down in "data wars". A solution will be to rewrite the mission statement well enough

	so it captures evaluations as one of the options and doesn't preclude assessment. Jeff Willet said he is concerned that if the group is saying it conducts assessments in the mission statement and then doesn't do it, it fails, and the group does not want to fail. Gregg Erickson expressed concern if the program does not do assessments and suggested the Delta RMP as a way out of the data wars. One reason for the current situation is that monitoring programs are collecting more and more data without developing consensus on what they mean. However, there is concern over making regulatory assessment a function of the program. Ken Landau expressed concern over putting any slight issues around the program into the language of the mission statement and indicated that there is a need for flexibility. There was also discussion on the inclusion of beneficial uses. Brock Bernstein suggested that the lack of agreement stems from a lack of development of collaborations among all the individual efforts. A key conclusion from the State Water Board workshops was that participants are looking for a collaborative group to evaluate the data. Dave Tamayo expressed concern over "cost-neutral", suggesting that the SC does not want to preclude accepting other funding sources. Linda Dorn liked the idea of adding "beneficial uses" at the end. CV-SALTS was suggested as a potential model for the Delta RMP as another policy-driven process. Ken Landau said he likes the part of "support decisions and inform prioritization", which makes clear that the Delta RMP is not an esoteric exercise, and also expressed concern over "cost-neutral". He indicated that there would be questions that need to be answered, either in a coordinated manner or by individual requests. Therefore, he said he cannot promise a "cost-neutral" future but also assured that he is not saying that this wouldn't be a very good thing. Linda Dorn suggested to use "cost-effective" or "cost-efficient" instead. *Decisions* 5.1. Approved new sign-in sheets 5.2. Minor revisions required to documents describing SC and TAC committee roles; review for approval at March meeting 5.3. Revise mission statement based on discussion, then final decision at March meeting
6.	**Action: Management Questions** The SC discussed example management questions that were developed by ASC staff by using the management questions of the San Francisco Bay RMP and the San Francisco Bay Nutrient Strategy as models. There was some basic agreement that the first set of questions (derived from the San Francisco Bay Nutrient Strategy questions), with some tweaks, would be a good starting point.

	Decisions *6.1.* Develop a list of major constituents and programs, brief descriptions of opportunities they might present, and a set of criteria to make decisions about that.
7.	**TAC** The TAC discussion was postponed to a future meeting
8.	**Confirmed date for February SC meeting (Feb. 27th)**
9.	**+/Δ[2] on today's meeting** +: good discussion Δ: state where you expect to end (was unclear in the beginning); state desired outcomes more clearly in general; put the date on all revisions to the agenda; supply the agenda electronically at the meeting (i.e. put it on a screen); put revision data on all docs
10.	**Action items** 9.1. Brock Bernstein, Thomas Jabusch, and Meghan Sullivan to work with Linda Dorn on mission statement: make draft, send out, discussion via email/phone if necessary (due: February 20) 9.2. SC to send a list of potential TAC members to Meghan Sullivan (due: February 20) 9.3. SC to send recommendations for contaminants, management questions, and criteria to Meghan Sullivan (due: February 20)

[2] A *+/Δ* allows a team, group, or committee quickly to gather feedback from its participants on what it has been doing well and what it could do better. The name, intentionally more positive than Plus/Minus would be, uses delta, the Greek letter that symbolizes change in mathematics, to highlight the team's opportunities for improving how it does its work. The process can take as few as five minutes, i.e. going around the table asking, "What was good/went well in this meeting?" "What can we improve?"

Steering Committee

The core responsibilities and authorities of the Steering Committee (SC) are to determine the overall budget, allocate program funds, track progress, and provide direction to the Program from a manager's perspective. The SC will meet quarterly.

The Delta RMP Steering Committee is the key decision-making authority of the Delta RMP. The Steering Committee is responsible for establishing the RMP's strategic direction and the policies and procedures that govern its operation. The Steering Committee may direct RMP staff and/or advisory committees to assist in meeting the RMP's objectives and may delegate the day-to-day functions of the RMP to the RMP's implementing entity.

The Steering Committee authorizes the implementation of agreements among the participating members and, specifically:

1. Directs the fiscal/operating agent to request and receive federal, state, local, and private funds from any source and to expend those moneys to accomplish the Delta RMP's goals
2. Approves budgets and expenditures
3. Directs the fiscal/operating agent to enter into partnerships, contracts, and other legal agreements on behalf of the Delta RMP, as necessary to fulfill the Delta RMP's mission
4. Approves Delta RMP work products and any other plans, products, or resolutions of the Delta RMP
5. Sets priorities and oversee the activities of the Stakeholder and Technical Advisory Committees
6. Establishes and oversees the implementation of policies and procedures necessary to the day-to-day functioning of the Delta RMP

Membership on the Steering Committee will not diminish the regulatory responsibilities or authority of any participating agency or organization.

Technical Advisory Committee

Under direction of the Steering Committee, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) provides oversight of the technical content and quality of the RMP. It consists of technical representatives from the RMP membership groups, with technical support from Delta RMP staff[1]. The Technical Advisory Committee will meet as needed, at a minimum quarterly.

The responsibilities of the TAC are to assist the Steering Committee in developing, reviewing, and revising the Delta RMP's monitoring and special studies priorities in line with the management questions; report to the Steering Committee on technical issues as requested by Steering Committee members and develop white papers where appropriate; select and convene *ad hoc* subcommittees or workgroups to provide guidance on specific issues, with members drawn from both within and outside the TAC, as needed to include appropriate and/or specialized scientific or technical expertise not fully represented on the TAC; to provide guidance on specific issues; provide review and recommendations to the Steering Committee on select project proposals that are technical in nature or have a strong technical component; and to provide review and recommendations to the Steering Committee on select policies being considered for adoption that are technical in nature or have a strong technical component; and to develop and/or contribute to the annual Pulse of the Delta report.

The TAC consists of experts in estuarine science and related fields who are able to provide scientific opinions on a broad range of subject areas related to the Delta RMP's activities. TAC members should have a working familiarity with the current scientific knowledge in their field.

[1] Currently, staff from the Central Valley Regional Water Board and Aquatic Science Center have been specifically assigned to work on the Delta RMP and are funded by the State Water Board, but this is expected to change when the long-term program infrastructure and organizational structure are implemented.

TAC members may be drawn from the organizations represented on the Steering Committee but are not limited to these. They may be drawn from a variety of sectors, e.g. academia, NGOs, government agencies, but they function as individuals and disinterested scientific experts, not as representatives of their sectors or individual institutions. The TAC may convene appropriate science advisory panels and/or independent experts to provide science advice on specific projects, initiatives, reports, and studies. Finally, TAC members are able to work collaboratively to examine technical issues and develop advice and recommendations for the Steering Committee.

Membership on the TAC is for a two-year term. SC members (including alternates) cannot also serve on the TAC[2]. The number of terms served by an individual is not limited but membership on the TAC must be renewed. Once the TAC is established, the TAC members will work with Delta RMP staff to nominate new (or existing) members for approval by the Steering Committee. The members of the TAC will appoint a Chair for a two-year term[3]. A qualified Chair has a broad understanding of scientific issues in the Delta and can provide strong leadership and direction to the group.

Delta RMP staff will provide the communication link between the SC and the TAC.

Other Stakeholders

All meetings of the Delta RMP Steering Committee are public. Stakeholders that are not RMP participants will have the opportunity to weigh in by participating in meetings and providing additional project and product review. Other stakeholders may also participate in specific technical workgroups.

[2] In particular instances (e.g., a represented group has only a few staff with the appropriate expertise), an alternate could serve on the TAC, and if a particular issue comes up that may create a conflict of interest, would recuse themselves from decisions on the SC.

[3] The exception is the first chair, who is going to be selected by the SC and will then fill out the TAC.

DRAFT Delta RMP Mission Statement

Mission statement distributed with materials for 01/23/13 Steering Committee meeting:

The primary goal of the Delta RMP is to provide coordinated Deltawide monitoring, reporting, and assessment of contaminants. A secondary goal is to improve the efficiency of water quality data collection and management in the Delta. The program's mission is to support decisions and inform the prioritization of actions intended to protect, and where necessary, restore beneficial uses of water in the Delta, by developing objective scientific information critical to understanding regional water quality conditions and trends.

Revision proposed by POTW group at 1/23/13 Steering Committee meeting:

The program's mission is to develop objective scientific information critical to understanding regional water quality conditions and trends. Goals of the Delta RMP are to provide a cost neutral, coordinated and comprehensive monitoring and reporting of water quality data, and improve the efficiency of water quality data collection and management in the Delta. An objective of the RMP is to inform and educate the public, agencies and decision makers, raising awareness of Delta water quality.

Revision proposed by stakeholder via email 01/24/13:

The Delta RMP will coordinate a comprehensive water quality monitoring, assessing and reporting program to improve the efficiency of water quality data collection and management in the Delta. The Delta RMP will produce objective scientific information critical to understanding regional water quality conditions and trends. Reports by the Delta RMP will inform and educate the public, agencies, and other stakeholders and decision makers, raising awareness of Delta water quality and its effects on beneficial uses of the Delta's waters.

Minor revision by Delta RMP program staff:

The Delta RMP will coordinate Deltawide water quality monitoring, assessment, and reporting to improve the efficiency of water quality data collection and management in the Delta. The Delta RMP will produce objective scientific information critical to understanding regional water quality conditions and trends. Reports by the Delta RMP will inform and educate all stakeholders, raising awareness of Delta water quality conditions and how they impact beneficial uses.

DRAFT Delta RMP Core Management Questions

Type	Management Question
Status and trends	Is there a problem or are there signs of a problem? a. Is water quality currently, or trending towards, adversely affecting beneficial uses of the Delta? b. Are contaminants (e.g. pesticides or nutrients) impairing beneficial uses in subregions of the Delta? c. Are trends similar or different across different subregions of the Delta?
Sources, Pathways, Loadings, and Processes (e.g. transformations)	Which pollutant sources and processes are most important to understand and quantify? a. Which pathways, sources, loadings, and pathways contribute most to impacts? b. What is the relative contribution of each source (municipal wastewater, upstream inputs, NPS, etc.)? c. What are contributions of internal sources (e.g. benthic fluxes) from sediments and sinks to the Delta contaminant budgets?
Forecasting water quality under different management scenarios	a. What contaminant loads can the Delta assimilate without impairment of beneficial uses? b. What is the likelihood that the Delta will be water quality-impaired in the future?

Are management actions working?	a. Are water quality conditions improving such that beneficial uses are met? ~~a.~~b. Are loads getting smaller? ~~b.~~c. Etc.

Criteria for selecting initial focus areas

1. POTWs List of Criteria and Potential Constituents

Criteria to evaluate Core Constituents for monitoring:

1. Is there a mutual benefit to POTWS and funders on steering committee
2. Are there opportunities for cost sharing, leveraging?
3. Does it attract several different stakeholders to participate in funding?
4. Can it be done with the available budget? Is funding available?
5. Is it a significant water quality question?
6. Is it significant to future policy/regulatory programs?
7. Will the data be used to answer WQ questions?
8. Are there existing (modeling) tools that can be used to answer WQ questions? Data use.
9. Does it fill a data gap?

Potential Constituents to apply criteria to:

- Pathogens
- Nutrients
- Pesticides
- Methyl Mercury
- Toxicity
- Ancillary Data (DO/Ph/EC/TDS, etc)

Approach:

1. Start with management questions to do data gap analysis.
2. Opportunities for cost offsets or cost sharing?
3. Overall significance to water quality?
4. Can we assess the beneficial use community (look at the users)

Management Question

Start with Status and trends:

Is there a problem or are there signs of a problem?

a. Is water quality currently, or trending towards, adversely affecting beneficial uses?
b. Are constitients impairing beneficial uses in subregions of the Delta?
c. Are trends similar or different across different subregions of the Delta?

2. POTWs List of Criteria, as revised by Delta RMP staff:

Criteria to evaluate Core Constituents for monitoring:

1. Is there a mutual benefit to program participants on steering committee
2. Can it be done with the pool of available financial and in-kind resources? Is funding available?
~~2.~~3. Are there opportunities for cost sharing, leveraging?
~~3.~~4. Does it attract several different stakeholders to participate in funding and/or implementation?
~~4.~~5. Does it help address a significant water quality question?
~~5.~~6. Would the data provide a key input to an important modeling tool?

Potential Constituents to apply criteria to:

- Pathogens
- Nutrients
- Pesticides
- Methyl Mercury
- Toxicity
- Ancillary Data (DO/pH/EC/TDS, etc.)
- CECs

Approach:

1. Start with management questions to focus current understanding and provide basis for data gap analysis.
2. Opportunities for cost offsets or cost sharing?
3. Overall significance to water quality?
4. Can we assess the beneficial use community (look at the users)

Core Monitoring Constituents

Constituent	Mutual Benefit	Cost Sharing Opportunity	Multiple Stakeholders	Funding Available	Significant WQ Issue	Signifcant to Future Policy or Regulatory Program	Data Used in Modeling Tools	Data used in answering WQ questions	Does it fill a data gap
Pathogens									
Nutrients									
Pesticides									
Methyl Mercury									
Toxicity									
Anciliary Data									

Rank each constituent using a scale of 1-5

1=not at all 2=to little extent 3=to some exten 4=to a moderate 5 =to a large extent