

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 present¹:

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.	<p>Approval of Agenda and Minutes Introduction, established quorum. Notes and minutes were approved.</p>
2.	<p>Information Updates</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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.	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Decisions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.	<p>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.</p>
5.	<p>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</p>

	<p>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.</p> <p><u>Decisions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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
<p>6.</p>	<p>Action: Management Questions</p> <p>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.</p>

	<p><u>Decisions</u></p> <p>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.</p>
7.	<p>TAC</p> <p>The TAC discussion was postponed to a future meeting</p>
8.	<p>Confirmed date for February SC meeting (Feb. 27th)</p>
9.	<p>+/Δ² on today's meeting</p> <p>+: good discussion</p> <p>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</p>
10.	<p>Action items</p> <p>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)</p> <p>9.2. SC to send a list of potential TAC members to Meghan Sullivan (due: February 20)</p> <p>9.3. SC to send recommendations for contaminants, management questions, and criteria to Meghan Sullivan (due: February 20)</p>

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?"

