

Delta RMP Steering Committee Meeting

March 27, 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:

Voting Steering Committee (and/or Alternate) members present¹:

Dave Tamayo, Stormwater, Phase I Communities (Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership)

Gregg Erickson, Coordinated Monitoring (IEP/CDFW)

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

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

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

Erich Delmas, Alternate-POTWs (City of Tracy)

Jeff Willett, POTWs (City of Stockton)

Jason Lofton, Alternate-POTWs (SRCSD)

Stephanie Fong, Alternate-Water Supply (SFCWA)

On phone:

Stephanie Reyna-Hiestand, Alternate-Stormwater, Phase II Communities (City of Tracy)

Others present:

Casey Wichert, City of Brentwood

Brock Bernstein, Facilitator

Cathy Johnson, FWS

¹ Name, Representation (Affiliation)

- Michael Johnson, MLJ-LLC
- Thomas Jabusch, ASC
- Vyomini Pandya, SRCSD
- Stephen McCord, MEI
- Brian Laurenson, LWA
- Rainer Hoenicke, DSP
- Meghan Sullivan, Central Valley Regional Water Board
- Emily Mortazawi, DSP
- Stephen Clark, Pacific Ecorisk
- Joanna Rinderneck, CDFW-WPCL
- On phone:*
- Bruce Houdesheldt, SVWQC
- Mike Mosley, Reclamation
- Karen Ashby, LWA

1.	<p>Introductions</p> <p>Brock Bernstein reviewed the agenda and expected outcomes. It was decided to discuss Guiding Principles next time and to focus the meeting on the discussion of candidate constituents for monitoring and the selection of the TAC and TAC chair.</p>
2.	<p>Approval of agenda and minutes</p> <p>March 27, 2013, meeting minutes were approved.</p>
3.	<p>Information update</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Cost estimates and permit changes (Ken Landau)</u>: Regional Board staff conducted a review of a) how POTWs are funding monitoring now, and b) how funding could be arranged in the future. Initially, the goal of negotiations with dischargers is cost neutrality for dischargers. Then, the RMP could evolve based on interest and the availability of supplemental funding.
4.	<p>Guiding principles</p>

	<p>The discussion was postponed to the next meeting.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Apply criteria for selecting initial focus areas</p> <p>SC members and their consultants presented the results of their rankings of water quality topics for the initial focus of the Delta RMP. Four topics emerged from these discussions as broadly supported priorities: pathogens, methylmercury, nutrients, and pesticides. These range from short-term studies to long-term monitoring and assessment efforts. Pathogens could be the subject of a shorter one-time special study that could be initiated immediately but would most likely not be a long-term priority for regional monitoring. Methylmercury is at the opposite end of the temporal scale, a long-term issue that would become a focus of ambient monitoring a few years down the road. Ambient monitoring questions for methylmercury will depend to a large degree on the data needs for loading models that are still being developed during Phase I of the Delta Methylmercury TMDL. Nutrients are an issue that needs more specific definition. Monitoring for nutrients would also not start immediately, because regional nutrient management strategies are still being developed. However, the timeframe for nutrients is shorter than for MeHg. This leaves pesticides as a major focus area of mutual interest that should be investigated as an initial monitoring and assessment target. In addition to this broad guidance, the SC also decided to provide more specific guidance and more focus to the future TAC, by narrowing down the list of potential constituents at the next meeting. This timing would help the TAC formation, since the SC will need to define what the TAC is going to work on to recruit its membership. With regards to the timing, Ken Landau cautioned that the SC will very likely need to go back and forth a few times deciding on priorities for pesticide monitoring, but he also acknowledged that the decision to start the process of working on this topic meant considerable progress in itself.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Selection of TAC chair</p> <p>The following candidates were nominated for TAC chair: Tony Pirondini, Mike Johnson, Cathy Johnson, Stephen McCord, and Terry Fleming. The selection of a TAC chair was tabled, since SC members felt they needed more information about the candidates' backgrounds before making a decision. One-paragraph statements are sought for each candidate describing qualifications and interests as well as experience in managing a diverse group such as the SC or TAC or running meetings that involved stakeholders with diverse and conflicting perspectives. In addition, the latest CV should be provided for review. Jason Lofton commented that some candidates on the list are consultants and that their salaries would be one consideration the SC would need to talk about. Ken Landau noted that while there</p>

	<p>could be an issue if someone nominated for TAC chair is politically attached, that person would probably not be on that list of he or she was so uninformed in the issues that they wouldn't be representing one of the Delta stakeholder perspectives. He also commented that the TAC chair would need to have a broad interest in and understanding of Delta issues and should not be a candidate with a narrow focus on just one issue (e.g., focused on fish health alone).</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Next meetings</p> <p>The next meeting dates are Tuesday, April 30th, at SRCSD and Tuesday, June 4th, at the Central Valley Regional Board. Both meetings will be from 9:00 to 12:00.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>+/Δ² on today's meeting</p> <p>No comments were made.</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p>Action items</p> <p>10.1. TAC chair candidates (or their champions) to provide background information on each candidate to Meghan. The information should include a one-paragraph statement describing qualifications and interests as well as experience in managing a diverse stakeholder group with competing interests. In addition, the latest CV should be provided for review (due: April 15).</p> <p>10.2. Staff to distribute the information from the TAC Chair candidates (due: April 23)</p> <p>10.3. Staff to develop and distribute draft guiding principles (due: April 23)</p> <p>10.4. Staff to distribute State of the Bay-Delta Science Report (due: April 23)</p> <p>10.5. Staff to collect readily available background information on pesticides and organizing for distribution to SC members as basis for discussion at the April 30 meeting (due: April 23)</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?"

