

## Delta RMP Steering Committee Meeting

June 4, 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 present<sup>1</sup>:*

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 (San Joaquin County and Delta Water Quality Coalition)

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

Erich Delmas, Alternate-POTWs (City of Tracy)

Linda Dorn, POTWs (SRCSD)

Jeff Willett, POTWs (City of Stockton)

*On phone:*

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

Stephanie Fong, Alternate-Water Supply (SFCWA)

Val Connor, Water Supply (SFCWA)

*Others present:*

Brock Bernstein, Facilitator

Thomas Jabusch, ASC

Stephen McCord, MEI



---

<sup>1</sup> Name, Representation (Affiliation)

- Brian Laurenson, LWA
- Meghan Sullivan, Central Valley Regional Water Board
- Stephen Clark, Pacific Ecorisk
- Karen Ashby, LWA
- Rachel Kubiak, Western Plant Health
- Tom Grovhoug, LWA
- Patrick Morris, Central Valley Regional Water Board
- Casey Wichert, City of Brentwood
- Jason Lofton, SRCSD
- Bari Touray, Parsons Brinckerhoff
- Jim Orlando (USGS)
- On phone:*
- Debbie Webster, CVCWA
- Bruce Houdesheldt, SVWQC
- Jenny Skrel, Ironhouse SD

<b>1.</b>	<p><b>Introductions</b> Brock Bernstein reviewed the agenda and expected outcomes.</p>
<b>2.</b>	<p><b>Approval of agenda and minutes</b> The agenda and June 4, 2013, meeting minutes were approved.</p>
<b>3.</b>	<p><b>Information update</b> Meghan Sullivan requested that information updates be made a standing item on the SC agenda.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>State Board update (Meghan Sullivan)</u>: Meghan Sullivan with several SC members provided an update on the Delta RMP at the May 7 State Water Board meeting. An issue emerging from the update was the lack of involvement by environmental and environmental justice groups in the Delta RMP process. Ken Landau requested the other SC members provide information about environmental justice and advocacy groups they interact with, such that Central Valley Water Board staff can</li> </ol>

	<p>conduct focused outreach to these groups and develop a strategy for key decision periods.</p> <p>2. <u>Delta RMP outreach (Ken Landau)</u>: the Delta Conservancy held public outreach meetings in Stockton and Courtland to discuss monitoring in the Delta: what kind of monitoring is going on? Where? Where to get the data? The meetings were poorly attended.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p><b>Decision: Selection of TAC chair</b></p> <p>There was some discussion about whether the vote should be anonymous, which was eventually agreed on. The SC also agreed to select the combination of co-chairs among three candidates (Joe Domagalski, Stephen McCord, Mike Johnson) receiving the most votes as opposed to the individual 2 top votes.</p> <p><u>Outcome:</u> The Steering Committee selected Joe Domagalski and Stephen McCord as the two TAC co-chairs.</p> <p>The discussion then moved to identifying options for funding the TAC chairs and specifically their participation in developing the TAC white papers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Water Boards: Unlikely. Meghan Sullivan indicated that it is not feasible to amend the existing contract with ASC, but that a contract request for additional State Board funding is underway. In either case, sole sourcing of subcontracts is challenging. SWAMP is potentially a source of funding for regional monitoring but distribution of SWAMP funds usually requires a bidding process.</li> <li>B. SFWCA: has currently a contract with Stephen McCord and is potentially a part of the solution. A contribution from SFCWA is not contingent on other contributions.</li> <li>C. Reallocating compliance monitoring resources: a possibility in principle. The Regional Board perspective is that it is easier to approve monitoring offsets if there is already a program in place to fund. However, permits in other regions (Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers) were changed to require both, participation in the program development and implementation. Permittee concerns need to be addressed (“off-ramps” and an acceptable level of assurance/protection).</li> </ul> <p><u>Outcomes:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Two TAC co-chairs to work with Thomas Jabusch and Meghan Sullivan to cost out their participation in developing the TAC white papers, in terms of product and effort. The idea is the ASC will do the legwork with substantial input of the co-chairs.</li> <li>- TAC chairs to present a budget to the SC to discuss</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Based on the budget, get back to Val Connor with a funding request and proceed with the development of the white papers</li> <li>- Next step will be a request to those who were thinking about permit language to enable shifting of funds</li> <li>- A small workerbee group will develop recommendations for changes in the NPDES permit language to allow shifting of funds and possible arrangements for the transition period (i.e. program development phase). Participants: Karen Ashby, Brock Bernstein, Linda Dorn, Thomas Jabusch, Ken Landau, Dave Tamayo, and Debbie Webster.</li> </ul>
<p>5.</p>	<p><b>Decision: Finalize SC Materials</b></p> <p>A. <u>Management questions</u>: several edits were made and the final version was approved.</p> <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>core management questions 06-04-3v2.6.d</p> </div> <p>B. <u>Guiding principles</u>: several edits were made. Linda Dorn commented that issues of cost equitability and proportionality would also need to be addressed in the Cost and Permit Changes section. The discussion was deferred.</p> <p>C. <u>Template for RMP priorities review</u>: the template was ok'd, provided that the discussion in the white papers will reflect the changes in language to the management questions. The SC discussed whether more emphasis would need to be placed on the criteria evaluation that had been done previously by the SC. It was decided that the TAC would reassess the criteria evaluation based on the review of current knowledge and information gaps and provide their recommendations to the SC.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p><b>Decision: Next Steps for RMP Priorities Review</b></p> <p>The SC reviewed the process, next steps, and timeline for TAC white papers as suggested by ASC. In addition to the suggested timeline, the SC needs <u>an</u> opportunity to provide initial input on content and direction. An adjusted timeline is attached</p> <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>Selecting Initial Assessment Targets -</p> </div>

<p><b>7</b></p>	<p><b>Action: Delta RMP development schedule</b>                  The discussion of the development schedule was postponed to the next meeting.</p>
<p><b>8.</b></p>	<p><b>Next meeting</b>                  The next meeting will be on August 21<sup>st</sup> at the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (9:00 to 12:00). Topics for discussion will include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Environmental Justice</li> <li>- Funding</li> <li>- Timeline</li> <li>- White papers (initial cut)</li> <li>-</li> </ul>
<p><b>9.</b></p>	<p><b>Action items</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9.1. Joe Domagalski and Stephen McCord to work with Thomas Jabusch and Meghan Sullivan to work out a budget for the white papers and submit to Val Connor for review (due: June 30)</li> <li>9.2. TAC chairs and staff to draft initial cut of white papers (due: August 15)</li> <li>9.3. Thomas to organize a conference call for the permit workerbee group (due: June 14)</li> </ol>

## Delta RMP Core Management Questions

Type	Management Questions
Status and Trends	<p>Is there a problem or are there signs of a problem?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Is water quality currently, or trending towards, adversely affecting beneficial uses of the Delta?</li> <li>b. <u>Which constituents may be</u> impairing beneficial uses in subregions of the Delta?</li> <li>c. Are trends similar or different across different subregions of the Delta?</li> </ol>
Sources, Pathways, Loadings, and Processes	<p>Which sources and processes are most important to understand and quantify?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Which sources, pathways, loadings, and processes (e.g., transformations, bioaccumulation) contribute most to <u>identified problems</u>?</li> <li>b. What <u>is the magnitude</u> of each source <u>and/or pathway</u> (e.g., municipal wastewater, atmospheric deposition)?</li> <li>c. What are the <u>magnitudes</u> of internal sources <u>and/or pathways</u> (e.g. benthic flux) and sinks <u>in</u> the Delta?</li> </ol>
Forecasting Water Quality Under Different Management Scenarios	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. How do ambient water quality conditions respond to different management scenarios</li> <li>b. What <u>constituent</u> loads can the Delta assimilate without impairment of beneficial uses?</li> <li>c. What is the likelihood that the Delta will be water quality-impaired in the future?</li> </ol>
Effectiveness Tracking	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Are water quality conditions improving as a result of management actions such that beneficial uses will be met?</li> <li>b. Are loadings changing as a result of management actions?</li> </ol>

## Selecting Initial Assessment Targets *DRAFT ITINERARY*

1. **TAC White Papers** – to be completed before July TAC meeting
  - To be developed by staff and TAC; prior to official formation, with experts who are likely to be members of the TAC, via phone calls and interviews
  - As much as possible, 1<sup>st</sup> cut by groups who are already working on topics
2. **Review by TAC**– before August SC meeting
3. **Presentation to SC** – August SC meeting
  - Present first drafts and recommendations from TAC
  - Opportunity to provide initial input and direction
4. **Revisions**
5. **Second check-in with TAC**
6. **Presentation to SC** – September SC meeting
  - Present summaries and TAC recommendations
  - Provisional recommendation; identify follow-up work for staff and TAC
7. **Selecting initial RMP priority(ies)** – October SC meeting
  - Final decision