

Delta RMP Steering Committee Meeting

December 2, 2013

9:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District Building

Sunset Maple Room

10060 Goethe Road, Sacramento, CA 95827

Draft Summary

Attendees:

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

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

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

Casey Wichert, POTWs (City of Brentwood)

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

Tim Vendlinski, Regulatory – Federal (USEPA)

Linda Dorn, POTWs (SRCSD)

Tony Pirondini, Alternate–POTWs (City of Vacaville)

Stephanie Fong, Alternate–Water Supply (SFCWA)

By phone:

Gregg Erickson, Coordinated Monitoring (IEP/CDFW)

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

Others present:

Brock Bernstein, Facilitator

Thomas Jabusch, SFEI-ASC

Brian Laurensen, LWA

¹ Name, Representation (Affiliation)

- Meghan Sullivan, Central Valley Water Board
- Joe Domagalski, USGS
- Patrick Morris, Central Valley Water Board
- Jay Davis, SFEI-ASC
- Dalia Fadl, City of Sacramento
- Vyomini Upadhyay, SRCSD
- Debbie Webster, CVCWA
- Stephen Clark, Pacific EcoRisk
- Jason Lofton, SRCSD
- Rachel Kubiak, Western Plant Health Association
- Larry Lloyd, Sutter County RCD
- Tessa Fojut, Central Valley Water Board
- Elaine Archibald, CUWA
- Tom Grovhoug, LWA
- On phone:*
- Karen Ashby, LWA
- Stephen McCord, MEI
- Mike Mosley (Reclamation)

1.	<p>Introductions A quorum was established.</p>
2.	<p>Announcements from Committee Members Ken Landau mentioned that he had conversations with DWR managers about the Delta RMP. The DWR managers did express interest in the RMP and potentially filling the vacant Resources seat. Various DWR branches are involved in monitoring and managing water resources in the Delta and now have to find out more about what the Delta RMP is doing, decide who will get involved, and which section is most appropriate to represent DWR at the committee level. DWR will get back to Ken or Meghan Sullivan.</p> <p>Jay Davis announced a change in personnel at SFEI-ASC: Interim Executive Director</p>

	<p>Meredith Williams resigned and the Interim Director position is being filled. SFEI-ASC has also begun a search for a permanent Executive Director.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Approve Agenda and Minutes Agenda and minutes were approved. Tim Vendlinski provided an edit to the panel summary.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Decision: Initial RMP priorities</p> <p>The outcomes from this discussion were largely influenced by the outcomes of the discharger group's SC pre-meeting coordination call. Participants in this group highlighted the need to give more consideration to the coordination aspects of each of the constituents that had been proposed (methylmercury, nutrients, pathogens, pesticides/toxicity). Each one has its different coordination needs and potential partners it would involve. For that reason, Linda Dorn recommended keeping all priority constituents in for now. She further suggested taking a look at the physical locations of interest, since the number of sampling locations (as opposed to the constituent list) is a major contributor to the overall cost of monitoring. Dischargers are in the process of identifying a proposed network of preferred monitoring locations that would meet their NPDES compliance needs and also provide a starting point for the RMP. Consultants are still working on it but it already became evident that there are some locations that need to be included to meet the monitoring needs of dischargers.</p> <p>Brock Bernstein described two overlays that are needed to identify monitoring locations for the RMP: the ideal monitoring designs for all constituents 1) with each other and 2) with the existing monitoring. Then, identifying locations would be a matter of making some tradeoffs, with scientists and managers involved in the discussion. The way forward could be to design the ambient characterization, see what it looks like in terms of sites, and figure out what is involved before taking any constituents out. He also suggested that the RMP would want to build knobs to turn into the design (e.g., number of sites, sampling frequency, constituent lists) so that the design could be adjusted as needed as resources change.</p> <p><u>Outcomes:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Move forward with planning and a design process for all issues presently on the table: methylmercury, nutrients, pathogens (Cryptosporidium/Giardia), and pesticides/toxicity

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Refine management questions for all issues - Provide a charge to the TAC to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further refine the management questions developed by the Steering Committee • Develop a monitoring design that looks at ambient conditions at the scale of the Delta • Identify opportunities for coordination (based on updated materials describing and mapping existing monitoring that have been developed by ASC) • Bring back a recommended approach
<p>5.</p>	<p>Decision: Outline of TAC Charter</p> <p>Previous discussions indicated the need to better define expectations, roles, and responsibilities of the TAC. Jay Davis reiterated that one of the most important things to do at this point is to identify where the management needs are and focus on them. A widely supported proposal for a process for forming the TAC emerged as follows: A) structure on top: each designated SC seat designates one person to sit on the TAC in a more permanent manner in a one to one relationship; B) flexibility on bottom to add subgroups and experts as appropriate: if there is need for additional expertise, expert subgroups could be formed that can report to the TAC; C) if the TAC chair foresee a need for additional horsepower on the TAC, they would come back to the SC with a recommendation.</p> <p>Tim Vendlinski and Stephanie Fong suggested that existing workgroups could serve as subgroups, i.e. the Delta Tributaries Mercury Council (DTMC, chair: Stephen McCord), the IEP POD Contaminants Work Team (CWT, chair: Stephanie Fong), and the Central Valley Drinking Water Policy Workgroup. Brock Bernstein proposed moving forward by identifying how to coordinate with the other groups.</p> <p>Brock then laid out conceptually how the TAC could work and interact with the other entities (SC and ASC). He envisioned the TAC as being made up of experts (i.e., practitioners that staff the boat and sample the Delta) that will provide more detail for decisions. Specifically, the TAC would be expected to come back with an actual program design that will also describe specifically how the Delta RMP and partners such as the IEP will practically implement the monitoring. The SC and ASC would make funding decisions for the implementation based on operational agreements that will be put in writing. Formal processes will be important, because</p>

	<p>“people get more worried about checks and balances when policy decisions get made”.</p> <p>Finally, Brock pointed out that the SC would need to give a clear charge to the TAC. He suggested that in addition to other materials to send out (see Action Item 7.1), staff (Thomas Jabusch, Meghan Sullivan, Brock Bernstein) would take a crack at putting a draft charge together (1-2 paragraphs) that the SC and other meeting participants would review as to whether it gives enough guidance, and tweak as needed.</p> <p>Also raised was the question of funding the TAC co-chairs. Joe Domagalski’s participation is covered by USGS through next summer. Dave Tamayo stated that Sacramento County has contracts in place that can give some funding to Stephen McCord. However, he still needs to ask managers and also needs assurance that his constituency will be credited for such an arrangement.</p> <p>The discussion turned to ASC’s role in the program vis-a-vis the TAC. Brock advised that utilizing ASC resources versus TAC contributions would be a balancing act. It will involve ASC, TAC, and TAC co-chairs mutually reviewing any plans, proposals, and products. Ultimately, ASC and the TAC will have to come to the SC for decisions regarding funding. Linda Dorn suggested the San Francisco Bay Nutrient Strategy as a model, where SFEI-ASC functions as the science manager and is in a role between the SC and TAC. The new structure of the San Francisco Bay Nutrient Strategy acknowledges SFEI-ASC as the science manager, making explicit the role already served in the Bay RMP for many years. Thus, Linda suggested ASC would function as a third part/arm of the program governance.</p> <p><u>Next Steps:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agree on TAC formation and charge - TAC co-chairs with ASC and Regional Board staff digging in to assignments - Figuring out TAC meeting structure and moving forward without getting bogged down
<p>7.</p>	<p>Next meeting The next meeting will be on January 14, 2014. The tentative meeting location is the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (9am-12pm).</p>
<p>8.</p>	

	<p>Action items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">7.1. Staff will send out original documents on governance etc. with track changes to capture agreements from the TAC discussion and include language on TAC structure and flexibility (due: Dec 10)7.2. SC to review edited governance documents and description of the charge of the TAC (due: Jan 10)7.3. SC to nominate TAC members (each SC seat nominates one TAC member)(due: Jan 2)7.4. Linda Dorn to confirm meeting room availability at SRCSD (due: Jan 2)
--	---