Delta Regional Monitoring Program (RMP)

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting

October 22, 2014
1:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District Building
Sunset Maple Room
10060 Goethe Road, Sacramento, CA 95827

Summary

Attendees:
TAC (and/or Alternate) members present[1]*:*
Stephanie Fong, Water Supply (State and Federal Contractors Water Agency)
Brian Laurenson, Stormwater – Phase I (Larry Walker Associates)
Joe Domagalski, TAC co-Chair (U.S. Geological Survey)
Claus Suverkropp, Agriculture (Larry Walker Associates)
Stephen McCord, TAC co-Chair (McCord Environmental, Inc.)
Karen Ashby, Stormwater – Phase II (Larry Walker Associates)
Tessa Fojut, Regulatory – State (Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board)
Erwin Van Nieuwenhuyse, Coordinated Monitoring (Reclamation)
Debra Denton, Regulatory – Federal (U.S. EPA Region 9)
Lisa Thompson, POTWs (Sacramento Regional CSD)
Vyomini Upadhyay, POTWs (Sacramento Regional CSD)
By phone:
Tony Pirondini, POTWs (City of Vacaville)

Others present:
Patrick Morris, Central Valley Regional Water Board
Thomas Jabusch, SFEI-ASC
Hope McCaslin Taylor, LWA
On phone:
Jay Davis, SFEI-ASC
Brant Jorgenson, Pacific EcoRisk
Stephen Clark, Pacific EcoRisk
Rachel Pisor, DWR MWQI

1.	**Welcome and Introductions**

[1] *Name, Representing Category (Affiliation)*

2.	**Announcements from TAC Members** SFCWA is funding four new studies that investigate water quality-related foodweb effects in the Cache/Prospect Slough Complex. The San Francisco Estuary Partnership (SFEP) released its first State of the Bay report in 2011. The first State of the Estuary Report (SOTER) is slated for release next fall, concurrent with the State of the Estuary (SOE) conference. The difference to 2011 is that the SFEP wants to include the Delta in the 2015 report. Jay Davis proposed that it would make sense for the Delta RMP to assume a similar position as the Bay RMP by reviewing draft major messages around February 2015. SOTER 2015 would provide summaries of several aspects of Bay health, including water quality. Jay will be updating the water quality section for the Bay. Stephanie Fong is coordinating the Delta component of the report. Jay described SOTER 2015 as a "lean project" because SFEP is trying to do the update without designated funding. Due to the lack of funding, SOTER 2015 will be focusing on "low-hanging fruit" such as the data that can be readily pulled from the Safe-to-Swim, Safe-to-Eat, and Healthy Streams portals of the CWQMC. A Safe-to-Drink portal is still pending rollout due to some unresolved issues, and it won't include quantitative data for pathogens. However, pathogens of interest to the RMP will be part of a Safe-to-Drink narrative. The assessments will focus on current conditions rather than trends, which will be assessed in the next SOTER (potentially in 2019). An approach that combines quantitative reporting with narratives leaves a lot of flexibility for including what the public is really concerned about. For example, trash is an issue of emerging concern that cannot be assessed quantitatively in the same way as constituents with Water Quality Objectives. However, it is important that it is on the public's radar whether or not strategies for reducing or eliminating trash are working. Recommendations: - Call attention to priority issues of Delta RMP in SOTER, i.e. at least a narrative treatment of why there is concern and why there aren't quantitative objectives yet. - Get input from TAC on SOTER 2015 Delta water quality section at later stage of report development

3.	**Steering Committee Updates** The Regional Board has approved a permit amendment allowing participation of Delta POTWSs in the Delta RMP in place of individual receiving water monitoring. As requested at the Regional Board meeting, the Executive Officer has to specifically approve each individual permit change.
4.	**Approval of Agenda**
5.	**Monitoring Designs – Subgroup Reviews** *Mercury (Stephen McCord, Jay Davis):* The initial mercury monitoring design summary is complete. Two site issues remain to be resolved: 1) whether to include a sampling site in the March Creek area, and 2) whether to keep both or only one of Site "B" (Sacramento River near Isleton) and Site "J" (Little Potato Slough). The use of specialized techniques (cross-sectional sampling and ultra-clean methods) makes the piggybacking of mercury water sampling onto other efforts challenging. IEP's resident fish monitoring could potentially be used for in-kind support, but requirements for fish sampling for mercury analyses are different from other fish sampling as well. The difficult part is obtaining a spectrum of fish sizes so that results can be length-normalized. *Nutrients (Thomas Jabusch, Joe Domagalski):* The initial nutrients monitoring design summary is complete. There was some discussion about whether and how to prioritize tasks. The Nutrients Subcommittee does not recommend an order of prioritization and would leave a decision to the SC, if it became necessary to reduce the proposed effort. Data analyses would presumably be prioritized relative to program development efforts. *Pathogens (Brian Laurenson):* Brian Laurenson and Elaine Archibald (CUWA/MWQI) are in the process of refining the budget proposal to be presented to the SC. The main concern of the Pathogens Subcommittee is whether RMP funding and a mechanism to distribute the funding would be in place in time to start the monitoring in April 2015. One advantage is the opportunity to piggyback on the Bay model via ASC, which simplifies how to do the funding distribution contractually. In the San Francisco Bay RMP, fees come into SFEI to be distributed over the year. Another challenge the group faces is that there is no clear understanding of expected work products. The pertaining language in the Basin Plan is purposely vague, so that information can come from different sources. As for planned next steps, the subcommittee wants to further define the final work products and management roles.

	Pesticides (Stephen McCord): Stephen thanked the participants of the October 8 Pesticides Subcommittee meeting for finalizing a recommendation for the current use pesticides monitoring design summary. The design now entails a) modified questions, b) a broad chemistry/pesticide scan on every sample, c) 5 recommended sites for focused monthly monitoring and 3-4 sites where monitoring would happen only during five specific annual events, and d) gleaning sediment monitoring information from the SpoT program (SWAMP). SpoT samples six in/near Delta sites once each fall (there are ~ 100 sites SpoT sites total 100 statewide). The subcommittee also recommended forming a subcommittee for real-time TIE decisions. Running the DPR prioritization model would provide an opportunity to cross-reference USGS' list of analytes. One caveat for comparing DPR prioritization model results is that non-professional urban pesticides applications are not reported.
6.	**Pulling It Together** Although there was discussion about the relative readiness of the various proposed elements by timeliness and costs, the TAC did not make recommendations to prioritize the four constituents. Each of the four constituents (current use pesticides, mercury, nutrients, and pathogens) was deemed ready to be moved forward as funding becomes available. There was some preliminary discussion about coordination opportunities. Ancillary parameters are of mutual interest to all specialized effort. A prerequisite for consolidating the acquisition of ancillary data would be to ensure that adequate information would be collected to satisfy the needs for each study effort. There was also discussion about the importance of adaptive management of the RMP, so that new innovations could be incorporated into future phases of the program. Key partnering opportunities include the California Estuaries Portal (can host Delta RMP website) and DWR-EMP (sampling). The DWR-EMP goes out bi-weekly and monthly at high tide slack. Other potential partners will be sought after the SC decides on constituent priorities.
7.	**Wrap-up** The TAC will not meet again until the SC makes decisions about funding.
8.	**Action items:** **By October 31** 9.1. Estimate overall PM, planning, coordination, data handling, and reporting costs and coordinate these costs with each study area and possible in-kind contributions (Thomas Jabusch)

	9.2. Clearly show for monitoring questions: (1) edits to set last seen by SC, and (2) highlighted questions addressed by the proposed design. (Thomas Jabusch) 9.3. Provide monitoring design summaries and cover document to Steering Committee (Stephen McCord, by October 31) 9.4. Prepare Year 2 data product examples and update Year 2 costs (Brian Laurenson) 9.5. Provide list of scope items that will need to be assigned to in-kind contributors or Delta RMP staff (Brian Laurenson) **By January 2015** Overall 9.6. Thomas and Stephen (at least): discuss monitoring coordination opportunities with IEP senior management (Oct. 15, 1-3 pm), Shaun (DWR) for EMP, and Cindy Garcia (DWR) for MWQI. 9.7. Thomas: Identify opportunities to consolidate individual RMP constituents' designs (events, sites) 9.8. TAC: Review updated monitoring sites table and on-line map (http://bit.ly/1vpwofH) Mercury 9.9. Jay: Determine whether Army Corps monitoring of fish in Marsh Cr. is adequate 9.10. Jay: Decide whether to monitor fish at sites B or J 9.11. Jay/ Stephen: Look into coordination with potential partners (DWR, ERP, USGS) Nutrients 9.12. Refine budget estimate while scoping out specific projects 9.13. Obtain SFCWA's database of USGS, IEP, RegBd monitoring data 9.14. Obtain USGS continuous sensors data Pathogens 9.15. Draft sample collection planning documents in coordination with MWQI and RMP standards 9.16. Finalize roles and responsibilities in coordination with Delta RMP and in-kind services provided by Pathogen Subcommittee/Central Valley Drinking Water Policy Workgroup 9.17. Draft CY2015 schedule for sample collection Current Use Pesticides 9.18. Scope and identify a TIE Subcommittee 9.19. Link monitoring design to available modeling tools (USGS risk assessment

	model, EPA watershed loading model) 9.20. Compare USGS' pesticide scan suite to: o DPR's pesticide prioritization model o Pesticides regulated in current OPs TMDL and draft pyrethroids TMDL, and permits/WDRs