



Delta Regional Monitoring Program (RMP) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting

May 27, 2015
1:00 PM – 5:00 PM
Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District Building
Sunset Maple Room
10060 Goethe Road, Sacramento, CA 95827

Summary

Attendees:

TAC (and/or Alternate) members present¹:

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)
Stephen McCord, TAC co-Chair (McCord Environmental, Inc.)
Tessa Fojut, Regulatory – State (Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board)
Mike Johnson, MLJ LLC (Agriculture)
Karen Ashby, Stormwater – Phase II (Larry Walker Associates)
Debra Denton, Regulatory – Federal (U.S. EPA Region 9)

Others present:

Patrick Morris, Central Valley Regional Water Board
Thomas Jabusch, SFEI-ASC
Selina Cole, Central Valley Regional Water Board
Cam Irvine, CH2M Hill
Rachel Kubiak, Western Plant Health Association
Linda Deanovic, UC Davis APHL
Adam Laputz, Central Valley Regional Water Board
Thalles Perdigao, McCord Environmental, Inc.
Sam Safi, Regional San
Stephen Clark, Pacific EcoRisk
Phil Trowbridge, SFEI-ASC
Yumiko Henneberry, Delta Science Program
Josie Tellers, City of Davis

On phone:

Hamid Parsa, Mountain House CSD
Stephen Louie, CDFW

¹ Name, Representing Category (Affiliation)

Gerardo Dominguez, San Joaquin County

1.	Welcome and Introductions
2.	Approval of Agenda Stephen McCord introduced the agenda. The group agreed to also cover a brief discussion of the pyrethroid TMDL and its potential nexus with the Delta RMP under the Monitoring Design item.
3.	Approve Meeting Summary from April 22, 2015 The summary of the previous meeting (with edits submitted) was approved.
4.	Review Revised Monitoring Design and Response to Comments Stephen McCord introduced the Item by explaining that the Monitoring Design Summary presents the longer-term conceptual plan for the Delta RMP that is based on information developed by the TAC subcommittees and information sheets that were developed for the initial Delta RMP priorities. It is meant to be broad and high-level and not to include all the specific details of implementation nor be fully implemented in year 1. Thomas Jabusch provided an overview of the revised Monitoring Design Summary document and a Response to Comments prepared by ASC. He explained that there are no substantial changes to the design itself from when it was agreed upon by the TAC on October 22, 2014 and submitted to the SC on November 5, 2014. The SC provisionally approved the monitoring design on January 22, provided that specific revisions would be made that were requested at the meeting. Following that meeting, program participants also provided additional comment letters requesting more revisions to the document. In response, ASC revised the Monitoring Design Summary document and prepared a Response to Comments. Thomas highlighted some of the changes, such as an updated and more detailed proposed 5-year schedule for the program. More detail will be provided in a 5-year plan that is to be produced by the end of the calendar year. He also explained that certain comments relating to the interpretation and reporting of results would be addressed in another document, i.e. the Communications Plan that is to be produced with State Board funds by the end of the calendar year. The Communications Plan will have information on reporting for all program elements, a list of all existing documents, and merge documents as necessary. Pending changes to the design document include: (1) harmonizing the budget tables with the recently prepared FY15/16 budget and (2) further simplifying the budget tables for general planning purposes only.

Participants raised a question about the planning horizon for the 5-year plan and whether the 5-year projection would be updated annually. This would be important with regards to special studies. Phil Trowbridge explained that in the Bay RMP, special studies are part of the 5-yr planning process, and that each year the program would look five years forward. Special studies of the Bay RMP are developed by workgroups. Currently there are six Bay RMP workgroups: 1) Sources, Pathways, and Loadings, 2) Emerging Contaminants, 3) Dioxin, 4) PCBs, 5) Mercury, and 6) Exposure and Effects. Each workgroup meets annually to propose special studies to the Technical Review Committee (TRC). The TRC selects special studies to propose to the SC after fitting them to the available budget. Stephen McCord suggested that another possibility for funding special studies would be grants.

There was a discussion about the Central Valley Pyrethroid TMDL and a potential nexus with the Delta RMP. Tessa Fojut explained that, if any, the nexus would be in monitoring. The proposed monitoring related to the TMDL has some flexibility, but monitoring sites would need to be in impaired waters. There are currently 15 listings for pyrethroids in the San Joaquin and Sacramento basins. Most impaired waters are in the Sacramento urban area (mostly small creeks, such as Arcade Creek) and Roseville, and some are in agricultural areas farther upstream of the Delta. Proposed Delta RMP monitoring sites for current use pesticides (CUPs) are mostly in the mainstems of rivers and not representative of these impaired waterbodies. The group concluded that there is a potential nexus, albeit small. Since Tessa is part of both efforts, she can help ensure that there is coordination. Brian Laurenson noted that it would be important from a regulated perspective to identify where the Delta RMP can provide input into the TMDL development. The TMDL will be presented to the Regional Board for approval in June 2016. There was interest in having the DRMP CUP monitoring data be ready in time for the June 2016 deadline.

Stephen McCord asked if the TAC would recommend approval of the revised document by the SC. Mike Johnson and Debra Denton noted that they would have some comments to share. The group was not able to make a recommendation to approve the document and requested more time to review. Adam Laputz advised that the SC would likely not approve a workplan if the TAC does not at least provisionally approve the design. The SC meeting may need to be delayed to July.



	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not necessary to include the Workplans or future Communications Plan as attachments - Ensure there is consistency in terminology and conditions among the Monitoring Design, QAPP, and Workplan documents.
<p>5.</p>	<p>Review Revised QAPP and Response to Comments</p> <p>Thomas Jabusch provided an overview of the revised QAPP and Response to Comments prepared by ASC. He advised that labs are also currently reviewing the QAPP. Their comments are due by June 1st. Debra Denton pointed to a footnote in the QAPP about the SC’s decision to suspend <i>Hyaella</i> monitoring that does not match Tim Vendlinski’s recollection of the meeting. There was discussion whether the State Board Quality Assurance Officer must approve the QAPP, because the program is receiving SWAMP funding. This process could take several months. Adam Laputz agreed to have a discussion with the State Board about what scope of the QAPP needed to be reviewed.</p> <p>The group stated that they had not had enough time to review the revised QAPP and that information from the labs needed to be incorporated into the plan before they could recommend approval by the SC. Phil Trowbridge advised that the QAPP would not address interpretation of results (which would be addressed by the Communications Plan) and noted that the QAPP’s draft status had not prevented the RMP from initiating monitoring for pathogens.</p> <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The SC co-chairs should sign the QAPP. - Lab managers and QAOs should sign the QAPP. - The State Board QAO may also need to sign the QAPP - Jim Orlando can serve as the QAO for both USGS labs (the PFRG lab and the lab in Denver). - Field work and lab SOPs will be burned to a CD once the QAPP is final, rather than appended to the hardcopy
<p>6.</p>	<p>Review Preliminary FY15/16 Budget and Workplan</p> <p>Phil Trowbridge led the discussion with the purpose of obtaining input on in the preliminary FY15/16 Budget and Workplan. Several TAC members stated that it would be difficult to provide feedback on the questions, especially since budget decisions are policy decisions and up to the SC. However, they advised that it would be critical to inform the SC about what the “bare-bones” options are for each of the</p>

	<p>monitoring elements. It was clarified that there are no cost savings in reducing the list of target analytes for USGS.</p> <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Present "bare bones" Monitoring Design funding levels as a menu of options for the TAC to review and the SC to decide - Present "CUP bare-bones" as 5 Delta input sites approximately monthly - TAC members and constituent subcommittee participants respond to Phil answering questions raised in the budget slides ("Item 06 - Delta RMP FY1516 Budget Slides") - The TAC agreed that scheduling CUP monitoring based on the water year was appropriate. The TAC also agreed that there would be limited value in presenting CUP monitoring results for only the remainder of water year 2015. Rather, combine those data with water year 2016 data and report on the results for the first time in spring 2017.
7.	<p>TIE Process and Subcommittee</p> <p>The TAC discussed Karen Ashby's recommendation to add Stephen Clark to the TIE Subcommittee and Mike Johnson as his alternate. There was consensus on the importance for the TIE Subcommittee to remain technically competent, rapidly available, and not having conflicting interests. However, the meeting had gone overtime at this point and some TAC members needed to leave before a decision on the Subcommittee members could be reached.</p>
8.	<p>Planning for Pesticide Monitoring and Reporting</p> <p>The item was deferred.</p>
9.	<p>Update on Stormwater Toxicity Testing Laboratory Intercalibration (SCCWRP).</p> <p>This item was taken out of order and discussed after agenda item 4. The group had a lengthy discussion but concluded rather unanimously that the SCCWRP study would not answer most of the questions they had about the use of <i>Hyaella</i> as a test organism (within the broad categories of variability and environmental relevance). Therefore, they should report to the SC on options for resolving the questions. One option was to start including <i>Hyaella</i> to gain experience. Another option was to propose special studies to resolve the remaining questions.</p> <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stephen McCord will ask the SC to state its decision point for including <i>Hyaella</i> (or not) as a toxicity test organism.
10.	<p>Wrap-up</p> <p>Action items from the meeting were recounted and clarified (see 11.)</p>



	<p><u>Recommendations</u></p> <p>TAC Process Improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - When developing technical documents, build in a clearly described structure of the review process.
<p>11.</p>	<p>Action items:</p> <p>Monitoring Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TAC members: provide comments (by June 4). - Thomas Jabusch: revise the Design document and send it back out the TAC with 5 business days for review (by June 8). - Stephen McCord: convene a conference call or use an online polling method before June 16 so that he can report to the SC whether the TAC recommends approval or provisional approval of the revised Monitoring Design (by June 15). - TAC co-Chairs: Schedule an agenda item for Tessa Fojut to discuss the nexus between Delta RMP and Central Valley Pyrethroids TMDL (by April 2016). <p>QAPP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adam Laputz: follow up with Rich Breuer to learn if the requirement for State Board approval of the QAPP only applied to SWAMP-funded part of the work or the full QAPP (by June 3). - Phil Trowbridge will check with Cristina Grosso to make sure that the data management provisions in the QAPP are SWAMP compatible (by June 3). - Thomas: After receiving comments from the laboratories by June 1, revise the QAPP and send it back out to the TAC with 5 business days to review (by June 8). - Stephen: convene a TAC conference call or use an online polling method to determine whether the TAC recommends approval of the QAPP or provisional approval (by June 16). Stephen McCord will provide a verbal report to the SC on June 16. - Joe (USGS) and Linda (AHPL): coordinate to add “alert” triggers for toxicity sampling to the pesticides monitoring event triggers table (by June 1). – <i>Complete.</i> <p>FY 15/16 Budget and Workplan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Phil: Discuss with the SC co-chairs about having a joint meeting of the SC and TAC (or portion of the SC meeting) to decide about the funding allocations for FY15/16 (by June 3)



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Phil: Revise the budget for the SC to show the available funding relative to the "bare bones" Monitoring Design funding levels so the SC can make the trade-off decisions (by June 5) <p>TIE Process and Subcommittee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stephen McCord will send a message to the whole TAC inquiring if there are any issues with the final TIE Subcommittee appointments (by June 3). If there are any issues remaining to be resolved, the decision will be deferred to the SC. - Cam and Stephanie will revise the draft TIE decision process document, for ASC to then circulate a revised version for other TAC/TIE Subcommittee members to review (by June 22). - Thomas: receive comments on the revised TIE process memo. When all the comments have been received, ASC will send them to the TIE subcommittee to review and incorporate into the memo (by June 29). <p><i>Hyaella</i> Interlab Study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mike Johnson: send Stephen McCord his slides with questions about the <i>Hyaella</i> test (by June 3) - Stephen Clark: send Stephen McCord information about possible special studies that could be done to resolve questions about the <i>Hyaella</i> test (by June 3). - Brian Laurenson: send Stephen McCord his comments on the last set of slides for the SC, which had information on possible special studies (by June 3). - Stephen McCord: write a brief memo to the SC with options regarding the <i>Hyaella</i> test (by June 9).
--	--