

## Delta RMP Steering Committee Meeting

July 20, 2016

11:00 AM – 4:15 PM

Central Valley Regional Board, 11020 Sun Center Drive #200, Rancho Cordova, CA

### Summary

#### Attendees:

*Voting Steering Committee (and/or Alternate) members present<sup>1</sup>:*

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

Linda Dorn\* (Regional San), POTWs

Josie Tellers (City of Davis), POTWs

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

Adam Laputz\* (Central Valley Water Board), Regulatory – State

Dave Tamayo (Sacramento County)/Dalia Fadl (City of Sacramento), Stormwater Phase I

Gregg Erickson (Interagency Ecological Program), Coordinated Monitoring

David Cory (Westside San Joaquin River Watershed Coalition), Agriculture

Greg Gearheart (State Water Board), Regulatory – State

Deedee Antypas (City of Stockton)/Tom Grovhoug (LWA), POTWs

Val Connor (GEI), Water Supply

Jeff Stuart (NMFS), Resource Agencies

Terry Fleming (EPA), Regulatory – Federal

\*Co-Chairs

#### *By phone*

Brendan Ferry (El Dorado County), Stormwater Phase II

#### *Others present:*

---

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

- Brock Bernstein, Facilitator
- Thomas Jabusch, SFEI-ASC
- Brian Laurensen, LWA (TAC)
- Phil Trowbridge, SFEI-ASC
- Michael Johnson, MLJ-LLC (TAC)
- Melissa Turner, MLJ-LLC
- Stephen McCord, MEI (TAC co-Chair)
- Rachel Kubiak, WPHA
- Meg Sedlak, SFEI-ASC
- Patrick Morris, Central Valley Water Board
- Bruce Houdesheldt (SVWQC), Agriculture (Alternate)
- Joe Domagalski, USGS (TAC co-Chair)
- Paul Bedore, RBI
- Selina Cole, Central Valley Water Board
- Dave Melilli, City of Rio Vista
- Lindsay Correa, DSP
- Yumiko Henneberry, DSP
- Alisha Wenzel, Central Valley Water Board

*On phone*

- Tony Pirondini (City of Vacaville), POTWs (Alternate)
- Karen Ashby, LWA (TAC)
- Otome Lindsey (DWR)

<b>1.</b>	<p><b>Introductions and Review Agenda</b> A quorum was established.</p> <p>Terry Fleming is the new EPA representative on the SC. He will abstain from any voting, because EPA staff was advised that they could only participate “ex officio” in Committees.</p> <p>Val Connor indicated that although SFCWA was no longer able to fund her participation in the Finance subcommittee, she would continue to participate on a</p>
-----------	--

	<p>voluntary basis. She will not participate in the Revenue Committee. Several SC members requested that the agenda package include page numbers for each agenda item on the agenda.</p> <p><b>OUTCOMES</b> → <b>Action Item:</b> ⇒ Include page numbers in the agenda indicating location of agenda items, add blank pages between items in the agenda package (Meg Sedlak, by October 18)</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p><b>Decision: Approve Meeting Summary from April 25th, 2016 and confirm/set next meeting dates</b></p> <p>The 4/25 Meeting Summary was approved. A clarifying edit was requested:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Delete “and Phil Trowbridge” from Action Item “Set up a Finance Subcommittee meeting (members include Dalia Fadl, Mike Wackman, Linda Dorn, Adam Laputz and Phil Trowbridge, only 3 needed for quorum)”. ASC staff will be invited to participate as needed to provide information but is not part of the Subcommittee.</li> </ol> <p>The next SC meeting dates are October 18, 2016 and January 26, 2017. The Oct 18 meeting will be an important all-day joint TAC/SC meeting (10:00 – 4:30) to discuss longer-term priorities and workplans. Most SC members confirmed their availability; Stephanie Reyna-Hiestand indicated that she had a conflict and would send an alternate.</p> <p><b>OUTCOMES</b> → <b>Decision:</b> ⇒ Meeting minutes, as amended, were approved. → <b>Action Item:</b> ⇒ Send an invitation out to SC for January 26th meeting indicating time/location (Meg Sedlak, by August 1)</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p><b>Information: TAC Meeting Summary</b></p> <p>The TAC co-chairs provided a brief update on the June 14 TAC meeting and a summary of recent Delta RMP activities and results. Highlights included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introduction of the Delta RMP Highlight Report that will be prepared by the TAC co-chairs for each SC meeting,</li> <li>2. Consent (no objections) to recommend the QAPP for approval,</li> <li>3. USGS Sensor Synthesis Report is expected August 1<sup>st</sup>; TAC will review this document.</li> </ol>

	<p>4. Recap of the USGS presentation at the TAC meeting. USGS is improving its analytical capabilities by adding six new analytes to pesticide analyses. The new analytes will not be part of the Delta RMP dataset. There was consensus on the need for a process to review and update the list of pesticide analytes reported by the Delta RMP.</p> <p>5. Brian Laurenson informed the SC that based on the results to date, there is no need for a trigger study at this time; additional funding beyond the \$20K allocated in FY15/16 is not warranted. Additional funding may be needed if trigger criteria are exceeded.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p><b>Decision: Approve QAPP</b>                  The updated QAPP now also includes mercury monitoring. Mercury sampling is scheduled for August.</p> <p>OUTCOMES                  → <b><u>Decision:</u></b>                  ⇒ QAPP was approved upon the condition that there are no significant changes requested by the SWAMP QA officer. If significant changes are requested, the SC will be informed by e-mail. Vote: 10-0-2</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p><b>Decision: Approve Charter and revised Communications Plan</b>  <i>Communications Plan</i></p> <p>Two small changes to the Communications Plan were requested. These changes are needed to allow provisional data to be shared with Agricultural participants for the purpose of ILRP compliance reporting. The revisions to the Communications Plan were approved. However, the following concerns were expressed:</p> <p>1. Val Connor objected to previously approved language: “ASC will upload the provisional data to the password-protected Delta RMP TAC Google website as soon as they are available, from where they will be pulled into the password-protected workerbee space of the California Estuaries Portal”, and “Final data will be will be incorporated into CEDEN and at a minimum made available through portals such as CD3, Bay Delta Live, etc.” She stated that it would make more sense to post data on the Estuary Portal. She qualified that she would be okay with the Communications Plan as is, provided that the Delta RMP would not have to pay for maintaining CD3 and that there is no added cost for posting preliminary data on the Delta RMP TAC Google website. Phil indicated that there were no additional costs.</p> <p>2. Josie Tellers expressed concern that the use of CEDEN for data access might</p>

	<p>result in requirements for POTWs to upload data in two different databases, CWIQS and CEDEN. Water Board representatives assured that dischargers wouldn't be required to put data in CEDEN. Water Boards are working on the integration of CEDEN and CWIQS.</p> <p><i>Charter</i></p> <p>ASC staff presented the revised Charter for approval. The following additional changes were requested:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Change language for Regulatory Agencies (“agencies that administer state and federal water quality regulations, i.e. Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, State Water Resources Control Board, and EPA Region 9 Water Division...”)</li> <li>2. Move sentence “A TAC co-Chair may attend by invitation of the Coordinating Committee” from the definition of Coordinating Committee to the section describing its role and functions.</li> <li>3. Make the composition of the Coordinating Committee consistent between the definition section and the section describing its role and functions and remove the role to set the agenda for TAC meetings.</li> <li>4. Update TAC roster to match the SC composition and add the SC representative for groups that don't currently have a TAC member.</li> <li>5. Revise org chart to show the connection of the Financial Committee to the Steering Committee</li> </ol> <p>OUTCOMES</p> <p>→ <b><u>Decisions:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Communication Plan approved (12-0-1).</li> <li>⇒ Charter as amended approved (12-0-2)</li> </ul> <p>→ <b><u>Action Items:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Accept track changes sent to SC and incorporate language modifications requested (Phil Trowbridge, by August 1).</li> <li>⇒ Update table for TAC roster to reflect the composition indicated in the charter (e.g., Resource Agencies) (Thomas Jabusch, by August 1).</li> <li>⇒ Send TAC and SC the final version of the Charter (Meg Sedlak, by August 1)</li> <li>⇒ Add Greg Gearheart and Jeff Stuart to the TAC mailing list as they seek to find TAC representatives (Thomas Jabusch, by August 8).</li> </ul>
<p>6.</p>	<p><b>Information: Delta RMP Financial Update</b></p> <p>The FY14/15 budget is nearly closed and will end on budget. The FY15/16 budget is</p>

	<p>59% spent. ASC anticipates completing the FY15/16 tasks on budget and closing with a surplus of \$84,444, because new participants joined the program and contributed fees after the FY15/16 budget was approved. ASC requested SC authorization to transfer this surplus to the Reserve.</p> <p>→ <b><u>Decision:</u></b></p> <p>⇒ Transfer surplus from FY15/16 to the Reserve. Revise ledger. (Motion: Val Connor. Approved 9-0-5).</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p><b>Information: Finance Committee Report</b></p> <p>The current Finance Committee members are Mike Wackman, Linda Dorn, Selina Cole/Patrick Morris, and Dalia Fadl. The key discussion point was the reporting template to be generated by ASC. The Finance Committee members requested more detail to review from ASC, (i.e. breaking down for each deliverable the time each staff has spent working on it and for which specific activities). They stated that this detail would be needed to compare allocated vs. completed hours, as a basis for assessing cost savings. Not all Steering Committee members saw need for the level of detail requested by the committee. Comments were made that the approach resembled an audit rather than a financial review, and that the Committee should focus on the appropriateness of the task-level budgets and whether the deliverables are being completed within those budgets. Many tasks have required additional effort because both the SC and TAC had difficulties reaching agreements, resulting in multiple iterations for decisions, program documents, and deliverables. ASC staff advised that more detailed financial reporting would require extra work for which there is no budget.</p> <p><i>OUTCOMES</i></p> <p>→ <b><u>Action Item:</u></b></p> <p>⇒ ASC and Finance Committee will meet to determine a way to provide the level of information requested. ASC will provide a cost estimate for any extra work associated with the increased reporting. <i>(Note: This meeting took place immediately following the SC meeting. For future financial reports, ASC will use the same format as was developed for the Q2 report but also add the hours billed by each staff member for each task from the invoices.)</i>(Phil Trowbridge, August 1)</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p><b>Discussion: How does the program obtain additional funding?</b></p> <p>Regional Board staff have identified and evaluated additional funding sources for the Delta RMP. Adam Laputz provided an update and requested feedback on how</p>

to allocate funding, when it becomes available to the Regional Board.

#### *Region 5 SWAMP contracts*

There are different options for using the Region 5 SWAMP funds in future years. SWAMP funds could continue to pay for toxicity testing (through UC Davis) or be used for contracts with chemical-analytical labs (e.g., WPCL, MLML). SWAMP contracts for FY17/18 need to be written by the end of September. Regional Board staff will need to decide how the SWAMP funds for the next three years (2017-2020) should be allocated. In addition to the current program priorities, the Regional Board will be considering future topics such as Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the decision for which lab to pick. A contract with WPCL, for example, would provide flexibility to pay for analyses of pesticides, nutrients, or CECs, or a combination of those. Using multiple labs or switching to another lab would require interlab calibration studies.

#### *SEPs*

The Regional Board has approved the use of SEP funds for Delta RMP projects. SEP funding is expected to be available within the next few months and possibly before the joint SC/TAC October meeting. The proposed idea is to use the SEP funds to pay for monitoring at sites that are recommended in the monitoring design but are currently not monitored. The Delta RMP would need to cover the cost for management of these additional activities.

#### *401 Projects*

Regional Board staff is working on an approach for determining contributions by 401/404 permittees that would constitute Delta RMP participation. SC members welcomed the idea of bringing additional funding into the program but also had several concerns, including the complexity and magnitude of specific water quality requirements for bigger projects and duplication of fees (many projects are already conducting monitoring for their permits). However, the Regional Board's approach is to move away from project-by-project mitigation and fees and towards meeting larger goals by combining resources. Adam indicated that he would take the comments under advisement and bring this topic back to the SC in the spring.

#### *OUTCOMES*

##### **→ Decision:**

⇒ Use SEP funds to pay for projects that have been reviewed and approved by

	<p>the SC (12-0-2)</p> <p>→ <b>Action Items:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Develop a list of SEP projects that can be discussed at the October SC meeting (Adam Laputz, September 30)</li> </ul>
<p>9.</p>	<p><b>Decision: Fees for FY17/18</b></p> <p>The discussion was about whether there should be a fee increase in FY17/18. Linda Dorn recommended that a decision on fees needed to be part of a broader conversation about long-term work plans. There were concerns from the Regional Board and others over the potential loss of sampling power, because without a fee increase, the program will not keep up with cost increases from inflation and subcontractor fees. However, the group as a whole did not support a fee increase for FY17/18 at this time and agreed to reschedule the discussion of fees for the January SC meeting, with the multi-year workplan and budget in hand.</p> <p><i>OUTCOMES</i></p> <p>→ <b>Decision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Fees for FY17/18 will have a zero percent increase from FY16/17 for budgetary planning purposes for the October 18th SC meeting. The SC will determine the final FY17/18 fees at the January SC meeting.</li> </ul>
<p>10.</p>	<p><b>Delta Science Plan: Science Action Agenda</b></p> <p>The Delta Science Program has reached out to the Delta RMP to evaluate how its activities can be meaningfully integrated into the Delta Science Action Agenda (SAA), which is one part of a three-part Delta Science Strategy (the other parts are the Delta Science Plan and the State of the Bay-Delta Science report). DSP is looking to the SC for responses to the following four questions by November:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How will the Delta RMP and its member agencies/organizations use the 2017 SAA?</li> <li>2. How would you define success of the 2017 SAA?</li> <li>3. From the Delta RMP perspective, what are the most important documents/information that we should be looking at to best understand your relevant management needs/questions and associated science actions?</li> <li>4. How and when does the Delta RMP want to engage in developing the 2017 SAA?</li> </ol> <p>The DRMP input will be used to help prioritize science actions planned by the DSP as part of the SAA. The idea is to identify science gaps that of interest to several collaborative groups and thereby leverage the effort. The expected outcome is a</p>

	<p>strategic action plan. The next step for the action plan would be to identify funding to implement these actions.</p> <p>Steering Committee members suggested that the DSP staff review the monitoring design, workplan, and management drivers table, which have been provided by ASC. Some people also recommended reviewing the CVSALTS and Nutrient Research Plan documents.</p>
11.	<p><b>Information: Plans for the Delta RMP Nutrient Monitoring Workshop</b>          ASC staff presented the goals and agenda for a Delta RMP Nutrient Monitoring Workshop scheduled for September 30. The purpose of this workshop is to develop recommendations for “no regrets” nutrient monitoring to inform the Delta RMP multi-year planning efforts in October. No changes to the agenda were requested by the SC. ASC staff will provide the SC with updates.</p> <p><i>OUTCOMES</i>          → <b><u>Decision:</u></b>          ⇒ Move forward with workshop planning.</p>
12.	<p><b>Discussion: Planning for the Joint TAC/SC meeting on October 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016</b>          ASC staff provided a short reminder that the next SC meeting will be a joint meeting with the TAC for multi-year workplan development. ASC asked the SC to review the table of upcoming management drivers before the meeting. Also on the agenda for October is a report out on the results of the External Review Panel. The External Review Panel has received preliminary documents to review. On August 23<sup>rd</sup>, the Panel will have a teleconference with the Delta RMP External Review Committee to ask clarifying questions. The External Review Panel will report their findings in September so that they can be incorporated into the planning activities scheduled for the Joint TAC/SC meeting.</p> <p><i>OUTCOMES</i>          → <b><u>Action Items:</u></b>          ⇒ Send out the Management Driver table to the SC and TAC (Meg Sedlak, by August 1)          ⇒ Add an agenda item to the 10/18/16 Joint Meeting agenda to discuss TAC comments on the Charter (Meg Sedlak, by August 1)</p>
13.	<p><b>Discussion: Status of Deliverables, Action Items and Upcoming Meetings</b>          This item was not discussed.</p>
14.	<p><b>Member updates</b></p>

	<p>a. Adam Laputz is actively reaching out to 1-2 groups/month to encourage participation in the Delta RMP.</p> <p>b. Adam Laputz advised the SC that it would be a good business decision to start water toxicity testing with <i>Hyaella</i>, because the Regional Board would eventually be asking for the data. Josie Tellers stated that she would fully support the use of <i>Hyaella</i>, once the protocol from the intercalibration study would become available. Adam indicated that he would attempt to cover the cost for <i>Hyaella</i> with additional SWAMP funding not already allocated to the Delta RMP. This additional funding would not cover TIEs and therefore, there would not be any <i>Hyaella</i>-related TIEs.</p>
15.	<p><b>Review action items and plan agenda/topics for upcoming meetings</b> Decisions and action items for the meeting were reviewed and confirmed.</p>
16.	<p><b>Adjourn</b></p>