

**REGIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM FOR WATER QUALITY
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
October 23, 2007**

Members Present:

Dave Allen, USS POSCO/Industry
Kevin Buchan, WSPA/Refineries
Bob Hale, Alameda County Clean Water Program
Ellen Johnck, Bay Planning Coalition
Jim MacGrath, Board Member
Adam Olivieri, EOA/Stormwater Agencies
Chuck Weir, EBDA/Large POTWs
Tom Mumley, SFB RWQCB

Others Present:

Mike Connor, SFEI
Jay Davis, SFEI
Meg Sedlak, SFEI

1. Approval of Agenda and Minutes

Kevin Buchan opened the meeting and asked for comments on the July 2007 minutes. Kevin Buchan motioned that the minutes be approved; Adam Olivieri seconded and the minutes were approved unanimously.

2. Committee Member Updates

Ellen Johnck indicated that the dredging community had met to discuss the proposed RMP fees. The resolution of the meeting was that the dredgers accepted the proposed increase in the annual fees (for the five largest dredgers) and recommended that the project-based fees remain at the 2004 rates. Ms. Sedlak indicated that the invoices for 2008 would be sent out based upon this recommendation.

Ellen Johnck requested that there be a stronger link between SFEI and the LTMS, and that the dredgers sit down with the Board and SFEI to compare and review studies from the two programs and discuss information needs. She also asked that Lynford Edwards of the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District be included on the TRC mailing list.

Action Items: SFEI to review with dredgers and RWQCB need for studies. Lynford Edwards to be included on TRC mailing list.

3. Information: Technical Review Committee (TRC) Meeting Summary

Meg Sedlak summarized the minutes from the TRC meeting on September 17, 2007. The major items were a recommendation for Pilot and Special studies for 2008 and an overview of the program for 2008. Ms. Sedlak indicated that Dave Tucker would be

resigning from the TRC in December to participate in the SC (assuming approval from BACWA). A new TRC chair will need to be selected.

In the context of PS/SS project selection, the TRC also requested that the SC develop a list of potential projects/topics that are needed for permits and for development of TMDLs.

The TRC also thought that because the RMP was in the midst of a number of changes that it was somewhat premature to schedule a five-year program review for late 2008/beginning of 2009. The TRC did not see a strong need for a review. Kevin Buchan expressed agreement with the TRC. Jim McGrath noted that a great deal of institutionalized change has occurred and is occurring within the Program, lessening the need for frequent external reviews. Adam Olivieri suggested that the Program conduct reviews at whatever frequency is needed, and not be tied to a particular periodic cycle. The Committee decided to put this topic on the agenda for further discussion at the next SC meeting.

The RMP is considering incorporating pyrethroids into the Status and Trends program. A more developed plan will be presented at the TRC meeting in December.

A discussion ensued about the value of the Pulse. Tom Mumley expressed some concern about the budget; however, a number of members indicated that it was a useful document for justifying RMP fees. The Committee discussed having a biennial publication. Chuck Weir noted that it was probably more work per issue to do this. Mike Connor noted that the Pulse provided an opportunity for staff to synthesize data and that many of the Pulse figures are used in presentations at a variety of venues throughout the year. Most of RMP participants stated that they felt the document was exemplary and very useful. The Committee requested that an outline and distribution strategy be presented at the next meeting.

Action item: SC to develop a list of projects needed for permits and TMDLs. SC to discuss the next Program Review at the January SC meeting. SFEI present an outline and distribution strategy for the next Pulse at the January SC meeting.

4. Information: Budget Status

Ms. Sedlak reviewed the RMP budget summary memorandum. The 2007 budget is general on track.

At present, unpaid fees from 2007 are approximately \$75,000; largely Cal Trans. Ms. Sedlak indicated that as a result of the JPA, we should receive this funding shortly. Approximately \$17,000 of the fees was written off.

Approximately 73% of the labor budget has been expended (i.e., \$1,038,319).
Approximately \$1.4 million of subcontracts have been written (\$1,649,384).
Approximately 60% of the direct costs have been spent (\$76,720 out of a total of

\$133,150); major costs to date include purchasing of equipment for tributary loading studies, financial audit, field equipment and workshops and workgroup meetings.

A request was made to present only the years for which open contracts remain and to show the accumulated reserve from the years that have been zero-ed out.

5. Action: Revised RMP Management Questions

Jay Davis presented the revised RMP management questions and how they related to the workgroup activities. Revision of the management questions was initiated to provide a foundation for the comprehensive five year planning effort for the Program. Each of the workgroups is developing a prioritized list of specific questions that the workgroups will address over the next five years. These prioritized lists will guide the selection of PS/SS. As an example, he stated that the Contaminant Fate Workgroup was in the process of developing an RFP for methylmercury.

Chuck Weir asked whether there was a methylmercury budget. Jay indicated that this is one of the tasks recommended by the Contaminant Fate Workgroup and will be performed soon. Tom Mumley indicated that the ratio of methylmercury to total was quite small indicating that even a small pathway might have a significant impact on methylmercury. Ellen Johnck asked whether a methyl mercury budget was consistent with data needs for the TMDL. Tom confirmed that it was, and will be important information for the next iteration of the mercury TMDL.

Adam Olivieri commented that MQ 1.2 shouldn't specifically focus on pollutant concentrations. As an example, copper loads have been effectively reduced, but concentrations have not also responded. Mr. Olivieri also noted that the questions use more negative terminology than the previous version of the RMP management questions, and requested that this be modified. Mr. Olivieri also reported that BASMAA is still holding internal discussion on the draft objectives and questions and requested more time to submit them at a later date.

Chuck Weir indicated that we need to know what are the drivers for loading. Mr. Weir commented that the risk reduction provision of the Municipal Regional Permit is not fair and reasonable. Mr. Weir also stated that work along these lines would need to be conducted through the RMP in a concerted manner with other related work. Tom Mumley indicated that the watershed permit was very specific about risk management actions.

The group requested additional time to review and comment on the management questions and objectives. Kevin Buchan requested that the management questions and RMP objectives be sent out electronically to the group.

Action: SFEI to send out the text and Powerpoint files to the Committee.

6. Action: 2008 Pilot and Special Studies (P&SSs) and 2008 Program Plan

Meg Sedlak gave a presentation of the elements of the 2008 program plan, including a summary of the pilot and special studies. Approximately \$200,000 of the PS/SSs budget was being retained for mercury studies (e.g., a \$100,000 to augment the EEPS small fish study and \$100,000 for a mercury RFP to be developed). The remaining PS/SSs total approximately \$270,000.

Kevin Buchan motioned for approval of the 2008 P&SSs; Adam Oliveri seconded. The group unanimously approved the P&SSs.

Kevin Buchan motioned for approval of the 2008 Program Plan; Tom Mumley seconded. The group unanimously approved the 2008 plan.

7. Information: Feedback on the Annual Meeting

Meg Sedlak presented a summary of the results of the annual meeting. Attendees totaled 219; up from 2006 and 2005 where 191 attended each year. Survey responses were generally quite favorable and were tabulated in an attachment to the committee.

Ms. Sedlak asked for comments from the SC on the meeting. A request was made for a list of places to park in the nearby vicinity with a map.

Following up on one of the comments on the survey, Ms. Sedlak asked whether SFEI staff should prepare a one-page handout on how the public might improve water quality. The SC felt that it was not the role of the RMP; however, EBMUD or BACWA might want to include such a document in the meeting package.

A question was asked about who attended the meeting. There was some concern that no industry or wastewater representatives were there. Ms. Sedlak indicated that some of the TRC and SC representatives from these sectors had conflicts with the meeting but would check to see the representation at the meeting. Also there was a request that the 10-year plan be sent out.

Action: Confirm which industry sectors attended the annual meeting and send out the 10-year plan.

8. Program Update

Meg Sedlak indicated that most of the 2006 data were in and were being validated. The big milestones for this quarter were: finishing workgroup five-year plans; the 2006 sportfish report; the estuary insert; and the AMR. The meeting was adjourned at 3:05.

Next Steering Committee meeting is set for January 29th.