bay restoration commission

STEWARDS OF SANTA MONICA BAY

santa monica bay restoration commission 320 west 4th street, ste 200; los angeles, california 90013
213/576-6615 phone 213/576-6646 fax www.smbrc.ca.gov

THE SANTA MONICA BAY RESTORATION COMMISSION
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARY

Contact: 310-953-7149 or lprotopapadakis@santamonicabay.org

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Chairman Ambrose called the meeting to order on September 12, 2014 at 9:35am at Pereira 128, Loyola Marymount University, 1 LMU Drive, Westchester, CA 90045. Round robin introductions followed.

TAC Members

Rich Ambrose (Chair)	Present
Steve Bay (Vice Chair)	Present
Mas Dojiri	Present
John Dorsey	Present
Rainer Hoenicke	Absent
Karen Martin	Present
Dan Pondella	Absent
Eric Stein	Absent

Staff Present
Lia Protopapadakis, Marine Scientist & Project Manager
Guangyu Wang, Deputy Director
Jaynel Santos, Intern
Ivan Medel, Watershed Project Manager
Karina Johnston, Watershed Program Director

Members of the Public
Kathy Knight, Ballona Ecosystem ED Project/A-M Sierra Club
Laura Nunez, MBC
Peter Shellenbarger, Heal the Bay
Charlynn Rachell, LADWP

PUBLIC FORUM

Kathy Knight of the Ballona Ecosystem Education Project and Airport Marina Group Sierra Club gave public comment on the history of the Ballona Wetlands conservation efforts and her group's ongoing interest in the activities occurring on the Wetlands.

GENERAL BUSINESS

a. Order of the Agenda. Approved
b. Approval of Meeting Minutes. Approved with changes submitted by Mas.
c. Reports from the Chair, Subcommittees, and Staff

- Chair: Rich is working on study of biofilters in Melbourne. Their Millennium Drought that occurred a few years ago spurred a lot of research into water treatment, supply, and conservation. Their water authority has been spearheading research and projects in these areas. The city of Melbourne has implemented hundreds of rain gardens. The goal of these projects was to project the natural creeks and

santa monica bay restoration commission 320 west 4th street, ste 200; los angeles, california 90013
213/576-6615 phone 213/576-6646 fax www.smbrc.ca.gov

streams. Now that the drought has broke, it will be interesting to see how interest in these projects holds.

Kathy Knight mentioned that she believes there are 3 underwater aquifers below Ballona.

- Subcommittees: Lia reported for Dan on the progress on the Wetland White Paper.
- Staff: Lia gave an update on the Habitat Health Assessment progress. The current timeline is to have all workshops completed by March 2015 so the TAC can review them during their meeting. Also, the MRAC membership will likely change the next time they meet (Jim Allen will likely be replaced by Steve Murray).

Guangyu reported that Tom Ford has been appointed by the SMBRC as the new Director. The EPA conducted 5-year program review of the Commission's work, which went really well. Internally, we have begun to revise our approach to the Urban Coast; it will be an online journal in an attempt to increase our audience, participation, and frequency of publishing. Karina added that the goal is to have the online journal live by the end of the year. If we can find funding for a print version, we have the capacity to retain a print version. We are also considering the urban coast as a venue for publishing the State of the Bay Report. Rich mentioned that an online journal can make downloading articles and downloading citations to reference managers very easy, and we should try to make those features available.

Jaynel reported on her progress on LID research for the State of the Bay. She is focusing on non-ordinance projects. She's contacted several groups already and is waiting for responses from several organizations. She will be building a database containing information about who's doing the project, where it is, the type of project, and what kind of data is gathered about it.

Steve mentioned a project by SCCWRP to build mobile apps for data collection. John suggested contacting University campuses in the watershed for information on projects they are engaged in including LMU, UCLA, Pepperdine, etc. The project must focus on programs not individual efforts given the time constraints. Stormwater Monitoring Coalition has started looking at building permits for an idea of individual efforts. Rich also recommended looking at how MS4 permits and watershed plans are starting to require LID implementation. He can also give her information on the biofilters that he has identified in the LA area. Peter from Heal the Bay noted that many of the stormwater plans don't have a good baseline. For implemented projects, it might be better to contact the consultants that are writing the plans.

d. Member Comment *(TAC members may wish to comment on issues not otherwise on the agenda.)*

Steve Bay mentioned that water supply is now under the purview of the State Water Board, which will make communication between the water quality managers and water supply managers easier. SCCWRP will be involved in research on recycled water.

Mas Dojiri has hired a new water biologist to look at CECs in the effluent in a new way. His division is also developing a Comprehensive Monitoring Plan for their 1-mile outfall diversion project. When their 5-mile outfall undergoes repairs, the city will be diverting their effluent to 1-mile outfall for 3-7 weeks. The work is scheduled to occur in October. They are working with SCCWRP, SCOOS, Scripps, UCSB, JPL, and USC to study the effects of the diversion.

santa monica bay restoration commission 320 west 4th street, ste 200; los angeles, california 90013
213/576-6615 phone 213/576-6646 fax www.smbrc.ca.gov

Karen has a book coming out called "Beach Spawning Fishes…"

AGENDA ITEM 4: Level 3 Wetland Monitoring Program Development

Presentation. Karina presented on the level 3 wetland monitoring program development. Two years of data have been collected to date. Level 3 monitoring is site-level data. The goal of this project is to develop recommendations for standard detailed site-level data collection to allow comparisons between different sites, which includes CRAM, etc. and validate the level 2 assessments. The project has evaluated monitoring protocols currently in use, gathered baseline data for each site in the study using the priority targets identified in the core protocols. The project is now working to identify standardized quality assurance and quality control procedures and needs to find a place to house the resulting standardized database. It would be ideal to house the data in an existing system. Mugu Lagoon is the reference wetland for the project. All sites are estuarine wetlands. The non-reference sites were selected to inform ongoing projects and to include a variety of wetland types and degradation. The sites selected are: Ormond Beach Lagoon, Malibu Lagoon, Ballona Wetlands, and Los Cerritos Wetlands. Karina provided examples of the core protocols and priority parameters and the methods that are recommended for collecting the recommended data. Goal is to provide a framework to guide the development of standardized and comparable level-3 wetland monitoring plans. In addition, the project will provide baseline reports on each of the wetlands in the study. There are a few questions the project is seeking to answer, such as the level of expertise that is required to conduct these protocols. Karina hopes to come back in the spring to discuss the project findings. The final products are due at the end of June 2015.

Discussion. Core protocols aren't meant to restrict people to monitoring just the core components, but integrating extra data into a standard database will be a challenge. Maintaining non-core data could be included in the metadata.

The results of this project will provide a framework for other projects to implement voluntarily and inform monitoring program development for future projects.

The assessment is a condition assessment of biological indicators and doesn't look at stressors. We are putting together a proposal to develop a similar framework for evaluating stressors at the 3rd level assessment. The assessment doesn't include fish, which is a big gap. It wasn't possible to include fish in the project because of budget, data, and permitting constraints. Rich recommended doing some analysis of fish data and linking it to level 2 data and including it in the report.

Public Comment. None.

AGENDA ITEM 5: LID projects resulting from LID ordinances.

Presentation. Peter Shellenbarger presented on LID projects that have been implemented in the 5 years since LID ordinances have been in place in LA County. The goal is to evaluate effectiveness of the ordinances and use the information to improve future storm water management. This study focused on unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County, the City of Los Angeles, and the City of Santa Monica. Long Beach and Ventura County have had LID ordinances in place for a long time, but they did not have very good data, so they were omitted. Data came from the agencies in charge of the MS4 permits. Projects included were public and private projects implemented as a result of MS4 permit requirements. Findings include the number of different types of BMPs implemented and estimated values for volume of water filtered and infiltrated per a single, 3" storm event. The miscellaneous category included landscaping and tree planting and was the most installed type of BMP. Recommendations include better data management (will be included in the new MS4 permits, but the data will be even less centralized because each jurisdiction will be responsible for maintaining their own data), better maintenance requirements, more stringent performance criteria and

santa monica bay restoration commission 320 west 4th street, ste 200; los angeles, california 90013
213/576-6615 phone 213/576-6646 fax www.smbrc.ca.gov

triggers, digitizing historic LID projects, fixing rain barrel overflow problems, and bi-annual reporting. Conclusions include the number of BMPs and projects implemented, approximate gallons of water captured or treated, annual water capture or treatment during designed storms, and the percentage of water generated during designed storms based on the % impervious surfaces in the watershed. He is trying to figure out how to incorporate smaller storms into the report.

Discussion. The TAC gave feedback on the recommendations as follows: Data should be electronic and centralized. Many BMPs (rain barrels included) might not function properly when storms occur in series. Assumptions for rainwater capture don't include this potential for overflow and should be addressed. The retrofit trigger might be problematic for smaller residential landowners, and would be easier to do if it is tied to an application for a permit or on a home sale or included incentives on a water rate. Monitoring LID projects should include better monitoring of individual BMP performance in different soil types. The San Diego region did a study on BMP performance, which resulted in a fine for the city of San Diego for poor construction of BMPs (i.e. downspouts directed to impervious surfaces rather than landscaping, or rain gardens with no inlets).

The TAC also suggested evaluating not just on BMP type, but also on things such as who has implemented them (public/private/commercial/residential), the land use, etc.

Public Comment. Kathy suggested improving incentives for implementation and improved public outreach.

AGENDA ITEM 6: State of the Bay 2015

Some TAC members couldn't access the FTP site. Lia will create a google drive for the project moving forward.

Citations should be included but not as intensely as for a journal paper.

UCLA's IOE is working on a report card for the LA area. There might be overlap in one area of the report card. Mark Gold is really trying to put out an actual report card that would track status over time. Even if the assessments are focused so differently, and they come up with very different results, it would not look good. How do we want to try to coordinate? They are planning to release a report by the end of the calendar year. Rich, Lia and Guangyu will meet with Mark Gold and his team to try and discuss the possibility of coordination.

Story 3.1.2 The Malibu Lagoon Restoration and Enhancement Project. This is a revised version of the draft the TAC looked at in June. Updates include new YSI data and DO profiles from ~8 stations in the lagoon on one day. The conclusion is that the lagoon is not experiencing anoxic conditions in either open or closed conditions. It doesn't include biological data in the interest of space.

Discussion. The changes and updates were good, but the third table could be seen as misleading because it doesn't capture an average condition. Table two can be weaved into the text of the figure caption. The figure should include an indication of day and night and the tides, to better interpret the data. There is no good scientific understanding of what low DO levels are biologically relevant. It appears to be extended periods of low DO. The caption or text should point out that the difference between pre and post restoration is that pre restoration, the DO remains low for extended periods of time. In contrast, post restoration, the DO bounces back very quickly. Also check the definition of anoxic.

Karina's group is working up some data on infauna. If the data is available John can incorporate a paragraph on those results.

Public Comment. None.

santa monica bay restoration commission 320 west 4th street, ste 200; los angeles, california 90013
213/576-6615 phone 213/576-6646 fax www.smbrc.ca.gov

Story 2.1. Water Resources: Water Supply and Use: Overview. The story needs a better introductory paragraph that provides an overview on water supply and how that impacts dischargers. Eric's first paragraph might be a better lead-in for the entire chapter. The lead-in needs to include a basic overview of where our water comes from.

Discussion. Mas expressed concern about the focus on water supply. The title should be changed to water use. Staff will work on an introductory paragraph and blending the two authors work. Mas has some revisions and will send them to Lia.

Public Comment. Kathy Knight suggested additional ways of incentivizing water conservation using contents.

Story 2.2.1 Bacterial TMDL and LFDs.

Discussion. Run-off is spelled differently in different stories, this will need to be adjusted. The article mentions dry-weather beach water quality has significantly improved. The graph would be better if it showed percent of exceedences/ sites monitored (i.e. normalize the data) for both dry and wet weather charts. The LFDs are automated now we need a sentence noting when this change occurred. The map needs to be updated to include the area south of Imperial Hwy. Staff will find the map used last time. The opening paragraph can mention how many LFDs are in the SMB.

John will work on the part b to this story about treatment wetlands for the December meeting.

Story 2.2.1. Sidebar: Preventing Boat Sewage Discharge

Discussion. Reorganize article to start by talking about the problem, then introduce the different programs, and only way to quantify is to discuss how much activity has occurred, or how many people have been touched. The figure should not be included. The bullet about honey pot day needs to be re-worded so it doesn't read like all the effluent pumped out through the program would have otherwise been illegally discharged.

Public Comment. None.

Story 2.2. Sidebar: Malibu Creek TMDL

Discussion. The main point of this sidebar was to talk about this as a new type of TMDL. The draft doesn't quite hit on that. However, Cindy was uncomfortable stating that this was a good process and should be done more frequently. The sidebar story will describe the process (the listing was based on biological impairments not based on high levels of some pollutant), while the importance of this new TMDL can be described in the overview story. This sidebar also needs to be tightened up and needs a bit of wrap-up to bring the story back to the additional challenges in adapting the TMDL process to the biological data.

Story 3.2.1 Red-legged Frog Recovery

Discussion. Raises discussions of style. The level of writing needs to be simplified and a little less technical. The details, like the unexplained die-off doesn't need to be included in this kind of story. The detailed number of tadpoles released, etc. is less important. Why do we care about amphibians, their populations are down world-wide, and they are a canary in the coal mine and an indicator of environmental pollution. Then why this frog is one we care about is important to highlight in the introduction more. Include only 2-3 pictures and if possible a graph or map of the red-legged population. Good pictures to include are the adult frogs on the rock and the people collecting eggs. Also can reduce number of citations, including the personal communications.

santa monica bay restoration commission 320 west 4th street, ste 200; los angeles, california 90013
213/576-6615 phone 213/576-6646 fax www.smbrc.ca.gov

Public Comment. Starting with the introduction of the frog was a nice way to humanize it and draw in interest before getting into the bad news about their decline.

Story 4.3.1 Ocean Acidification.

Discussion. Information on local species was added but the connection is not very strong. Need to expand the first sentence about generic extent of the problem to include other species (outside the bay and different species), various life stages. Then describe the specific examples from the west coast.

Story 4.3.2 Nutrients.

Discussion. Looks like everything was incorporated.

Story 3.2.4 Fishery Management

Discussion. Missing objective or purpose for including it. The focus is that there are significant fisheries in California and locally. We know very little on the status of these fisheries. The information on the status of these fisheries could be trimmed down and less detailed. Less important is the information on the restrictions in the bay. The table of on the status could be turned into a pie chart by stock assessment completion. Needs better focus on message: 1) what are the fisheries in the bay and 2) what are their status? Can turn table 1 into a sidebar. Table 2 is important to the main story. Update the map figure.

Story 3.2.3 Sea Star Wasting Disease (not discussed)

Story 4.3.2 HABs (not discussed)

Martha Setulla at SCCWRP is doing a study on fish consumption of microplastics. This should be added as a sidebar to the trash story.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEXT MEETING:

The next meeting will be held on Monday, December 15, 2014.