



# bay restoration commission

STEWARDS OF SANTA MONICA BAY

santa monica bay restoration commission 320 west 4<sup>th</sup> 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@santamonica bay.org](mailto:lprotopapadakis@santamonica bay.org)

### WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Chairman Ambrose called the meeting to order on April 3, 2015 at 9:39 am in Pereira 128, 1 LMU Drive, Westchester, CA 90045. Round robin introductions followed.

### ATTENDANCE

#### *TAC Members*

Rich Ambrose (Chair)	Present
Steve Bay (Vice Chair)	Present
Mas Dojiri	Absent
John Dorsey	Present
Rainer Hoenicke	Present (left at 3:00 pm)
Karen Martin	Present (left at 2:30 pm)
Dan Pondella	Absent
Eric Stein	Present

#### *Staff Present*

Lia Protopapadakis, TAC Coordinator  
Guangyu Wang, Deputy Director

#### *Members of the Public*

Alex Steele, LACSD  
Laura Nunez, MBC

### PUBLIC FORUM

None

### GENERAL BUSINESS

- a. *Order of the Agenda.* Approved with no changes.
- b. *Approval of Meeting Minutes.* Ambrose noted he had emailed some comments to Protopapadakis, Bay identified a few omissions, and Dojiri emailed comments in his absence. The minutes were approved by consensus with the abovementioned changes (moved by Bay, seconded by Hoenicke).
- c. *Reports from the Chair, Subcommittees, and Staff*

*Chair Report.* The chair had nothing to report.

*Subcommittee Report.* Protopapadakis gave the report for Pondella. A revised timeline for the Wetland White Paper will be completed soon. The goal is to release it shortly after the State of the Bay Report, but not so soon as to cause competition for staff and TAC time and media attention.

*Discussion.* The TAC appreciated the attempt to prevent a work overload.

*Staff Report.* Wang reported that the Governing Board approved an augmentation of funds for a project to remove fish migration barriers along Arroyo Sequit. The City of Los Angeles also

*our mission: to restore and enhance the santa monica bay through actions and partnerships that improve water quality, conserve and rehabilitate natural resources, and protect the bay's benefits and values*





# bay restoration commission

STEWARDS OF SANTA MONICA BAY

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

gave a presentation regarding their sewer line upgrade project occurring in the Marina Del Rey/West Los Angeles areas. Also, the SMBRC hosted the annual Watershed Advisory Committee to begin planning for next year's work plan. This year, in addition to the meeting, an online survey was also available for the general public who were not able to attend the meeting. A summary of the comments will be presented to the SMBRC Executive Committee and Governing Board and incorporated into next year's work plan. In general staff anticipates more emphasis being placed on the impacts of climate change. Protopapadakis added that at the upcoming Governing Board meeting, they will receive a presentation on the source ID study at Topanga Lagoon. Protopapadakis also noted that the Executive Director decided that we would publish the State of the Bay Report as a special edition of the Urban Coast journal; the details will be worked out soon. *Discussion.* There was interest in who was giving the Topanga Lagoon presentation and the prospect of publishing the Report as a special edition of the Urban Coast.

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

*Report:* Stein reported that he and Ambrose have submitted a Sea Grant proposal to look at the effect of sea level rise on coastal wetlands with the goal of helping managers make decisions about how to manage and/or restore wetlands in the face of climate change. *Discussion.* Hoenicke noted that the Delta Stewardship program sponsors UC Sea Grant science fellows with the equivalent of a Post Doc type position and offered to share the call for sponsors when it comes out with Stein and Ambrose.

*Report.* Ambrose gave an update on Sea Star Wasting syndrome. There have been huge sea star recruitment events in other places, but so far nothing of the kind has been seen in the Santa Monica Bay. In addition, purple urchins are now showing signs of an illness, although how widespread and what is the cause has not been determined. *Discussion.* None.

*Public Comment.* None.

## AGENDA ITEM 3: Discuss Habitat Health Assessments

*Presentation:* Protopapadakis presented an overview of the timeline for completing the State of the Bay Report and described the process by which staff expects the Habitat Assessments will be completed (working with the previously established groups for Beach, Rocky Intertidal, and Coastal Pelagic habitat; working with select people for Wetlands, Freshwater Aquatic, Rocky Reef, and Soft Bottom Benthos). In addition, extent indicators for surfgrass, eelgrass, and deep canyons will be presented alongside their respective habitats. Then Protopapadakis presented each of the three frameworks that have already been developed (for Beaches, Rocky Intertidal, and Coastal Pelagic).

*Discussion:*

*Regarding the Timeline:* Ambrose suggested that it might be good to have several TAC members participate in the presentation to the Governing Board.

*Regarding the Freshwater Aquatic assessment:* What was being referred to as "riparian" habitat should instead be referred to as "freshwater aquatic and riparian" habitat. Stein suggested coordinating with State Parks regarding data for this habitat.

*Regarding the wetland assessment:* Wetland habitat should be referred to as "Coastal Wetlands".

*Regarding the overview to the section:* This should describe where the management goals came from (i.e. goals listed are identified in the Bay Restoration Plan except where otherwise noted), how this relates to the Bay Restoration Plan (BRP) and Comprehensive Monitoring Plan (CMP) (i.e.. goals identified here that are not in the BRP may be added and indicators identified here that are not in the

*our mission: to restore and enhance the santa monica bay through actions and partnerships that improve water quality, conserve and rehabilitate natural resources, and protect the bay's benefits and values*





# bay restoration commission

STEWARDS OF SANTA MONICA BAY

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

CMP may be added), and discuss the progress in developing these assessments.

*Regarding the assessment text:* In addition to the description of the habitat, the text should be specific about whether it is discussing management goals or actions or both. The text should also describe which indicators are to be used for the assessment and if any substitutions were made in the absence of data. It should also include a summary of the assessment findings, whether any of the trends raise research questions, and identify any research needs. Furthermore, goals should be tied to indicators. Could also borrow and update the text from the last report.

*Regarding scoring the assessments:* There are several possible ways to present the data. One idea is to determine the overall status and trend for the habitat by consensus and BPJ, then give the status and trend for each habitat assessment category (extent, structure, biology) numerically. Another idea is to numerically score the overall habitat by score each metric and then average them. A third approach is to score as % of management goal. When we do develop the approach for rolling the assessment into a single score, the process should be described in detail so that it can be unrolled again. Hoenicke offered that the San Francisco Estuary Program had developed indices that allow them to roll and unroll their assessments. He will compile the description of the process and method they used and send to the group. Another challenge in scoring the habitats will be giving a score for the entire region, separate sub regions or individual sites. One option is to include a metric that relates to the spatial pattern of scores for the habitat (i.e. is the condition homogeneous across the region or are good and bad scores clustered together) that can be incorporated into the overall score. Regional monitoring programs deal with this using area weighting (i.e. what % of the area is above the threshold of concern). However, this approach is best used when the sampling design is randomized. However, the philosophy could be adapted.

*Regarding infrastructure needs for future assessments:* Rainer recommended developing the infrastructure to complete assessments in the future and suggested the State Sea Grant Fellows as a good source. Other ideas were to set up a program for student interns through the Bay Foundation, LMU and UCLA to teach students how to conduct assessments and also have students work on the assessments in future years. Data management will also be an issue. The data need to be centralized or accessible through a centralized location, such as the Bay Foundation's Center for Santa Monica Bay Studies.

*Regarding indicators used for the assessments:* Selected indicators need to be refined and should be cumulative over time (# acres restored Vs # projects each year). In addition, it would be nice to have icons associated with each metric to indicate whether data exists, or it exists, but hasn't been compiled yet, etc. The different habitats have different types of indicators selected, which will make treating them the same challenging. For example the beach metrics are mostly single indicators, where as the Rocky Intertidal and Coastal Pelagic metrics are groupings of several indicators.

*Regarding the Rocky Intertidal assessment:* The management goals need to be rephrased as goals and include more from the BRP. Important management actions should be discussed in the text rather than in the management goals section. Ambrose commented that it would be helpful to use these to coordinate with data collection groups, such as MARINE's biodiversity surveys for future reports.

*Public Comment:* None.

## AGENDA ITEM 4: Discuss State of the Bay Stories

*Presentation:* Protopapadakis presented the table of contents with the completion status of each story identified. She also asked whether the stories that hadn't been written yet should be dropped or not. She then presented each of the stories to be reviewed during the meeting. The TAC will review the stories that were not reviewed during the meeting (numbers 4.3.1, 2.1, 4.3.3a, 4.3.3b, and 4.3.3b sidebar) on their own time and submit feedback via dropbox by next week.

*our mission:* to restore and enhance the santa monica bay through actions and partnerships that improve water quality, conserve and rehabilitate natural resources, and protect the bay's benefits and values





# bay restoration commission

STEWARDS OF SANTA MONICA BAY

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

*Discussion:* Generally, there is a lot of variation in detail, length, and style between articles. This will be cleaned up by staff before the TAC sees the final version in June. The following is organized numerically by story, not in the order discussed.

*Regarding the Table of Contents:* The content that would have been in the sidebar on climate change and water supply (2.1 sidebar) should be incorporated into the section overview and focus (2.1) if it hasn't already. The Delta Stewardship Council may have some information regarding snowpack recycling. Ambrose suggested asking Carol Blanchette to write the MPA update story (3.1.3) given that Dan may be overwhelmed. Ambrose will try to write the Sea Star Wasting Syndrome story (3.2.3) and the Climate Change looking ahead story (4.1). Guangyu will try to write the Santa Monica Mountains Land Use story (4.3.1a), however if it doesn't happen in time, it won't be a big loss. We will drop the sidebars on access to local seafood and sea otter (both 3.2.4 sidebars) and the sidebars on value of local beaches and climate change induced coastal squeeze (both 4.3.2 sidebars).

*2.1 Sidebar: Examples of Low Impact Development.* This sidebar should be organized as follows: an introduction explaining that LID can occur at many scales and the following are examples. Then organize the information by type. Under each type there should be a photo, an example, and the related resources. Selected examples should emphasize SMBRC's work, where possible.

*2.2 Sidebar: Benthic TMDL for Malibu Creek and Lagoon.* The title is wrong. It should be "Benthic" not "Sediment". The story could be shortened and should mainly focus on what is interesting (the newness of the method, rather than the process taken to get there). Protopapadakis will reach out to the author about the requested changes, while Stein will make the revisions before sending to the author for her final edits. The process was controversial and we need to be sensitive to that.

*2.2.1b The Ballona Wetlands: Nature's Water Treatment System.* Overall, it needs to be merged with Dorjiri's story on LFDs in such a way that it focuses on meeting Bacterial TMDLs. This combined story should be outlined as follows: How can bacteria be removed? A watershed wide approach would include LFDs, restoring flow to wetlands, bioswales, LID (reference Prop 84 projects), and the removal in inputs (sewage leakage, picking up dog poop, etc). Dorsey will work with Dojiri and Ambrose's Post Doc to combine and revise the stories.

*2.2.1 Sidebar: Epidemiology Studies in Southern California.* The story is generally good. The comparison between the 1995 study and the 2009 study is confusing as written. It can probably be cleaned up by removing the information about the correlation and can focus on the behavioral change and the relationship between contamination and illness. Protopapadakis will make the edits before sharing a final with the author and Bay will check with the author about whether there were additional steps Malibu was planning on taking (in addition to Legacy Park retention basin and the Wastewater treatment system to take the colony and civic center off septic systems).

*2.2.1 Sidebar: Preventing Boat Sewage Discharges.* This story is generally good, it just needs a final look-through for style and tone.

*2.2.2 Toxics TMDLs.* The introduction needs to be more specifically about Toxics. In addition, Guangyu will add information about the EPA's approach to remediating the DDT deposit following the coming meeting that the EPA is having on the subject.

*2.2.3 Trash and Debris.* When discussing the TMDL goal of achieving zero trash by 2015, should comment on how likely it is that this happen. Also discuss the revision to the TMDL. A biplot comparing the rank of each trash item in the beach cleanup data Vs the rank on streams might be a better chart. A recent LA Times article on the movement of trash through the watershed might be a useful graphic to look at. The article still needs to be finished and additional information from the beach cleanup data. Bay cautioned about the representativeness of the annual beach data. References need to be added.

*our mission: to restore and enhance the santa monica bay through actions and partnerships that improve water quality, conserve and rehabilitate natural resources, and protect the bay's benefits and values*





# bay restoration commission

STEWARDS OF SANTA MONICA BAY

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

**2.3.1 Contaminants of Emerging Concern.** Keith Maruya, from SCCWRP, is the third author for the article. Meredith Williams should be acknowledged. The table should be taken out of the sidebar. The additional constituents monitored by the Santa Monica Bay POTWs that are not part of the pilot monitoring program should just be listed in the sidebar with a reference to Table 1 for the others. Figure two needs the shoreline added, and the Santa Monica Bay watershed should be highlighted. In addition, an inset showing just the Santa Monica Bay Watershed should be included. The fact that the Dominquez watershed wasn't included in the study should be noted.

**3.2.1 Red Legged Frog Recovery.** The article is better, but the writing style still needs some work. It would also be helpful to know what proportion the Santa Monica bay population represents and how it is doing in relation to other populations in the region. USGS has a region-wide monitoring program and should have this data. References and photo credits and captions are also needed.

**3.2.2 Grunion.** The paragraph about grooming needs an additional sentence explaining that as wrack accumulates, the public often questions why it is there and that in addition to helping grunion, wrack provides all sorts of other benefits to the beach ecosystem. The evidence suggesting grunion have never been abundant prior to 2002 needs to be described and cited (references are also needed throughout). The paragraph describing fishing for grunion needs to include a sentence on why the behavior of fishermen impacts grunion spawning. Additionally, a picture of grunion fishing, a graph showing the median run size changing over time, and a map indicating temporal trends in grunion runs would enhance the story.

**3.2.2 Sidebar: Climate Change, Grunion and Coastal Squeeze.** Correct the statement that 1/3 of the beaches in California are armored (should be southern California). The fact that air temperature is critical for incubation should be included in the article. One important distinction that grunion have that could be emphasized more in the story are the unique constraints grunion face when adapting to climate change. Typically, adaptation can come in the form of phenological and distributional changes. However, grunion will have difficulty spawning earlier in the season to avoid hotter temperatures because the high tides do not occur at night earlier in the season and the grunion range is limited to the south by air temperature and to the north by the availability of sandy beaches, making a shift north more challenging. The sentence about grunion vulnerability to changes in water quality should be moved to the main article.

**3.2.4 Fishery Management.** The text of table 3 should be incorporated into the story. In addition, the definition of each category needs to be better defined and described, in particular what "active management" and "not managed," mean. The categories for Management Status should be changed to: Actively managed w/ a stock assessment, monitored, not monitored, and not managed. The categories for Population Status should be changed to: Stable, Rebuilding, Declining, and Unknown. In addition, the text should discuss the status of management and the status of the populations, fishery independent data and data gaps.

**4.2.1 Rapid Measurement of Enterococci in Beach Water.** This story is intended as a focus article and should also include a discussion of QMRA and source specific markers and how the interpretation of samples might be different when using these instead of fecal indicator bacteria. It should also go into more detail on the challenges and tradeoffs such as how the genetic test does not identify live vs inert bacteria and could pick up dead bacteria or pieces of bacterial cells being released from treatment facilities. It also needs a final paragraph on implementation (i.e. what the timeline is) and the new EPA regulations. References are needed throughout. An image showing what the QPCR devise looks like and another showing the digital sign from the pilot study at Doheny Beach parking lot should be added. Protopapadakis will see if John Griffith, the article's author can make the changes. If not, she will look for other authors, such as Jenny Jay.

**4.3.2 Coastal Sediment Management.** The article should include a discussion of efforts to manage sand, how armoring causes erosion, beach nourishment from dredge spoils, the littoral cells

*our mission: to restore and enhance the santa monica bay through actions and partnerships that improve water quality, conserve and rehabilitate natural resources, and protect the bay's benefits and values*





# bay restoration commission

STEWARDS OF SANTA MONICA BAY

---

santa monica bay restoration commission / 320 west 4<sup>th</sup> street, ste 200; los angeles, california 90013  
213/576-6615 phone / 213/576-6646 fax / [www.smbrc.ca.gov](http://www.smbrc.ca.gov)

including Ringe Dam, and a summary. References, and image, and a figure (e.g. the number of nourishment projects planned each year, etc.) should be added to the article. One source of data could be the various agency reports about sand management.

*Public Comment:* Alex Steele noted the risk in replacing the bacteria culture technique for beach water quality with a genetic one in that the culture technique identifies living bacteria, not dead cells.

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEXT MEETING:** The next TAC meeting will be on June 29. However, there will be a full TAC conference call in May to discuss developing the assessments. Two, 2-hr blocks of time on different dates will be targeted. Staff will try 5/18 and 5/22. There will be two conference calls with subcommittees of the TAC, selected by Protopapadakis, to review the Water and Living Resources sections of the report and their respective Looking Ahead stories. A tentative date was identified for the State of the Bay Conferences.

The meeting adjourned at 3:40pm.

*our mission: to restore and enhance the santa monica bay through actions and partnerships that improve water quality, conserve and rehabilitate natural resources, and protect the bay's benefits and values*

