

**THE SANTA MONICA BAY RESTORATION COMMISSION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
April 28, 2016 MEETING MINUTES**

Contact: Guangyu Wang, 231-576-6639 or [gwang@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:gwang@waterboards.ca.gov)

ATTENDANCE

*TAC Members*

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

*Staff Present*

Tom Ford, Executive Director  
Guangyu Wang, Deputy Director  
Karina Johnston  
Vicki Gambale  
Melodie Grubbs

*Members of the Public*

Alex Steele, LACSD  
Barbara Cameron, City of Malibu

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Steve Bay called the meeting to order at 9:45 am. Round robin introductions followed.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

3. GENERAL BUSINESS

a. Order of the Agenda.

Approved with no changes.

b. Approval of Meeting Minutes.

Guangyu mentioned that Mas provided his revisions to the minutes via e-mail to every member prior to the meeting and suggested that the Committee approve the minutes with the revisions incorporated. Steve handed Guangyu a copy of the minutes with his minor editorial changes and suggested that those changes also be incorporated. Mas moved to approve the minutes as amended. Eric seconded. The minutes of the 3/3/16 meeting was approved unanimously.

c. Reports from the Chair, Subcommittees, and Staff

Chair and staff report: Steve briefed the Committee on the SMBRC Governing Board meeting he attended on April 21. At the Governing Board meeting he gave a report on the 3/3/16 TAC meeting and encouraged the Governing Board to utilize more the expertise of the TAC. There was no report from the MRAC.

Tom told the Committee about the presentation he gave to the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board at its April 14 Board meeting on the progress of the Bay comprehensive monitoring program. The presentation generated more interest from the Board members than in the past. As a follow-up, he has had conversation with leadership of the State Water Resource Control Board regarding more resources for fulfilling EWMP-related and other monitoring needs in the region. Tom also informed the Committee that the Congress just passed the bill reauthorizing the funding for the National Estuary Program, which will guarantee NEP funding at a higher level for at least the next five years.

Guangyu mentioned the Watershed Advisory Committee meeting held on March 30, 2016, thanked Mas for attending on behalf of the TAC, and asked Mas to share his observation. Mas told the Committee that he provided comment and suggested that more outreach should be down to publicize the State of the Bay report.

d. Member comments

Steve asked Alex from LACSD to give an update on the pH sensor installation project that the TAC discussed at the last meeting. Alex told the Committee that one of the sensors has been received and they plan to deploy the sensor package in June. He confirmed that thermistors will also be deployed along with the pH and CO<sub>2</sub> sensors and said the data will be integrated with data generated by SCCOOS and C-CAN network and will be used by SCCWRP's regional modeling effort. Rich commented that he is glad to see the sensors will be placed at relatively shallow depth because the current information on ocean acidification comes mainly from large-scale ocean monitoring and modeling and we need to know how this information translate to the influence on nearshore and intertidal environment. Eric told the Committee about the ichthyoplankton bar-coding technique study newly-initiated by SCCWRP and LACSD.

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION: BAY RESTORATION PLAN CLIMATE CHANGE VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT PROJECT PHASE 1 – REVIEW OF EXISTING INFORMATION AND PHASE 2 – RISK IDENTIFICATION

Tom briefly introduced the goals and objectives of the project. Melodie then gave a Power Point presentation and mentioned that staff wants feedback from the TAC on the overarching process moving forward.

Mas informed the Committee that a climate resilience and adaptation study conducted by the City of LA's Bureau of Sanitation will be completed and presented next month. He will share the study report with the staff and the Committee once it is available.

Karina asked the TAC to provide recommendations and agreement on what the risk assessment matrix should look like, whether changes/adjustments are needed to the framework provided in the EPA workbook. After discussion receiving comments from several members, Steve summarized TAC recommendations as follows:

- Risk assessment will be done at the "BRP objective" level.
- Bring in experts and organize a half-day workshop for a dry-run of one objective from each section of the BRP, and finalize the approach to evaluate and prioritize risks.
- Invite other groups to help populate the matrices, utilizing the approach developed at the workshop.
- TAC helps to figure out how synthesize the results of the populated matrices.

#### 4. PRESENTATION: WORK PLAN ACTIVITIES AND SPECIFIC TASKS OF THE TAC IN THE COMING YEARS

This agenda item was presented after Item 6.

Guangyu presented a list of FY 2016 work plan tasks that involve TAC and the specific roles of TAC related to those tasks. He pointed out that most of these tasks will be carried over to the next year and some beyond next year. Rich suggested that staff give regular update to the TAC at each TAC meeting (as part of staff report) on projects that have most potential value to the TAC. Mas further suggested that staff give presentations to the TAC on projects they are responsible for.

Dan talked about the status of rocky reef index development. He pointed out that we need to start early if we want to use the index in the next State of the Bay report. Rich commented that the indices for rocky reef, rocky intertidal, and sandy beach are all related and we should continue to promote the development of these indices.

Steve wrapped up the discussion and proposed that in the remainder of the year, the TAC focuses on three activities including significant interaction with staff on the climate change vulnerability assessment project, discussion on the next State of the Bay, and storm water BMP monitoring.

#### 5. UPDATE AND DISCUSSION: PRE- AND POST STORM WATER PROJECT MONITORING AND BMP EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT

This agenda item was moved up before Item 5 because both Eric and John would like to participate in this discussion before they leave early.

Guangyu showed on screen the Prop. 84 project monitoring guideline the TAC developed and adopted in December 2014. He told the Committee that the guideline was used for Prop. 84 projects implemented after 2014 but no monitoring results from these projects yet to demonstrate how the guideline has worked. He suggested that the TAC could work to modify the guideline as they see fit, or look beyond SMBRC-funded bond projects and promote/facilitate region-wide effort to assess LID/BMP effectiveness.

Eric suggested that a first next step for the TAC should be to take a look at two ongoing efforts to see if they are useful for us. The first is an effectiveness assessment guideline developed by the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA). The second is a standardized data sheet for BMP monitoring database developed by the Stormwater Monitoring Coalition (SMC).

After receiving additional comments and suggestions on this item, Steve recommended that moving forward the TAC first work on another review of the guideline and develop a more specific data transfer format; and secondly, promotes coordination throughout the region and support effort to get a large picture.

#### 6. DISCUSSION: NOMINATION OF NEW TAC MEMBERS

Guangyu showed on screen a list of expertise represented by current TAC members and several areas of expertise that are considered missing. Steve commented that the current TAC seems to function well and membership seems to be stable. After receiving further member comments, Steve summed up the discussion by suggesting that there seems no critical need for adding new members to the TAC at this time. We can develop a list of experts and tap into the experts on the list or form subgroups as needed. The TAC should also revisit the need at least once every year.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm.