

**THE SANTA MONICA BAY RESTORATION COMMISSION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**August 30, 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	Absent
Dan Pondella	Absent
Eric Stein	Present

*Staff Present*

Tom Ford, Executive Director- SMBRC  
Jack Topel, Staff- SMBRC  
Karina Johnston, Staff- The Bay Foundation  
Melodie Grubbs, Staff- The Bay Foundation  
Ariadne Reynolds, Staff- The Bay Foundation  
Vicki Gambale, Staff- The Bay Foundation

*Members of the Public*

Hassan Rad, City of Los Angeles RAD  
Phyllis Grifman, USC Sea Grant  
Laura Nunez, MBC Environmental

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Steve Bay called the meeting to order at 9:45 am. Introductions followed.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comments.

3. GENERAL BUSINESS

a. Order of the Agenda  
Approved with no changes

b. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes  
Minutes were not sent to TAC members in advance, approval of April 28<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes was deferred until the next meeting.

c. Reports from the Chair, Subcommittees, and Staff

Tom Ford discussed the completion of the SMBNEP's annual workplan. A consent item to approve the revised workplan will be held at the next governing board meeting. The next annual work plan will begin to be developed this fall, and will incorporate some of the suggestions and changes from the BRP Climate Change Vulnerability Analysis. Staff will also soon start working on the Bay Restoration Plan update, which will be the next opportunity for the BRP Climate Change Vulnerability Analysis to have an impact on our planning. Tom also gave an update on the Southern California Bight Regional Aerial Kelp Surveys and the intersection with TBF's kelp restoration project.

Steve Bay reported that the Southern California Assessment of Rocky Reefs reports are coming out soon. The reports developed models and indices that looked at fishing pressure and water discharge plumes on rocky reefs of southern California. The Sept 9<sup>th</sup> commission meeting at SCCWRP will include a review of the findings of the Bight Report. Agenda is posted on SCCWRP website.

#### d. Member Comments

Eric Stein commented that SCCWRP is starting to think about Bight 18', which would be a good opportunity to coordinate with State of the Bay report. In general, TAC should think about how we can better coordinate regional efforts like the Bight report, State of the Bay, and other large reports.

Mas Dojiri reported that one of the biggest holes for comprehensive monitoring was the pelagic realm. Ichthyoplankton DNA barcoding study is underway. The study incorporates traditional taxonomy with DNA work. If that is successful, they can better assess impacts of outfalls. Partnership with SWFSC.

#### 4. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION: Bay Restoration Plan Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment Project Phase 3- Risk Characterization and Ranking

Melodie Grubbs gave a presentation showing results of vulnerability rankings of BRP objectives to various climate change stressors. Some changes to the assessment were made as a result of an expert panel workshop held on June 30<sup>th</sup>.

Rich Ambrose suggested using a different method to calculate the weight of exposure, adaptive capacity, and sensitivity. Instead of averaging the values, perhaps using a logic tree of some sort. He also recommended changing the definition of exposure from "impact and extent" to "intensity and extent" because impact has to do more with sensitivity.

Eric Stein commented that the extent to which we can anchor stresses into the future based on year will change with the evolution of new models. He suggested tying stressors and vulnerability more to thresholds such as aragonite saturation and sea level rise levels rather than to the specific years of 2050 and 2100. He also brought up a point of using 1980 as a baseline year instead of "current", since we are already seeing the effects of climate change in many cases, or to at least include this in a discussion section of the report. Eric also commented that we do not have high confidence in the trajectory of some climate change stressors, so how do we take that uncertainty into account over long time periods.

The group discussed how to deal with interactions and compounding effects of climate change stressors with uncertainty over time. The model is assuming the effects of most climate change stressors will be worse into the future, but this may not necessarily be true and may not take future adaptive capacity into account. Staff will look at those assumptions and make them clear in the discussion of the model. Staff will also state all assumptions of the model, and explain justification for how vulnerability numbers were arrived at and calculated.

Phyllis commented that the COSMOS 3 model will be coming online in October, plus more detail on backshore characterization of the bay and beaches.

Hassan Rad commented that the City of Los Angeles conducted a similar assessment with EPA's tool called CREATE. One item was to identify capital improvement projects in the face of climate change. One additional climate change stressor the City included was Tsunamis. However, they were dealing with structures, more straightforward, costs, etc. while this analysis is much more subjective. But the goal should still be an actionable plan.

Staff posed a question to the TAC about scaling vulnerability scores up from the objective level to the goal level. TAC agreed that it is worth doing because scaling up says something about the extent of the vulnerability. It also shows which stressors are most important for each goal, and how to look at stressors across goals. This could even lead to a new goal for the Bay that will help several goals/ objectives adapt. Still need to have more discussion about methods for scaling to the goal level.

TAC members signed up to review the vulnerability scores of objectives in their areas of expertise.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 pm.