

Sediment Quality Objectives Stakeholder Advisory Committee

Meeting Summary

August 6, 2014

Note: The list of attendees and the meeting agenda follow the meeting minutes. Additional materials from the meeting (PowerPoint presentations) have been sent to each Committee member and interested party along with this meeting summary. Meeting materials will also be posted on the SCCWRP website at: <http://www.sccwrp.org/ResearchAreas/Contaminants.aspx>. Under this program heading, there are separate webpages for “Direct Effects in Bays,” “Delta Direct Effects Assessment,” and “Sediment Contaminant Effects on Humans and Wildlife.”

Another note: The summary captures the major issues presented and discussed during the meeting, though they are not intended either as formal minutes, or an exhaustive record of all comments made. Rather the summary is intended to provide participants and other interested parties with a general description of topics addressed and different perspectives on those topics.

Where it contributes to the readability of the summary, discussion of the same issue that occurred at more than one place during the meeting is summarized together. Items on which the Committee expressed general agreement are indicated **in bold**, although it is important to emphasize that the Committee did not vote on these items. General agreement was assessed by the facilitator although no votes were taken. Specific commitments by State Board staff, SCCWRP, the facilitator, or Committee members are also indicated **in bold**.

Meeting objectives

The objectives of the meeting were to:

- Provide an update on adjustments to the project schedule
- Summarize the status of committee discussions as of the last meeting on September 17, 2013
- Summarize the status of thinking on implementation issues for both direct and indirect effects
- Summarize recent technical efforts conducted as part of the Ports TMDL case study
- Summarize recent progress on the statewide application of the indirect effects decision tool
- Discuss the structure of the advisory committee moving forward
- Identify issues the committee wishes to consider at subsequent meetings

The following notes do not repeat material contained in the presentations but focus instead on key issues identified during the discussion.

Update on program status

(see Adv comm mtng 08-06-14 Existing Milestones Beegan.pdf and Adv comm mtng 08-06-14 Technical Update Bay.pdf distributed with the meeting summary)

Chris Beegan and Steve Bay summarized the current program status, from both programmatic and technical perspectives. Key points noted included:

- Schedule revised to allow for Ports TMDL work to make more progress and results incorporated into the SQO policy (Beegan slide #2)

- The focus of the indirect effects SQO is on chlorinated hydrocarbons. The project may attempt to examine prospects for modeling other pollutants such as PDBEs, but this will not be a major effort
- Presentation slides from a San Diego Regional Water Board information meeting on recent bioaccumulation studies in San Diego Bay are included with the meeting summary (SD_Bay_Studies_Meeting_Slides 07-30-14.pdf)
- There is no funding to complete development of a direct effects assessment tool for the Delta; any new funding will go toward indirect effects (bioaccumulation) and improving guidance for stressor identification for direct effects in bays

Summary of previous meeting

(see Adv comm mtng 08-06-14 mtng review slides.pptx distributed with the meeting summary)

Brock Bernstein reviewed results of the last Stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting in September 2013, focusing on the status at that time of the assessment framework and the categorization of outstanding regulatory issues.

After reviewing the current membership of the Bays and Delta advisory committees, **participants agreed that the two should be combined into a single advisory committee. Brock Bernstein will contact members to confirm their continuing interest and will prepare a consolidated roster for the project's review and approval.**

Ports case study: Compliance implementation

(see Adv comm mtng 08-06-14 Status Harbors Test Drive Beegan.pdf distributed with the meeting summary)

Discussion highlighted the following issues:

- Re slide #4, it was emphasized that a finding of “impacted” under the direct effects SQO refers only to changes likely due to toxic chemicals; impacts due to other pollutants, e.g., nutrients, would not be an impact under the SQO policy
- Re slides #7 – 9, segregating hotspots so that just a hotspot would be listed has been discussed but might require a redefinition of waterbodies and waterbody segments, something that must be approved by USEPA; however participants pointed out that such flexibility does currently exist in the 303d listing policy
- Re slide #8, it is possible to delist using a weight of evidence approach, but the relevant Regional Board would have to be willing to apply this approach
- Re slide #9, discussion is focusing on other approaches, e.g., based on area, that move away from the binomial test in the current listing policy
- Re slides #14 – 15, if stressor identification demonstrates that a TMDL is targeted at the wrong chemical, then the TMDL can be changed but the underlying listing for benthic impact would remain in place

Ports case study: Technical work

(see Adv comm mtng 08-06-14 Port_ScienceStudiesC.pdf distributed with the meeting summary)

Andrew Jirik (Port of Los Angeles) and James Vernon (Port of Long Beach) summarized technical studies conducted as part of the effort to prepare for the TMDL reopener. The studies fit within the definition of the more detailed, site-specific studies envisioned for Tier III of the indirect effects SQO.

This effort has been ongoing for the past year or more while the State Board's SQO effort was waiting for additional funding. A key issue for the committee will therefore be to ensure coordination with the Ports case study being conducted by the Harbors Technical Working Group (HTWG).

Statewide application of assessment tool

(see Adv comm mtng 08-06-14 HH SQO Application Bay.pdf distributed with the meeting summary)

Steve Bay reviewed the SQO indirect effects assessment framework and the results of earlier sensitivity analyses that highlighted the importance of a key subset of the input parameters (slides #1 – 23).

Steve Bay then reviewed results of a recent statewide application of the Tier I and Tier II assessment tools (slides #24 – 39).

Plan future activities

Discussion of the assessment tool and the regulatory framework highlighted a number of specific issues that will be prioritized and addressed at future meetings. These include:

- For the direct effects SQO, clarify the process for reopening a TMDL when new information changes the identified stressor(s)
- Revisit the Tier I decision criteria related to whether a finding of clean tissue can outweigh a finding of contaminated sediment
- Share the dataset used in the statewide Tier I vs Tier II assessment with the committee when available
- Identify minimum site characteristics required for a meaningful assessment, e.g., size, amount/type of data
- Determine how to validate that the assessment approach is appropriate to a specific site, e.g., is white croaker in the assumed location in the food web (perhaps a major meeting topic)
- Examine how spatial patterns in sediment contamination (e.g., hotspots, elevated regional background) should be addressed in the assessment and in guidance for remedy planning
- Determine how technical studies by the Ports of LA and Long Beach can be integrated and coordinated with the SQO project
- Revisit the overall regulatory framework included in the summary of the September 2013 meeting
 - Clarify whether Tier II can/should be bypassed and the assessment move directly from Tier I to Tier III
 - Consider how compliance will be evaluated, including for TMDL allocations
 - Consider the basis for 303d listings, especially in cases where Tier I and Tier II contradict each other
- Provide guidance on selection of cancer risk factor(s) to use in assessment, e.g., percent of state impacted using different risk factors
- Ensure that the policy clearly states any limits on the applicability of the assessment tool to specific chemicals
- Identify the trophic transfer factors used in the bioaccumulation model
- Examine how the bioaccumulation model could be run backwards to help identify targets for sediment contaminant levels as part of remedy planning
- Provide guidance on how best to meet the timeline for policy implementation
- Determine what data will be used for the economic analysis and how the choice of cancer risk factor could affect the cost of implementation
- Stakeholder committee to review and comment on the draft update to be prepared for the Scientific Steering Committee

- Continue efforts to fill the NGO environmental protection positions on the committee, expanding the search to include those that deal with health/socioeconomics

Next meeting and next steps

The next committee meeting will take place sometime in November. Brock Bernstein will distribute a Doodle poll with tentative dates.

Attendees

Name	Organization	Representing	Position
<i>Staff</i>			
Steve Bay	SCCWRP		
Chris Beegan	State Water Resources Control Board		
Doris Vidal-Dorsch	SCCWRP		
Brock Bernstein	Facilitator		
Bridget McCann			
<i>Committee</i>			
Kevin Buchan	Western States Petroleum Association	Industrial SW	Alternate
Karen Cowan	Larry Walker Associates	POTWs	Primary
Tess Dunham	Somach, Simmons, & Dunn	POTWs	Alternate
Lisa Haney	Orange County Sanitation Districts	POTWs	Alternate
Kathryn Curtis	Port of Los Angeles	Ports	Primary
Susan Paulsen	Exponent	Industrial Direct	Primary
<i>Other Participants</i>			
Geremew Amenu	LA County Public Works		
Jennifer Arblaster	Environ		
Frank Cheng	LA County Dept. of Public Works		
Jason Conder	Environ		
Andrea Crumpacker	Weston Solutions		
Elaine Darby	Anchor QEA		
Will Gala	Chevron		
Philip Gibbons	Port of San Diego		
Rich Gossett	Physis Labs		
Tom Grovhaug	Larry Walker Associates		
Brian Hitchens	Geosyntec Consultants		
Sheila Holt	Weston Solutions		
Wendy Hovel	Anchor QEA		
Emiko Innes	LA County of Public Works		
Andrew Jirik	Port of Los Angeles		
Scott Johnson	Aquatic Bioassay & Consulting		
Ami Latker	City of San Diego Public Utilities		
Leslie Lundgren	Environment and Nuclear Bus Group		
Michael Lyons (P)	LA Regional Water Board		
Mayela Manasjan	City of Encinitas		
Tom McDonnell	Brown and Caldwell		
Laura McWilliams	Haley & Aldrich		
Jennifer Miller	Vista Analytical Laboratory		
Chris Minto	Larry Walker Associates		
David Moore	Environ		

Tim Murphy	City of Encinitas
Taraneh Nik-Khah	City of Los Angeles
Thanhloan Nguyen	LA Regional Water Board
LB Nye	LA Regional Water Board
Jian Peng (P)	Orange County Stormwater Program
Chris Stransky	AMEC
Chi-Li Tang	LA County Sanitation Districts
James Veron	Port of Long Beach
Adam Walukiewicz	Assoc. of California Water Agencies
Marsha Westrap	Orange County Water District
Vada Yoon	Flow Science
Clayton Yoshida	LA Department of Water and Power
Charlie Yu	City of Los Angeles

Agenda

Sediment Quality Objectives Advisory Committee Meeting
August 6, 2014, from 9:30 to 3:30
Southern California Coastal Water Research Project
3535 Harbor Blvd., Suite 110, Costa Mesa, CA 92626.

9:30 – 9:45	Introductions	Brock Bernstein
9:45 – 10:00	Update on Program Status	Chris Beegan
10:00 – 10:15	Summary of Previous Meeting	Brock Bernstein
10:15 – 11:15	Ports Case Study – Compliance Implementation	Chris Beegan
11:15 – 12:15	Port Case Study – Technical Work	Ports staff
12:15 – 1:15	Lunch	
1:15 – 2:15	Statewide Application of Assessment Tool	Steve Bay
2:15 – 3:15	Plan Future Activities	Brock Bernstein
3:15 – 3:30	Comments and Adjourn	Brock Bernstein

Please RSVP to: Christina Steidley: christinas@sccwrp.org

Remote access information:

Webcast access site: <http://conference.sccwrp.org/>

Phone number for large conference room: 714-755-3295 code: 3535