

## BOG Meeting Summary

November 3, 2008

**In attendance:** Bob Brodberg, Terry Fleming, Aroon Melwani, Jennifer Doherty, Mark Stephenson, Autumn Bonnema, Karen Taberski, Dave Crane, Jay Davis, Gary Ichikawa, Marco Sigala, Cassandra Lamerdin, Ken Schiff, Michael Hobbs

### Key Points

- Ken Schiff reported that the Bight Group met on October 28 and in general was extremely positive about collaborating with SWAMP on the Coast Bioaccumulation Survey. They had two concerns. One was the species list, because some of the species they are interested in were not on our preliminary list. The second was reporting – they need a report on their region by September 2011. On the species question, a revised list of target species discussed at the meeting alleviated their concern. On reporting, the group again endorsed the importance of producing a report on year 1 of the study in order to demonstrate the value of the program on an annual basis. Following this plan, the report covering the Bight region will be completed in January 2011, well before the September deadline.
- Bob Brodberg noted some concern about the Bight labs producing comparable data to the Water Pollution Control Lab (WPCL). Some of the data from these labs weren't comparable to data from the MSRP. The group agreed that it would be important to perform an intercalibration as early as possible (first quarter of 2009) to work through any inconsistencies.
- Ken suggested that joint meetings of the BOG and the Bight Group may be appropriate at some stage.
- Gary Ichikawa has checked with all of the Regions on the proposed zone delineations. Bob Brodberg indicated that OEHHA is willing to go along with the Regions decisions on this.
- A revised list of primary and secondary target species was presented and discussed, and agreed on in general terms by the group. A subgroup of Bob Brodberg, Gary Ichikawa, Autumn Bonnema, Ken Schiff, Mark Stephenson, Jennifer Doherty, and Jay Davis will resolve the remaining details.
- The group agreed that the most important criteria in order of priority for selecting species are: 1) popular for consumption; 2) sensitive indicators of problems; 3) spatial distribution.
- Bob Brodberg noted that it would be useful for OEHHA to have omega-3 fatty acid data on the species to be sampled. The group did not make a decision on this.
- Mark Stephenson provided a rationale for analyzing mercury in individual fish for selected target species. The data would allow for more precise definition of spatial patterns and comparison to health risk thresholds. Including analysis of mercury in individual fish would mean sampling fewer zones. Karen Taberski liked the idea of looking at individuals for at least one species per zone. The group agreed that the budget should be developed to allow evaluation of this option. There was some discussion of potential target species. Rockfish and

- lingcod may be good candidates. Mercury is not a drive in southern CA as it is in northern CA. Sharks may be too variable.
- Bob Brodberg indicated that the estimated Aroclor concentrations are no longer needed by OEHHA.
  - Arsenic was discussed as a potential analyte. We would need to get speciation data, as it is the inorganic form that is a small fraction of total arsenic and toxic. Bob Brodberg recommended not including arsenic and the group agreed.
  - Bob also indicated that selenium would be a minor concern and not worth including, and the group agreed.
  - Bob didn't think cadmium would be a significant concern, though it hasn't been looked at.
  - SCCWRP is interested in doing PBDEs and maybe PFCs in southern CA fish to complement the measurements being made in San Francisco Bay.
  - Regarding dioxins, Karen Taberski thought it would be valuable to get some perspective from other parts of the state to help interpret data from SF Bay. Such data might have a bearing on the need for a TMDL in SF Bay.
  - We should decide whether we apply the 75% rule after we get information on the size ranges of the target species. Bob Brodberg noted that for advisory development strict application of the 75% rule is not necessarily a good approach.

#### **Action Items**

- Ken, Dave, and Mark Stephenson will meet to work out a strategy for WPCL involvement in the 2009 work.
- Mark Stephenson and Jay Davis to develop proposed approach and rationale for analyzing mercury in individual fish in bays and estuaries.
- Bob dig out HML dioxin data for the coast.
- Ken Schiff to check with the Bight Group labs on trading samples between 2009 and 2010 in order to distribute the workload with the Water Pollution Control Lab.
- Dave Crane and Michael Lyons to estimate the number of samples to be analyzed with Region 4 dollars.
- Dave Crane to develop a plan (tasks and timeline) for the intercalibration between the organics labs. Developing a consistent analyte (congeners) list should be part of this. Lipid should also be included in the intercalibration.
- Cassandra Lamerdin will talk with Shelly at SCCWRP to work out how to get data from the Bight labs into SWAMP format.
- Karen Taberski will look into whether she can obtain funds to augment the budget for dioxin analysis in order to obtain data from other coastal areas in CA. If these analyses are done, they would be sent to Axys Analytical along with RMP samples.
- SFEI should keep Keith Maruya from SCCWRP apprised of emerging contaminant monitoring in SF Bay.
- Jay Davis will arrange a meeting of the species selection subgroup to work out remaining details on species selection.

