

BOG Meeting Summary

August 19, 2011

In attendance: Terry Fleming, Mark Stephenson, Autumn Bonnema, Jay Davis, Gary Ichikawa, Jon Marshack, Cassandra Lamerdin, Eric von der Geest, Max Puckett, Dave Crane, Janis Cooke, Jennifer Doherty, Trevor xx

Item 1: Roll Call, Review of Agenda, Updates

Key Points

- The meeting had limited attendance. The group agreed to summarize the decisions made and distribute the summary to the full group for review and discussion.
- Dave Crane described recently obtained preliminary results on some very high concentrations of PCBs for fish samples from Silverwood Lake.

Action Items

- Distribute a summary of the meeting to the full group for review and discussion.
- The preliminary data for Silverwood Lake will be distributed to the group. They are for BOG members only and are not to be distributed or cited.

Item 2: BOG Strategy Development: Preliminary Discussion

Key Points

- The group reviewed the document “BOG Strategy Elements” in detail. The document “Potential BOG Elements” was not discussed in detail due to time limitations.
- The group agreed that the problem statement, goals, and recommendations in “BOG Strategy Elements” were a good start for the BOG Strategy.
- The problem statement should also capture the need to improve coordination among agencies in communicating to the public. A recent example of this was the uncoordinated press releases by OEHHA and the State Board during the week of May 23.
- The problem statement should also capture the need for synthesis and reporting.
- Pulling in all of the available data on bioaccumulation is a significant undertaking. It will be good to come up with a way to prioritize among the datasets.
- The scope of BOG efforts should include supporting bioaccumulation monitoring at the local scale as well as the regional and statewide scale. Providing guidance on monitoring protocols, data management, and perhaps synthesis and reporting would be appropriate for the local scale.
- The problem and goal statements should explicitly state what we are trying to protect – the health of humans and aquatic life.
- The term aquatic life includes wildlife.
- The Council can and should assist with bringing more participants to the workgroup.

- The strategy should be a tool for communicating the value of participation in the BOG.
- Participants should include groups that can partner with BOG on BOG activities (monitoring, data management, communication) and that can join in the effort to obtain funds for bioaccumulation monitoring and related activities.
- The BOG can also form a stakeholder group which is not directly involved in BOG activities but would be interested in periodic updates.
- Emerging contaminants and biotoxins are important bioaccumulation topics that also need to be addressed by the BOG. The NOAA mussel watch effort and DPH biotoxin monitoring are covering these topics for the time being. A draft report on mussel monitoring that describes the DPH program (in addition to summarizing State Board and NOAA mussel monitoring) is nearing completion and will be distributed to the BOG soon.

Action Items

- Develop a draft strategy to present to the Council two weeks before the October meeting.
- Update the problem and goals statements based on the feedback received – partially done (more to come)

Item 3: **Potential Bioaccumulation Elements for 2011/2012**

- The group discussed five potential monitoring elements for 2011/2012 and briefly discussed other elements (strategy development and portal development). The documents “Project descriptions”, “Project 1c”, and “FY08 Statewide Hg BAFs” were reviewed. Autumn Bonnema provided cost estimates for the monitoring tasks. The “Project Descriptions” file was updated to include these cost estimates.
- Approximately \$500,000 is available for BOG tasks in 2011/2012. Approximately \$200,000 is going to management, coordination, and peer review (\$120,000) and \$50,000 is going to strategy development. That leaves approximately \$300,000 for monitoring, portal development, or other tasks.

Key Points

- Brief summaries of the discussion for each potential element are presented below. The goal is to determine which of these proposals should be developed further for consideration for inclusion in the workplan for 2011/2012.
- There is consensus that developing a strategy should be an element of the workplan for 2011/2012.
- In summary, proposals 1b, a combination of 1c and 1e, and portal development are the potential tasks that had the strongest support.
- **1a) Revisit Lakes That Were Inadequately Characterized**
 - The members present did not support this proposal. Drawbacks mentioned included a lack of value on the statewide scale and limited value in helping sell the program. The work should be done by the regions rather than the statewide program.
- **1b) SWAMP/EPA Probability Survey**
 - There were no objections to this proposal.

- **1c) Determining Mercury Concentrations in Fish Species from Representative California Reservoirs**
 - The group liked the idea of combining this study with study 1e. No objections to this study were raised.
- **1d) Establish Time Series for Sport Fish at Selected Lakes**
 - The members present did not support this proposal. Drawbacks mentioned included limited value and no expectation of change in the absence of management actions. Trend monitoring would be useful if the Water Boards have plans to take actions – then it would be valuable to monitor those lakes and control lakes.
- **1e) FWS BAF Study**
 - The group liked the idea of combining this study with study 1c. Jay Davis suggested that USGS might be interested in collaborating on this study. The possibility of three agencies (State Board, USFWS, USGS) working together on this study is attractive. It would be especially attractive if USFWS and USGS could bring additional resources to the table. Janis Cooke noted that whether there really is a wildlife problem is a common question. A key question is whether the BAFs obtained would really have applicability statewide. Janis commented that this approach is being taken with the statewide TMDL.
- **Portal Development**
 - This was mentioned briefly but is still a candidate for inclusion in the 2011/2012 BOG budget. It would be nice to find other (non-BOG) funds for this so more resources are available for performing needed monitoring.

Action Items

- Distribute this summary to the BOG for additional discussion.
- Pending general BOG approval, further develop proposals 1b and the combined 1c/1e.
- Bring a recommendation from the BOG to the Roundtable at their meeting on 9/14.

Item 4: Next Meetings

- Meetings were tentatively set for 9/14 from 1:30-3:30 (after the RT meeting) and 10/6 from 1:30-3:30.
- Agenda Items
 - Develop a recommendation for BOG work in 2011/2012 to bring to the Roundtable on 9/14.