

Attendance: Jay Davis, Jennifer Doherty, Chris Beegan, Dominic Gregorio, Michael Buckman, Rich Fadness, Karen Taberski, , Michael Lyons, Chris Foe, Terry Fleming, Bob Brodberg, Mark Stephenson, Max Puckett, Gail Cho, Josh Ackerman, Tom Maurer, Autumn Bonnema, Gary Ichikawa, Stacey Swenson, Cassandra Lamerdin, Eric von der Geest

Item 1: Roll Call, Agenda Review, General Updates

Key Points

- Bob Brodberg – Went to CalEPA Tribal Advisory Committee last week and after conversations with the tribes in attendance, he wanted to speak to the BOG about concerns of some of the tribes that the BOG is not addressing the tribal fish eating habits and consumption rates relative to the non-tribal communities.
 - Upper Lake Pomo from the Clear Lake area expressed concerns over the State not addressing tribal consumption.
 - Bob suggested adding this issue to the strategy.
 - Gail Cho would like the tribes to clarify the tissues the tribes want to monitor.
 - Previously DFG worked with the Yurok Tribe and they wanted whole-fish (sans gills) samples analyzed verses skinless filets.
 - Not all the tribes in California may be aware of the coordination that took place between the State Water Boards, Yurok and Hoopa tribes on the Klamath TMDL.
 - Terry Fleming – The tribes should be getting funding from the EPA for their own water quality monitoring. It's important to understand their needs. Suggested this be more of a coordination effort versus taking on this on as a BOG issue.

Action Items

- Jennifer Salisbury to fix October 25, 2011 meeting note typo, send out to the group and repost it on BOG Workgroup Meeting page. DONE.
- Work on coordination with tribes as part of the Bioaccumulation Strategy.

Item 2: Review of Revised Grebe Study Proposal

The revised proposal will be briefly described and then discussed.

Desired Outcome:

- Decision on general scope of the study (1 year or 2 year study)
- Agree on a plan to seek other partners/funders

Key Points

- Questions:
 - Are BAFs useful in establishing risk to wildlife on lakes?
 - If useful, use it to calculate risk
 - Can it be a more global BAF or does it need to be more locally/geographic in nature?
 - What are the mercury levels and risk to wildlife in trophic level 2-3 fish?
- Four criteria in deciding lakes (in order of importance)
 - Lake sampled by BOG previously
 - BOG trend lake
 - Grebes known to have bred and their relative abundance
 - High levels of mercury previously found in sport fish
- Adding sport fish to the lakes will most likely cost \$1,000/lake (\$12,000 for year one or \$24,000 for two year study)

- Adding PBDEs (*polybrominated diphenyl ethers*) and OCs (*organochlorines*) will add:
 - \$200,000/year if we analyze individual fish
 - \$60,000-\$80,000/year if we analyze three (3) composites.
- Selenium (Se) suggested as another potential constituent. The previous BOG lake data did not show high enough levels of Se to be a human health concern. No decision was made on this suggestion.
- We could archive fish samples to look at the additional constituents later.
- One of the selling features of this proposal is potentially developing a tool to link impairment to reproductive success.
- We need to think about whether this project cost too much with the small sample size.
- Carrie Austin felt that the proposal did not address her comments.

Action Items

- Stick with the 1-year study (including Michael's supplement?)
 - Continue to look into including large fish
 - Have peer review panel look at the proposal
 - Shop around for other/more funding (including in the Strategy)
 - Grow the pot and figure out ways to be more "self-sustaining" (including in the Strategy)

Item 3: Mussel Monitoring

A report examining long-term trends at State Mussel Watch/Endowment stations and National Mussel Watch stations has been drafted. The report will be distributed within a week.

Desired Outcomes:

- Provide a preview of the report, and an update on the current status of mussel monitoring.
- Discuss next steps for mussel monitoring

Key Points

- A lot of declines in most traditional pollutants
- Starting to look at CECs
- SCCWRP released some of the data to the Mussel Monitoring group. They plan to deliver more data soon.
- In March 2012, the CEC mussel data will be part of a report published in the Marine Pollution Bulletin.
- Last National Mussel Watch sampling was in 2010. It is typically every other year and therefore would typically be happening in 2012. Dominic has not heard anything from the Feds yet.
- There is only has two more years left in the Endowment (22 stations and approximately \$140k/year)
- SFEI's draft report will be released on December 15 - it was delayed to allow incorporation of the most recent endowment data.
- Mussels are valuable to monitor because:
 - They are used in finding out the status of biotoxins because they filter versus metabolize the toxins.
 - Have historically been the first line of defense in identifying traditional pollutants.
 - Wildlife exposure
 - Seeing inter-annual trends (using resident not bagged mussel)
 - Have been instrumental in clean-up efforts and enforcement

Action Items

- Would we like an email/lyris sent out to the BOG about the Mussel Monitoring report once the report is released?
- We need to ask ourselves – will continuing to focus on mussels, will this line of thinking move the program forward. **We need to see what comes out of the CEC sampling from 2010.**

Item 4: BOG Strategy Development

At the last meeting, we refined the problem statement. Next, we will focus on goals of the Strategy

Desired Outcomes:

- Consensus on goals of the Strategy
- Update on action items from last meeting

Key Points

- We did not have time to discuss this item.
- The State Board and EPA feel that the Strategy needs to take a higher priority. The Strategy should be the driver for what the BOG will be doing in the future and not the current monitoring available.

Action Items

- Move this to the next BOG meeting and place as the first item for discussion.

Item 7: Next Meeting

Key Points

- Next meeting scheduled for early January.
- It would be nice if a strawman draft of the strategy to be ready by the next meeting.
 - This will include goals, draft recommendation and partners/stakeholders.
- Have the Peer-Review Panel review our Strategy.

Action Items

- Next meeting scheduled for January 9, 2012 at 1 p.m.
- Schedule a meeting in early February for the Peer-Review Panel Meeting.