Sediment Quality Objectives For California Enclosed Bays and Estuaries

Statewide Assessment of Sediment Quality

July 10, 2007

OBJECTIVES

- Estimate area of state with unimpacted/impacted sediment quality
 - EPA 305(b) Report
- Apply assessment framework and tools to available data
 - SQO "Test Drive"
- Compare waterbody condition with previous 303(d) assessments
 - SQO Economic Analysis

Study Design

- Select and Compile Data
 - Surveys with random stations
 - 3 LOEs
- Determine LOE Category Responses
- Apply Direct Effects Assessment Framework
 - Integrate LOEs and determine station assessment
- Determine Area Impacted
 - Statewide
 - North Bays
 - South Bays
 - San Francisco Bay

Data

		Sample sizes			
Study	Year	North	SFBay	South	
SoCal Bight	1998	0	0	113	
	2003	0	0	102	
	1999	19	0	24	
WEMAP	2000	0	40	0	
	2005	8	0	15	
Huntington Harbor/ Anaheim Bay	2001	0	0	60	
Total		27	40	314	

Sediment Chemistry Classification Steps

• Compile Data

- Calculate sums, estimate nondetects
- Calculate Chemistry Indicators (SQGs)
 - Chem-Tox: CA LRM (maximum probability of toxicity)
 - Chem-Benthos: CSI (weighted mean score)
- Combine Indicator Scores to Determine Chemistry LOE Category

Toxicity Classification Steps

Compile Data

- Normalize to control response
- Statistical significance tests
- Apply Toxicity Classification Criteria
 - Amphipod survival (Eohaustorius estuarius)
- Determine Toxicity LOE Category

Benthic Community Classification Steps

• Compile Data

- Standardize taxonomy
- Calculate abundance and other metrics
- Calculate Benthic Indices
 - Benthic Response Index (BRI)
 - Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI)
 - Relative Benthic Index (RBI)
 - River Invertebrate Prediction and Classification System (RIVPACS)

 Combine Index Scores to Determine Benthos LOE Category

Sediment Quality Lines of Evidence

and the second state of th	CHEMISTRY	TOXICITY	BENTHOS
RESPONSE	(Exposure)	(Toxicity)	(Disturbance)
Equivalent to reference or control condition (1)	Minimal Exposure	Nontoxic	Reference
Clight shangs of upogrtain			
statistical significance (2)	Low Exposure	Low Toxicity	Low Disturbance
Reliable difference generally	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
regarded as significant (3)	Exposure	Toxicity	Disturbance
Highly reliable response of high magnitude (4)	High Exposure	High Toxicity	High Disturbance

Direct Effects Station Assessment

Six assessment categories

- Unimpacted
- Likely Unimpacted
- Possibly Impacted
- Likely Impacted
- Clearly Impacted
- Inconclusive



MLOE Integration Framework



6 Assessment Categories

MLOE Conceptual Framework Direct Effects

Three lines of evidence (LOE) needed to assess direct effects of sediment contamination



Severity of Effect

Toxicity

		Nontoxic	Low Toxicity	Moderate Toxicity	High Toxicity
S	Reference	Unaffected	Unaffected	Unaffected	Low Effect
Bentho	Low Disturbance	Unaffected	Low Effect	Low Effect	Low Effect
	Moderate Disturbance	Moderate Effect	Moderate Effect	Moderate Effect	Moderate Effect
	High Disturbance	Moderate Effect	High Effect	High Effect	High Effect

Potential that Effects are Chemically Mediated Toxicity

	Nontoxic	Low Toxicity	Moderate Toxicity	High Toxicity
Minimal	Minimal	Minimal	Low	Moderate
Exposure	Potential	Potential	Potential	Potential
Low	Minimal	Low	Moderate	Moderate
Exposure	Potential	Potential	Potential	Potential
Moderate	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
Exposure	Potential	Potential	Potential	Potential
High	Moderate	Moderate	High	High
Exposure	Potential	Potential	Potential	Potential

Chemistry

MLOE Conceptual Framework Direct Effects



Station Categories

• Unimpacted

- Confident that sediment contamination is not causing significant adverse impacts.
- Likely Unimpacted
 - Sediment contamination at the site is not expected to cause adverse impacts to aquatic life. Some uncertainty from small disagreement among the LOE.
- Possibly Impacted
 - Sediment contamination at the site may be causing adverse impacts to aquatic life. Small impacts or LOE disagreement cause substantial uncertainty.

Station Categories

Likely Impacted

- Evidence for a contaminant-related impact to aquatic life at the site is persuasive, even if there is some disagreement among LOE.
- Clearly Impacted
 - Sediment contamination at the site is causing clear and severe adverse impacts to aquatic life.
- Inconclusive
 - Large disagreement among the LOE suggests that either the data are suspect or that additional information is needed before a classification can be made.

Station Assessment

Severity of Effect

	Unaffected	Low Effect	Moderate Effect	High Effect
Minimal Potential	Unimpacted	Likely Unimpacted	Likely Unimpacted	Likely Unimpacted or Inconclusive
Low Potential	Unimpacted	Likely Unimpacted	Possibly Impacted	Possibly Impacted
Moderate Potential	Likely Unimpacted	Possibly Impacted or Inconclusive	Likely Impacted	Likely Impacted
High Potential	Likely Unimpacted or Inconclusive	Likely Impacted	Clearly Impacted	Clearly Impacted

Potential that Effects are Chemically Mediated







Spatial Assessment

- Select Regions of Interest
 - Statewide
 - North, SFB, South
- Combined Sample Frames, and Recalculated Area Weights
 - We used GIS tools to post-stratify
 - Area weights were recalculated separately for North and South
- % Area in MLOE Category

= Sum of area weights in category/total area weight

Statewide Condition



California Regions





Do We Believe The Results?

Several potential sources of uncertainty:

• Data Errors

- QA review of data and calculations
- Assessment Framework Application
 - Individual LOE Responses
 - Concordance/Discordance
- Data Differences
 - Variations of tools among regions
 - Actual tools vs "Common" tools

Data QA Review

- Verified All SF Bay Sediment Toxicity Results
- Hand-Checked Calculations for Each LOE
- Independent Check of All MLOE Station Classifications
- No Errors Found

LOE Responses (% Area)

Region	Response	Benthos	Toxicity	Chemistry
North	Affected	51	20	7
SFB	Affected	62	86	46
South	Affected	24	29	44

Affected: Moderate or High response

Chemistry: Toxicity Relationships



LOE Concordance Analysis

- Highly Concordant
 - 2-3 LOEs agree, no more than one category difference
 - E.g., Low/Low/Low; Low/Low/Moderate
- Somewhat Concordant
 - All LOEs differ by no more than two categories
 - E.g., Low/Moderate/High
- Somewhat Discordant
 - All LOEs differ by three categories
 - E.g., Minimal/Low/High
- Moderate Outlier
 - 2 LOEs agree, other LOE differs by two categories
 - E.g., Low/Low/High
- High Outlier
 - 2 LOEs agree, other LOE differs by three categories
 - E.g., Minimal/High/High

Concordance Summary

Category	North %	SFB %	South %
Highly Concordant	36	69	62
Somewhat Concordant	8	19	17
Somewhat Discordant	32	8	7
Moderate Outlier	12	4	13
High Outlier	12	0	1

Tool Differences Among Regions

Region	Toxicity	Benthos	Chemistry
North	Eohaustorius	RBI	CALRM
SFB	Eohaustorius	RBI, IBI, RIVPACS, BRI	CALRM
South	Eohaustorius	RBI, IBI, RIVPACS, BRI	CA LRM CSI

Common Tools: Eohaustorius, RBI, CA LRM

Effect of Tool Differences on % Area Estimates

Region	Response	Tools	Benthos	Toxicity	Chemistry
North	Affected	AII	51	20	7
North	Affected	Common	51	20	7
SFB	Affected	All	62	86	46
SFB	Affected	Common	90	86	46
South	Affected	All	24	29	44
South	Affected	Common	37	29	50

Summary

- SQO Assessment Framework Successfully Applied Throughout State
 - Integrated data from 381 stations
 - Few inconclusive station classifications
- Variation in Tools Had Little Impact on Outcome
 - Similar results with "common" tools
- MLOE Results Generally Concordant
 - Relative agreement among LOEs
 - SFB and South show similar degree of concordance
- Results Provide a Focus for Research and Management Actions
 - Stressor identification studies in SF Bay and other areas
 - Develop benthic indices for other habitats