California Water Quality Monitoring Council

Council Meeting Notes

February 2, 2009, 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM

Southern California Coastal Water Research Project
3535 Harbor Blvd., Suite 110, Costa Mesa, CA
Large Conference Room

Monitoring Council members in attendance:
Jonathan Bishop, Sarge Green, Rufus Howell (by phone), Terry Macaulay, Sam Mowbray, Armand Ruby, Linda Sheehan, Steven Weisberg

SB 1070 Work Group members in attendance:
Brock Bernstein, Valerie Connor, Rainer Hoenicke, Karl Jacobs, Jon Marshack, Melenee Emanuel

Others in attendance:
Bryan Bjorndal, Sherie Brubaker, Erick Burres, Shelly Moore, Carolyn Remick, Ken Schiff, Eric Stein, Carolyn Yale, Phil Markel, Mark Springer, Joanne Cox, Karen Taberski, Mark Pranger

ITEM: #	1	Assigned to:	Time:
Title of Topic:	**HOUSEKEEPING & ANNOUNCEMENTS**	Jon Marshack	9:00 – 9:20
Purpose:	1) Approve notes from November 18, 2008 Council meeting 2) Review agenda for today's meeting 3) State Budget update and other announcements		
Desired Outcome:	1) Approve November 18, 2008 meeting notes 2) Adjust today's agenda, as needed 3) Information		
Attachments:	Notes 11-18-08.pdf		
Contact Person:	Jon Marshack	(jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov, 916-341-5514)	

Notes:	**Budget** (Jonathan Bishop)
	    State worker furloughs 1st and 3rd Fridays of each month. Bond expenditure freeze due to inability of state to sell bonds. Beach monitoring funding on hold, maybe for two years. 10% General Fund cut – vacant positions to be eliminated to avoid layoffs at Water Boards.
	    The need to show improvement is not a requirement to receive bond funding.		

Decisions:	**11/18/08 Meeting Notes** Approved without modification.		

ITEM: #	2		**Assigned to:**	**Time:**
Title of Topic:	**IMPLEMENTING MONITORING COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS**		Jon Marshack	9:20 – 10:20
Purpose:	Planning implementation of the Monitoring Council's initial recommendations.			
Desired Outcome:	Direction on implementation of the December 1, 2008 Monitoring Council recommendations, including tasks and a schedule for outreach to other organizations, formation of initial theme-based work groups, and taking the Monitoring Council's website public.			
Background:	In its December 1, 2008 recommendations report, the Monitoring Council outlined a vision for enhancing monitoring, assessment, and reporting. Identified near term actions include: 1) Working with initially identified workgroups in four sub-themes: a) Groundwater sub-theme of "Is our water safe to drink?" – Water Boards' Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) b) Sportfish sub-theme of "Is it safe to eat fish and shellfish from our waters?" – Bioaccumulation Oversight Group (BOG) of the Water Boards' Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) c) Coastal beaches, bays, and estuaries sub-theme of "Is it safe to swim in our waters?" – Beach Water Quality Work Group and Clean Beach Task Force d) Wetlands sub-theme of "Are our aquatic ecosystems healthy?" – California Wetlands Monitoring Workgroup 2) Outreach to additional local, regional, state and federal agencies, non-government organizations, and other entities that are responsible for existing monitoring and assessment efforts 3) Formation of stakeholder-based workgroups to support each theme or sub-theme A key component of the recommendations is a website that provides a single, coordinated, global point of entry to water quality data, assessment results. A test website has been created, focusing on the coastal beaches, bays, and estuaries sub-theme of "Is it safe to swim in our waters?" The legislature has asked when this website will be made public.			
Attachments:	Theme Updates.pdf BOG Description 01-26-09.pdf			
Contact Person:	Jon Marshack	(jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov, 916-341-5514)		
Notes:	Val Connor suggested two new workgroups – Data Management and Stream Bioassessment (ecosystem health; SWAMP) Freshwater beach data assessment was funded by SWAMP in 2007/2008.			

Decisions:	1. Long term strategy to include funding integration and data system support.
	2. Monitoring Council open for all groups to approach – provide opportunities to make 5 to 10 minute presentations at Council meetings.
	3. Subcommittees of the Monitoring Council needed – e.g., financing/funding, outreach to new organizations and working with existing workgroups, data management standardization
Action Items:	1. Jon Marshack will attend meetings of the 4 workgroups already identified.
	2. Safe to Drink Groundwater – need linkage soon to GeoTracker GAMA advisory committee. 4 workgroups needed to respond to legislature.
	3. 1-2 page summary of progress on each workgroup.
	4. Strategy for outreach to workgroups.
	5. Website to go public by end of June.
	6. Workgroup representatives to come to Monitoring Council meeting to explain what they bring and where they fit in the grand scheme – to give the public the best information on the health of the state's waters and to help to fulfill the Council's mission. Beach Water Quality Workgroup and GAMA at next meeting.
	7. Next meeting – What groups are out there? Propose priorities. Develop matrix of water body types and beneficial uses – add stressors/processes and groundwater.
	8. Develop guidance to workgroups – how to contact the Council; how to present information; benefits and obligations of affiliation; use group charter (see Wetlands Monitoring Workgroup); expectations on both sides; public advantages. Place on website.
	9. Poll Council Members by email for subcommittee interest.

ITEM: #	3		**Assigned to:**	**Time:**
Title of Topic:	**CALIFORNIA WATER QUALITY MONITORING PROGRAM STRATEGY RECOMMENDATIONS**		Jon Marshack	10:20 – 12:00
Purpose:	Begin planning to develop Monitoring Council recommendations on strategy.			
Desired Outcome:	Guidance on the development of a comprehensive state monitoring program strategy, including tasks, schedule, and deliverables.			
Background:	In its December 1, 2008 recommendations report, the Monitoring Council committed to provide recommendations for this strategy to the agency secretaries, as part of a December 2009 progress report.			
	SB 1070 added Water Code Section 13181(a) and (e), which provide direction for this effort.			
	In 2005, the Water Boards' Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program			

	(SWAMP) developed a *Comprehensive Monitoring and Assessment Strategy to Protect and Restore California's Water Quality* that focuses on USEPA's 2003 *Elements of a State Water Monitoring and Assessment Program*, which identifies 10 basic elements of a state program. Val Connor will provide an overview of progress on the SWAMP strategy. The SWAMP strategy and the Monitoring Council's December 2008 recommendations could provide a foundation of the Monitoring Council's strategy recommendations.
	In its 2008 recommendations, the Monitoring Council consolidated EPA's 10 elements into 6 performance measures: • Program strategy, objectives, and designs • Indicators and methods • Data management • Consistency of assessment endpoints • Reporting • Program sustainability
	At its January 13, 2009 meeting, the California Wetlands Monitoring Workgroup committed to develop a state wetlands monitoring program strategy by the end of 2009, including priorities, methods, performance standards, and funding. Josh Collins of SFEI and Eric Stein of SCCWRP will develop an outline of this strategy by the March meeting of CWMW.
Attachments:	Monitoring Strategy Recomm.pdf SB 1070 highlighted.pdf SWAMP Comprehensive Monitoring and Assessment Strategy (Oct 2005) SWAMP Overview.pdf
Contact Person:	Jon Marshack (jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov, 916-341-5514)

Notes:	Should the SWAMP review be combined with the SB 1070 audit?
	
	Should SWAMP assist the Council in developing the strategy?
	
	See Google Oceans and Scripps Institute websites.
	
	How to provide stable funding?
	
	Data presentation via themes/questions – friendly report card assessments.
	
	Data exchange framework needed.
	
	Monitoring Council offers:
	
	1. Workgroup for each cell in water body type/beneficial use matrix
	
	2. Questions are clearly defined, consistent across matrix boxes
	
	3. Identify level of answers – detail, public-focused formats
	
	4. To get out of the way, except:
	
	    a. Mandate to merge data from a variety of sources – workgroups should report back to Council
	
	    b. Identify consistency issues that get in the way of coordination
	
	5. Website to highlight progress and shortcomings – helps focus on improvements needed

	6. Status report – fill all matrix boxes with target workgroups and organzations; 2-page status report from each workgroup
	7. Outreach/communication with workgroups and organizations –forum in each Council meeting for assistance
	8. Encourage existing groups to coordinate in to larger organizations to address coherent questions, data management, monitoring coordination
	Beach Water Quality Workgroup – will they take on ownership of web portal and be willing to accept the whole theme?
	Workgroups develop details – indicators, format, data management
Decisions:	1. Clear communications and outreach strategy needed
	2. Clear communication to the general public with synthesized/analyzed information up front – fact sheets, question based
	3. Bioaccumulation Oversight Group needs to take on more than their own program – e.g., DPH shellfish data, FDA, CDPH
	4. Waterbody types are ambient water -- reclaimed water is a stressor, not a waterbody type
	5. Strategy development [CWC 131281(e)] is a Monitoring Council effort/product with State Water Board staff assistance, rather than a State Water Board effort with Monitoring Council recommendations
	a. Promotes outreach to outside organizations – broader than SWAMP
	b. Council provides authority
	c. Multiple stakeholder process – coordinated/integrated – Council members represent a broad network of stakeholders
	d. Audience includes USEPA, legislature, National Resources Subcommittee, Legislative Analyst Office
	6. Website – before a workgroup sub-theme/portal is added:

	a. Needs to be vetted by Monitoring Council – focused on right questions?
	         i. Mock-up of concept presented
	         ii. Teleconference with subcommittee of Council
	         iii. Council reviews twice before going live
	         iv. Discussion with players at Council meeting

	b. Target ~ 3 months between presentation to Council and going live
	c. Take each product live when ready; don't wait for others
Action Items:	1. 1-2 groups to meet with Council at each meeting – include what are they not doing; demonstrate web portal or mockup

	2. Next meeting
	     a. Report back on vision for fishable and drinkable
	     b. Put agenda on website – outreach to new groups
	     c. fill all matrix boxes with target workgroups and organizations

	d. 2-page status report from each workgroup e. Process for workgroup formation 3. Website – identify current public prototyping mode 4. Need protocol for development of a web portal – QA, vetting		

ITEM: #	4	**Assigned to:**	**Time:**
Title of Topic:	**REGIONAL MONITORING PROGRAMS**	Brock Bernstein	1:00 – 2:00
Purpose:	Discuss relationship between Monitoring Council and regional monitoring programs.		
Desired Outcome:	Determine how regional monitoring programs fit into theme-based work group structure and how the Monitoring Council could provide coordination between RMPs.		
Background:	Several regional monitoring programs (RMPs) focus on water quality monitoring and assessment within specific geographic areas. Additional RMPs are being developed. • San Joaquin River Basin • Sacramento River Basin • San Francisco Bay • Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta • Southern California Bight • Klamath River Watershed • Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers Watersheds • Central Coast SWAMP provides guidance and tools to help RMPs and provides a degree of coordination. Ken Schiff of SCCWRP will provide perspectives from one of those efforts, the Southern California Bight, and will provide ideas on how the Monitoring Council could help to coordinate RMPs. Carolyn Yale of USEPA, Region 9 will provide additional perspectives on coordination and enhancement of RMPs, based on a January 22 teleconference on this topic. A high-level inventory of monitoring efforts was compiled in 2008 and included as an appendix to the Monitoring Council's December 1, 2008 recommendations. The San Joaquin River RMP has developed a more detailed web-based inventory of monitoring efforts within its area, which is being expanded to include the entire Central Valley Region. Should such an effort be expanded statewide as part of the Monitoring Council's web portal? • What common interests are shared between RMPs? • How should Monitoring Council or SWAMP provide RMPs with technical support, data management/linking, website standardization, statewide coordination, guidance on study design?		

Attachments:	Enhancing Regional Monitoring.pdf Sacramento River Watershed RMP report.pdf	
Contact Person:	Brock Bernstein	(brockbernstein@sbcglobal.net, 805-646-8369)
Notes:	Monitoring Council outreach to regional monitoring programs (RMPs) • Focus on questions – need questions sensitive to regional context • Encourage members to participate in theme-based workgroups RMPs develop core indicators and tools that can be used by others – foster sharing. EPA / SWAMP can keep dialogue going between RMPs: • SWAMP training curricula through Training Academy useful to RMPs. • Directory of monitoring efforts to reduce redundancy • Data exchange and standardization used to bring RMPs together • Funding considerations • Sharing experiences See San Gabriel River Watershed Program – Google maps and beneficial use buttons. How to establish the basis for sharing/integration of information between RMPs and with the Monitoring Council (e.g., by means of articulated monitoring objectives, whether a 'comprehensive' set of objectives or more focused) was not resolved. This is an area for further work. Affiliation with Monitoring Council provides RMPs with • Larger audience for their work • Broader context • Legitimacy	
Decisions:	Monitoring Council wants to foster RMPs, but workgroups need to be theme-focused. Monitoring Council not interested in simply linking to websites of individual monitoring efforts. RMPs need to feed data into theme-based portal effort. Monitoring Council goals: 1. Bring together similar information 2. Consistency to a degree necessary to allow (1) to occur Monitoring Council relationship to RMPs: 1. Theme-based 2. No geographic-base workgroups 3. Assistance – support mechanisms 4. Data interpretation guidelines – workgroups develop, pass to RMPs Outreach to RMPs needed.	
Action Items:	1. Carolyn Yale and Val Connor will work on joint Monitoring Council/SWAMP regular WebEx conferences for RMPs – SWAMP tools, training, Council goals 2. Jonathan Bishop, Jon Marshack, Carolyn Yale, Ken Schiff, and Val Connor will develop a protocol on how RMPs coordinate through theme-	

| | based workgroups to Monitoring Council. |
| | 3. Sarge Green will help to shepherd San Joaquin River RMP. |

ITEM: #	5	Assigned to:	Time:
Title of Topic:	**DATA MANAGEMENT**	Brock Bernstein	2:00 – 3:00
Purpose:	Information and feedback.		
Desired Outcome:	Guidance from the Monitoring Council on issues related to data management.		
Background:	Shelly Moore from SCCWRP will provide perspectives on Regional Data Centers and their role in meeting the data management needs of theme-based work groups and local/regional monitoring programs. Sherie Brubaker of the Department of Water Resources will present information on the Bay-Delta and Tributaries database system (BDAT) and other water quality and related ecosystem information management at the Department of Water Resources. Karl Jacobs will provide an update on the development of CEDEN and the Regional Data Centers and efforts to develop a data management work group. Potential questions to be addressed include: • What kind of information and data types are supported by CEDEN and BDAT that could support the theme-based work group efforts? • What aspects of these systems can be used now? • What features will be available soon and what is the time frame for future development? • What resources are available for system development? • Can these systems be used for statewide assessments and to help local monitoring programs to get meaningful data out? • What additional players should be involved in a data management work group? • What level of detail is needed in shared data?		
Attachments:	Regional Data Centers.pdf CEDEN Update.pdf		
Contact Person:	Brock Bernstein	(brockbernstein@sbcglobal.net, 805-646-8369)	
Notes:	Sherie Brubaker of the Department of Water Resources listened in, but did not make a presentation; may present at a future meeting. Regional Data Centers should focus their support on both monitoring and assessment.		

	Vision = Regional Data Centers are the hubs for all water quality data, including regional monitoring programs, agricultural monitoring programs, NPDES, etc.
	To help them answer questions, theme-based workgroups should have access to all water quality data via Regional Data Centers.
	Bond money should be made conditional on providing RDCs with access to data.
	How successful will we be in getting access to data from other departments?
	What degree of control should theme-based workgroups and the Monitoring Council have over data management efforts? Focus on ability of web portals to answer questions.
	How can we partner with university programs to leverage our data without directly competing with them? RCDs can provide templates and tools to universities and can add fields to allow data to be used by others.
	Super Computer Center at San Diego State University – "WaterML" exchange standards.
	UC Berkeley, Water Resources Center Archives – hydrology tools, water quantity data; not a competing effort with RDCs.
	National Marine Fisheries Service and California Department of Fish & Game – habitat & flow data; screening and trend tools
	Most issues are institutional, rather than technical.
	Wetlands IT group already plugged into RDC/CEDEN group.
	Harmful algal blooms – can the database of Safe-to-eat shellfish handle these data? Produce a map product?
	Current CIWQS management structure works well.
Decisions:	A separate data management workgroup is not needed or desired.
	Ability to answer questions should drive and prioritize data management efforts. Theme-based workgroups are to identify what data management things and players are needed and present them to the Monitoring Council for prioritization.
Action Items:	Add to web page – data management contacts/priorities/tools developed.

ITEM: #	6	Assigned to:	Time:
Title of Topic:	**GOVERNANCE**	Jon Marshack	3:00 – 3:30
Purpose:	Develop Monitoring Council governance protocols for replacement of members and using substitutes at meetings.		
Desired Outcome:	1) Recommendations for a new member to replace Parry Klassen		

	2) Process for confirming new/replacement members
	3) Protocols for use of substitutes at Monitoring Council meetings.
Background:	Parry Klassen has indicated that due to time and travel restrictions, he will need to resign his position on the Monitoring Council. A replacement member, representing agriculture, will be needed. A process for confirming replacement members is also needed.
	Members have sent substitutes to past meetings. Does the Monitoring Council want to establish protocols for the attendance and role of substitutes?
Attachments:	Klassen Letter.doc (not yet received)
Contact Person:	Jon Marshack (jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov, 916-341-5514)
Decisions:	**Changes to Council Membership**
	1. Nomination by staff or Council Member(s) with input from represented entities
	2. Vetting with represented entities by staff and/or outgoing Council Member
	3. Co-Chairs notify Agency Secretaries of change(s)
	Substitutes for Members
	1. Council Members identify substitutes
	2. Substitutes act as members at meetings
Action Items:	1. Add Council Member vacancies to website
	2. Poll Council Members to provide
	a. List of represented groups for vetting of potential replacements
	b. Alternate individual to stand in for Council Members when not able to attend meeting(s)
	3. Develop separate Lyris email list for Monitoring Council

ITEM: #	7		Assigned to:	Time:
Title of Topic:	**2009 MEETING CALENDAR**		Jon Marshack	3:30 – 3:50
Purpose:	Set dates, locations, and main agenda items for 2009 meetings			
Desired Outcome:	Monitoring Council meeting calendar through 2009			
Background:	How many meetings will be needed to implement the 2008 Monitoring Council recommendations and to develop the 10-year monitoring program strategy?			
Contact Person:	Jon Marshack (jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov, 916-341-5876)			

Decisions:	1. Next meeting April 2, 2009 in Sacramento
	2. Meetings every 2 months, alternating between SCCWRP and Sacramento
Action Items:	Poll Monitoring Council members on other 2009 meeting dates via email

ITEM: #	8		Assigned to:	Time:
Title of Topic:	**MEETING WRAP-UP**		Jon Marshack	3:50 – 4:00
Purpose:	1) Summarize meeting 2) Agenda items for next meeting			
Contact Person:	Jon Marshack	(jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov, 916-341-5514)		
Decisions:	1. Next meeting on April 2, 2009 in Sacramento a. BOG and GAMA presentations with web portal mock-ups			
Action Items:	1. Develop mock-up web portal for safe-to-eat-sportfish 2. Develop questions front-end for Geotracker GAMA web portal			

April 3, 2009   JBM