



HEALTHY STREAMS PARTNERSHIP

February 20, 2015

MEETING NOTES



Roll Call

Mike Fuller (Department of Conservation); Pete Ode, Andy Rehn (CDFW); Patricia Bratcher (CDFW, Redding Office); Karen Worcester (Central Valley Regional Board); Dave Paradies (CCAMP); Heather Boyd (Santa Ana Regional Board), Jon Marshack, Kris Jones (CA Water Quality Monitoring Council); Eric Stein (SCCWRP); Chris Solek (Council for Watershed Health); Lori Webber, Nick Kunz, Michelle Tang, Calvin Yang (State Water Board); Terry Fleming (USEPA); Brock Bernstein

1. HSP Mission – Review and discuss HSP Mission and Scope

- What is the role of HSP? Does the mission statement accurately reflect that role?
- The role of HSP – Eric Stein's Language:
 1. Develop tools to better define and assess watershed health
 2. Develop approaches to use tools to prioritize restoration and management actions
 3. Serve as a mechanism to communicate health to partners and programs empowered to effect change
 - Focus on local partners who are closest to decisions
- Should HSP have a watershed or stream focus?
 - Both the EPA Healthy Watershed Assessments and the Portal focus on more than streams.
 - A watershed focus can serve as a framework to integrate regional or waterbody specific projects (e.g. SWAMP's bioassessment and toxicity monitoring programs, regional watershed report cards, etc.)
 - A watershed focus may attract more partnerships.
- Partner Programs – What do other agencies hope to get out of this workgroup?
 - **Department of Conservation** – An awareness and understanding of what is available through the workgroup so to determine how future data collection can better fit needs. Could use workgroup to verify data interpretation.
 - **Department of Fish and Wildlife**
 - State Wildlife Action Plan: Use instream data to help prioritize areas for land acquisition and/or protection.
 - NCCP/HCP: Understand how water quality and stream health relates to the recovery of endangered species.
 - **Forest Activities Program** – How do forest practice codes and measures relate to watershed health, and how effective are they?

- **Local decision makers** – Apply statewide data sets to the local scale to prioritize restoration, management, and regulatory decisions
 - Is there a need to invite more local representatives?
- Meeting participants agreed to rename the workgroup “**Healthy Watersheds Partnership**” (HWP).

2. **Projects – Discuss and prioritize projects to be included in the HSP Business Plan**

- Develop the mission statement and charter of the workgroup. Evaluate the outreach needed, and then make decisions based on outreach needs.
- Create local-scale products from EPA Healthy Watersheds Assessment to demonstrate how state data can be used to inform local decisions.
- Create an interactive stressor map on the portal that allows users to interact with the map (zoom in and out, toggle data layers on and off, show modeled vs. empirical data). The map could be integrated into EcoAtlas or a similar tool.
- Plot or combine condition data + vulnerability data from EPA Healthy Watershed Assessments to preliminary identify restoration and protection priorities.
- Develop the portal into a “hub” for related resources and tools that have already been developed.
- Offer a dataset that can be used for different purposes (e.g. show the impact of climate change) and by different partners.
- Partner with local groups to determine how they would use these tools to influence local decisions.
 - Identify categories of potential applications to develop case studies.
 - Allow local groups to append maps with new information or examples of how they use these data to make decisions

Other Issues/Considerations

- Long-term goal is to iteratively refine data set and models to improve assessments.
- Separate condition from stress indicators.
 - Include flexibility to incorporate birds, fish, and amphibians in areas where the data exist.
 - Experiment with how to use these additional indicators where they exist
- Iteratively refine tools over time with new products.
- The portal should be updated on at least an annual basis.
- Working on stronger links to Water Board assessment efforts.
- Need for a prototype to attract interest
- Whether the workgroup should use existing resources (DIT/GIS) or work with an outside provider to develop these products.

3. **Business Plan – Discuss format and timeline for developing the Business Plan**

- Three Elements of a Business Plan
 - Key actions

- Necessary resources
- Potential funding resources
- Identify agency mandates that could be better accomplished through workgroup and portal activities
- Timeline: Business Plan should be completed within a year from when the Triennial Audit report was released: end of December 2014.

Action Items

- Eric Stein will send his meeting notes to Lori Webber and Michelle Tang. (Done)
- Michelle & Lori will combine the meeting notes and put them into skeleton format.
- Michelle will create a Google Doc for the three action items listed below and send the location to the group.
 1. Mission/Charter – Pete & Eric
 - Draft language for the mission/charter of the workgroup
 2. Business Plan Skeleton – Michelle & Lori
 - Business plan outline based on the three elements identified by Jon Marshack: Key Actions, Necessary Resources, and Potential Funding Sources and Mandates
 3. Future Products – Karen & Terry
 - Flesh out and articulate the anticipated products of the workgroup

Draft versions of items 1-3 will be posted on Google Docs by March 20th.

- The next workgroup meeting is scheduled for April 24th. An agenda will be prepared and distributed prior to the meeting.
- Agenda item at an upcoming Wetlands Workgroup meeting to explore watershed assessment collaboration ideas.
- Agenda item at an upcoming Monitoring Council meeting about name change.