CALIFORNIA WATER QUALITY MONITORING COUNCIL

Monitoring Council Meeting Notes

Wednesday, October 13, 2010 – 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM

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

Monitoring Council Members and Alternates in attendance:

Rich Breuer	Parry Klassen	Carl Lischeske	Armand Ruby
Sarge Green	Karen Larsen (phone)	Phil Markle	Ken Schiff

Others in attendance or on the phone:

Shakoora Azimi-Gaylon, SWRCB (phone)	Elizabeth Nielsen (phone)
Brock Bernstein, consultant to SWRCB	Bruce Posthumus, SDRWQCB
John Borkovich, SWRCB (phone)	Alex Steele, LACSD
Valerie Connor, SFCWA (phone)	Eric Stein, SCCWRP
Terry Fleming, USEPA (phone)	Martha Sutula, SCCWRP
Lisa Hazard, UCSD & SCCOOS (phone)	Meredith Williams, SFEI
Brian Lewis, DTSC (phone)	

ITEM:	1
Title of Topic:	INTRODUCTIONS AND HOUSEKEEPING
Purpose:	1) Introductions 2) Review draft notes from August 11, 2010 Council meeting 3) Review agenda for today's meeting
Desired Outcome:	a) Approve June, 2010 Monitoring Council meeting notes b) Preview what will be presented today and overall meeting expectations c) Adjust today's agenda, as needed
Attachments:	Notes from August 11, 2010 Council meeting
Contact Person:	Jon Marshack	jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov, 916-341-5514
Decisions:	a) Rich Breuer was made Co-Chair Dale Hoffman-Floerke's Alternate via email b) Notes from August 11, 2010 Council meeting were approved without changes

ITEM:	2
Title of Topic:	ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES
Purpose:	1) ~~State budget update (Jonathan Bishop)~~ item postponed 2) Riparian mapping for Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (Eric Stein)
Desired Outcome:	Information

Background:	***Wetland and Riparian Mapping for the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan***
	At the August 11, 2010 meeting, the Monitoring Council supported the request from the Wetland Monitoring Workgroup for the Natural Resources Agency to use of the WRAMP riparian mapping tool in development of the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan. See Item 2 in the notes from the August 11, 2010 Monitoring Council meeting.

Contact Person:	Jon Marshack	jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov, 916-341-5514

Notes:	Eric Stein of the Wetland Monitoring Workgroup explained recent discussions with the Department of Water Resources, Department of Fish and Game, Chico State, and the Riparian Habitat Joint Venture about using the workgroup's riparian mapping module in the development of the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan. A meeting is being arranged to transfer the mapping module that is based on more than vegetation mapping. The CDFG CalVeg mapping method will be used in Phase I and the workgroup's riparian mapping method will be used in Phase II to create more detailed mapping. Eric explained that the riparian mapping module builds on vegetation maps, such as those developed with CalVeg, by adds more detail to represent all riparian functions that connect uplands to the water body, generating maps that are consistent with the National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council riparian definition. This definition is being considered for the Wetland and Riparian Protection Policy being developed by the Water Boards. Monitoring Council members indicated that this is a good example of how an existing program can be leveraged to provide additional benefits, rather than creating new programs.

ITEM:	3
Title of Topic:	**WATER QUALITY ASSESSMENT – 303(d)/305(b)**
Purpose:	Brief Council Members on the process of developing the Water Board's Integrated Assessment Report.
Desired Outcome:	Information and discussion
Background:	Clean Water Act Section 303(d) requires that every two years, states and tribes develop lists of water bodies that do not meet water quality standards (impaired water bodies). Listing a water body as impaired in California is governed by the Water Quality Control Policy for developing California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) Listing Policy. Clean Water Act Section 305(b) requires states and tribes to periodically develop a report on the quality of waters within their jurisdictions. In California, the Water Boards develop both lists. Beginning with the 2010 California assessment, these reports have been combined into a single "Integrated Report". The 2010 Integrated Report was approved by the State Water Board in August of this year. Approval by USEPA is required before these listings become final. Additional information on California's Integrated Report is on the State Water Board website.
	Two of the *My Water Quality* portals, Safe to Eat Fish and Shellfish and Safe to Swim, include web pages that present impaired waters information.
	During the August 11, 2010 Monitoring Council meeting, Council Members raised the issue that data from Natural Resources Agency sources are not

	necessarily used in current 303(d) listing process by Water Boards, that Natural Resources Agency data would make listings more robust. Jonathan Bishop indicated that it may be better to focus such an effort on 305(b) assessments.
Attachments:	Shakoora Azimi-Gaylon's presentation
	Fact Sheet, *2010 Integrated Report on Water Quality with Web-Based Interactive Map*, April 2010
	State Water Board Integrated Report website, including the mapping program
	Safe to Swim portal – impaired waters page
	Safe to Eat Fish and Shellfish portal – impaired waters page
Contact Person:	Shakoora Azimi-Gaylon sagaylon@waterboards.ca.gov, 916-341-5508
Notes:	Shakoora Azimi-Gaylon gave a presentation on the water quality assessment report, integrating the Water Boards' responses the reporting requirements of Sections 303(d) and 305(b) of the Clean Water Act. As part of Section 305(b) reporting, navigable surface waters and their tributaries are assigned to five categories to indicate whether some or all designated uses are protected and whether there are sufficient data to make such a determination. The recent listing cycle sought to include data from more diverse sources, including other state agencies, than prior listing cycles.

In response to a question by Sarge Green, Shakoora indicated that most of the new listings are likely due to more and better data, rather than worsening water quality. Armand Ruby indicated that the sources of pollution identified in the listings may not be consistent, due to inadequate data. Shakoora explained that each data source becomes a separate line-of-evidence (LOE), if it passes a quality assurance check and meets listing policy requirements. QA checks, similar to that used for SWAMP, include a review of sampling location information, data completeness, sample holding times, detection limits, and other factors. If information is missing, staff asks the data source to provide it. Listing decisions use all available LOEs combined, based on the listing policy.

When asked how the Monitoring Council can facilitate the submittal of data for water quality assessment, Shakoora replied that the Monitoring Council could encourage others to submit their data and information needed to assess accuracy, and to find ways to make access to data easier. The Monitoring Council could also endorse CEDEN as a way to get data into the assessment process. The *My Water Quality* portals could eventually help with the assessment of beneficial use protection. The portals should eventually include tools to help agency staff make decisions such as 303(d) listing.

In response to the Monitoring Council's desire to see the integrated assessment report information via a map-based interface, Shakoora demonstrated the Integrated Report website, which includes just such an interface to 303(d) and 305(b) information, links to the LOEs, and assessment categories. The map allows listings to be sorted by pollutant category or individual pollutants. Terry Fleming asked that sorting by beneficial uses be added.

Phil Markle suggested that the map-based Integrated Report would be a perfect vehicle for communicating ecological health. He suggested that the Monitoring Council concentrate on making data from other sources (e.g., Natural Resources Agency) more easily available to Water Board Assessment Unit staff and improvements that could facilitate more timely re-evaluation. |

Decisions:	a) A data management workgroup is needed to facilitate the sharing of data between agencies and organizations and with the *My Water Quality* portals
	b) The legislature should be asked to provide additional funding for data management and the development of data exchange systems
	c) Ambient water quality data in CIWQS needs to be integrated with CEDEN

ITEM:	4
Title of Topic:	SAFE TO DRINK PORTAL
Purpose:	Review beta version of portal
Desired Outcome:	Direction on portal development and public release
Background:	The Safe to Drink portal, initially focusing on groundwater, is one of the four portals identified by the Monitoring Council for initial development, based on existing efforts that had already made significant progress. The four initial portals are intended to be used as proof of concept of the Monitoring Council's December 2008 recommendations to the Agency Secretaries.
	The draft portal is based on the existing GeoTracker GAMA information system that was developed as a result of AB 599 (Liu) the Groundwater Quality Monitoring Act of 2001.
	At the May 2009 Monitoring Council meeting, Water Board staff made a presentation and gave a demo of the exiting GeoTracker GAMA system. Following the demonstration, the Monitoring Council proposed to leverage the existing GeoTracker GAMA system as an important initial piece of the Safe to Drink portal. The Monitoring Council requested a more detailed mock-up of Safe-to-Drink portal for Monitoring Council review and comment, including defined assessment questions and existing data sources, higher level statistics from GAMA program and others (e.g. nitrate data), and what is being done to improve groundwater quality.
	At the February 2010 meeting, the Monitoring Council reviewed a mockup of the Safe to Drink portal developed by GAMA staff. The Council directed staff to develop a working draft of the "Safe to Drink, Groundwater" portal, to add statewide assessment statistics, e.g. as "canned" queries generated by GeoTracker GAMA, and to a add color key in the legend. In response, GAMA staff added functionality to the existing system, resulting in the draft portal.
	Key questions for the Monitoring Council to consider are:
	• Does the portal meet the Monitoring Council's guidelines?
	• Does the portal sufficiently address earlier Monitoring Council direction?
	• Are the assessment questions presented in the portal appropriate?
	• Are the presented data and information readily understandable and appropriate to address each question?
	• Is sufficient background information presented?
	• Is the portal ready for public release?

Attachments:	View the beta version of the Safe to Drink portal user name = cwqmc; password = council *Note: This beta version is considered DRAFT and has not been approved for public release.* Monitoring Council, *Guidelines for Workgroups and the Development of My Water Quality Theme-Based Internet Portals*, September 23, 2010 Meeting notes of the February 10, 2010 Monitoring Council meeting (see item 4) Meeting notes of the May 22, 2009 Monitoring Council meeting (see item 4)	
Contact Person:	Jon Marshack	jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov, 916-341-5514
Notes:	Jon Marshack provided a brief demonstration of the draft portal and solicited input from the Monitoring Council. GAMA staff and the GeoTracker GAMA consultant, with significant input from Carl Lischeske of the California Department of Public Health (CDPH), had developed the draft Safe to Drink portal. The idea was to leverage the existing GeoTracker GAMA (raw) groundwater quality system to initially use as the initial part of a "Safe to Drink" portal. CDPH directly regulates public water systems and their treatment of raw surface water and groundwater sources to ensure the safety of drinking water supplied to consumers. The Safe to Drink portal should also eventually include more information on surface water and public water systems. Concern was expressed that the draft portal does not adequately address the main question of drinking water safety, "Is My Water Safe to Drink?", which, for most water supply systems is the regulatory purview of the CDPH. Carl Lischeske indicated that safety is addressed in the Consumer Confidence Reports (CCRs) from water purveyors. Currently, the portal link to the USEPA web-based list of CCRs produces an insufficient number of California listings and the CCR link is not sufficiently prominent. CDPH would need new regulations to require water suppliers to provide all of the CCRs electronically, and new regulations would probably require 3 to 5 years to complete. CDPH is working with UC Davis to produce map-based access to drinking water utility information; but that will not be available for a couple of years. CDPH is working on providing map based access to drinking water quality information, based on address. CDPH could not take on portal development for about three years, due to other priorities. To address the main question, the portal emphasis should be in the following order: (1) CCRs, (2) sources of water, (3) raw water quality. The term "raw" is used by USGS to mean untreated, in-situ, ambient water. It was also suggested that the portal's main question might need to be modified to reflect its initial focus on the quality of raw groundwater, rather than finished drinking water safety. This portal was not developed by a traditional Monitoring Council sanctioned workgroup. It was a product of Water Board staff and their consultant, adapted from the existing GeoTracker GAMA groundwater information system with some input from CDPH. However, according to the Monitoring Council's vision the portal is a mechanism to get entities that monitor water quality to work together to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of monitoring, assessment, and reporting. Without a workgroup, there is no mechanism to address monitoring and assessment issues.	

Decisions:	a) Add a note that explains the portal's initial groundwater focus and what information will be coming in the future
	b) Portal is not ready for public release until adequate access to CCRs is provided for all of the larger water systems (serve >90% of the population)
	c) Reword the fist portal page to have users determine the safety of their drinking water by determining their water supplier and viewing the CCR
	d) Remove the "Questions Answered" subheading from the first page

	e) To conform to the other portals, rearrange the existing portal information to address the following main questions:
	
	  i) What is the extent of the resource? / From where does my drinking water come?
	
	  ii) What is the status of the resource?
	
	  iii) What are the trends?
	
	  iv) What programs are in place to address the problems?
	
	Frame the entire portal for what it will include in the long term, showing what is currently missing or not addressed.

	f) This portal needs a drinking water safety workgroup, including Dept. of Water Resources, Association of California Water Agencies, American Water Works Association, CDPH, GAMA, Groundwater Resources Association, Dept. of Toxic Substances Control, and Dept. of Pesticide Regulation
Action Items:	CDPH will request that at least all larger water supply systems provide information on their CCRs for inclusion on the USEPA web-based list of CCRs

ITEM:	5
Title of Topic:	**AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM HEALTH**
Purpose:	• Explore structure and function of workgroups, portals, and data management infrastructure that address the theme *Are Our Aquatic Ecosystems Healthy?* • Meredith Williams of the San Francisco Estuary Institute will make a presentation on the proposal to develop an Aquatic Atlas data management tool that would be utilized by all aquatic ecosystem health workgroups • Consider whether the California Ocean Protection Council should be asked to form a workgroup to develop an ocean portal
Desired Outcome:	Direction on how this theme should be addressed
Background:	Aquatic ecosystem health is one of five primary questions presented in the Monitoring Council's *My Water Quality* website. The Monitoring Council approved dividing this theme into five portals – estuaries, lakes, streams & rivers, ocean, and wetlands. The Monitoring Council has approved coordination with the California Wetland Monitoring Workgroup; their California Wetlands Portal addresses this theme for wetlands. The Monitoring Council has also approved formation of the Healthy Streams Partnership and tasked that workgroup with developing a stream health portal, a mockup of which was

	approved at the June 9, 2010 Monitoring Council meeting.
	At the August 2010 meeting, the Monitoring Council directed staff to conceptualize alternatives to address the aquatic ecosystem health theme for next meeting, to outline potential strategies and approaches to integrate biological monitoring components into ecosystem health workgroups and to address portal navigation and workgroup interaction. In addition, the Monitoring Council instructed staff to not stop working on healthy streams and estuaries workgroups. Item 6 of this agenda presents an estuary workgroup and portal proposal.
	Brock Bernstein has developed an Ecosystem Portal Options paper that addresses portal and workgroup structure, assessment approaches, and data management. Josh Collins of the California Wetland Monitoring Workgroup has proposed that all ecosystem health themes utilize a common Aquatic Atlas data management tool.
Attachments:	My Water Quality website *Are Our Aquatic Ecosystems Healthy?* page
	Meeting notes of the August 11, 2010 Monitoring Council meeting (see item 3)
	Ecosystem Portal Options paper by Brock Bernstein
	Aquatic Atlas presentation by Meredith Williams
Contact Person:	Brock Bernstein brockbernstein@sbcglobal.net, 805-646-8369
Notes:	Larger groups may be needed to coordinate the efforts of more narrowly focused workgroups. Freshwater lakes and streams should be combined. The boundaries between freshwater, estuarine and marine are not always clear. Separating habitats and key species into separate workgroups is too fine a division.
	The primary objectives of the Ocean Protection Council (OPC) area aligned with those of the Monitoring Council: - Coordinate activities of ocean-related state agencies to improved the effectiveness of state efforts to protect ocean and coastal resources; - Establish policies to coordinate among agencies the collection and sharing of scientific data related to coast and ocean resources; - Identify and recommend changes in state and federal law and policy to achieve California Ocean Protection Act goals. The Secretaries of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection sit on the OPC.
	Portals should identify the sources of water quality and ecosystem problems.
	Data management needs to be coordinated between all ecosystem health workgroups. Meredith Williams of SFEI made a presentation on a proposed Aquatic Atlas to help integrate aquatic resource information. Features of the Atlas would include: (1) a common master aquatic base map for all California surface waters; (2) project-related information; (3) ambient and reference site information; and (4) reporting in all ways independent of water body type. Questions arose as to how this would interact with CEDEN and how the two would differ. CEDEN focuses mainly on water quality data does not include a master base map. CEDEN data could be added onto the master base map of aquatic resources. Tom Lupo of CDFG indicated that a primary mission of BIOS is to have a master base map. Such a map would need to account for differing quality and completeness from place to place and the need to keep incorporating

	updated information. Rich Breuer indicated that a broad-based ad hoc query tool like the Aquatic Atlas would be very expensive to develop and is not doable in the short term.
	Maintaining a common master base map would be a substantial effort and may be too large a task for one organization to accomplish. Local input and control will be needed, as has been demonstrated in the SF Bay, Southern California Bight, Lake Tahoe, and the Central Coast. Three existing based maps currently exist: the National Hydrologic Dataset (NHD) of USGS, the National Wetland Inventory (NWI) of USFWS, and baseline watershed maps. Stewardship is split between federal, state, and local players. Local ground-truthing and updates need to feed back up to the federal level. There is no current state lead for NHD in California. The Natural Resources Agency is lead for NWI in California. An overall strategy for communication and management is needed.
	Eric Stein made three requests of the Monitoring Council:
	• Support the development of a common based map and framework for integrating aquatic resource information across water body types
	• Engage CDFG and DWR to produce and shepherd the master base map, including information from BIOS and NHD
	• Form a data management workgroup to facilitate data sharing and integration across agencies.
Decisions:	a) The Ocean Protection Council should be convinced to take on developing an Ocean Health portal and coordinating the efforts of more narrowly focused ocean-related workgroups
	b) Major divisions of the Ecosystem Health theme should be (1) Freshwater – streams, rivers and lakes; (2) Estuaries; (3) Ocean; and (4) Wetlands
	c) A Data Management Workgroup should be formed to develop a recommended strategy for water quality and ecosystem data sharing and integration between state agencies and others. The strategy should include the concept of a master base map, prioritize data pathways to be developed, and cost implications. The Monitoring Council will bring the Workgroup's recommendations to the two Agency Secretaries. The Natural Resources Agency should lead the Data Management Workgroup effort.
Action Items:	Brock Bernstein and Jon Marshack will develop a list of candidate members of a new Data Management Workgroup.

ITEM:	6
Title of Topic:	ESTUARY WORKGROUP AND PORTAL
Purpose:	Formation of California Estuary Monitoring Workgroup and development of a California Estuaries Portal, initially focusing on the San Francisco Bay-Delta
Desired Outcome:	Approval to form workgroup and develop portal
Background:	For the *My Water Quality* website, the Monitoring Council approved dividing the theme *Are Our Aquatic Ecosystems Healthy?* into five portal categories, one of which would focus on estuaries.

	At the July 2009 and August 2010 Monitoring Council meetings, Anke Mueller-Solger made presentations on the Interagency Ecological Program (IEP) that focuses on the health of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta ecosystem. Additional presentations were made at the August 2010 meeting regarding Natural Resources Agency programs, some of which also focus on the Delta. At that meeting, Richard Breuer made a presentation on IEP data management.
	Additional background is presented in the *Proposal to Develop a California Estuaries Portal*.
Attachments:	My Water Quality website *Are Our Aquatic Ecosystems Healthy?* page
	Proposal to Develop a California Estuaries Portal
	Meeting notes of the August 11, 2010 Monitoring Council meeting (see item 3)
	Meeting notes of the July 27, 2009 Monitoring Council meeting (see item 3)
Contact Person:	Jon Marshack	jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov, 916-341-5514
Notes:	Jon Marshack indicated that the two Regional Monitoring Programs, for the Delta and the SF Bay, and from the Interagency Ecological Program have indicated general support for the formation of this workgroup, with the understanding that the workgroup itself would workout the details of leadership and workgroup function. IEP is a logical cornerstone organization. The Bay-Delta Science Program of the Delta Stewardship Council is also a key player. Having multiple Co-Chairs, like the Wetland Monitoring Workgroup may also work well for the Estuary Monitoring Workgroup.
	In addition, Valerie Connor offered resources from her organization, the State and Federal Contractors Water Agency (SFCWA) to support portal development. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California funded the development of the BayDeltaLive.com website, which brings together real-time monitoring results, interactive mapping, and research information. Many attributes of BayDeltaLive would be useful to the new workgroup. She offered that SFCWA could fund expansion of BayDeltaLive into the new portal, thereby bypassing the need to adhere to state web development and contracting limitations.
	A San Francisco Bay-Delta initial emphasis would be low-hanging fruit and a logical place to start, considering the large degree of collaboration that already exists. However, information from other California estuaries would benefit the overall function of the workgroup and will enable the focus to expand to statewide in the future. Martha Sutula of SCCWRP would like to participate. Sediment Quality Objectives program data and sea grass monitoring information represent two broader areas that could be included.
	Rich Breuer offered that an initial portal product could be a web page focused on status and trends, produced by DWR to replace an annual report to the State Water Board.
Decisions:	a) The Monitoring Council agrees to the formation of a new California Estuary Monitoring Workgroup that will develop a California Estuaries portal.
	b) While the initial emphasis of the workgroup and portal will be the San Francisco Bay-Delta, the effort should include a statewide focus from the beginning and be open to participants representing monitoring and assessment efforts in other California estuaries.

ITEM:	7
Title of Topic:	COMPREHENSIVE MONITORING PROGRAM STRATEGY
Purpose:	Review the latest draft of the Comprehensive Monitoring Program Strategy
Desired Outcome:	Comment and direction on finalizing the strategy
Background:	The strategy is required by California Senate Bill 1070 (Kehoe, 2006) and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Cal/EPA and Natural Resources. Each of these documents provides specific direction on the content of the strategy. The Monitoring Council considered the March 2010 draft of the strategy at its June 2010 meeting and provided specific comments and direction. The Monitoring Council requested briefings with the two Agency Secretaries and with key legislators prior to finalizing the strategy. Agency Secretary briefing have occurred and both Secretaries provided support for the direction of the strategy. A briefing with Senator Kehoe's staff is scheduled for October 21. The Monitoring Council is requested to provide direction on the following issues: • Should the Agency Secretaries be asked to sign off on the strategy? • Should the Strategy identify next steps, and if so, which ones? • Does the new strategy section on grant project monitoring accurately reflect the Monitoring Council's recommendations? • Do recommendations accurately reflect the Monitoring Council's consensus? • What issues/items should be stressed in the l transmittal letter?
Attachments:	California Senate Bill 1070 [see Section 13181(a) and (e)] MOU between Cal/EPA and Natural Resources Meeting notes of the June 9, 2010 Monitoring Council meeting (see item 6) Comprehensive Monitoring Program Strategy - 9/23/10 Draft
Contact Person:	Brock Bernstein	brockbernstein@sbcglobal.net, 805-646-8369
Notes:	The state funded improvement project monitoring (grant monitoring) discussion in Section 2.2.6 (pages 30 to 32) are not completely reflected in specific Chapter 4 recommendations. Funding is needed to ensure comparability of data, data aggregation, and ambient monitoring coordination. It was mentioned that coordination of grant monitoring in the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program is already being done by the watershed coalitions and the data go into CEDEN. So why would those monitoring efforts need to pay for additional coordination? The Monitoring Council will need to provide more specific recommendations on grant monitoring in the future. While it would add more force to the document, Agency Secretary sign-off on the Strategy would significantly delay completion of the document, especially with the approaching change in administration.

Decisions:	a) The Comprehensive Strategy document should be completed and sent to the two Agency Secretaries by the end of 2010
	b) Agency Secretary sign-off on the Comprehensive Strategy should not be requested
	c) Revise discussion of Aquatic Ecosystem Health themes to reflect four primary workgroups: (1) Freshwater – streams, rivers and lakes; (2) Estuaries; (3) Ocean; and (4) Wetlands
	d) Revise Chapter 4 to differentiate between "requests" and "recommendations" (e.g., second, third and fourth bullets are requests)
	e) Add a new open bullet to the Chapter 4 recommendations on grant monitoring (bottom of page 48) that a funding mechanism (without specifying a specific amount or percentage) is needed to ensure that the changes are implemented; append "for each project" to the end of the first open bullet recommendation
	f) Still too much emphasis on portal development; be more explicit up front (Chapter 2 and Foreword) and in the Years 2-8 Plan about the other monitoring and assessment improvement tasks required by SB 1070 – with detailed tasks for the workgroups (evaluation, reporting back to Monitoring Council then to Agency Secretaries); see pages 52 & 53; multiple needs are being served by the workgroups and the portals
	g) Add up front • incredible progress made in a short time with limited resources • time and resource to implement the opportunities for improvement identified to date
Action Items:	In the upcoming legislative staff briefing, the main messages should be: • Continued role for Monitoring Council to provide coordination • Contracting problems need to be addressed • Each participating state government organization needs additional funding for coordination and portal development • Ask what else the Monitoring Council should be doing

ITEM:	8
Title of Topic:	**2010 MONITORING COUNCIL ANNUAL REPORT**
Purpose:	Report to Agency Secretaries, due by end of 2010
Desired Outcome:	• Direction on content and emphasis of the progress report • Direction on additional interaction with Agency Secretaries
Background:	In the transmittal letter to its December 2008 Recommendations, the Monitoring Council agreed to deliver annual progress reports to the Agency Secretaries. The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Cal/EPA and Natural Resources includes the following under State Agency Responsibilities, "The Secretaries will meet annually to review the Monitoring Council's progress in integrating and coordinating water quality monitoring programs with state, local,

	and federal agencies, and with the public to identify additional opportunities for progress."
	The Monitoring Council is requested to provide direction on the following issues:
	• Articulation of the relationship between the Council and the Secretaries, as requested by the MOU
	• Additional feedback process that involves the Secretaries in addition to the Monitoring Council's annual report, such as annual briefings
Attachments:	2009 Annual Progress Report of the Water Quality Monitoring Council Transmittal Letter to the December 2008 Monitoring Council Recommendations MOU between Cal/EPA and Natural Resources
Contact Person:	Jon Marshack	jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov, 916-341-5514
Notes:	With the submission of the Comprehensive Strategy at the end of 2010, is there any need for an annual report for 2010? Many of the achievements of 2010 are outlined in the Strategy document.
Decisions:	a) Satisfy the annual reporting within the cover letter for the Comprehensive Strategy document; call out significant progress made in 2010, such as engagement with the Natural Resources Agency
	b) Add a short (1-2 page) Monitoring Council governance document to the Comprehensive Strategy prior to submission; address changes in membership, decision making methods (largely consensus), relationship to workgroups, and relationship to Agency Secretaries, mission/vision statement
	c) Annual Agency Secretary briefings should continue, patterned on the ones given by Jon Marshack plus a few Monitoring Council Members in 2010 and timed to follow submission of annual reports
	d) Down the road, an annual Monitoring Council conference to showcase the work of each workgroup would be beneficial
Action Items:	a) Brock Bernstein and Jon Marshack will develop the cover letter and governance document
	b) Jon Marshack will draft a letter to Gary Yamamoto requesting that the Director of CDPH sign the Monitoring Council MOU, emphasizing support for data management and obtaining resources

ITEM:	9
Title of Topic:	MEETING WRAP-UP
Purpose:	a) Summarize meeting b) Plan agenda for next Council meeting on December 8, 2010 in Sacramento
Desired Outcome:	Develop agenda items for December 8 meeting
Contact Person:	Jon Marshack	jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov, 916-341-5514

Monitoring Council Meeting Notes – 13 – October 13, 2010

Notes:	December 8 meeting may conflict with the Central Valley Regional Water Board hearing on the Sacramento Regional Plant NPDES permit. CDPH and others may be testifying.
Decisions:	The next meeting will include: a) Progress reports by/on all workgroups b) Monitoring Council sign off on the Comprehensive Strategy document, cover letter, and governance c) Develop calendar of meetings for 2011

October 26, 2010
Amended October 27 and November 30, 2010
Approved December 8, 2010