

## CALIFORNIA WATER QUALITY MONITORING COUNCIL

### Monitoring Council Meeting Notes

Wednesday, September 3, 2014 – 10:00 AM to 4:30 PM

Fifth Floor, Conference Room 550  
Joe Serna Jr. Cal/EPA Headquarters Building  
1001 I Street, Sacramento



#### Monitoring Council Members and (Alternates) in attendance:

(Sean Bothwell)	Sarge Green	Armand Ruby
Bruce Burton	Paul Helliker	(Stephani Spaar)
Beth Christman	(Karen Larsen)	Stephen Weisberg

#### Others in attendance or (on the phone):

Dori Bellan, State Water Resources Control Board  
(Brock Bernstein, independent contractor)  
Rich Breuer, State Water Resources Control Board  
(Val Connor, State & Federal Contractors Water Agency)  
(Kelsey Cowin, State & Federal Contractors Water Agency)  
(Mike Fennessy, Orange County Public Works)  
Terry Fleming, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9—Monitoring Council Liaison  
Stephanie Fong, State & Federal Contractors Water Agency  
(James Fortuna, Orange County Public Works)  
(Anna Garcia, Mojave Water)  
(Ian Hull, Environmental Resources Management)  
(Karina Johnston, Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission)  
Kris Jones, Department of Water Resources—Monitoring Council Assistant Director  
Judy Kelly, San Francisco Estuary Partnership  
(Dawn Koepke, McHugh and Associates)  
Jon Marshack, State Water Resources Control Board—Monitoring Council Executive Director  
(Lisa McCann, Central Coast Water Board)  
(Stephen McCord, McCord Environmental, Inc.)  
(Jill Murray, City of Santa Barbara)  
Melanie Okoro, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
Dave Paradies, Bay Foundation of Morro Bay  
Mariela Paz Carpio-Obeso, State Water Resources Control Board  
Rik Rasmussen, State Water Resources Control Board  
(Steve Saiz, Central Coast Water Board)  
(Grant Sharp, Orange County Public Works)  
Frances Spivy-Weber, State Water Resources Control Board  
(Man Voong, Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board)  
Lori Webber, State Water Resources Control Board  
Johanna Weston, State Water Resources Control Board  
Karen Worcester, Central Coast Water Board  
(Jun Zhu, Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board)

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>INTRODUCTIONS AND HOUSEKEEPING</b>	
<b>Purpose:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Introductions (in the room and on the phone)</li> <li>2) Review draft notes from May 28, 2014 Monitoring Council meeting</li> <li>3) Review agenda for today's meeting</li> </ol>	
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Approve May 28, 2014 Monitoring Council meeting notes</li> <li>b) Preview what will be covered today and overall meeting expectations</li> <li>c) Adjust today's agenda, as needed</li> </ol>	
<b>Attachment Links:</b>	<a href="#">Draft notes from May 28, 2014 Council meeting</a>	
<b>Contact Persons:</b>	Kris Jones Jon Marshack	<a href="mailto:kristopher.jones@water.ca.gov">kristopher.jones@water.ca.gov</a> , (916) 376-9756 <a href="mailto:jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov">jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov</a> , (916) 341-5514
<b>Decisions:</b>	Meeting notes for May 28 were approved without amendment.	

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES</b>	
<b>Purpose:</b>	<p>These are brief informational items that could be expanded into more detailed discussions for future meetings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) National Water Quality Monitoring Council, July meeting highlights (Jon Marshack &amp; Kris Jones)</li> <li>b) Delta Stewardship Council's Delta Science Plan Environmental Data Summit (Jon Marshack)</li> <li>c) California Drinking Water Program move from the Department of Public Health to the State Water Board – implications for the Monitoring Council and development of the Safe-to-Drink Portal (Karen Larsen &amp; Bruce Burton)</li> <li>d) California Department of Fish and Wildlife's role with the Monitoring Council and its workgroups (Jon Marshack &amp; Kris Jones)</li> </ol>	
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	Information and comment	
<b>Background:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <b>National Water Quality Monitoring Council</b> – The National Council provides a national forum for coordination of comparable and scientifically defensible methods and strategies to improve water quality monitoring, assessment and reporting, and promotes partnerships to foster collaboration, advance the science, and improve management within all elements of the water quality monitoring community. The National Council held its latest meeting on July 29-31, 2014. Jon Marshack, the Executive Director of California's Monitoring Council, represents the Pacific Southwest States (Arizona, California, Hawaii, and Nevada) on the National Council.</li> <li>b) <b>Delta Science Plan Environmental Data Summit</b> – The Delta Science Program held a Data Summit on June 5-6, 2014. The Delta Science Plan</li> </ol>	

	<p>included an action to hold a Data Summit. The plan committed the Science Program to “Host a data summit to explore and identify needed improvements to cyber-infrastructure, data management capacity, and mechanisms to facilitate active data sharing, data mining, and analysis. Information generated in the Summit will inform the Science Action Agenda, support innovations in data integration and management, and develop paths for enhancing and sustaining current initiatives.”</p> <p>c) <b>California Drinking Water Program</b> – Pursuant to Governor Brown’s direction and recent legislation, California’s Drinking Water Program moved from the Department of Public Health on July 1, 2014 to form the new Division of Drinking Water within the State Water Resources Control Board. Karen Larsen, Monitoring Council Co-Chair representing Cal/EPA has accepted an Assistant Deputy Director position within the new Division.</p> <p>d) <b>Department of Fish and Wildlife</b> – CDFW staff are currently involved to some extent in the Monitoring Council’s Estuary Monitoring Workgroup and Wetland Monitoring Workgroup. Other workgroups have requested increased participation from CDFW staff and data generated from their monitoring programs. The Monitoring Council has requested a presentation on this topic from CDFW. On July 28, 2014, Monitoring Council staff met with CDFW staff to plan for this presentation and to explore areas of potential increased participation by CDFW staff.</p>				
<p><b>Attachment Links:</b></p>	<p>a) <a href="#">National Water Quality Monitoring Council website</a></p> <p>b) <a href="#">Environmental Data Summit website</a></p> <p>c) <a href="#">California Drinking Water Program transfer information</a></p>				
<p><b>Contact Persons:</b></p>	<table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="415 1094 727 1150">Jon Marshack</td> <td data-bbox="727 1094 1495 1150"><a href="mailto:jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov">jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov</a>, (916) 341-5514</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="415 1150 727 1209">Kris Jones</td> <td data-bbox="727 1150 1495 1209"><a href="mailto:kristopher.jones@water.ca.gov">kristopher.jones@water.ca.gov</a>, (916) 376-9756</td> </tr> </table>	Jon Marshack	<a href="mailto:jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov">jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov</a> , (916) 341-5514	Kris Jones	<a href="mailto:kristopher.jones@water.ca.gov">kristopher.jones@water.ca.gov</a> , (916) 376-9756
Jon Marshack	<a href="mailto:jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov">jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov</a> , (916) 341-5514				
Kris Jones	<a href="mailto:kristopher.jones@water.ca.gov">kristopher.jones@water.ca.gov</a> , (916) 376-9756				
<p><b>Notes:</b></p>	<p>a) <b>National Water Quality Monitoring Council</b> – Jon Marshack provided an overview of the National Water Quality Monitoring Council (NWQMC) meeting held on July 29-31 (see <a href="#">meeting minutes</a>), including brief updates on National Council initiatives. Jon indicated that the National Water Quality Portal would greatly benefit from the CWQMC’s question driven approach. He added that currently the national portal does not provide assessment information (it’s just a great source of data). Stephen Weisberg asked how the CWQMC compares to other similar efforts around the nation—are any states ahead of California? Jon indicated that he did not think so. Jon added that our coordination efforts seem to be a bit ahead, for example, getting issue experts involved in the various workgroups. Jon did indicate that there were some states that do some great things, such as holding annual conferences, which the CWQMC could try and emulate.</p> <p>Stephen expressed concerns regarding possible differences between the data presented on the national portal versus California’s CEDEN. He referenced issues with CEDEN and WQX, for example. Rich Breuer indicated that his team is currently working to resolve the issues with CEDEN. Stephen Weisberg suggested a future Monitoring Council agenda item that would explore differences between the message provided by the National Water Quality Portal and CEDEN.</p> <p>b) <b>Delta Science Plan Environmental Data Summit</b> – Jon Marshack provided an update regarding the Delta Science Program’s Environmental Data</p>				

Summit, which took place on June 5-6, 2014. Jon indicated that the information that was generated from the Summit is currently being incorporated in a 'Vision Document', which will provide recommendations regarding needed improvements to cyber-infrastructure, data management capacity, and mechanisms to facilitate active data sharing, data mining, and analysis. The report will be used to inform the Science Action Agenda and will serve as a guide for future partnering opportunities and funding needs.

Jon suggested that the Monitoring Council members could serve as external reviewers for the report, and asked for their feedback. Paul Helliker mentioned that the goals of the Data Summit seem to closely parallel those of the Monitoring Council. Jon agreed, and indicated that members of the Monitoring Council's Data Management Workgroup were closely involved in organizing the Summit, as well as the development of the Vision Document. Jon added that the Delta Science Program is fully aware of the goals of the Monitoring Council, and they have indicated that they are interested in our active collaboration in their efforts.

Paul asked for specifics regarding the Science Program's focus. For example, are they focused primarily on the technology used for data sharing or the actual data? Jon mentioned that their primary focus is how we can make data systems open and available. Specifically, it will focus on the technology and how we can fund these efforts. Karen Larsen mentioned that the impetus of the summit was AB378, which was intended to break down the current silos of monitoring and research data collected about the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. Originally, the Summit was intended to focus on Delta related data; however, the focus later broadened to include environmental data statewide.

- c) **California Drinking Water Program** – Karen Larsen provided an update regarding the drinking water program moving from the Department of Public Health to a new Division of Drinking Water at the State Water Resources Control Board. Karen informed the Monitoring Council that as of July 31st, she has been serving as the new Assistant Deputy Director for the Division of Drinking Water. Monitoring Council member Bruce Burton also informed the group that he has moved over to the State Water Resources Control Board with the Drinking Water Program, and is now serving as the Assistant Deputy Director of the Northern California Drinking Water Field Operations Branch. Karen indicated that this would be her last meeting as Jonathan Bishop's alternate for the California Environmental Protection Agency. She added that she will take over Bruce Burton's position as the Monitoring Council member representing the Drinking Water Program.

Fran Spivy-Weber asked for an update regarding the Drinking Water Program's data and data sharing. Bruce Burton indicated that his staff is working to get those data online and accessible. Jon Marshack added that they are working to make drinking water data available through the Safe to Drink Portal. Fran suggested that that Monitoring Council should have an agenda item for an upcoming meeting regarding the data sources from the various programs of the Department of Water Resources and the Water Boards, including recycled water, water use data, and local drinking water sources. She indicated that these data types are becoming increasingly important due to the drought and climate change, and having such a presentation would help ensure that we are not duplicating efforts.

Stephen Weisberg mentioned that plans for the Safe to Drink portal are ambitious and impressive. He added that the transition of the Drinking Water

Program to the State Water Board could serve as an opportunity for the Monitoring Council to highlight these new changes and getting those data available through the portal. Jon Marshack agreed with this point. Paul Helliker added that this could be a good theme for a conference of the CWQMC. Sarge Green questioned whether the group would have enough participation or time to develop the portal and organize a conference. Terry Fleming asked whether the workgroup had a timeline for the portal's completion. Jon indicated that it would hopefully be online by the end of 2015.

- d) **Department of Fish and Wildlife** – Jon Marshack discussed the brief history of the Monitoring Council's interest in partnering with the Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW). He mentioned that the Monitoring Council had asked for an agenda item to discuss integration of efforts among DFW and the Monitoring Council, and such an agenda item was originally scheduled for this meeting. However, after meeting with DFW staff and management on July 28th to discuss potential options for collaboration, Jon indicated that CDFW staff repeatedly indicated that they have limited resources and staff time for such collaboration. During the meeting Jon suggested several areas where DFW and the Monitoring Council's workgroups could partner, such as work relating to the lake and streambed alteration program, mapping restoration efforts and grant programs. However, DFW staff continued to show resistance and apprehension regarding participating in Monitoring Council efforts. They suggested that Jon contact Sandra Morey (Deputy Director, Ecosystem Conservation Division) and Dan Yparraguirre (Deputy Director, Wildlife and Fisheries Division) to enquire about who could present an agenda item at the Monitoring Council meeting on September 3. Sandra replied via email saying, 'Thanks for your email and for your recent discussions with several CDFW staff. As I'm sure you can understand, our staff are currently fully subscribed with critical drought and related priorities and so we will have to decline your invitation to participate in the Sept 3 meeting of the California Water Quality Monitoring Council. It just isn't possible for our staff to take on more workload right now. Thanks for your inquiry.' Jon indicated that this response would not end our dialogue with DFW. He added that there are a number of DFW staff that are key participants in Monitoring Council workgroups (e.g., Wetlands and Estuaries)—we will continue to seek grass roots involvement.

Karen Larsen indicated that we need to try and do a better job approaching DFW and other agencies from the stand point of 'what's in it for you.' Terry Fleming asked whether DFW staff were involved in the work relating to EcoAtlas. Jon indicated that there are a few staff involved peripherally. Fran Spivy-Weber asked about whether we have conducted outreach with DFW's Marine Division. Jon mentioned that the Ocean Ecosystem Health Workgroup is currently forming, and that they will be conducting outreach with that division in the near future.

Sarge Green indicated that DFW's response bothered him. Is there a way to approach DFW, letting them know that their involvement will have net benefits over time? Jon Marshack mentioned that we need to have top-down support as well as dedicated funding for their involvement. Kris Jones mentioned that during their meeting with DFW, he and others point to examples such as DWR's Water Quality Conditions Report. Once a static annual report, a version of this report is now interactive and available online via the Estuaries Portal. Kris added that in their outreach with potential partners, he and Jon are now trying to identify existing departmental

	<p>mandates and highlighting examples such as the Water Quality Conditions Report to try and entice participation; getting department's annual reports available via the My Water Quality portals has the potential to save considerable staff time. However, currently, the Water Quality Conditions Report is the only example to highlight and that example is not yet complete. As similar efforts continue to become available via the portals, Kris indicated that there is more potential to convince partners that such collaborations could free up staff time and be a benefit to their agency. Paul Helliker mentioned that he will communicate with DFW management to see whether there are any potential linkages that he can initiate from his perspective.</p>
<b>Action Items:</b>	<p>Monitoring Council workgroups need to identify opportunities where existing departmental mandates can be better met through workgroup and portal development efforts. Jon and Kris will use that information in approaching departmental managers regarding staff participation in the workgroups.</p>

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>3</b>	
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>MONITORING COUNCIL ESTABLISHING SPECIFIC AUTHORITY FOR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND ASSISTANT DIRECTOR</b>	
<b>Purpose:</b>	Jon Marshack presented proposed changes to the Monitoring Council's governance document that would establish specific authority for the Executive Director and Assistant Director.	
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	Discuss and vote on proposed amendments to the Monitoring Council's governance document to establish specific authority for the Executive Director and Assistant Director.	
<b>Background:</b>	<p>At its May 28, 2014 meeting, the Monitoring Council amended its governance document to change the title of its full-time Coordinator to Executive Director and to change the title of its half-time Coordinator to Assistant Director. While general duties and responsibilities of these positions were included, no specific actions of the Council were authorized for these two staff positions. In late June, the Executive Director was asked by a former Monitoring Council Member to provide a letter of support for a project that, if funded, could enhance a future ocean and coastal ecosystem health workgroup of the Monitoring Council. While the letter was written in such a way that project support from Monitoring Council Members was not specified, the situation raised the issue of the Monitoring Council establishing specific authority for its two staff positions.</p>	
<b>Attachment Link:</b>	<a href="#">Approved amendments to the Monitoring Council's governance document</a>	
<b>Contact Person:</b>	Jon Marshack	<a href="mailto:jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov">jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov</a> , (916) 341-5514
<b>Notes:</b>	<p>In late June, Jon Marshack was asked by a former Monitoring Council Member to provide a letter of support for a project that, if funded, could enhance a future ocean and coastal ecosystem health workgroup of the Monitoring Council. While the letter was written in such a way that project support from Monitoring Council Members was not specified, the situation raised the issue of the Monitoring Council establishing specific delegated authority for its two staff positions. Jon presented the suggested changes to the governance document, and requested feedback from the Monitoring Council. Sean Bothwell asked whether the</p>	

	<p>example of the letter of recommendation would fall under part B (page 5 of the <a href="#">governance document</a>), which states that ‘the Monitoring Council hereby authorizes the Executive Director, with the support of the Assistant Director, to... Comment on proposed projects and programs related to implementation of the Monitoring Council’s <i>A Comprehensive Monitoring Program Strategy for California</i>.’ Jon agreed with this assessment. Paul Helliker asked whether Jon requested feedback from the Monitoring Council after he sent the letter. He also asked whether the letter had Monitoring Council letterhead, with the Monitoring Council member’s names removed. Jon indicated that the names were removed from the letterhead after he received feedback from the Monitoring Council members to clarify that they were not necessary involved in the letter’s endorsement. Paul followed up by suggesting that in the future, that the Executive Director should come to the Monitoring Council first. Jon agreed.</p> <p>Sean Bothwell asked for clarification regarding the new language—if there is any controversy, would you have gone forward with sending the letter? Jon indicated that he would approach the co-chairs to request their feedback, as is stated in the new language. Jon added that the Monitoring Council only meets four times per year, so in this case, getting the letter to the Monitoring Council members for approval would have not been possible. Sean asked how Paul Helliker’s agency, for example, delegates authority. Paul mentioned that there are analogous organizations that meet under similar rules. Jon indicated that much of the language was derived from the State Water Board’s delegation authority to their Executive Director. Fran Spivy-Weber mentioned that in similar situations their Executive Director at the SWRCB would request feedback from their Board Members before acting. Jon indicated that he would endeavor to request feedback from Council Members before acting in the future. He also reminded everyone that when the Monitoring Council members respond to such a request, that they not ‘respond to all’ so as to avoid potential violations of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act.</p> <p>Paul Helliker asked whether there were any objections to the proposed changes. Sean Bothwell asked for clarification again—if there were any opposition to this letter of recommendation, can you (Jon) still send out the letter? Sean asked Fran what is normally done at the State Water Board. Officially, Fran said that if there are any objections, their Executive Director can still send such a letter. However, she added that their Executive Director would most likely not send comments that Board Members found objectionable. Sean continued by saying that his concern is that there is not enough recourse, in case the Monitoring Council members disagree. Paul Helliker mentioned that the language is there to address these concerns—we either give him the authority or we do not. Sean acquiesced, agreeing that the language was fine as is. Paul asked whether there were any other comments or objections. There were none.</p>
<p><b>Decisions:</b></p>	<p>Proposed amendments to the Monitoring Council’s Governance document were approved without modifications.</p>
<p><b>Action Items:</b></p>	<p>The Monitoring Council staff will endeavor to circulate comment letters to Council Members for review and individual feedback before taking action. Council Members will provide comments without replying “to all,” so as to avoid Open Meeting Act issues.</p>

<b>ITEM:</b>	4	
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	TRIENNIAL AUDIT OF THE MONITORING COUNCIL'S STRATEGY	
<b>Purpose:</b>	Jon Marshack and Kris Jones presented the final draft of the first triennial audit report, followed by discussion among the Monitoring Council Members, Alternates, and EPA Liaison.	
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	Approval of the first triennial self-audit of implementation of the Monitoring Council's <i>A Comprehensive Monitoring Program Strategy for California</i> and a cover letter transmitting the report to the California Secretary for Environmental Protection.	
<b>Background:</b>	<p><a href="#">SB 1070</a>, specifically California Water Code Section 31383(h), and the MOU that created the Monitoring Council require that the Secretary of Cal/EPA, in consultation with the Secretary of the California Natural Resources Agency, conduct a triennial audit of implementing the Monitoring Council's <a href="#">A Comprehensive Monitoring Program Strategy for California</a> (2010). Cal/EPA Secretary Matthew Rodriquez requested that the Monitoring Council perform a self-audit.</p> <p>The content of this report was discussed at Monitoring Council meetings on <a href="#">December 12, 2013</a>, <a href="#">February 19, 2014</a>, and <a href="#">May 28, 2014</a> and specific direction was given to staff. At the May 28 meeting, final content and organization of the report and specific recommendations were determined; the Monitoring Council also decided to address the report to the Secretaries of Cal/EPA and the Natural Resources Agency and to key legislators.</p>	
<b>Attachment Links:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Increasing Efficiency and Effectiveness Through Collaboration: First Triennial Audit of Implementing A Comprehensive Monitoring Program Strategy for California</a> – presentation by Jon Marshack</li> <li>• <a href="#">Final Draft of the First Triennial Audit Report</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Draft Cover Letter to Cal/EPA Secretary Rodriquez</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Draft notes from May 28, 2014 Council meeting</a> (see Item 6)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Notes from the February 19, 2014 Monitoring Council meeting</a> (see Item 5)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Notes from the December 12, 2013 Monitoring Council meeting</a> (see Item 6)</li> <li>• <a href="#">CA Senate Bill 1070</a> (Statutes of 2006, specifically Water Code §13181(h))</li> <li>• <a href="#">Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)</a> establishing the Monitoring Council (see section IV, 4 on page 4)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Comprehensive Monitoring Program Strategy</a> (see page 22)</li> <li>• Monitoring Council's <a href="#">2008 Initial Recommendations</a> report (see page 11 and Appendix 3)</li> </ul>	
<b>Contact Persons:</b>	Jon Marshack Kris Jones	<a href="mailto:jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov">jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov</a> , (916) 341-5514 <a href="mailto:kristopher.jones@water.ca.gov">kristopher.jones@water.ca.gov</a> , (916) 376-9756
<b>Notes:</b>	During his <a href="#">presentation</a> , Jon Marshack discussed the background of the audit as well as the feedback that was provided at the May 28th Monitoring Council meeting. In order to make the document more useful for the Agency	

Secretaries, the Monitoring Council instructed its Executive Director and Assistant Director to add an executive summary and a roadmap to the latest draft of the audit report. They also requested that sections be added which provide specific recommendations to both the Agency Secretaries as well as legislators. During his presentation, Jon also recommended that space be added at the front of the document for the signatures of the Monitoring Council members. He also asked for feedback regarding his acknowledgement section. A cover letter to transmit the report from the Monitoring Council Co-Chairs to Cal/EPA Secretary Rodriguez was also presented.

Following Jon's presentation, Paul Helliker asked whether the document had changed significantly since the May 28<sup>th</sup> meeting, and whether the changes had been circulated. Jon had mentioned that a strikeout and underline version was sent out to the Monitoring Council Members to show the changes. Paul asked whether the strikeout version of the document was based on the comments from the May meeting. Jon said that it was. After reviewing these changes, Paul indicated that he did not feel that the recommendations would be very effective. Jon mentioned that at the May meeting, there had been a great deal of discussion regarding our approach. Jon indicated that the Monitoring Council members that attended the May meeting agreed that we needed to target the Agency Secretaries and the Legislature with specific recommendations, which is why these recommendations were included in the latest draft. Paul pointed out that the Agency Secretaries do not normally get involved in how departments allocate staff time, for example. Jon mentioned that at the May meeting, we had considered having the language be that the Agency Secretaries should 'recommend' that departmental staff become involved in the Monitoring Council's workgroups; however, it was later agreed that the language should be changed to 'direct departmental staff' rather than 'recommend'. Jon added that to be successful and sustainable implementation of the Monitoring Council's strategy will need top-down support. Karen Larsen indicated that management at the Water Board does get direction from their Agency Secretary; however, she agreed with Paul's point that our recommendations are not the highest priority for the Agency Secretaries. She asked whether we should modify our recommendations knowing this.

Paul recommended that we should have specifics regarding how the Agency Secretaries can support the Monitoring Council's efforts. For example, what are the specific needs of the workgroups, as detailed in their business plans. Jon mentioned that this is one of the recommendations in the audit—for the workgroups to develop business plans that identify the personnel and funding needed for their respective activities. Jon estimated that the business plans would be finished within the next year.

Bruce Burton asked whether having an external review of the audit would be helpful. Paul asked what would be the benefit of such an external review. Bruce added that it could highlight certain areas for funding as well as encourage the Agency Secretaries to respond. Sarge Green asked who would be qualified to review the document, adding that whatever recommendations we receive would depend on the reviewer.

Sarge asked Paul what he would suggest. Paul indicated that if we were to approach the Agency Secretaries for support, we would likely get a response similar to what we received from Sandra Morey at the DFW (see Item 2d)—they would likely respond by saying that they do not have the resources to do this type of work. Paul mentioned that we have identified our needs generically, but we do not have specifics (e.g., business plans). Providing this type of

information would enable the Secretaries to pursue budget requests, for example. Paul suggested that if we modify our recommendations to say something along the lines of ‘we are currently developing business plans, identifying our needs, and will contact you (the Agency Secretaries) when we have the specific details for the needed support.’ Paul and a number of other Monitoring Council members suggested that we reference some of the state’s current action items, such as the drought or the Water Action Plan, and try and identify ways where the Monitoring Council’s goals can help further these efforts. Paul added that doing so could help attract the attention of the Agency Secretaries.

Stephen Weisberg mentioned that that document as a whole is in good shape. He’s less concerned with what is in the Executive Summary. Rather, he thinks that the cover letter needs updating. Specifically, he thinks we should tie in some discussion of how our efforts compare to other states—highlighting our successes relative to other efforts. He added that we should emphasize that if the Agency Secretaries want us to continue to be successful that we need their support. Stephen thought that the tone of the letter and the recommendations needs to be more positive and highlight our successes. Paul Helliker and others agreed. Stephen added that he also agrees that our next goal should be to pursue the legislature for their support. Jon mentioned that he had communicated with the Water Boards Legislative Affairs Office asking what would be appropriate, given that Secretary Rodriquez specifically requested that we conduct the self-audit. Their response was that we could not address the audit to the legislature directly. Stephen suggested that we might consider rephrasing the letter to ask permission to approach the legislature.

Fran Spivy-Weber mentioned that it is very difficult for any agency to go directly to the legislature. Usually, agencies do not do this publically, if at all. She indicated that ordinarily agency management would push issues up the chain to the Secretary level and if they were supportive, they would be sent to the Governor’s office for a determination. With that said, she indicated that if the legislature asks the Secretaries to speak on a particular issue, they would do so. It was mentioned that the Triennial Audit document is publically available online. While it may not be appropriate or possible for a government agency to bring the report to the legislatures’ attention, Sean Bothwell mentioned that he and other non-government Monitoring Council members would not have such constraints.

Fran provided some background regarding how the secretaries were delegated authority over certain areas relating to natural resources and the environment. She mentioned that years ago there was a theme in the legislature, that if the Agency Secretaries were delegated authority over certain areas, that more would be accomplished in areas such as Ocean related monitoring, access to data etc. This was the theory, at least. However, she indicated that they have since learned that there are limitations of delegating authority to the Agency Secretaries when they have no staff or budget. Fran indicated that she thought the Monitoring Council may want to consider changing their approach with the Agency Secretaries—she suggested that we not wait for support from the Secretaries and consider other avenues. She continued that the more we are able to get data available that can help address issues such as drought and climate change, the more likely the legislature will be to support our efforts.

Fran suggested that we might want to promise to the Secretaries that the business plans and budgets will be provided to them by a certain date. Karen Larsen and others agreed that this was a good idea—this would provide the Secretaries something solid to which they could respond (e.g., in budget

	<p>requests). Sarge Green suggested that the Monitoring Council should make itself more visible. He added that he thought that the data visualization tools such as EcoAtlas are a great way to attract attention to our efforts. Sarge indicated that the audit should highlight these tools and indicate that we need support for these efforts to continue.</p> <p>In response to the earlier point of addressing the audit in the context of current issues (e.g., drought, climate change etc.), Karen Larsen mentioned that we currently can only look at present and past conditions. We lack the resources to make predictions, such as responses to drought and climate change. She added that the portals could do more, given additional support and resources. Fran suggested that we try and feed into these types of efforts—she added that the governor has a keen interest in climate change.</p> <p>Jon Marshack mentioned that he appreciated these comments and requested that the Monitoring Council send him their specific suggestions for how the audit report should be modified. He added that the Monitoring Council will not be able to approve the document outside of a publicly noticed meeting. Karen Larsen suggested that there be a subcommittee of the Council to review and finalize the document. Jon agreed that that would be fine and the document could be approved, as long as the subcommittee would not include a quorum of Monitoring Council Members. Paul Helliker and Sarge Green agreed to be on the subcommittee. Karen Larsen also volunteered Jonathan Bishop to participate.</p>
<b>Decisions:</b>	<p>The recommendations and cover letter of the Triennial Audit will be modified according to the discussion above and brought back to the Monitoring Council for approval.</p>
<b>Action Items:</b>	<p>Under the direction of Paul Helliker, Jonathan Bishop and Sarge Green, Jon and Kris will modify the Triennial Audit recommendations and cover letter for consideration by the Monitoring Council at their December 10 meeting.</p>

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>DATA VISUALIZATION TOOLS DEVELOPED BY THE CENTRAL COAST REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD</b>
<b>Purpose:</b>	<p>Karen Worcester (Senior Environmental Scientist) and Dave Paradies (software designer) demonstrated web-based data visualization tools (still in development) developed by the Regional Water Board for the Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program and described the system requirements and basic approach used.</p>
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	<p>Information and feedback as to the degree to which these tools would enhance both the Healthy Streams Portal and CEDEN.</p>
<b>Background:</b>	<p>At the Central Coast Water Board, staff has been working for several years towards implementation of a regional Vision of “Healthy Watersheds”. As part of this effort the Region established three measureable goals, related to healthy aquatic habitat, clean groundwater, and proper land management. To support the assessment of these goals, Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) staff has been developing a new web-based tool for synthesizing data from multiple sources into measures of health. This project is garnering attention</p>

	<p>at the state and national level because it provides a unique new way to view complex data in a user friendly environment that allows the user to quickly understand where our streams are healthy, and if not healthy, why not. The project requires selection of thresholds of concern, a scoring approach to translate measurement values into grades, translation of site level data to larger geographic scales, and integration of those data with assessments that have already been conducted at a state-wide level. The website is linked to multiple databases and can be automatically updated on a routine basis. The Council's Healthy Streams Partnership workgroup is considering whether this web tool may be adaptable for statewide use in the Healthy Streams Portal. Aspects of this product are also being considered for future enhancements to the California Environmental Data Exchange Network (CEDEN).</p>	
<p><b>Attachment Link:</b></p>	<p><a href="#">A Central Coast Water Quality Report Card For Healthy Watersheds</a> – presentation by Karen Worcester and Dave Paradies</p>	
<p><b>Contact Person:</b></p>	<p>Karen Worcester</p>	<p><a href="mailto:karen.worcester@waterboards.ca.gov">karen.worcester@waterboards.ca.gov</a>, (805) 549-3333</p>
<p><b>Notes:</b></p>	<p>Karen Worcester provided a <a href="#">presentation</a> regarding the web-based data visualization tools currently being developed by the Regional Water Board for the Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP). Her presentation provided background regarding their general approach and methods. Their project would allow users to view complex data in a user-friendly environment and would allow them to quickly understand where our streams are healthy, and if not healthy, why not. David Paradies finished by presenting the technical background regarding their web-based interface and data management environment. He indicated that they chose to use open source software for a number of reasons, such as the reduced risks associated with system development failure and the ability to empower agency staff with the development and modifications of these tools. David also discussed the topic of data flow, indicating that their system is intended to use routine automated queries of other data sources to keep data up-to-date. He also discussed their methods for data grooming (e.g., data standardization, quality assurance, etc.) and data visualization (e.g., geospatial, trend graphs etc.).</p> <p>Following their presentations, Jon Marshack indicated that there are a number of potential applications for these tools, including integration into the Healthy Streams Portal. Jon added that these tools could also be used to visualize data from CEDEN or other similar efforts. Dori Bellan asked how these tools deal with queries or trends which are based on little data. Karen Worcester indicated that in those instances, the analyses would not run.</p> <p>Armand Ruby asked whether it would be possible to see trends within seasons (i.e., storm driven events). He added that it's important to be able to identify the difference between within-season trends and long term trends. Armand suggested that they flag data from storm events. David indicated that they do not currently have storm water data incorporated, but they are working towards incorporating those data. Armand also mentioned the issue of sample size, and indicated that this information should be clearly provided. He also thought that for their summary slides, it would be good to have the relevant information displayed (e.g., site name) as you drill down from regional scale to a specific site. Karen thought this was a good point and indicated that she would try and make this information more transparent.</p> <p>Terry Fleming thanked Karen and David for their efforts, specifically for getting 303(d) impaired waters data available through their web-based visualization</p>	

	<p>tools. His only concern was regarding the standards they were using to select their assessment thresholds; Terry thought that they should work to get their thresholds clearly listed and available for the user. Karen Worcester agreed, however, she wanted to point out that they are focusing on the assessment of the 'health' of the water body rather than from an exceedance standpoint. This emphasis was derived from strategic planning goals adopted earlier by the Central Coast Region.</p>
--	--

<b>ITEM:</b>	6
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>WATER BOARD REGULATORY INITIATIVES</b>
<b>Purpose:</b>	<p>Three regulatory initiatives of the State Water Board were presented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biological integrity policy (Karen Larsen)</li> <li>• Toxicity policy (Rik Rasmussen)</li> <li>• Trash policy (Johanna Weston)</li> </ul> <p>Potential impacts of these initiatives on monitoring programs were discussed.</p>
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	Information and comment
<b>Background:</b>	<p>At the May 28, 2014 Monitoring Council meeting, Council Member Armand Ruby asked that this item be included in the next meeting agenda.</p> <p><b>Biological integrity</b> – The goals of the Biological Integrity Assessment Implementation plan are to: establish consistent, statewide methods for conducting biological assessments and interpreting biological data as indicators of biological integrity in California’s surface waters; identify streams or stream reaches in which biological condition is similar to appropriate reference sites and to prevent degradation of those streams; and identify streams or stream reaches in which biological condition is significantly different from appropriate reference condition and use this information to determine whether additional information is needed and to prioritize actions necessary to improve biological condition.</p> <p><b>Toxicity amendment</b> – State Water Board staff are developing an amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California that would establish statewide water quality objectives for chronic and acute toxicity and extend the authority of the Plan to inland surface waters. Originally proposed as the Policy for Toxicity Assessment and Control, the draft toxicity amendment would provide a standardized approach for toxicity regulation through uniform reasonable potential analyses, monitoring schedules, and effluent limitations for traditional point source dischargers.</p> <p><b>Trash amendment</b> – The State Water Board proposes a Statewide Water Quality Control Plan to Control Trash. The provisions in the proposed Trash Amendment includes the following six elements: (1) water quality objective, (2) prohibition of discharge, (3) implementation provisions, (4) time schedule, (5) time extension option for State Water Board consideration, and (6) monitoring and reporting requirements. The project objective for the proposed Trash Amendments is to provide statewide consistency for the Water Boards’ regulatory approach to protect aquatic life and public health beneficial uses, and reduce environmental issues associated with trash in state waters, while focusing limited resources on high trash generating areas.</p>

<p><b>Attachment Link:</b></p>	<p><a href="#">Amendments to Statewide Water Quality Control Plans to Control for Trash</a> – presentation by Johanna Weston</p>	
<p><b>Contact Persons:</b></p>	<p>Karen Larsen Rik Rasmussen Johanna Weston</p>	<p><a href="mailto:karen.larsen@waterboards.ca.gov">karen.larsen@waterboards.ca.gov</a>, (916) 319-9769 <a href="mailto:rik.rasmussen@waterboards.ca.gov">rik.rasmussen@waterboards.ca.gov</a>, (916) 341-5549 <a href="mailto:johanna.weston@waterboards.ca.gov">johanna.weston@waterboards.ca.gov</a>, (916) 327-8117</p>
<p><b>Notes:</b></p>	<p><b>Biological integrity</b> – Karen Larsen provided background regarding the Biological Integrity Assessment Implementation plan. Part of the plan’s focus is to establish consistent, statewide methods for conducting biological assessments and interpreting biological data as indicators of biological integrity in California’s surface waters. Karen indicated that this plan is still being developed and that they are currently working to develop tools to manage and analyze these data (e.g., using the California Stream Condition Index). Karen added that there is less certainty with regard to how prescriptive the plan will be for the various regions. Will they be required to use these tools in the various programs? She mentioned that some of these details are still being worked out.</p> <p>Armand Ruby mentioned concerns regarding reference conditions. Karen indicated that she felt that they had a robust pool of reference conditions, particularly compared to other states. Armand added that he still thought that this was an area that needs to be validated. Karen added that the focus of the plan has been assessment of aquatic macroinvertebrate assemblages in wadeable streams. A system using algae is not as well developed, currently.</p> <p><b>Toxicity amendment</b> – Rik Rasmussen described the State Water Board's efforts to develop an amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California. This plan would establish statewide standardized methods with which to assess chronic and acute toxicity, including the Test of Significant Toxicity (TST) and thresholds, and to extend the authority of the Plan to inland surface waters. He indicated that they are in the process of developing implementation procedures for point source dischargers, including monitoring frequencies and reasonable potential analysis. The amendment will largely be silent on nonpoint sources and ambient monitoring, except for application of the TST.</p> <p><b>Trash amendment</b> – Johanna Weston provided a <a href="#">presentation</a> on the background of the Trash amendment. The goal of the amendment is to provide statewide consistency for the Water Boards’ regulatory approach to protect aquatic life and public health beneficial uses. In addition, the amendment is intended to reduce environmental risks associated with trash in state waters.</p> <p>Following Johanna’s presentation, Armand Ruby mentioned that he was unclear how the data management and data sharing will be accomplished, and how these efforts were relevant for the Monitoring Council. Johanna mentioned that they are currently working towards developing GIS visualization tools for presenting and evaluating trash capture effectiveness data (e.g., to look at status and trends). Armand asked whether there are any other data coming from these efforts other than the weight of trash at a particular site. Johanna indicated that the amendment is not getting into any more specificity on methods at this stage, leaving them to be specified in permits issued by the Regional Water Boards. Armand indicated that this would make it difficult to make comparisons between permitted programs or to develop statewide statistics. He urged them to standardize data collection methods.</p>	

<b>ITEM:</b>	7	
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>ESTUARY MONITORING WORKGROUP – INDICATORS PROPOSAL</b>	
<b>Purpose:</b>	Stephanie Fong of the State & Federal Contractors Water Agency and Judy Kelly of the San Francisco Estuary Partnership presented proposed plans for coordination between the California Estuaries Portal and the State of the Estuary Report and discussed the possible effects that may have on California Estuary Monitoring Workgroup (CEMW) work plans and resources. This effort may also result in differences in how information is presented on the Estuaries Portal.	
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	Recommendations from the Monitoring Council on priorities – collaboration versus continuity with other portals – and when the CEMW would need to come back to the Council for approval on the types of changes we would make to the Estuaries Portal, especially in look and feel.	
<b>Background:</b>	The CEMW has been working with the San Francisco Estuary Partnership (SFEP) to add Delta indicators to the 2015 State of the Estuary Report, linking the Bay and Delta. There are a handful of indicators that seem to have potential for joint or coordinated assessment. CEMW members have been exploring the possibility of having other workgroups and portals participate, in particular Safe-to-Swim and Safe-to-Eat. Salinity and habitat indicators have also been discussed. Both the Monitoring Council's Portals and SFEP's report have little funding available, so we are trying to capitalize on collaborative efforts, but with the resources available it may be difficult to develop separate presentations of information.	
<b>Attachment Links:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">State of the Estuary Report 2015</a> – presentation by Judy Kelly</li> <li>• Proposed <a href="#">Changes to the Look and Feel of the Estuary Portal</a> – presentation by Stephanie Fong</li> <li>• <a href="#">2015 State of the Estuary Report fact sheet</a></li> </ul>	
<b>Contact Persons:</b>	Stephanie Fong Judy Kelly	<a href="mailto:sfong@sfcwa.org">sfong@sfcwa.org</a> , (916) 400-4840 <a href="mailto:jakelly@waterboards.ca.gov">jakelly@waterboards.ca.gov</a> , (510) 622-8137
<b>Notes:</b>	Judy Kelly <a href="#">presented</a> the background on the State of the Estuary Report. She described how the San Francisco Estuary Partnership's (SFEP) first State of the Bay report was released in 2011 (prior status and trends reports had been produced in 1988, 1990 and 1992 under the Clean Water Act Section 320 National Estuary Program). Originally, the report focused on the bay, as they were not yet able to incorporate enough delta-specific data. In 2015 they plan to incorporate more existing data from the Delta through their collaboration with the Monitoring Council's Estuary Monitoring Workgroup and to have the majority of the report be web-based through the California Estuaries Portal. A shorter printed summary would be produced to help publicize the product. Judy provided a general description of their methods, and showed a list of the indicators planned for the 2015 report. In terms of the resources available for this effort, Judy indicated that they have hired a lead scientist and funding for a science writer, as well as some funds to develop the publication; however, they are seeking additional funding. They also have a number of contributing organizations that are helping to develop the report and its content. Armand Ruby asked whether their funding accounted for extending the report to include	

	<p>the Delta. Judy Kelly mentioned that the original effort was a big expense (e.g., to develop the framework, methods etc.), whereas updating the reports has been much less expensive; she added that since much of the work will be carried out through collaboration, there should be sufficient funding to cover the addition of the Delta indicators. Stephani Spaar asked whether SFEP was coordinating with the Delta Science Program. Judy mentioned that Rainer Hoenicke of the Delta Science Program is on their committee and heavily involved.</p> <p>Stephanie Fong then <a href="#">presented</a> on how the Estuary Monitoring Workgroup will be collaborating with SFEP for the State of the Estuary Report, indicating that the workgroup has identified a number of 'low hanging fruit', indicators that will be achievable by the 2015 report deadline (e.g., data relating to swimming safety, and the safety of eating fish). Terry Fleming asked whether there was much swimming data? Jon Marshack mentioned that the regional programs have data in CEDEN. He added that the data used in these efforts will come from CEDEN rather than the Safe to Swim or Safe to Eat portals.</p> <p>Kris Jones mentioned that even though other of the Monitoring Council's portals have used a letter grade approach, a number of workgroup members had expressed concerns regarding developing letter grade assessments for their respective indicators. Kris indicated that part of the reason he had suggested having this agenda item was because he thought it would be good to get the Monitoring Council's feedback regarding these efforts and the approach. Armand Ruby mentioned that he favored the descriptive wording, e.g., good/fair/poor, rather than a letter grade approach.</p> <p>In addition to their collaboration with SFEP, Stephanie also presented on potential changes to the look and feel of the Estuaries Portal, based on work being done by 34 North on a San Joaquin River Portal. She mentioned that the look of the existing Estuaries Portal is a bit dated, and indicated that the group is trying to think about ways to modify the portal and showed some examples. Terry Fleming said that he was supportive of these changes, and did not mind whether the Estuaries Portal was consistent with the other My Water Quality portals. Jon Marshack indicated that he liked the examples Stephanie provided; he added that there was flexibility with regard to the portal's appearance, as long as it kept to the question driven approach for navigation and retained Monitoring Council branding at the top of each page. He also suggested that dropping the Questions Answered box from all but high-level pages in the portal would provide more space on other portal pages. Stephanie agreed that the question driven approach would be maintained. Jon also added that the current look is limited to the SWRCB's current ability to update the portals, i.e., existing staff resources, which have prevented implementation of newer state webpage style templates. Karen Larsen mentioned that the Water Boards staff has been focused on the move of the drinking water program from the Department of Public Health to the State Water Board. Terry Fleming asked about the long term funding for the Estuaries Portal. Stephanie indicated that there was less funding available through the State and Federal Contractors Water Agency; however, the Department of Water Resources is working to get funding for IT support.</p>
<p><b>Decisions:</b></p>	<p>The Monitoring Council agreed that the Estuary workgroup should continue with their collaboration with SFEP to integrate the State of the Estuary Report on the Estuaries Portal. The Monitoring Council also approved the request by the Estuary Workgroup to develop an updated look and feel for the Estuaries Portal.</p>

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>8</b>	
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>MEETING WRAP-UP</b>	
<b>Purpose:</b>	<p>Plan agenda for December 10, 2014 Monitoring Council meeting in Sacramento. Potential items include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Delta Stewardship Council, Environmental Data Summit – white paper on managing California’s environmental information</li> <li>2) Development of Monitoring Council recommendations to improve grant project monitoring, data management, assessment, and reporting</li> <li>3) Department of Fish &amp; Wildlife’s role with the Monitoring Council and its workgroups – coordination, financial support, data management and data access, what they need from the Monitoring Council to improve collaboration</li> <li>4) Data quality standardization efforts of SWAMP – “Data Comparability”</li> <li>5) Possibility of holding an annual conference. A representative from the Maryland Monitoring Council would be invited to participate by phone (see <a href="#">May 2012 notes</a>, Item 2d)</li> </ol>	
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	Develop agenda for the December 10 meeting	
<b>Contact Persons:</b>	<p>Kris Jones Jon Marshack</p>	<p><a href="mailto:kristopher.jones@water.ca.gov">kristopher.jones@water.ca.gov</a>, (916) 376-9756 <a href="mailto:jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov">jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov</a>, (916) 341-5514</p>
<b>Notes:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Monitoring Council expressed interest in hearing Items (1) through (5), above.</li> <li>• The Triennial Audit Report will need to come back to the Monitoring Council for approval at the December meeting, after a draft is approved by a subcommittee comprised of Paul Helliker, Jonathan Bishop, and Sarge Green.</li> <li>• With respect to Item (4), Armand Ruby suggested including a presentation regarding a SWAMP/CEDEN user’s group, which was mentioned at a previous meeting. Terry Fleming added that it would also be worth having a discussion of the new vision for SWAMP and CEDEN, including the new QA and Data Management Team. Incorporating citizen monitoring data was also mentioned.</li> <li>• Sarge Green also mentioned that it might also be worth having an item going over some of the other efforts currently underway in California to develop data visualizations tools, e.g., for the San Diego River.</li> <li>• With respect to Item (3), Stephani Spaar also suggested having presentations from other organizations within the Natural Resources agency (e.g., those identified in SB 1070). This would relate to our next steps for outreach, based on the inventory of monitoring programs contained in the Monitoring Council’s <a href="#">2008 Initial Recommendations Report</a>. Current Monitoring Council workgroups should be consulted for their recommendations on which organizations to target first.</li> </ul>	