

CALIFORNIA WATER QUALITY MONITORING COUNCIL
Planning Subcommittee Meeting Agenda
Monday, November 16, 2015 – 9:00 to 12:00 Noon

First Floor, Training Room 1 East/West
 Joe Serna Jr. Cal/EPA Headquarters Building
 1001 I Street, Sacramento



IMPORTANT INFORMATION!!

Meetings of the Monitoring Council are open to the public. Times indicated in the agenda are approximate. The order of agenda items is subject to change. Actions of the Monitoring Council are advisory to the Secretaries of the California Environmental Protection Agency and the California Natural Resources Agency.

Handouts, presentations, notes, and related Monitoring Council meeting information will be available prior to or after the meeting at http://www.MyWaterQuality.ca.gov/monitoring_council/meetings.

Remote access will not be available for this subcommittee meeting.

For a map to the Cal/EPA Headquarters Building, visit: <http://www.calepa.ca.gov/EPABldg/location.htm>. For security purposes, all visitors are required to sign in and receive a badge at the Visitor Center to the left of the lobby upon entering the building. Valid picture identification may be required due to the security level. Individuals who require special accommodations are requested to contact the State Water Board's Equal Employment Opportunity Office at (916) 341-5881.

ITEM:	1	Approx. Time:
Title of Topic:	INTRODUCTIONS AND HOUSEKEEPING	10 minutes
Purpose:	1) Introductions (in the room and on the phone) 2) Review agenda for today's meeting 3) Brief announcements of Monitoring Council Members and others	
Desired Outcome:	a) Preview what will be covered today and overall meeting expectations b) Adjust today's agenda, as needed c) Provide opportunity for brief announcements	
Attachment Link:	Meeting Notice	

ITEM:	2	Approx. Time:
Title of Topic:	CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND FOR DISCUSSION	25 minutes
Purpose:	Jon Marshack and Kris Jones will provide a background for discussion items that appear later in the agenda, drawing from the Council's discussion on August 27.	
Desired Outcome:	Information and comment	
Background:	The following topics arose from the Monitoring Council's August 27 meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What has been successful? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wetland Monitoring Workgroup – funding, outreach, standardized 	

	<p>methods for monitoring/assessment/reporting, federal agency support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Bioaccumulation Oversight Group – statewide survey of sport fish and resulting action by the Water Boards to develop a statewide mercury TMDL○ Estuary Monitoring Workgroup – development of tools and dashboards useful to agency staff and decision makers (e.g., for adaptive management purposes)○ Healthy Watersheds Assessment for California● What has been less than successful?<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Relying on grassroots efforts to move the mission forward○ Safe to Swim Workgroup and portal progress○ Ocean Ecosystem Health Workgroup formation○ SWAMP / Monitoring Council strategy implementation○ Portals as the driver to improve monitoring and assessment○ Improvements in IT infrastructure – data management systems, web, GIS○ Safe to Drink Portal – getting construction started○ Data Management Workgroup – participation and developing recommendations○ Participation by certain governmental organizations○ Data sharing across organizations● Opportunities for Monitoring Council and workgroup progress<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ California Wetland Monitoring Workgroup and Wetland and Riparian Area Monitoring Plan (WRAMP)○ California Estuary Monitoring Workgroup: SF Bay-Delta actions<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Merger of Bay-Delta Live and Estuary Portal – dashboards for managers▪ Delta Plan Interagency Implementation Committee (DPIIC): High-Impact Science Actions▪ Bay-Delta Science Synthesis Team Proposal▪ Delta Restoration Project Tracking (Delta Conservancy; Wetland Monitoring Workgroup, Estuary Monitoring Workgroup)○ Healthy Watersheds Workgroup and Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program○ California CyanoHAB Network monitoring and response actions guidance○ Delta Council's Data Summit White Paper and Data Management Workgroup● Challenges that need to be addressed for the above opportunities to be successful<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ State governmental organization approval for using tools developed by outside organizations, such as SFEI and MLML.○ State governmental organization willingness to allow their staff to
--	--

	<p>participate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Improving state agency participation in the Data Management Workgroup, particularly by staff who are willing and able to make broad-based recommendations for improving data infrastructure ○ Developing and maintaining strong workgroup leadership ○ Funding and IT support for portal maintenance and development and willingness to use newer and evolving technologies for data visualization ○ Increased integration between SWAMP and workgroup actions ○ Continued/increased outreach to foster participation and use of workgroup tools by a greater number of organizations ○ Support for Monitoring Council and workgroup efforts from state agencies and the legislature
Attachment Links:	Monitoring Council meeting notes of August 27, 2015 (see Item #7)

ITEM:	3	Approx. Time:
Title of Topic:	PERSPECTIVE OF THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY	25 minutes
Purpose:	CalEPA Undersecretary Gordon Burns will provide his agency’s perspective on the Monitoring Council’s strategy and first audit report findings and where CalEPA envisions the Monitoring Council moving forward	
Desired Outcome:	Information and feedback from the Council. Potential for Agency assistance.	
Background:	During in-person briefings, both CalEPA and the Natural Resources Agency have expressed appreciation for the efforts of the Monitoring Council and its workgroups. Council Co-Chairs and staff have been meeting with CalEPA Secretary Rodriguez and Undersecretary Gordon Burns to explore the structure and focus of the Monitoring Council and potential Agency support for future Council actions. Discussions emphasized the need to tie future Council actions to high-profile activities that already have state administration support.	
Attachment Link:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring Council meeting notes of August 27, 2015 (see Item #7) • Monitoring Council’s Comprehensive Monitoring Program Strategy (2010) • First Triennial Audit of Implementing the Monitoring Council’s Strategy (2014) 	

ITEM:	4	Approx. Time:
Title of Topic:	MONITORING COUNCIL GOVERNANCE	45 minutes
Purpose:	Discuss current and future Monitoring Council membership and structure	
Desired Outcome:	Recommendations on future structure and function of the Monitoring Council	
Background:	Current Monitoring Council membership includes representatives from the State Water Board, the Department of Water Resources, the Division of Drinking	

	<p>Water, citizen monitoring groups, regulated publicly owned treatment works, stormwater and agriculture, water supply interests, the scientific community, and the public. A liaison from U.S. Environmental Protection Agency regularly participates. While this diversity of interests had helped to shape the Monitoring Council's strategy and planning efforts, many state governmental organizations critical to implementation are not represented. Providing representation from those organizations could help foster support for the Monitoring Council, as well as increase participation and support for Council and workgroup actions.</p> <p>Discussion at the August 27 Monitoring Council meeting (see Item #7) explored the concept of transforming the current Council into an executive advisory group and to develop a new council comprised of governmental organization managers to lead implementation by the workgroups.</p> <p><u>Questions for discussion include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should the Monitoring Council membership and organizational structure remain the same or should it be modified? • If the Council should be modified, in what manner? • What structure and membership would improve chances for success?
Attachment Link:	Current Monitoring Council Governance document

ITEM:	5	Approx. Time:
Title of Topic:	FOCUS OF THE MONITORING COUNCIL AND ITS WORKGROUPS	60 minutes
Purpose:	Discuss the existing focus of Monitoring Council and workgroup actions, as well as potential changes in the direction of those efforts.	
Desired Outcome:	Recommendations for future focus of Council and workgroup actions	
Background:	<p>The Council's current focus is to foster improvement in monitoring, assessment and reporting of water quality and aquatic ecosystem health using a statewide perspective, dividing workgroup and portal efforts by beneficial use themes and water body types, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe to drink • Safe to swim • Safe to eat fish and shellfish • Aquatic Ecosystem Health <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wetlands ○ Estuaries (allowed to begin with SF Bay-Delta focus) ○ Streams, rivers, and lakes (recently changed to watersheds) ○ Ocean and coastal • Stressors and processes that affect water quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Harmful algal blooms and cyanotoxins <p>Two additional workgroups were formed outside of this structure:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data Management • Collaboration Network <p><u>Questions for discussion include:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should a statewide focus be maintained, or should a more opportunistic focus be adopted that better addresses regional monitoring efforts and issues as they arise? 2. Should monitoring, assessment, and reporting improvement efforts continue to be divided into theme areas by beneficial uses and water body types? 3. Should the Council continue to pursue efforts in all of the above theme areas, or should the focus be narrowed to those shown to be successful? 4. Should the Council's efforts be expanded to include water supply information to better align with mandates of the Department of Water Resources and the State Water Board's Division of Water Rights? 5. Should portal development continue to be the Council's driver to improve monitoring, assessment, and reporting? 6. Who is the audience of workgroup and Council efforts? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Agency managers and decision makers ○ The public ○ Legislators ○ Scientists and researchers 7. How can the Monitoring Council and its workgroup efforts become indispensable to organizations that can supply funding? 8. Is new legislation needed to refine and bolster the Monitoring Council effort? 9. What can Council Members do to increase support for the Council's efforts?
<p>Attachment Links:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theme-specific workgroups and portals diagram (attached) • Guidelines for Workgroups and the Development of My Water Quality Theme-Based Internet Portals

<p>ITEM:</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>Approx. Time:</p>
<p>Title of Topic:</p>	<p>MEETING WRAP-UP</p>	<p>15 minutes</p>
<p>Purpose:</p>	<p>Summarize main recommendations to the full Monitoring Council</p>	

ADJOURN



California Water Quality Monitoring Council

Theme-Specific Workgroups and Portals

THEMES					
WATER BODY TYPES	Is Our Water Safe to Drink?	Is It Safe to Swim in Our Waters?	Is It Safe to Eat Fish and Shellfish from Our Waters?	Are Our Aquatic Ecosystems Healthy?	What Stressors & Processes Affect Our Waters?
Streams & Rivers	Safe Drinking Water Workgroup	/	Bioaccumulation Oversight Group (SWAMP)	Healthy Watersheds Partnership (SWAMP)	California CyanoHAB Network
Lakes				/	
Estuaries				Estuary Monitoring Workgroup	
Ocean Waters	N/A	Safe to Swim Workgroup	Ocean & Coastal Workgroup		
Wetlands	N/A	N/A	/	Wetland Monitoring Workgroup	
Tap Water	Safe Drinking Water Workgroup	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Groundwater		N/A	N/A	N/A	