

CALIFORNIA WATER QUALITY MONITORING COUNCIL

Monitoring Council Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, June 1, 2016 – 10:00 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:

Jonathan Bishop Phil Markle Stephen Weisberg
Beth Christman Armand Ruby
Karen Larsen (Stephani Spaar)

Others in attendance or (on the phone):

(David Altare, State Water Resources Control Board)
(Bev Anderson, State Water Resources Control Board)
Steve Bay, Southern California Coastal Water Research Project
(Avery Blackwell, Geosyntec)
Roger Butow, Clean Water Now
(Greg Gearheart, State Water Resources Control Board)
(Karen Gehrts, Department of Water Resources)
David Gillett, Southern California Coastal Water Research Project
Kris Jones, Water Quality Monitoring Council, Department of Water Resources
(Lauri Kemper, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board)
(Wendy Killou, State Water Resources Control Board)
(Grace Komjak, Los Angeles Department of Public Works)
(Yao Kouwonou, Los Angeles Department of Public Works)
Jon Marshack, Water Quality Monitoring Council, State Water Resources Control Board
Raphael Mazor, Southern California Coastal Water Research Project
(Eric Miller, MBC applied Environmental Sciences)
(Carly Nilson, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board)
(Dave Paradies, Bay Foundation of Morro Bay)
(Bryan Pastor, Orange County Public Works)
Ken Reich, Suburban Water Systems
(Paul Rochelle, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California)
(Steven Sander, member of the public)
(Jay Shrake, Amec Foster Wheeler)
Chris Stransky, Amec Foster Wheeler
(Bic Tran, Orange County Public Works)
(Cedric Twight, Sierra Pacific Industries)
(Lori Webber, State Water Resources Control Board)

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| ITEM: | 1 |
| Title of Topic: | INTRODUCTIONS AND HOUSEKEEPING |
| Purpose: | 1) Introductions (in the room and on the phone) 2) Review draft notes from February 23, 2016 Monitoring Council meeting 3) Review agenda for today's meeting |

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| Desired Outcome: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Approve February 23, 2016 Monitoring Council meeting notes b) Preview what will be covered today and overall meeting expectations c) Adjust today's agenda, as needed | |
| Attachment Links: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft notes from February 23, 2016 Monitoring Council meeting | |
| Contact Person: | Jon Marshack | jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov , (916) 341-5514 |
| Notes: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of February 23 meeting notes was not addressed. • Council Members elected to end the meeting early, due to limited return airline flights. • Agenda items 3 and 4 were taken in reverse order. • Steve Weisberg questioned how the Monitoring Council would be moving forward with key activities. He expressed the opinion that the topic of harmful algal blooms needs the Council's help. Multiple organizations are involved separately in freshwater and marine water HABs, but their efforts are low-level, in the background, and underfunded. He questioned whether bond funding would be appropriate to enhance this work, perhaps \$1 million? | |

| | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|
| ITEM: | 2 | |
| Title of Topic: | PUBLIC FORUM | |
| Purpose: | Any member of the public may address and ask questions of the Monitoring Council relating to any matter within the Council's jurisdiction under California Senate Bill 1070 (Statutes of 2006) provided the matter is not on the agenda. | |
| Desired Outcome: | Information and potential agenda topics for a future meeting. No decisions can be made regarding items that have not received prior public notice. | |
| Attachment Link: | California Senate Bill 1070 (Statutes of 2006) | |
| Contact Person: | Jon Marshack | jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov , (916) 341-5514 |
| Notes: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roger Butow of Clean Water Now (CWN) introduced himself and his NGO, and offered support for the Monitoring Council and its workgroups. • Steven Sander (concerned citizen) expressed concerns regarding the portals. Specifically, he asked why the Safe to Drink portal was not active and whether there was independent verification of the data in Consumer Confidence Reports. Karen Larsen (former Assistant Deputy Director of the State Water Board's Division of Drinking Water) indicated that lack of resources has been the main reason for why the launch of the Safe to Drink portal was delayed. She indicated that the Division of Drinking Water is in the process of developing web-based information related to the Human Right to Water and MCL compliance, and that the data and information should go live in June 2016 and could be linked to My Water Quality. In the interim, Karen offered to make those data available to Steven; Jon Marshack offered | |

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| | to provide Steven's contact information to Karen so that she could provide him with the requested data and information. |
| Action Items: | Jon Marshack will provide Wendy Killou of the Division of Drinking Water with Steven Sander's contact details, so that she can address his request for data and information relating to drinking water safety. |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| ITEM: | 3 – <i>Note: This item was heard after Item 4.</i> |
| Title of Topic: | MY WATER QUALITY WEB UPDATE |
| Purpose: | Jon Marshack demonstrated the updated look and feel of the My Water Quality website and theme-based portals. The Monitoring Council was asked to provide direction future development of the portals. |
| Desired Outcome: | Information and comment; direction on future portal development. Questions to consider include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent should the question-driven navigation and page titles be retained? • What kinds of data and assessment information should be added and by whom? • Should the Safe-to-Drink Portal be built (mockup approved in late 2013)? |
| Background: | <p>At the August Monitoring Council meeting (Item #5), Kris Jones presented an adjusted mock-up for pages of the California Estuaries Portal, based on features that could be made available through conversion to the latest State of California website template. The Council was supportive of the revised look and feel and approved having the Estuary Monitoring Workgroup redesign Estuaries Portal accordingly. At the February Monitoring Council meeting (Item #5d), Val Connor presented information on the interagency efforts developing new content for the Estuaries Portal that will assist Delta resources managers with the information needed for real-time operations.</p> <p>Because My Water Quality has its own web domain and because all portions of My Water Quality are interconnected and share navigation, the State Water Board's Web Unit decided that the most efficient way to implement the template change was to migrate the entire My Water Quality website and all of the portals to the new template. Over the last several months, Jon Marshack worked with the State Water Board's web developers to migrate every page to the new template, adjust page content, and implement a new navigation system.</p> <p>The updated My Water Quality has a number of beneficial features, as compared with the earlier version:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced clutter and improved readability; • Enlarged content area on each page; • Automatic adjustment of page content when viewed on tablets and smartphones; • Improved drop-down menu navigation for easy access to each of the portals and to pages within each portal, workgroup web pages, and Monitoring |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| | <p>Council information;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portal-specific formatting, including customized banners and menus; and • Image carousel for the My Water Quality home page and, potentially for the home page of each portal, to highlight new content and announcements. <p>The My Water Quality web domain is now ready for each workgroup to take advantage of the new template features with updates to their portals and workgroup pages.</p> |
| Attachment Link: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes from the August 2015 Monitoring Council Meeting (see Item #5) • Notes from the February 2016 Monitoring Council Meeting (see Item #5d) • Newly reformatted My Water Quality website and portals |
| Contact Person: | <p>Jon Marshack jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov, (916) 341-5514</p> |
| Notes: | <p>Jon Marshack demonstrated the updated look and feel of the My Water Quality website and theme-based portals. The Monitoring Council members provided positive feedback regarding the new web template, particularly the improved navigation; the Council members felt that using the drop-down menus was a much easier way to navigate the portals.</p> <p>Roger Butow asked whether citizen monitoring groups were active in the workgroups. Jon indicated that Erick Burres of the Water Quality Monitoring Collaboration Network seeks to connect citizen monitoring groups with Monitoring Council related efforts.</p> <p>Karen Larsen emphasized that the Water Board's Human Right to Water initiative would be an appropriate place to start development of the Safe to Drink Portal, involving both the Division of Drinking Water and the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's multi-indicator assessment.</p> |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| ITEM: | 4 |
| Title of Topic: | MONITORING COUNCIL LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES FOR 2016 |
| Purpose: | Council Members will provide updates of their legislative activities |
| Desired Outcome: | Information sharing and comment; decisions on further action |
| Background: | <p>At the February meeting (Item #6) the Monitoring Council tasked a committee composed of Jonathan Bishop, Karen Gehrts, Kris Jones, and Jon Marshack with developing a straw-man concept paper, including talking points and specific legislative changes, for non-governmental Monitoring Council Members to use in addressing the legislature externally. Governmental Monitoring Council Members would work with their legislative affairs staff to propose the same bill changes. The committee developed amendment language that would strengthen the Monitoring Council and provide a potential pathway toward additional funding, along with a fact sheet and background document. The effects of the proposed amendments are summarized below.</p> <p><i>AB 501 amendment language</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specify that the requirements that 85287(b) shall be met by the Water |

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| | <p>Quality Monitoring Council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change the composition of the water quality monitoring council to include the Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Delta Stewardship Council and the Delta Conservancy. <p>AB 1755 amendment language</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated the Monitoring Council, rather than the Department of Water Resources, to create, operate, and maintain a statewide integrated water data platform, allowing the Council to partner with an existing or new nonprofit organization or another state agency to do so. • Designate the Monitoring Council, rather than the Department of Water Resources, Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Board, to coordinate and integrate existing water and ecological data from local, state, and federal agencies. • Designate the Monitoring Council, rather than the specified state agencies, to develop protocols for data sharing, documentation, quality control, public access, and promotion of open-source platforms and decision support tools related to water data. • Change the composition of the Monitoring Council's to require participation of representatives from the Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Delta Stewardship Council and the Delta Conservancy. • Direct the Monitoring Council to consider all data that affects water quality, including water supply, flow and aquatic ecosystem health data. |
| <p>Attachment Links:</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes from the February 2016 Monitoring Council Meeting (see Item #6) • Legislative Priorities Spring 2016 fact sheet • Monitoring Council Background Information Regarding Strengthened Legislation |
| <p>Contact Persons:</p> | <p>Jon Marshack jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov, (916) 341-5514</p> |
| <p>Notes:</p> | <p>Jonathan Bishop introduced the agenda item, indicating that Jon Marshack and Kris Jones had developed documents (fact sheet, background document and specific bill language changes) to provide non-government Monitoring Council members with talking points for their outreach to the legislature. Jon Marshack introduced AB 501 and AB 1755, and mentioned that background document was updated to reflect recent changes to AB 1755. Both of these bills have aspects that involve interagency access to data, goals that are similar to SB 1070. Jon Marshack mentioned that he, Greg Gearheart, and other Water Board staff recently met with the California Water Foundation who are sponsors of AB 1755. Representatives from the Water Foundation expressed some interest in the concept of the Monitoring Council being listed in AB 1755 as the coordinating body for those efforts in the bill relating to data access.</p> <p>Jon indicated that as of May 31st, AB 501 had moved to the Senate Committee on Natural Resources and Water. AB 1755 had moved to its third reading in the assembly (as of May 11th). Jon asked whether any of the Council members had conducted outreach or had any updates. No one had anything to report. Jon indicated that our proposed amendments to AB 501 and AB 1755 had yet to be incorporated into those bills, but he added that he was encouraged that the bills</p> |

were still moving forward.

Steve Weisberg asked what were our proposed next steps. Jon encouraged the non-governmental Council members to conduct outreach with the legislature to help move these bills forward and to lobby for the Monitoring Council language to be added to the bills. Dave Paradies indicated that both bills appear to be well supported in the legislature and that now is the time for the Monitoring Council members to conduct outreach, with an emphasis on the State Senate; Jon Marshack will provide Dave with copies of the fact sheet and background document so that he can help with outreach with the legislature. Steve added that outreach is needed—particularly outreach to educate the legislature regarding the Monitoring Council and its need for support (e.g., greater authority and resources).

Jon Marshack mentioned that AB 501 and AB 1755 offer an opportunity to modify the Water Code relating to SB 1070. Specifically, the proposed language changes to both bills would add the Department of Fish and Wildlife, Delta Stewardship Council, and Delta Conservancy as members of the Council and would formally instruct the Council to consider water supply and flow information as they relate to water quality. When asked, the Council members did not raise any concerns or ask questions regarding these proposed bill changes.

Jonathan Bishop highlighted that to elevate the Monitoring Council, we should try and connect our efforts to high level initiatives (e.g., EcoRestore, Water Action Plan etc.). For that reason, the Delta should play a key role in our efforts. Jonathan added that the Council's initial strategy was to develop portals and workgroups to raise awareness of its efforts. He encouraged us to "broaden our toolset". Jon indicated that the Estuary Monitoring Workgroup and Bay Delta Live are addressing the real time and adaptive management needs of resource managers in the Delta, including the development of data dashboards for the online interactive Water Quality Conditions Report (for compliance with Water Rights Decision 1641). Jonathan also suggested that the Monitoring Council could help raise the profile of harmful algal blooms (HABs) and help coordinate related monitoring efforts (e.g., via the CCHAB).

Steve Weisberg is encouraged by the Monitoring Council's legislative initiative. However, he suggested that the Council should have an agenda item at an upcoming meeting to educate the Council and its workgroups regarding potential funding opportunities, particularly with respect to bond funds and which workgroup activities were appropriate candidates for bond funding; he suggested that we create fact sheets which highlight these opportunities for the workgroups.

Steve indicated that the HAB presentation at the February 23 meeting emphasized the need for greater coordination and funding. Steve suggested that Jon and Kris Jones work with the CCHAB to 1) identify the various HAB related monitoring efforts in California; 2) identify gaps in HAB monitoring; 3) identify which efforts are coordinating; and 4) identify the reasons why coordination is not occurring amongst the various monitoring efforts. Steve felt that this exercise could allow the Monitoring Council to better understand the monitoring needs, as well as the barriers to coordination (e.g., resources), and work with the CCHAB to try and address their needs. How can the Monitoring Council move this issue forward?

Steve suggested additional areas where the Monitoring Council could lend support. He pointed out that there is no single place to access HABs related data and information, are no procedures to verify these data, no consistent

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| | <p>methods or established QA/QC, and no data management systems to collectively store these data. He added that the Monitoring Council could play a role in helping to support these efforts. Identifying sources of funding may also be a potential way to address the resources needed by these groups.</p> <p>Jonathan pointed out that prioritizing support for HAB related efforts would require considerable time of the Monitoring Council's 1.3 staff members, which would likely take away from other efforts. He suggested that we identify the needs of this effort and develop a strategy for how to prioritize the time of the Council's Executive Director and Assistant Director.</p> |
| Action Items: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-government Council members will conduct outreach with the legislature, lobbying for the Monitoring Council's involvement in AB 501 and AB 1755. • Jon Marshack and Kris Jones will work with the CCHAB to identify opportunities to help support the coordination of HAB monitoring in California. • Jon Marshack will arrange a meeting with Jonathan Bishop, Greg Gearheart, Stephani Spaar, Karen Larsen, and Kris Jones to discuss the ways in which the Monitoring Council can lend its support to the development of a unified HABs program. This meeting is intended to scope out the nature and extent of this support and tasks for Council staff. |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| ITEM: | 5 |
| Title of Topic: | WATERSHED HEALTH AS MEASURED BY BIOASSESSMENT, TOXICITY, AND PESTICIDES |
| Purpose: | Bryn Phillips of UC Davis, Robert Budd of the Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR), and Pete Ode of the Department of Fish and Wildlife made data-rich presentations of their respective programs – Stream Pollution Trends (SPoT) program, DPR's Surface Water Protection Program, and Bioassessment Program, followed by an interactive discussion to help future combined data assessment/synthesis efforts, both what the intersection of these datasets may tell us and what else we may need to know to get there. The goal is to achieve a more complete story of watershed health. |
| Desired Outcome: | Identify useful data intersection themes and topic areas for future focus of these programs. |
| Background: | <p>Within the Water Boards' Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP), Stream Pollution Trends (SPoT) monitors trends in sediment toxicity and sediment contaminant concentrations in selected large rivers throughout California, and relates contaminant concentrations and toxicity to watershed land uses. It is designed to improve our understanding of watersheds and water quality by monitoring changes in both over time, evaluating impacts of development, and assessing the effectiveness of regulatory programs and conservation efforts at the watershed scale. The overall goal is to detect meaningful change in the concentrations of contaminants and their biological effects in large watersheds at time scales appropriate to management decision making. Sediment toxicity and a suite of pesticides, trace metals, and industrial compounds have been analyzed from 100 sites annually since 2008. The program design is periodically revised to reflect observed trends in stream contaminants and toxicity. This will allow for monitoring of additional chemicals of</p> |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>emerging concern and toxicity indicator species appropriate for these chemicals.</p> <p>The Department of Pesticide Regulation’s (DPR) Surface Water Protection Program protects human health and the environment by preventing pesticides from adversely affecting our surface waters, by addressing both agricultural and urban sources of pesticide residues in surface waters. Samples are collected throughout northern and southern California at storm drains, agricultural drains, streams, rivers, and estuaries. DPR utilizes a prioritization model to help determine appropriate current use pesticides to monitor for within a watershed. Surface water monitoring data are used to help identify potential contamination problems before direct evidence of impairment of water quality is available. The SURF database is an electronic repository for pesticide monitoring data collected by DPR and other agencies. DPR uses monitoring data to identify and trace pesticides in surface water and develop contamination prevention strategies.</p> <p>The Bioassessment Program is another key component of SWAMP – an ongoing, long-term statewide survey of the ecological condition of wadeable perennial streams and rivers throughout California. The PSA collects samples for biological indicators (benthic macroinvertebrates (BMIs) and algae) and chemical constituents (nutrients, major ions, etc.), and also conducts habitat assessments for both in-stream and riparian corridor conditions. A key to the success of PSA is the role it has played in standardizing, linking and supporting numerous independent programs conducting probability surveys in California. Partners include the EPA’s National Rivers and Streams Assessment, Southern California Stormwater Monitoring Coalition, Bay Regional Monitoring Program, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, Bureau of Land Management, and U.S. Forest Service. Such partnerships help create a statistically robust, yet cost-effective and efficient approach to answering important water quality monitoring questions.</p> | |
| <p>Attachment Links:</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrating Measures of Bioassessment, Toxicity, and Pesticides to Evaluate Watershed Health: Stream Pollution Trends Program (SPoT) – presentation by Bryn Phillips • SWAMP's Stream Pollution Trends monitoring program • DPR Surface Water Monitoring Program – presentation by Robert Budd • CDPR’s Surface Water Protection Program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SURF database • Putting Biology to Work: SWAMP’s Bioassessment Program – presentation by Pete Ode • SWAMP's Bioassessment Program | |
| <p>Contact Person:</p> | <p>Bryn Phillips Robert Budd Pete Ode</p> | <p>bmphillips@ucdavis.edu; (831) 624-0947 robert.budd@cdpr.ca.gov; (916) 445-2505 peter.ode@wildlife.ca.gov; (916) 358-0316</p> |
| <p>Notes:</p> | <p>Bryn Phillips made a presentation regarding the Stream Pollution Trends (SPoT) program. During his presentation, Bryn provided background regarding the program and discussed potential opportunities for coordination between the efforts described by Robert Budd and Pete Ode (to follow). SPoT has a directed design, focusing on toxicity and chemistry (mainly pesticides) in finer grained</p> | |

sediments at the bottom of large watersheds with repeat sampling to elucidate trends. Upstream land uses are compared with results to explore causality. Roughly 1/3 of the sample sites have mainly urban, agricultural, or other land uses upstream. Macroinvertebrate community impacts (California Stream Condition Index scores) appear to be correlated to toxicity data. Together, toxicity, bioassessment, and pesticide data may help with the development of causal assessments. The program has seen increases in the magnitude of toxicity of highly toxic samples over time. Urban pyrethroids and metals (Cd, Cu, Pb, Zn) show increasing trends. Fipronil has also shown an increasing trend, as it replaces pyrethroids in urban use settings. Correlations have been seen between toxicity and pyrethroid concentrations. SPoT has been collaborating with DPR to increase coverage of both monitoring programs. Funding is needed to expand such collaboration, e.g., adding toxicity testing at DPR pesticide monitoring sites. Results of this program are helping with the development of a stormwater strategy at the State Water Board.

Following Bryn's presentation, Steve Weisberg asked to what extent they provide training for regional efforts interested in using the methods developed by SPoT. Bryn indicated that SPoT does work to coordinate methods, as Steve described (e.g., via outreach and training). Collaborations are also being explored with local and regional stormwater, regional monitoring, and TMDL monitoring programs. SPoT relies on SWAMP for standardized monitoring protocols, QA and data management. Collaborations could expand the use of consistent protocols. Armand Ruby suggested that SPoT collaborations present an opportunity for the Council to expand the use of consistent methods and QA and to ensure that these data are consistently managed and stored statewide.

Robert Budd then made a [presentation](#) regarding DPR's Surface Water Protection Program, with emphasis on their southern California urban monitoring efforts. DPR's SURF online database contains water pesticide results back to 1990 and sediment results back to 1986. Pesticide data in CEDEN have been added to SURF. SURF data do not currently appear in CEDEN.

Following his presentation, Karen Larsen asked whether the various programs share samples (e.g., between SPoT and DPR) to prevent redundancies of effort. Bryn indicated that the programs do share samples, where possible. But there is little potential to increase alignment of the two programs, due to the limited number of locations sampled by DPR. There is also coordination between DPR and Regional Water Board Irrigated Lands Program monitoring. Steve Weisberg expressed concerns regarding the site selection for the DPR monitoring, indicating that the current design would limit the types of questions that could be answered using these data. Armand Ruby emphasized that the design and program should be viewed as a pilot program (a work in progress). Steve noted that site selection was not random and the number of sites is small, making statewide or regional extrapolations impossible. He suggested that DPR should clearly define the nature of their sampling—what questions they seek to address. He indicated that this would greatly help their sampling design. Robert clarified that the DPR sampling was not designed to evaluate the effects on beneficial uses, but rather to help DPR develop their pesticide use regulatory program. However, he added that they have a newly formed group along with a new statistician that will be reviewing and updating their sampling design. Jonathan Bishop indicated that the Monitoring Council could help to coordinate state, local, and regional pesticide monitoring efforts statewide in order to add sites to DPR's effort. For example, he mentioned that the storm drain sampling in Southern California could potentially be coordinated to support DPR's efforts. It was noted

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| | <p>that Robert Budd and Armand Ruby are involved in the statewide Storm Water Strategy (STORMS), including the Urban Pesticide Reduction project and statewide pesticide monitoring framework.</p> <p>Pete Ode then made a presentation regarding SWAMP's Bioassessment Program. The program assesses biological condition using benthic macroinvertebrates and algae, physical habitat, and a number of water quality parameters in perennial wadeable streams. Currently, the program does not monitor for pesticides. Methods are in development to extend the program into non-perennial streams, which comprise a majority of the state's stream miles. Collaborations with other monitoring programs include the Stormwater Monitoring Coalition in southern California, US Forest Service in the Sierras, private timber lands through the Natural Resources Agency, and the stormwater Regional Monitoring Coalition in the SF Bay area. Sites are selected at random to allow extrapolation of results into regional and statewide statistics.</p> <p>Following his presentation, Jonathan Bishop asked why the Bioassessment Program does not look at sediment toxicity. Pete indicated that the sampling is expensive. He also added that the two programs do not sample in the same locations. SPoT uses targeted sampling of fine-grained sediment in depositional areas at the base of large watersheds which are often not wadeable, locations where benthic macroinvertebrates are more difficult to sample. There is potential for coordination, but Pete indicated that this would need to be thought through more. Where there is overlap, California Stream Condition Index (CSCI) bioassessment scores do show impairment where significant sediment toxicity is also found. Steve Weisberg then asked Pete for his thoughts regarding potential obstacles to collaboration. Pete suggested that differing methodologies was a factor. Raphael Mazor indicated that he felt that data management was also an issue, adding that getting data from permittees was an obstacle. Jonathan emphasized that the Council should not force collaboration of sampling efforts where it does not make sense. Rather, he added that our role is to try and identify potential overlap to allow for the development of broader assessment tools.</p> |
| <p>Action Items:</p> | <p>Jon Marshack will arrange for the statewide Storm Water Strategy (STORMS) Urban Pesticide Reduction project to present at an upcoming Monitoring Council meeting.</p> |

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <p>ITEM:</p> | <p>6</p> |
| <p>Title of Topic:</p> | <p>NEXT MEETING AGENDA</p> |
| <p>Purpose:</p> | <p>Plan agenda for August 23, 2016 Monitoring Council meeting in Sacramento. Potential items include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The future of data – open data, data management plans, web services, data federation (Greg Gearheart, Tony Hale of SFEI) b) Interagency Ecological Program governance model – fostering ad hoc teams for specific tasks (Greg Erickson and Sakura Evans of CDFW) c) Human Right to Water – beginning of a Safe-to-Drink Portal? (Wendy Killou, SWRCB-DDW) d) Assessing aquatic habitat connectivity and low-flow ecological thresholds |

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| | (Robert Holmes, CDFW Water Branch) | |
| | e) Data quality and data management standardization efforts of SWAMP (Melissa Morris, SWRCB) | |
| | f) State stewardship for the National Hydrography Dataset by the Department of Water Resources (Greg Smith, DWR) | |
| | g) Possibility of holding a Monitoring Council annual conference | |
| | h) Monitoring Council strategic planning and progress of proposed legislation | |
| Desired Outcome: | Develop agenda ideas for the August 23 meeting. | |
| Contact Person: | Jon Marshack | jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov ; (916) 341-5514 |
| Notes: | The Council did not consider this item. However, future agenda items were identified in the above notes for other items on this agenda. | |
| Action Items: | Jon Marshack will correspond with Monitoring Council members via email regarding potential agenda items for the August 23 Monitoring Council meeting. | |

June 22, 2016
Approved August 23, 2016