

CALIFORNIA WATER QUALITY MONITORING COUNCIL

Monitoring Council Meeting Notes

Wednesday, June 15, 2011 – 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM

Board Room
 Association of California Water Agencies
 910 K Street, Suite 100, Sacramento



Monitoring Council Members and Alternates in attendance:

Rich Breuer	Paul Collins	Karen Larsen	Armand Ruby
Jonathan Bishop	Sarge Green	Phil Markle	Linda Sheehan
Dave Bolland	Parry Klassen	John Norton	Stephen Weisberg

Others in attendance or on the phone:

Brian Anderson, UC Davis, Granite Canyon Lab	Daniel Garcia, City of Fresno
Shakoor Azimi-Gaylon, SWRCB, OIMA	Paul Hann, SWRCB, DWQ
Isabel Baer, Dept. of Fish and Game	David Harris, Dept. of Water Resources, CERES
Adam Ballard, SWRCB, SWAMP	Laura S. Johnson, USEPA, HWI
Sean Bothwell, California Coastkeeper Alliance	Gail Kuenster, Dept. of Water Resources
Dennis Bowker, SWRCB, OIMA contractor	Fan Lau, URS Corp.
Heather Boyd, Santa Ana RWQCB	Dan Markiewicz, UC Davis, Aquatic Tox. Lab
Henry Buckwalter, Western Plant Health Assn.	Jon Marshack, SWRCB
Erick Burres, SWRCB, SWAMP	Stephen McCord, Larry Walker Associates
Terry Fleming, USEPA Region 9	Peter Ode, Dept. of Fish and Game
Valerie Connor, State & Federal Contractors Water Agency	Bill Orme, SWRCB, DWQ
Jay Davis, SF Estuary Institute	Rik Rasmussen, SWRCB, DWQ
Laura Dlugolecki, USEPA, HWI	Stephanie Rose, SWRCB, DWQ
Jennifer Doherty, SWRCB, SWAMP	"GS", (unknown)
Laura Gabanski, USEPA, HWI	Steven Steinberg, SCCWRP
	Hao Xin, Qiantang River Waterkeeper Program

ITEM:	1	
Title of Topic:	INTRODUCTIONS AND HOUSEKEEPING	
Purpose:	1) Introductions 2) Review draft notes from December 8, 2010 Council meeting 3) Review agenda for today's meeting	
Desired Outcome:	a) Approve December 2010 Monitoring Council meeting notes b) Preview what will be presented today and overall meeting expectations c) Adjust today's agenda, as needed	
Attachment Links:	Notes from December 8, 2010 Council meeting	
Contact Person:	Jon Marshack	jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov , 916-341-5514
Decisions:	December meeting notes approved without modification.	

ITEM:	2
Title of Topic:	ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES
Purpose:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Introduce new Monitoring Council Member Leah Walker representing the Department of Public Health (Jon Marshack) b) Introduce new Monitoring Council Member John Norton representing Citizen Monitoring Groups (Jonathan Bishop) c) Update on Citizen Monitoring Activities (Erick Burres, SWRCB, SWAMP) d) Cal State Northridge contract to produce GIS layers of CA water quality standards (Stephanie Rose, SWRCB) e) Update on the California Environmental Data Exchange Network and the Data Management Workgroup (Steve Steinberg, SCCWRP) f) Joint Water Boards / Department of Fish & Game Five-Year Wetland Conservation Program Plan (Bill Orme, SWRCB) g) Mapping Water Pollution Data in Hangzhou, China (Hao Xin, Qiantang River Waterkeeper Program) h) Legislation update (Steve Weisberg, Sarge Green, and Linda Sheehan) i) State budget update (Jonathan Bishop)
Desired Outcome:	Information and feedback
Background:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>New Monitoring Council Member Representing CDPH</i> – At the end of last year, Gary Yamamoto retired as Chief of the Division of Drinking Water and Environmental Management, the Monitoring Council Member representing the California Department of Public Health. The new Division Chief, Leah Godsey Walker, replaces Mr. Yamamoto as a Monitoring Council Member. b) <i>New Monitoring Council Member Representing Citizen Monitoring Groups</i> – Dr. Steven Steinberg, Co-Director of the Klamath Watershed Institute at Humboldt State University, has represented citizen monitoring groups on the Monitoring Council since the Council's inception in 2008. At the end of May of this year, Dr. Steinberg will end his service with the Institute and will leave the Monitoring Council. In March, the Monitoring Council announced this upcoming vacancy and received a number of applications. The Monitoring Council Co-Chairs interviewed three candidates on April 28, and selected John Norton of the Sierra Streams Institute to replace Dr. Steinberg on the Monitoring Council. c) <i>Citizen Monitoring Activities Update</i> – Erick Burres is the coordinator of the Clean Water Team (CWT) of the Water Board's Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) that provides support for citizen monitoring efforts. Mr. Burres also coordinates the regular webinar program of the Monitoring Council's Water Quality Monitoring Collaboration Network, also focused on supporting citizen monitoring. Mr. Burres will provide a brief overview of existing and planned support efforts for citizen monitoring. d) <i>GIS Layers of California Water Quality Standards</i> – The Water Boards have entered into a two year contract with Cal State Northridge to develop GIS layers representing California's water quality standards. Stephanie Rose of the Planning, Standards and Implementation Unit will provide an

	<p>overview of this project.</p> <p>e) <i>CEDEN and Data Management Workgroup Update</i> – In his new role as CEDEN Program Manager, Steven Steinberg has been interviewing key staff in various agencies and organizations that will provide data to or manage or use data in CEDEN. Due to the considerable overlap of CEDEN development with the data management needs of the Monitoring Council and its theme-specific workgroups, Dr. Steinberg will initiate the formation of a Monitoring Council’s Data Management Workgroup.</p> <p>f) <i>Coordinated Wetland Conservation Program Plan</i> – In October 2009, USEPA issued a memo encouraging State and Tribal wetland programs to provide “Wetland Program Plans” that outline goals and actions over the next few years, with a schedule for carrying out the actions and achieving the goals. Wetland Program Development Grant [pursuant Section 104(b)(3) of the Clean Water Act] applications that propose to help carry out actions articulated in Wetland Program Plans will be eligible for extra points in the competition process starting with the Fiscal Year 2011 Request-for-Proposal. In response and working through the California Wetland Monitoring Workgroup, the Water Boards and the Department of Fish and Game developed and signed a Five-Year Wetland Conservation Program Plan, which has been submitted to USEPA.</p> <p>g) <i>Mapping Water Pollution Data in Hangzhou, China</i> – Hao Xin, VP and Spokesman for the Qiantang River Waterkeeper Program, will introduce an easy-to-use interactive electronic mapping technology for use by Waterkeepers in their waterways. He will use the example of his Qiantang River Map, which is a crowdsourcing and volunteer geographic information (VGI) based Web 2.0 public interactive platform. It uses GeoCommons Web-GIS technology to visually present a comprehensive two-dimensional and three-dimensional geographical information for the Qiantang River basin, including the locations of water related government agencies, NGOs, industrial and mining pollution sources, livestock and poultry farms, aquatic populations, drinking water protected areas, water quality monitoring sites and other geographic information. It provides the general public an intuitive and easy way to access information about their river and pollution sources. In addition, the platform uses the Ushahidi data platform, enabling the general public to use cell phones, Twitter and email to report pollution sources directly.</p> <p>h) <i>Legislation Update</i> – During October 21, 2010 briefing with her staff, it was relayed that Senator Kehoe offered to carry legislative changes that would enhance implementation of the Monitoring Council’s comprehensive strategy. Potential legislative changes were discussed among non-state agency representatives at the Monitoring Council’s December 8, 2010 meeting. Proposed legislative language was submitted by Monitoring Members Sarge Green, Linda Sheehan, and Steve Weisberg on behalf of Monitoring Council in January 2011.</p>
<p>Attachments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter recommending Leah Walker and John Norton as replacement Monitoring Council Members + biographical sketches • An Update on the Clean Water Team and Citizen Monitoring, presentation by Erick Burres • An Update on CEDEN, presentation by Steven Steinberg

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USEPA Wetland Program Plans Memo (October 2, 2010) • Water Boards / Department of Fish & Game Five-Year Wetland Conservation Program Plan • Using Open Source GIS to Develop Interactive Maps for Our Qiantang River, presentation by Hao Xin • Qiantang River Water Map website 	
Contact Person:	Jon Marshack	jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov , 916-341-5514
Notes:	<p>c) Citizen Monitoring Activities Update – Terry Fleming suggested that more involvement is needed with the Keepers. Linda Sheehan indicated that this was on the Coastkeeper Alliance agenda for next week. Erick indicated that approximately 80% of citizen monitoring produced SWAMP comparable data.</p> <p>d) GIS Layers of California Water Quality Standards – Project deliverables are due by March 2013. Jon Marshack said that having these GIS layers will enhance the ability of the portals to compare monitoring data with standards. Jonathan Bishop asked the Council Members and workgroups to be thinking about portal integration. High resolution NHD will be the base map used, with some modification based on input from the Regional Water Boards. Jonathan Bishop recommended that we all be working from the same base maps. Sarge Green asked whether groundwater would be included. Terry Fleming cautioned that a communication mechanism is needed to ensure coordination, integration, and updating in real time. Phil Markle asked that averaging periods associated with water quality objectives are clarified as to how they apply.</p> <p>e) CEDEN and Data Management Workgroup Update – John Norton asked whether each data set would receive a quality assurance screen. Steve Steinberg responded that metadata associated with each measurement will allow users to screen the data according to their needs. Sarge Green asked whether Irrigated Lands program data and water quality data in CIWQS would be included in CEDEN. Steve Steinberg responded that two of the Regional Data Centers are currently working on Irrigated Lands program data and initial discussions have begun on providing connectivity between CEDEN and CIWQS. Rich Breuer asked when the Data Management Workgroup would be formed. Steve Steinberg responded that the workgroup would likely convene within two months. Dave Bolland indicated that water supply data needs to be integrated, due to the interconnectivity between water quality and quantity. Terry Fleming responded that this is a workload question for the Monitoring Council and Jonathan Bishop indicated that he is not sure when the Council should take this on.</p> <p>f) Coordinated Wetland Conservation Program Plan – Document lays the groundwork for the two agencies to work together in the future, with specific activities and timelines to achieve each agency’s goals. Having this document will increase California’s chances of obtaining EPA grant funds for wetland inventory and condition assessment. The lack of a consistent wetland definition was raised. Bill Orme responded that through the Wetland Monitoring Workgroup, all organizations (state, EPA, USACE) were working to support the state wetland policy being developed by the State Water Board.</p>	

	<p>g) Mapping Water Pollution Data in Hangzhou, China – Hao Xin demonstrated his waterkeeper website that was crated using open source GIS tools. The website makes it easy for anyone to submit reports of data or corrections to existing information. Site administrators verify reports submitted by others. Tools are available to assess where the most serious pollution exists. The website uses Google maps as the base maps.</p> <p>h) Legislation Update – Due to their focus on the state budget, Senator Kehoe has decided not to carry Monitoring Council related legislation this year. Legislative changes submitted by a subcommittee of Monitoring Council may be carried next year.</p> <p>i) State Budget Update – Nothing to report as to a budget solution. The hiring freeze is still on. All state agencies are facing shrinking budgets. Dave Bolland noted that this could be used as a opportunity to focus on leveraging resources between organizations, leading to greater efficiencies.</p>
Decisions:	none
Action Items:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine whether the contract for GIS layers of California's water quality standards will cover groundwater. <i>(According to Rik Rasmussen, Water Quality Standards program manger at the State Water Board, staff's intent is for the contractor to focus primarily on surface waters. If sufficient time and resources are available, groundwater will be addressed. Unfortunately, many Basin Plans do not include sufficient information to allow groundwaters to be mapped.)</i> • Send Dave Bolland a summary of the scope of proposed legislative changes. <i>(done)</i>

ITEM:	3
Title of Topic:	HEALTHY STREAMS PARTNERSHIP – STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK
Purpose:	Review stakeholder input and recommendations on how to proceed with Healthy Streams Partnership. Also review recommendations for accessing and linking portals to support stakeholder needs.
Desired Outcome:	Discuss recommendations and identify next steps
Background:	<p>The Healthy Streams Partnership (HSP) was formed to utilize the information from the SWAMP bioassessment and toxicity monitoring programs to draw attention to identifying and protecting healthy streams (rather than continuing to focus resources only on identifying impairments). To achieve this goal and to support the Monitoring Council's vision and strategy, the HSP assumed the role of a Monitoring Council workgroup and initiated development of a Healthy Streams portal. To gauge interest in the HSP and the Healthy Streams Portal (as well as the other existing My Water Quality portals) and to determine stakeholder needs, SWAMP hired Dennis Bowker to interview stakeholders, produce a summary of their input, and recommend next steps.</p> <p>Also mentioned will be potential partnerships with a parallel effort by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, called the Healthy Watersheds Initiative.</p>
Attachment Links:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briefing summary of outreach results for the Healthy Streams Partnership

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healthy Streams Partnership Strategy, presentation by Dennis Bowker • USEPA, Healthy Watersheds Initiative handout 		
Contact Person:	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30%;">Karen Larsen</td> <td>klarsen@waterboards.ca.gov, 916-319-9769</td> </tr> </table>	Karen Larsen	klarsen@waterboards.ca.gov , 916-319-9769
Karen Larsen	klarsen@waterboards.ca.gov , 916-319-9769		
Notes:	<p>Decision support tools are needed – what do the data mean? – translated into high quality information. Avoid redundant data uploads. Where can we apply our resources to have the largest impact? Move away from individual mandate (e.g., Clean Water Act) focus to one of integrating plans of various agencies (Water Boards, Caltrans, Calfire, etc.) Move from permit compliance to “Did we accomplish what we meant to accomplish? (e.g., Did TMDL actions produce the water quality outcome we envisioned?) What are the desired outcomes of our decisions? Measure performance, and then adjust as needed – feedback loop is needed.</p> <p>Currently, portals appear to be more interesting than useful. Are they useful? Are they being used? Are they making a difference? Are they fostering good decisions? Need to allow users to build reports that are useful to them. Predict results of potential activities on biological change.</p> <p>Parallels exist between California’s Healthy Streams Partnership and USEPS’s Healthy Watershed Initiative. Need paradigm shift – move from current situation where we need to demonstrate that it’s broken in order to get resources to work on it to one where we work to keep waters healthy (of high quality).</p> <p>Steve Weisberg cautioned that we are a Monitoring Council – scope of our work is to promote data systems to support decisions. Current organization is around beneficial uses with stressors covered later. Integration of stressor assessment is not a trivial change. It creates an opportunity to document how the watershed itself is changing and how this will impact the biota. He favors integrating three stressors on which we have data – hydrology/flow conditions, percent impervious surface as a surrogate for development, and vulnerability of undeveloped areas based on rate of development in the area. These could be linked to biology in the portal. This could allow data to inform changes in agency programs.</p> <p>Even though most state agencies shy away from calling something “healthy”, Jonathan Bishop indicated that it is important for the workgroups to determine whether waters are healthy. It is part of the Monitoring Council’s role to push new ideas through the workgroups. Where there are multiple ways to define “healthy”, the portals should show them all and explain the differences. Showing different perspectives drives discussion, which can lead to policy changes. It is hard to aggregate numerous measures into an overall score. It may not be beneficial to aggregate at all, even though some form of synthesis is needed. Healthy could be defined as the absence of unhealthy indicators.</p> <p>Laura Gabanski indicated that the discussion of this topic appeared to be consistent with EPA’s Healthy Watershed Initiative. She is willing to provide contractual support for portal development in California at a state scale. HWI focuses on bringing multiple issues together to develop a system approach. Terry Fleming favors a Healthy Watershed Initiative pilot project in California that does not focus on a single watershed, but maintains a statewide focus, relating to the portal. Portals bring diverse interests together, while small scale pilots are interesting mainly to a small contingent.</p>		
Decisions:	<p>Accept EPA Healthy Watershed Initiative contractual support for Healthy Streams portal development that integrates data types not previously</p>		

	considered.
Action Items:	Steve Weisberg, Karen Larsen, Jon Marshack, and Terry Fleming are to develop a concrete proposal for how to use USEPA Healthy Watershed Initiative contractual support, for consideration by the Monitoring Council at a later meeting. Laura Gabanski will generate the contract vehicle with the work defined by the Monitoring Council.
ITEM:	4
Title of Topic:	HEALTHY STREAMS PARTNERSHIP AND STREAM & RIVER ECOSYSTEM HEALTH PORTAL DEVELOPMENT
Purpose:	<p>a) Review recent monitoring and assessment activities of three SWAMP projects that contribute information to a new <i>My Water Quality</i> portal for stream and river ecosystem health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perennial Streams Assessment (PSA) (Pete Ode, Department of Fish & Game, Aquatic Bioassessment Laboratory) • Statewide Toxicity (Dan Markiewicz, UC Davis Marine Pollution Studies Laboratory at Granite Canyon) • Stream Pollution Trends (SPoT) (Brian Anderson, UC Davis Marine Pollution Studies Laboratory at Granite Canyon) <p>b) Review initial Stream and River Ecosystem Health Portal mockup (Meredith Williams, Aquatic Science Center at SFEI)</p>
Desired Outcome:	<p>a) Information and feedback on monitoring and assessment efforts</p> <p>b) Approval of initial portal mockup</p>
Background:	<p>In December 2009, the Monitoring Council asked SWAMP to develop a mockup of a stream ecosystem health portal based on SWAMP's statewide monitoring programs. In June, 2010, a mockup of a Healthy Streams Portal was presented for review and comment and the Monitoring Council decided that the Healthy Streams Partnership of SWAMP should proceed with developing the portal. That mockup was intended to show the kinds of information that would eventually be able to be presented, reflecting a multiple-indicator perspective. The Aquatic Science Center was awarded a contract by the State Water Board to develop the initial working portal. The workgroup met in December, 2010 and January and March of 2011 and decided to focus the initial portal release on the three statewide SWAMP monitoring and assessment efforts mentioned above.</p>
Attachment Links:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlights from SWAMP's Perennial Streams Assessment (PSA): 2000-2007, presentation by Pete Ode • Summary of Toxicity in California Waters, presentation by Dan Markiewicz and Brian Anderson • Healthy Streams Mockup Review, presentation by Meredith Williams
Contact Person:	Karen Larsen klarsen@waterboards.ca.gov , 916-319-9769
Notes:	NHD is not accurate with regard to assigning streams into perennial versus non-

	<p>perennial, especially in the arid portions of the state.</p> <p>Monitoring Council can help Perennial Streams Assessment by pushing increased collaboration, getting more agencies involved in the generation and use of PSA data. To date, the Water Boards have paid for most of the work so far. Other agencies should help to share cost. The Water Board's timber harvest waiver could be used to increase consistency of US Forest Service probabilistic monitoring data with SWAMP methods. The Monitoring Council could write letters to other agencies to push for increased coordination. BMI and algae are good indicators of broader ecosystem health.</p> <p>PSA sampling is probabilistic, allowing for more accurate statewide and regional interpretations. Most of the sampling in the Toxicity Summary Report is targeted, which prevents extrapolation.</p> <p>Stream Pollution Trends (SPoT) focuses on sediment as an integrator of accumulated contaminants at the bottom of large watersheds.</p> <p>Integration between the Healthy Streams and Wetland portals would be beneficial.</p> <p>Problems identified with the portal mockup include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused too much toward a scientist perspective and data rather than questions. Explain what the data mean, e.g., Is it safe for stream life? • Probabilistic versus targeted data and ability to extrapolate or not is not well handled. With targeted data, cannot provide wider extrapolations. With probabilistic data, cannot generalize to a stream reach. Be wary of drawing conclusions from small amounts of data. • Explanations of how data are generated are missing. • 303(d) listed waters map should be included, as with Safe to Swim and Safe to Eat Fish and Shellfish portals. • Adding data generated by other agencies could cause them to engage with the workgroup effort and help move toward Healthy Watersheds Initiative goals.
<p>Decisions:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Monitoring Council should do more to increase coordination between agencies, both state and federal. Letter writing is one mechanism. <p>Portal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council approves creation of a working portal from the mockup, with adjustments based on comments from the Council. Council approval needed prior to public release. • The lead story should be "Is it healthy?" Explain what we can say and what we cannot say. • Stressors identified in PSA and the Toxicity Summary Report (chemicals, land use, percent fines, relative risk) should be included. • Caveats from the Toxicity Summary Report should be included in the portal. • Healthy Watersheds Initiative contractor support from USEPA will be used to broaden the scope of the portal to include a broader range of data and assessment information.

Action Items:	Bring back a working version of the Healthy Streams Portal for review and approval by the Monitoring Council at a future meeting, prior to public release.	
ITEM:	5	
Title of Topic:	BIOACCUMULATION OVERSIGHT GROUP AND SAFE TO EAT FISH AND SHELLFISH PORTAL	
Purpose:	Review recent monitoring and assessment activities of the SWAMP Bioaccumulation Oversight Group (BOG), <i>Contaminants in Fish from the California Coast, 2009: Summary Report on Year One of a Two-Year Screening Study</i> and update of Safe to Eat Fish and Shellfish portal (Jay Davis, Aquatic Science Center at SFEI)	
Desired Outcome:	Information and feedback on monitoring and assessment efforts and portal update	
Background:	<p>The Safe to Eat Fish and Shellfish portal was released to the public in December 2009. It presents information on the efforts of the Bioaccumulation Oversight Group to assess contaminants in aquatic organisms and their potential impact on human health. Current data sets available through portal include fish consumption advisories from Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), a two year statewide survey of contaminants in sport fish from lakes and reservoirs, and data from the Fish Mercury Project and a few other data sets.</p> <p>Statewide survey sampling of contaminants in coastal sport fish was conducted in 2009 and 2010. Data from the first year of this study have been assessed and the resulting information was recently added to the portal. Information from the second year of this study will be available in Spring 2012. Sampling of a statewide survey of contaminants in sport fish from rivers and streams is currently underway, with results available in 2013.</p>	
Attachment Links:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contaminants in Sport Fish from the California Coast, 2009, presentation by Jay Davis • Contaminants in Fish from the California Coast, 2009: Summary Report on Year One of a Two-Year Screening Study • Safe to Eat Fish and Shellfish portal 	
Contact Person:	Jon Marshack	jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov , 916-341-5514
Notes:	<p>By the end of 2011, the BOG will have completed a five year survey of California sport fish – two years of lakes and reservoirs, two years of coastal, and one year of streams and rivers, all with the focus of impacts on human health. The BOG is contemplating its direction for 2012 and beyond. Options include aquatic life and wildlife impacts, additional sampling to broaden the survey to additional water bodies, more intensive monitoring in support of the development of fish consumption advisories, and supporting other regulatory or standards development activities.</p> <p>The BOG coastal survey did not utilize a probabilistic sampling approach. Rather it focused on popular fishing locations within pre-specified segments of the coast. The results showed moderate, wide-spread contamination by</p>	

	<p>methylmercury and PCBs, with significant variation by species and in some cases by location within a species.</p> <p>Trend data exist for San Francisco Bay fish from 1994 to the present, showing no change in sport fish over time. Toxic Substances Monitoring (TSM) program data are also being cleared for addition to the database. Funding would be needed to add this information to the Safe to Eat portal, as no portal funding exists for the BOG in Fiscal Year 2011/2012. EPA funding through the State Water Board for portal development is not sustainable. In FY 2010/2011, approximately \$50,000 was expended on the portal, half for maintenance and half to add new information.</p>
Decisions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portal user data are needed – who is using the Safe to Eat portal and how much it is being used. • A sustainable funding plan is needed for BOG monitoring and portal maintenance/development.

ITEM:	6
Title of Topic:	SUPPORTING THE DELTA STEWARDSHIPS COUNCIL’S DELTA PLAN USING THE MONITORING COUNCIL’S COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY AND WEB PORTALS
Purpose:	Inform the Monitoring Council, the Delta Stewardship Council, and the Delta Science Program of the overlap of opportunities and responsibilities associated with the implementation of CA SB1070 and the Delta Plan
Desired Outcome:	Delta Stewardship Council and Delta Science Program incorporate Monitoring Council portals and workgroups into the development of the adaptive management plan for Delta habitat restoration and water quality improvements. That, as appropriate, Delta Plan performance measures are tracked and communicated via the portals.
Background:	<p>The Delta Stewardship Council was created in legislation to achieve the state mandated coequal goals for the Delta.</p> <p>"Coequal goals' means the two goals of providing a more reliable water supply for California and protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem. The coequal goals shall be achieved in a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place." (CA Water Code §85054).</p> <p>The Delta Stewardship Council is required by law to use the best available science and adaptive management as the basis for the Delta Plan. The Delta Plan must include</p> <p>“a science-based, transparent, and formal adaptive management strategy for ongoing ecosystem restoration and water management decisions” (CA Water Code §85308(f)).</p> <p>The scientific body of knowledge of the Delta and California’s water conditions is constantly growing and changing, but Delta-related resource management decisions are often made with incomplete information. Adaptive management provides the necessary flexibility to manage complex natural resources. In addition, ongoing water management and ecosystem restoration covered actions</p>

	will be required to adhere to the adaptive management framework. Proponents of proposed covered actions must describe how they intend to apply the adaptive management framework, including a commitment for communicating to the public the information learned during the monitoring and assessment of implemented actions. The Monitoring Council's strategy, workgroups and portals can enhance the ability of the Delta Stewardship Council to meet their legislative mandates.	
Attachment Links:	Draft letter to Delta Stewardship Council	
Contact Person:	Valerie Connor	vconnor@sfcwa.org , 916-476-5053
Notes:	<p>The development of the Delta Plan provides the Monitoring Council with the opportunity to remind the Delta Stewardship Council of the Monitoring Council's strategy and the tools developed by the Wetland Monitoring Workgroup and others (e.g., Wetland Tracker, the 1-2-3 Monitoring Framework) that could enhance the DSC's ability to track performance measures associated with delta wetland restoration activities. The State and Federal Water Contractors have offered to provide funding and a contractor to develop the California Estuaries Portal with an initial SF Bay-Delta focus. Val Connor has offered to facilitate the California Estuary Monitoring Workgroup, but the Interagency Ecological Program needs to be in a lead role.</p> <p>CERES should be involved (David Harris).</p> <p>A briefing for Natural Resources Agency Secretary Laird or Jerry Merrill may be needed.</p>	
Decisions:	Monitoring Council approved sending the proposed letter to the Delta Stewardship Council.	
Action Items:	Rich Breuer will brief Dale Hoffman-Floerke to see if she would like to add any caveats before signing the letter.	

ITEM:	7	
Title of Topic:	MEETING WRAP-UP	
Purpose:	<p>a) Summarize meeting</p> <p>b) Plan agenda for August 24, 2011 Council meeting – potential items include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed report on Data Management Workgroup and CEDEN development • Central Valley Monitoring Directory • Grant Project Monitoring – potential formation of Committee of the Monitoring Council 	
Desired Outcome:	Develop agenda items for next meeting	
Contact Person:	Jon Marshack	jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov , 916-341-5514
Decisions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Postpone Data Management Workgroup item to the October meeting to give Steven Steinberg sufficient time to get that effort going. 	

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Potential topics for August 24 meeting include:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Central Valley Monitoring Directory
<i>(SFEI contactor not available on August 24; postponed until October)</i>○ Grant Project Monitoring – potential formation of Committee of the Monitoring Council○ Healthy Watersheds Initiative, California pilot proposal (Item #3 above)○ Department of Public Health involvement in Safe to Drink and other workgroup efforts, including sending a letter to water purveyors to place their Consumer Confidence Reports on the USEPA website○ Tracking portal usage |
|--|---|

July 8, 2011
Approved August 24, 2011