

CALIFORNIA WATER QUALITY MONITORING COUNCIL

Monitoring Council Meeting Notes

Wednesday, November 30, 2011 – 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM

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



Monitoring Council Members and Alternates in attendance:

Sara Aminzadeh	Dale Hoffman-Floerke	Parry Klassen	Armand Ruby
Jonathan Bishop	Mark Emmerson*	Phil Markle	Stephen Weisberg
Rich Breuer	Karen Larsen	John Norton	

* See Decisions for Item #1 below

Others in attendance or (on the phone):

Shakoora Azimi-Gaylon, SWRCB	(Elizabeth Nielsen, URS)
Gabrielle Bohrer, Dept. of Water Resources (John Borkovich, SWRCB)	(Greg Pepping, Coastal Watershed Council) (Chantell Royer, Klamath Basin Monitoring Program)
Kelly Briggs, Dept. of Water Resources	Rudy Schnagl, Central Valley RWQCB
Thomas Jabusch, SFEI/Aquatic Science Center	(Bob Solecki, SWRCB)
Jeannie Chilcott, Central Valley RWQCB (Paul Collins, CDPH)	(Louisa Squires, Santa Clara Valley Water Dist.)
Terry Fleming, USEPA	Steve Steinberg, SCCWRP
Cliff Harvey, SWRCB	(Meghan Sullivan, Central Valley RWQCB)
Anne Littlejohn, Central Valley RWQCB	(Catherine Woody, SWRCB)
Jon Marshack, SWRCB	Calvin Yang, Central Valley RWQCB
Michael May, SFEI/Aquatic Science Center	

ITEM:	1	
Title of Topic:	INTRODUCTIONS AND HOUSEKEEPING	
Purpose:	1) Introductions 2) Review draft notes from August 24, 2011 Monitoring Council meeting 3) Review agenda for today's meeting	
Desired Outcome:	a) Approve August 2011 Monitoring Council meeting notes b) Preview what will be presented today and overall meeting expectations c) Adjust today's agenda, as needed	
Attachment Links:	Draft notes from August 24, 2011 Council meeting	
Contact Person:	Jon Marshack	jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov , 916-341-5514
Decisions:	1) The Monitoring Council decided to allow Mark Emmerson to represent the Department of Public Health for this meeting, as Leah Walker and Paul Collins were not available 2) The August 2011 Monitoring Council meeting notes were approved without amendment	

ITEM:	2
Title of Topic:	ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES
Purpose:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) New Monitoring Council Member representing the Public (Jon Marshack) b) State budget update (Jonathan Bishop, Dale Hoffman-Floerke, Leah Walker) c) Monitoring Council meeting dates for 2012 d) Finalize comments on MARINE's draft rocky intertidal (tide pool) portal and 5-year online report (Jon Marshack) e) Support letter from Monitoring Council to MARINE (Jon Marshack) f) Safe to Drink Workgroup formation (Jon Marshack) g) Annual report to Agency Secretaries (Jon Marshack)
Desired Outcome:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information • Selection of 2012 meeting dates • Direction on annual report to Agency Secretaries including specific requests • Finalize comments on proposed Rocky Intertidal portal • Finalize support letter to MARINE
Background:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) In early August, Linda Sheehan stepped down from her position as Executive Director of the California Coastkeeper Alliance to start a new environmental nonprofit. At the same time, she relinquished her position on the Monitoring Council. A vacancy notice was circulated on August 30, eight candidates responded, and three individuals were interviewed by the Monitoring Council Co-Chairs in late October. They recommended to the Agency Secretaries that Sara Aminzadeh of the California Coastkeeper Alliance be appointed to the vacant position. Sara had been Linda Sheehan's Alternate on the Monitoring Council. c) With the current budget situation, implementation of the Comprehensive Monitoring Program Strategy has slowed. As a result, a number of Monitoring Council meetings were canceled in 2011. It has been proposed that the Monitoring Council meet once per quarter in 2012 on the following dates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wednesday, February 29 • Wednesday, May 30 • Wednesday, August 29 • Wednesday, November 28 d) At the August Monitoring Council meeting, Jayson Smith of the Multi-Agency Rocky Intertidal Network (MARINE) presented a proposed Rocky Intertidal Portal and associated 5-year report (see Item 3 of the August meeting notes). Monitoring Council Members were generally complimentary of what was presented, but want to review the site in more detail before providing specific comments. Monitoring Council Members and Alternates were to review the proposed portal and 5-year report and provide detailed comments to Jayson Smith and Jon Marshack.

	<p>e) Also at the August meeting (see Item 3 of the August meeting notes), the Monitoring Council agreed to send a letter of support that MARINe could use to encourage support from its partners for funding of future portal maintenance.</p> <p>f) In the October 2010 meeting (see Item 4), the Monitoring Council reviewed a proposed Safe to Drink portal initially focusing on groundwater and based on the Water Board’s Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment program’s GeoTracker GAMA information system. The Monitoring Council decided that the portal was not ready for public release without providing information on the quality of water at the tap. The proposed portal was developed by the Water Board’s GeoTracker GAMA contractor without input from a formal Monitoring Council workgroup. On August 18, representatives of the State Water Board, Department of Water Resources and Department of Public Health met to begin formation of a new theme-specific workgroup to address the theme “Is our water safe to drink?” with three perspectives: water at the tap, groundwater and surface water.</p> <p>g) In its December 2008 recommendations, the Monitoring Council committed to make annual progress reports to the Agency Secretaries and such reports were delivered in December 2009 and 2010. The Monitoring Council’s theme-specific workgroups and the Data Management Workgroup are being asked to summarize their progress during 2011. That information will be included in the next annual report, to be delivered in December. This presents an opportunity for the Monitoring Council to make specific requests of the Agency Secretaries.</p>
Attachment:	Stanford University, Water in the West Working Paper 2, “ Measuring Performance of Water Systems in California ” (see page 14)
Contact Person:	Jon Marshack jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov , (916) 341-5514
Notes:	<p>b) Very little of the Water Boards’ budget now comes from the General Fund. So the state budget situation will have little impact. Additional cuts are expected in the January proposed budget.</p> <p>d) Monitoring Council Members had no further comments on the Rocky Intertidal portal and the 5-year MARINe report</p> <p>f) The Monitoring Council was pleased with the proposal from CDPH to develop the Safe to Drink portal, in which both treated drinking water and source water data and information would be made available and the perspectives of all of the agencies involved with providing drinking water to the public and safeguarding source waters will be presented. As with the GeoTracker GAMA information system, locations of drinking water intakes will need to be blurred to some degree due to security concerns. Policy issues involving differing agency and statutory focuses on drinking water will need to be carefully presented in the portal.</p> <p>g) Jonathan Bishop mentioned that in the recent Stanford University <i>Water in the West</i> summit on performance measures for California water systems, two agency reporting efforts were favorably highlighted – the My Water Quality portals, and the Water Boards’ performance report on the web. A link to the Stanford report is under Attachment, above. The IBM representative on the Data Management Workgroup also lauded the <i>My Water Quality</i> portals for driving data integration via questions that needed to be addressed.</p>

<p>Decisions:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c) Meeting dates for 2012 were approved as proposed. The May 30 meeting will be held at SCCWRP in Costa Mesa. d) In a near-future roundtable meeting, SWAMP should formally endorse the use of the California Rapid Assessment Method (CRAM) and support CRAM training through the Water Boards Training Academy.
<p>Action Items:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) Jon Marshack will notify Jayson Smith that the Monitoring Council has no further portal or 5-year report comments (done) e) Jon Marshack will request further information from Mary Elaine Helix for the MARINe letter of support (done) f) CDPH will bring a formal proposal for the Safe to Drink portal to the February 29 Monitoring Council meeting for review and comment. Jon Marshack will meet with Liz Haven of the SWRCB to help identify a discharger potentially willing to fund portal development through a Supplemental Environmental Project (SEP) that is tied to enforcement. Jon Marshack will coordinate with Sarge Green regarding ACWA and WEF involvement in portal development and the potential for increased promotion of portals in general. g) Jon Marshack will draft the 2011 progress report for the two Agency Secretaries, including the following recommendations: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Secretaries encouraging their Departments, Boards, and Conservancies to implement the Monitoring Council's comprehensive monitoring program strategy, to be actively engaged with the Monitoring Council and workgroups, and to utilize tools (e.g., QA, data management, training) developed by the workgroups. Advantages of doing so will be highlighted. A proposed letter will be attached for use by the Agency Secretaries. 2) Endorse state stewardship of the National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) and the National Wetland Inventory (NWI) by DWR and DFG, respectively, and encourage that these be coordinated with each other and with local stewardship and refinement efforts. The Data Management Workgroup could facilitate such coordination. 3) Creation of the Safe to Drink portal presents opportunity to emphasize new coordination efforts between Water Boards, DTSC, DWR, and other organizations within the two agencies. 4) The Ocean Protection Council's Strategic Action Plan and planned geospatial information system should be integrated and consistent with the Monitoring Council's comprehensive monitoring program strategy and the <i>My Water Quality</i> portals. The OPC should facilitate coordination of the ocean ecosystem health workgroup and portal by the MPA Monitoring Enterprise. Initial focus should be on the Central Coast, recognizing the integration of water quality and ecosystem health information. 5) Take advantage of 40th Anniversary of the Clean Water Act (October 2012) to raise awareness around clean water by highlighting the <i>My Water Quality</i> portals and the coordination efforts of the Monitoring Council and workgroups. <p>Include highlights of progress and issues from each of the workgroups. Examples of successes (e.g., Stanford report) will also be highlighted.</p>

	<p>Highlight works in progress (e.g., Safe to Drink portal) and where additional support for these would be helpful.</p> <p>Jon will then arrange for in-person briefings by the Co-Chairs with both Agency Secretaries to discuss the progress report and recommendations. Other Monitoring Council Members will be invited to participate (briefing for Cal/EPA Secretary Matthew Rodriguez scheduled for February 6, 2012).</p>
ITEM:	3
Title of Topic:	DATA MANAGEMENT
Purpose:	<p>Reports on the following data management topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Activities of the new Data Management Workgroup (Steve Steinberg) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Request by Department of Water Resources include flow/supply data to assist in California Water Plan development and other efforts b) CEDEN development (Steve Steinberg) c) CEDEN grant project summary outcomes, including data types, quality, portal relevance (Karen Larsen) d) Assistance provided to grantees by the Regional Data Centers (Karen Larsen)
Desired Outcome:	Information and direction from the Monitoring Council
Background:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) In the Comprehensive Monitoring Program Strategy, the Monitoring Council identified the need for a Data Management Workgroup to address issues of data management, data sharing, web development, and geospatial information that are common to the theme-specific workgroups. The new Data Management Workgroup has met twice. b) The California Environmental Data Exchange Network (CEDEN) is developing to provide broad access to ambient water quality data for the Water Boards, including water and sediment chemistry, water and sediment toxicity, fish tissue contaminants, and bioassessment data. Map-based data visualizations tools are available through the CEDEN website. CEDEN is envisioned to be a key data source for several of the My Water Quality internet portals. Linkages with other databases have been created or are envisioned. c) At the August 24 Monitoring Council meeting (see Item 4), Leslie Laudon provided information about Water Board requirements to document grant project effectiveness. Karen Larsen provided information about work that is being done to assess the feasibility of moving Water Board grant water quality data into CEDEN. A large bond project is funding the upload of existing/current completed grant project water quality data. As a follow-up to that discussion, the Monitoring Council asked for a summary of CEDEN grant project outcomes, including data types, data quality, and portal relevance. d) The CEDEN network includes four Regional Data Centers at SCCWRP, SFEI, Moss Landing Marine Labs, and Central Valley (Davis). In addition to entering and managing ambient monitoring data, the RDCs provide assistance to outside entities in preparing data for with CEDEN templates for

	submission, data management, QA, and controlled vocabulary.	
Attachment Links:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEDEN Website (www.ceden.org) • Update on the Data Management Workgroup - presentation by Steven Steinberg • Update on the California Environmental Data Exchange Network (CEDEN) - presentation by Steven Steinberg 	
Contact Person:	Steve Steinberg	steves@sccwrp.org , (714) 755-3260
Notes:	<p>a) Jonathan Bishop urged that in-stream flow and water diversion data be included to encourage participation by DWR and the Division of Water Rights.</p> <p>b) Care is needed to avoid creation of duplicate entries with each data integration</p> <p>c & d) Water Board staff has been reviewing information in the Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST) database of grant projects awarded funds between 2007 and 2010. Of 100 grant projects reviewed, 5 lacked water quality data, 55 submitted water quality data through the Regional Data Centers or other electronic submittal. The remaining 40 will be contacted to locate water quality data, which may have been submitted in PDF reports. Staff is working with the Division of Financial Assistance to ensure grantees receive no further funding until past project data have been submitted. New grant contracts will require CEDEN data submittal in SWAMP comparable format, including ASBS and 419(h) grants.</p>	
Decisions:	a) Issues for which the Data Management Workgroup reaches consensus do not need to be brought to the Monitoring Council	
Action Items:	c) The relevance of grant data to the portals will be addressed in a future report.	

ITEM:	4
Title of Topic:	CENTRAL VALLEY MONITORING DIRECTORY
Purpose:	<p>a) Provide the background, current status and a short demonstration of the directory (Anne Littlejohn)</p> <p>b) Review potential improvements identified by users and the feasibility of meeting those items (Anne Littlejohn/Michael May)</p> <p>c) Discuss how the directory can support the Monitoring Council's goals and the "My Water Quality" format (Thomas Jabusch/All)</p>
Desired Outcome:	Information and feedback from the Monitoring Council on current directory capabilities, possibilities to implement improvements identified in Feasibility Report, and linkage to Monitoring Council's goals.
Background:	The Central Valley Monitoring Directory is a web-based tool developed to help improve the coordination and integration of existing and future surface water monitoring efforts. Initiated as a USEPA pilot project in the San Joaquin River Basin in 2007, the directory was updated and expanded to the entire Central

	<p>Valley under the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board’s SWAMP effort. The monitoring directory provides access to program details and metadata for current water quality monitoring efforts in the Central Valley (Delta, San Joaquin River, Sacramento River and Tulare Lake Basins).</p> <p>Features include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An interactive map for searching and viewing of monitoring locations and program information. • Tabbed basin summary tables of programs, agencies, parameters, and sites that interact with the map and are also available to download in Excel format. • Individual program pages that identify the lead agency and partners; provide links to available contacts, monitoring plans, and data products; and summarize program details (objectives, duration, funding) and metadata (sampling sites, frequency, parameters). • Password-protected domains as a convenient tool for program managers to enter and update monitoring information. <p>The updated version of the Central Valley Monitoring Directory went live in August 2010 and user feedback has since been solicited via an online survey and workshops with a variety of stakeholders. A feasibility report, documenting stakeholder identified constraints as well as costs and time lines to implement improvements, is being developed.</p>
<p>Attachment Links:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Valley Monitoring Directory website: http://www.centralvalleymonitoring.org • Central Valley Monitoring Directory - presentation by Anne Littlejohn, Michael May, and Thomas Jabusch • Central Valley Monitoring Directory Feasibility Report • Central Valley Monitoring Directory brochure
<p>Contact Person:</p>	<p>Anne Littlejohn alittlejohn@waterboards.ca.gov, (916) 464-4840</p>
<p>Notes:</p>	<p>The Central Valley Monitoring Directory provides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An opportunity to collaborate and share resources, improving monitoring coordination • Organized information by program, organization, analyte, or site • Excel download of information being viewed • Access to monitoring plans • A data entry domain to encourage partners to keep their information updated • A website survey button on the home page <p>The Directory does not store monitoring results.</p> <p>To be truly useful (e.g. eliminate duplication, help to develop regional monitoring programs that would lead to regional assessments) the Monitoring Directory would need to be more complete. Current Monitoring Directory entries cover mainly larger programs and sources. Smaller entities are currently poorly represented, due to lack of funding to acquire the data and to perform additional outreach. A grant has been obtained by Coalition For Urban/Rural</p>

	<p>Environmental Stewardship (CURES) to obtain San Joaquin Valley data.</p> <p>The North Coast and San Francisco Bay Regional Water Boards would like the Monitoring Directory expanded to their regions. The Klamath Basin Monitoring Program is interested in participating and submitting information to the Monitoring Directory. The Interagency Ecological Program (IEP) is evaluating use of the Monitoring Directory to inventory existing Delta monitoring efforts. SWAMP is considering making the Monitoring Directory a statewide tool.</p> <p>The Monitoring Council suggested that metadata could be added from CEDEN and CIWQS, automatically adding information on additional entities and programs that are already conducting monitoring.</p>
Decisions:	<p>The Central Valley Monitoring Directory has merit. The Data Management Workgroup should evaluate the feasibility of making the CV Monitoring Directory into a statewide tool, perhaps combining it with CEDEN, to help foster development of regional monitoring efforts.</p>
Action Items:	<p>Additional outreach is needed to acquire information from a larger number of monitoring entities, particularly smaller ones. Erick Burres (SWAMP Citizen Monitoring Coordinator) could help this effort. The Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA) could provide outreach to water districts.</p> <p>Future Monitoring Council meeting(s) could focus on existing coordinated monitoring programs (e.g., San Gabriel, SMC). What caused it to happen? Have they developed tools that would help others? Would the Monitoring Directory have been helpful?</p>

ITEM:	5
Title of Topic:	SANTA CLARA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT ECOLOGICAL MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK
Purpose:	Luisa Squires of the Santa Clara Valley Water District staff will present the District's Ecological Monitoring and Assessment Framework, as demonstrated in the Stream Ecosystem Profile for Coyote Creek Watershed
Desired Outcome:	Information and comment on this integrated approach to evaluating watershed health in support of management decision making
Background:	Luisa Squires of the Water District's staff made a presentation to the California Wetland Monitoring Workgroup on the District's Ecological Monitoring and Assessment Framework and how they have applied it in the Coyote Creek Watershed. The approach is consistent with the "Level 1-2-3 Framework" of Wetland Workgroup's Wetland and Riparian Area Monitoring Strategy , which was endorsed by the Monitoring Council. The approach links the monitoring data to clear management questions and uses the watershed assessments to inform management and stewardship decisions. The Wetland Monitoring Workgroup wrote a letter of support to Water District management.
Attachment Links:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stream Ecosystem Profile – Coyote Creek Watershed Report • California Wetland Monitoring Workgroup letter of support • Improving Water Resource Management Decisions through the 1-2-3

	Framework - presentation by Louisa Squires	
Contact Person:	Jon Marshack	jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov , (916) 341-5514
Notes:	<p>The budget for the Coyote Creek project was \$700,000, including developing management questions, the Ecological Services Index (see slide 18 of presentation), and the Coyote Creek pilot.</p> <p>The Santa Clara Valley Water District plans to use the framework and assessment results to inform asset management decisions – e.g., creek enhancements and watershed improvements.</p> <p>Many monitoring programs begin with obtaining Level 3 data, which is often the most expensive to acquire. Level 1 and Level 2 data can help prioritize Level 3 monitoring efforts, improving efficiency and effectiveness.</p> <p>Next steps include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessing the Guadalupe River watershed • Integrating more Level 3 monitoring • Adopting Ecological Services Index target stream conditions • Translating assessment information into projects, using assessments as a tool to ask the public for funding • Developing an integration strategy <p>The Monitoring Council was impressed with this program. The goals of the Santa Clara Valley Water District are broader than most, expanding their role beyond water supply and flood management to include watershed stewardship. The District is working to complete the circuit (monitoring design → assessment → prioritizing action).</p>	

ITEM:	6
Title of Topic:	USEPA HEALTHY WATERSHEDS INITIATIVE, CALIFORNIA PROJECT
Purpose:	Presentation of a proposal for identification of healthy watersheds in California based on a systematic integration of a number of existing data sets.
Desired Outcome:	Monitoring Council direction on the proposal
Background:	In the June meeting of the Monitoring Council (see Item 3), Laura Gabanski of USEPA, Healthy Watershed Initiative, offered to provide USEPA-funded contractor support for Healthy Streams portal development that integrates data types, including those not previously considered. The Monitoring Council asked that a concrete proposal be developed for how to use USEPA Healthy Watershed Initiative contractual support, for consideration at a later meeting.
Attachment Links:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HWI, California Project Proposal • Draft Technical Approach (Cadmus Group) • USEPA Healthy Watersheds Initiative - California Project - presentation by Jon Marshack

Contact Person:	Jon Marshack	jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov , (916) 341-5514
Decisions:	<p>The Draft Technical Approach from the Cadmus Group could not be evaluated because it did not satisfactorily address how the study would be done:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will statewide indicators be selected? • How will they be integrated (e.g., independent applicability or Sediment Quality Objectives method)? • How will the results be used to identify healthy watersheds? • How will the data be displayed? <p>Without this information, the Monitoring Council could not evaluate whether the results of this project would be a useful addition to the Healthy Streams Portal.</p>	
Action Items:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring Council Members will be invited to attend future workgroup meeting(s) to provide further direction to the Cadmus Group • Provide update on project at February 29 Monitoring Council meeting, including a presentation by the Cadmus Group. 	

ITEM:	7	
Title of Topic:	MEETING WRAP-UP	
Purpose:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Summarize meeting 2) Plan agenda for next Monitoring Council meeting – potential items include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Ocean Ecosystem Health <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Areas of Special Biological Significance (ASBS) monitoring ii) Marine Protected Area (MPA) Monitoring Enterprise iii) Plans for new Ocean Health Portal b) Healthy Streams Portal c) Department of Water Resources grant project effectiveness monitoring d) Monitoring Council goals for 2011 e) Outreach strategy to increase portal usage 	
Desired Outcome:	Develop agenda items for the next meeting	
Contact Person:	Jon Marshack	jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov , (916) 341-5514
Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was insufficient time to address this item. See above Decisions and Action Items. • The Bioaccumulation Oversight Group (BOG) strategy will be presented at the May 30 Monitoring Council meeting. 	