

CALIFORNIA WATER QUALITY MONITORING COUNCIL
Monitoring Council Meeting Notes
Wednesday, February 29, 2012 – 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM

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



Monitoring Council Members and Alternates in attendance:

Jonathan Bishop	Mike Connor	Karen Larsen	Ken Schiff
Sean Bothwell	Sarge Green	John Norton	Stephani Spaar
Paul Collins	Dale Hoffman-Floerke	Armand Ruby	

Others in attendance or (on the phone):

Jamie Aberhold, C.I. Agent Stormwater Solutions	(Cristina Grosso, San Francisco Estuary Institute)
Shakoora Azimi-Gaylon, State Water Board	(Lisa Hazard, So. Calif. Coast & Ocean Obs. System)
Adam Ballard, Dept. of Fish and Game	(Fan Lau, URS Corporation)
(Laura Blake, Cadmus Group)	Jon Marshack, State Water Board
Steve Blecker, Delta Science Program	(Brian Mendenhall, Santa Clara Valley Water Dist.)
Gabriele Bohrer, Dept. of Water Resources	Jason Moore, Dept. of Water Resources
Dennis Bowker, Consultant	(Elizabeth Nielsen, URS Corporation)
Lea Ann Chapman, C.I. Agent Stormwater Solutions	(Mark Pumford, City of Oxnard)
(Mark Emmerson, Dept. of Public Health)	(Keith Starner, Dept. of Pesticide Regulation)
Terry Fleming, USEPA-Region 9	(Eric Stein, SCCWRP)
(Corey Godfrey, Cadmus Group)	(Meredith Williams, San Francisco Estuary Inst.)

ITEM:	1	
Title of Topic:	INTRODUCTIONS AND HOUSEKEEPING	
Purpose:	1) Introductions 2) Review draft notes from November 30, 2011 Monitoring Council meeting 3) Review agenda for today's meeting	
Desired Outcome:	a) Approve November 2011 Monitoring Council meeting notes b) Preview what will be covered today and overall meeting expectations c) Adjust today's agenda, as needed	
Attachment Links:	Notes from November 30, 2011 Council meeting	
Contact Person:	Jon Marshack	imarshack@waterboards.ca.gov , 916-341-5514
Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stephani Spaar of the Dept. of Water Resources was introduced as the new Alternate for Dale Hoffman-Floerke representing the Natural Resources Agency Sean Bothwell of the California Coastkeeper Alliance was introduced as the new Alternate for Sara Aminzadeh, representing the Public 	
Decisions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes from the November 30, 2011 Monitoring Council meeting were 	

	<p>approved without amendment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agenda item (5) was postponed until August
--	--

ITEM:	2
Title of Topic:	ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES
Purpose:	<p>a) Annual report to Agency Secretaries (Jon Marshack)</p> <p>b) Briefing for Cal/EPA Secretary Rodriguez (Jonathan Bishop, Leah Walker, Sara Aminzadeh, Jon Marshack)</p> <p>c) Support letter from Monitoring Council to MARINe (Jon Marshack)</p> <p>d) State and federal budget update (Jonathan Bishop, Karen Larsen, Dale Hoffman-Floerke, Leah Walker)</p> <p>e) San Joaquin River Monitoring Forum (Parry Klassen, Karen Larsen)</p> <p>f) Wetland Monitoring Workgroup's planned Training Workshop on Implementation of the State Wetland and Riparian Area Monitoring Program (WRAMP) (Eric Stein)</p> <p>g) <i>Added item: Monitoring Council involvement in the National Water Monitoring Council Conference and the relationship between the California and National Monitoring Councils (Ken Schiff)</i></p>
Desired Outcome:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information and feedback • Finalize support letter to MARINe
Background:	<p>a) 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 2011 annual report included a cover letter that presented specific requests of the Agency Secretaries, a summary of 2011 progress by the Monitoring Council and its workgroups, and the text of a proposed letter to be sent by the Secretaries to the Directors of their boards, commissions, conservancies, departments, and offices. To provide their input into the annual report, number of the Monitoring Council's workgroups produced their own progress summaries (see links below).</p> <p>b) On February 6 as a follow up to the 2011 annual report, Monitoring Council Members, Alternates, and the Coordinator briefed California Environmental Protection Agency Secretary Matthew Rodriguez on SB 1070, the Monitoring Council and its Comprehensive Monitoring Program Strategy, workgroups and My Water Quality web portals. Specific requests for action by Secretary Rodriguez were also discussed.</p> <p>c) At the August Monitoring Council meeting (see Item 3 of the August 2011 meeting notes), the Monitoring Council agreed to send a letter of support that Multi-Agency Rocky Intertidal Network (MARINe) could use to encourage support from its partners for funding of future portal maintenance. A letter has been prepared for Monitoring Council review and approval.</p> <p>e) On February 14, a number of stakeholders involved in San Joaquin River monitoring met in Modesto to discuss forming a regional monitoring program, identifying common needs, goals, and assessment questions. The purposes</p>

	<p>of the meeting were to showcase water monitoring and assessment on the San Joaquin River and to gain input on the document, "Strawman Proposal for a San Joaquin River Regional Monitoring Program."</p> <p>f) In February 2010, the Monitoring Council approved in concept the Tenets of a State Wetland and Riparian Area Monitoring Program (WRAMP) prepared by the California Wetland Monitoring Workgroup (CWMW). The goal of WRAMP is to track trends in wetland extent and condition in order to assess the performance of wetland, stream, and riparian protection policies, programs, and projects. The primary strategy is to implement standardized assessment methods and data management through all of the State's wetland, stream, and riparian monitoring efforts in ways that improve them while minimizing new costs and maximizing public access to assessment information. Several programs across California have begun implementing various aspects of WRAMP. These early adopters provide case studies of how WRAMP tools and approaches for wetland monitoring and assessment are being used to support wetland regulatory and management decisions. A planned training workshop will provide a forum for sharing experiences and lessons learned regarding implementation of the tools of WRAMP. The goal is to broaden the network of partners familiar with WRAMP tools and to build capacity among water board staff and other practitioners for continued implementation of these tools. USEPA has committed to fund the workshop.</p> <p>g) The National Water Quality Monitoring Council will hold their 8th National Conference in Portland, Oregon from April 30 to May 4, 2012. The National Monitoring Council is a joint effort between USEPA and USGS.</p>
<p>Attachment Links</p>	<p>a) 2011 Annual Progress Report of the Water Quality Monitoring Council</p> <p> i) California Wetland Monitoring Workgroup 2011 Progress Report</p> <p> ii) "Safe to Swim" Workgroup 2011 Progress Report</p> <p> iii) Bioaccumulation Oversight Group 2011 Progress Report</p> <p> iv) California Estuary Monitoring Workgroup 2011 Progress Report</p> <p> v) Update on the Data Management Workgroup – presentation by Steve Steinberg at the November 2011 Monitoring Council Meeting</p> <p> vi) California Water Quality Monitoring Collaboration Network 2011 Progress Report</p> <p>c) Letter of support for the Multi-Agency Rocky Intertidal Network</p> <p>d) Strawman Proposal for a San Joaquin River Regional Monitoring Program</p>
<p>Contact Person:</p>	<p>Jon Marshack jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov, (916) 341-5514</p>
<p>Notes:</p>	<p>a) The 2011 annual report and cover letter were delivered to the Agency Secretaries on January 13, 2012</p> <p>b) Secretary Rodriquez proposed that coordination with the Ocean Protection Council be discussed after the new OPC Director has been selected. The Secretary appeared to support the concept of sending a letter to the Directors of his boards, departments and offices and requested that an electronic copy of the proposed letter be sent to him and his staff. Jon Marshack followed up by sending the draft letter and the Monitoring Council's comments on the OPC's Strategic Action Plan to Secretary Rodriquez and</p>

Kristin Stauffacher of his staff.

- d) The Governor's proposed budget was released in January and budget hearings are being scheduled on budget change proposals and other budget related items. A proposed cut in the federal Clean Water Act grant to the Water Boards may result in a \$700,000 to \$1 million reduction in funding for the Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP). The same grant funds NPDES permitting, inspections, pre-treatment and other related activities. The mix of federal and state funding for SWAMP may be adjusted to lessen the impact on that program. SWAMP has been immune to federal budget cuts for many years, but no longer. With respect to the Monitoring Council, SWAMP funding covers staffing for the coordinator, workgroup leads and participation, portal development and maintenance, and related tasks. Other Monitoring Council Members were urged to step up to fund Monitoring Council related activities.
 - e) The Coalition for Urban/Rural Environmental Stewardship (CURES) received a USEPA grant to develop a regional monitoring program (RMP) for the San Joaquin River. A RMP planning meeting will be held in June. The Monitoring Council was urged to entertain the concept of portals based on more limited geography. Responses ranged from favorable to limiting the Monitoring Council's focus to big-picture, statewide monitoring efforts and leaving local or regional organizations to manage their own websites or portals devoted to their efforts, with guidance and tools provided by the Monitoring Council.
 - f) The workshop may slip to a later date and may move from Sacramento. Water Board Training Academy sponsorship was opposed by the SF Bay Regional Water Board because they felt that training prior to wetland policy adoption by the State Water Board was premature. Eric Stein explained that the use of WRAMP tools is large than the Water Board policy with many organizations opting to use them now. Eric will keep the Monitoring Council informed about the workshop.
 - g) Several California presentations were made by state agency staff at the last National Council meeting in 2010. California involvement in the 2012 conference includes:
 - i) Jon Marshack will make a presentation on the California Monitoring Council, SB 1070, our workgroups, and portals, emphasizing data delivery to the user as a driver for collaboration
 - ii) Jon is also helping to facilitate a portion of the workshop "Building, Empowering & Sustaining State, Regional and Tribal Water Monitoring Councils and Water Monitoring Partnerships and Alliances.
 - iii) Karen Larsen will present California's Healthy Streams Partnership
 - iv) Shakoora Azimi-Gaylon will present the Perennial Stream Assessment
 - v) Pete Ode will present the Reference Condition Management Program
 - vi) Erick Burrell will present a workshop on volunteer monitoring and digital technologies
 - vii) Lilian Busse will present her work adapting the Massachusetts water quality report card to the San Diego Region
- Jon Marshack participates in occasional meetings of the Collaboration and Outreach Subcommittee of the National Council. Ken Schiff recommended

	that the National Council could benefit from the California Council's experience. Mike Connor favored conference presentations as the extent of California's participation in the National Council, due to limited staff and resources. Sarge Green asked where the National Council was headed and indicated that participation could show how others are handling policy issues and sustaining their programs. Involvement with the National Council could be used to advertise California's program, make connections, and encourage investment.
Decisions:	<p>c) The letter of support for MARINe was approved and signed</p> <p>g) Ken Schiff and Terry Fleming offered to help make connections with the National Water Quality Monitoring Council</p>
Action Items:	<p>f) Jonathan Bishop will look into the issue of Regional Board support for WRAMP tools and procedures</p> <p>g) An future Monitoring Council meeting agenda item will cover what we learned at the National Monitoring Conference</p>

ITEM:	3
Title of Topic:	HEALTHY STREAMS PORTAL
Purpose:	Review proposed Stream and River Ecosystem Health Portal (Jon Marshack and Meredith Williams)
Desired Outcome:	Approval to release new portal to the public
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.</p> <p>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. At the Monitoring Council's June 2011 meeting (see Item 4 on page 7), members of the Healthy Streams Partnership presented information on the three statewide monitoring and assessment efforts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perennial Streams Assessment (PSA) • Statewide Toxicity (see slides 1 to 17) • Stream Pollution Trends (SPoT) (see slides 18 and 19) <p>A revised portal mockup was also presented by the Aquatic Science Center. The Monitoring Council approved creation of the portal, based on the mockup and feedback given at the meeting, but asked that a working draft be brought back to the Monitoring Council for review prior to public release.</p> <p>The draft working portal presents (1) attributes that affect stream health, (2) the</p>

	<p>extent of stream and river resources, (3) stream health as measured by the indicators of bioassessment and water and sediment toxicity, and (4) a summary of programs to improve stream health. The portal includes a unique navigation system tied to a stream health attributes diagram, designed to inform the public and decision makers about this complex topic.</p> <p>Additional indicators – including water chemistry, sediment chemistry, physical habitat, and algae – will be addressed in future portal enhancements. Integration of multiple indicators into an overall score of stream health will be added through the California project of the USEPA’s Healthy Watersheds Initiative, which is the subject of the next agenda item.</p>	
Contact Persons:	<p>Meredith Williams Jon Marshack</p>	<p>meredith@sfei.org, (510) 746-7396 jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov, (916) 341-5514</p>
Notes:	<p>The following suggestions were made on the draft portal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities for users to make comments should be increased • Programs other than SWAMP that have data should be featured • Causes of impairment (e.g., chemistry) should be added • Modify colors used on maps and charts to accommodate persons with color perception issues; consistent colors should be used between portals • A single map that allows indicator layers to be turned on or off or shown together would be useful • Locations of data on maps should be shown • The bugs bioassessment page needs a link to the PSA report • Add regional summary pie charts • Overlay land uses on toxicity and bioassessment maps • What fish species are found where? – DFG data • Add hydrologic status of streams (adequacy of flow) • “What is being done...” page <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Change focus from programs to topics in a manner that makes sense to the public ○ Add other agency input (e.g., ecosystem restoration program of DFG) ○ Add “What can be done” in addition to what is being done ○ Add Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) waivers, e.g., irrigated agriculture, timber harvest • Add CIWQS information on receiving water quality, effluent locations and quality, effluent dominated conditions • Changes need to be prioritized 	
Decisions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for a common base map between agencies was stressed • Portal essentially ready for public release after some polish (esp., “What is being done...” page) and 1 to 2 week Monitoring Council review 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publicity needed for portal release, including a webinar
Action Items:	At the August Monitoring Council meeting, add an agenda item on the status of developing a common base map – include Greg Smith of DWR, Tom Lupo of DFG, and Josh Collins of SFEI to discuss the California Aquatic Resource Atlas
ITEM:	4
Title of Topic:	USEPA HEALTHY WATERSHEDS INITIATIVE, CALIFORNIA PROJECT
Purpose:	Presentation of a draft summary of proposed indicators for use in the California Healthy Watersheds integrated assessment (Laura Blake and Corey Godfrey of Cadmus Group)
Desired Outcome:	Monitoring Council direction
Background:	<p>In the June 2011 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 identifies healthy watersheds in California based on a systematic integration of a number of existing data sets. 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.</p> <p>At the November 2011 Monitoring Council meeting (see Item 6 on page 9), the Council discussed a Draft Technical Approach developed by USEPA's contractor, Cadmus Group, for identification of healthy watersheds in California based on a systematic integration of a number of existing data sets. The Council could not evaluate whether the results of this project would be a useful addition to the Healthy Streams Portal, based on this document and asked that an update on the project be presented at the next Monitoring Council meeting.</p>
Attachment Links:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Summary of Proposed Indicators (Cadmus Group) • Revised Project Schedule (Cadmus Group) • Identifying Healthy Watersheds in California – presentation by Laura Blake and Corey Godfrey of Cadmus Group • USEPA, Healthy Watersheds Initiative, Technical Document, "Identifying and Protecting Healthy Watersheds: Concepts, Assessments, and Management Approaches" (February 2012)
Contact Person:	Jon Marshack jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov , (916) 341-5514
Notes:	<p>The following comments were made on the modified technical approach and draft list of indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council Members questioned the heavy emphasis on regression modeling, as opposed to focusing on areas with real data, as considerable error/uncertainty will be introduced into the analysis, reducing confidence in the results • The degree of uncertainty must be identified, including how variation in indicators affect roll-up scores

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regression modeling should be calibrated using local and regional intensive data sets; BMI bioassessment data (Perennial Streams Assessment; PSA) already includes regressions and has real data in nearly all six categories – build on that effort • CRAM scores/components exist for many waterbodies – could be added to analysis • The process of combining indicators into overall scores of watershed health is of greater value and should be based on areas with real data for indicators in all 6 assessment component areas • Selected indicators represent a mixture of risk (stressors) and condition (health) factors; combining them may introduce confounding variables; can they all be expressed in terms of health? • Eco-regional differences will require independent regression analyses • Assessments at HUC₁₂ scale can be rolled up into larger watershed (e.g., HUC₈) assessments • Combining indicators will require decisions on scaling, normalization, and weighting – regional stakeholder input needed to achieve acceptance of/trust in results; project output will allow these factors to be adjusted in the future • List of indicators appears to be heavily weighted toward physical habitat information with water quality and biology metrics getting too little focus
<p>Decisions:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First, try using sites with real data in all 6 areas first to determine how to combine indicators – Cadmus will need to consult with Laura Gabanski of EPA (project manager) before committing to this change in project scope • Regression modeling will be verified with locally intensive real data sets (ground truthing) • Level of uncertainty based on modeling (due to lack of real data) will be spelled out – should be used to help prioritize future data acquisition efforts • Regression analysis will be built on PSA work • Scope of project is too limited to be able to include regional outreach to stakeholders on weighting, normalization, and scaling • Vulnerability assessment will be included in the final product • Results should focus on relative condition (e.g., percentile ranks), rather than definitive declarations of “health”; leave health thresholds to a future process • Check whether measures of pesticide use/presence can be added to water quality area
<p>Action Items:</p>	<p>Jon Marshack will send the USEPA Healthy Watersheds Initiative Technical Document to the Monitoring Council Members (<i>see link above</i>)</p>

<p>ITEM:</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Title of Topic:</p>	<p>SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM (RMP)</p>
<p>Purpose:</p>	<p>San Francisco Estuary Institute Executive Director Rainer Hoenicke will present</p>

	an overview of this successful collaborative monitoring program	
Desired Outcome:	Gain insight into successful collaborative monitoring programs	
Background:	<p>At the November 2011 meeting, the Monitoring Council requested presentations at future meetings by successful coordinated monitoring programs to explore a number of questions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What caused the coordination to occur? • Why has it been successful? • Has the coordination resulted in tools that would benefit coordination efforts by others? • Would a tool like the Central Valley Monitoring Directory have been helpful in getting the coordination going? • How are the data being managed and made available? <p>The goal will be to determine whether lessons learned can be transferred to aid other collaborative monitoring efforts, such as the Delta RMP and the San Joaquin River RMP.</p> <p>This is the first of several such presentations. Future presentations will include the San Gabriel River Regional Monitoring Program, the Los Angeles River Watershed Monitoring Program, and the Stormwater Monitoring Coalition in Southern California.</p>	
Attachment Links:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SF Bay Regional Monitoring Program website • 2011 Pulse of the Estuary: Pollutant Effects on Aquatic Life • Contaminant Data Display & Download 	
Contact Person:	Rainer Hoenicke	rainer@sfei.org , (510) 746-7381
Decisions:	<i>Item postponed to August meeting</i>	

ITEM:	6	
Title of Topic:	MONITORING COUNCIL'S GOALS	
Purpose:	Plan actions and initiatives for the year and beyond	
Desired Outcome:	Develop and prioritize list of actions for workgroup formation, portal development, outreach, and collaboration	
Background:	<p>In the August 2011 meeting, the Monitoring Council requested an agenda item early in the new year to discuss the Council's goals. Are we meeting the goals set forth in SB 1070 and the MOU that established the Monitoring Council? Are we properly focusing our efforts, as outlined in the 2008 Initial Recommendations Report to the Agency Secretaries and the 2010 Comprehensive Monitoring Program Strategy?</p> <p>Theme-specific Workgroups have been formed to address the following themes:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it safe to swim in our waters? • Is it safe to eat fish and shellfish from our waters? • Are our wetland ecosystems healthy? • Are our stream and river ecosystems healthy? • Are our estuaries healthy? <p>Additional workgroups are being formed to address the following themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is our water safe to drink? • Are our ocean ecosystems healthy? <p>A Data Management Workgroup has been formed to address issues of data sharing, data management, web development, and GIS that are common to all of the theme-specific workgroups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data silos at each agency and organization need to be broken down to increase access to and sharing of water quality and ecosystem health data and assessment information. • A standardized base map of California’s water resources is needed to enhance the ability of agencies and organizations to share water quality and ecosystem information. <p>My Water Quality Portals have been published for Safe to Swim, Safe to Eat, and Wetlands. A proposed Healthy Streams portal was presented today. Additional portals are envisioned for Estuaries, Ocean Health, and Safe to Drink.</p> <p>An additional “stressors and processes” theme was envisioned in the Monitoring Council’s strategy document. How should this theme be addressed? Do we need separate workgroups and portals to address harmful algal blooms, trash/marine debris, global warming, and other such topics?</p> <p>Publicity & Outreach are needed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase awareness and usage of <i>My Water Quality</i> portals • Gain new partners for the Monitoring Council’s workgroup an portal development efforts <p>This discussion is likely to require more time than will be available at this meeting. Continuation of this item to future meetings is likely.</p>
<p>Attachment Links:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CA Senate Bill 1070 • Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) • 2008 Initial Recommendations Report • A Comprehensive Monitoring Program Strategy for California, 2010 • Matrix of Monitoring Council Workgroups and Portals
<p>Contact Person:</p>	<p>Jon Marshack jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov, (916) 341-5514</p>
<p>Notes:</p>	<p>The following suggestions were expressed by Monitoring Council Members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For stressors, start with CEDEN – chemistry data • Allow local watersheds post information (e.g., blog, Facebook, crowd sourcing) to entice them to participate, finding ways to connect people and

	<p>validate efforts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove stressors and incorporate into other portals, e.g., incorporate harmful algal blooms (HABs) into ocean and stream portals/workgroup efforts • How should the Creek Watch mobile app be incorporated into the portals? • Need to get other agencies involved, starting with agencies named in SB 1070; goals are <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participation in workgroups 2. Bring data together – more than just providing access – How can your data serve a broader purpose? 3. Sustainable funding and staff commitments • Presentation and/or poster on portals at Delta Science Conference in October • Add agency logos to matrix of workgroups and portals • Need to track portal use statistics every three months • Bay Delta Conservation Plan implementation could be a portal funding source • Regional Monitoring Programs – should work within existing workgroup efforts; Monitoring Council and workgroups cannot get to level of detail that regional and local monitoring efforts need, but can provide tools and assistance such as QA, data management, webinars <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parry Klassen acts as a bridge to the San Joaquin River RMP 2. Armand Ruby acts as a bridge to the SF Bay RMP • App development – making portals readable on smart phones; to strengthen local interest, develop “surf my watershed that combines data from all portals based on phone location information (e.g. area within 10 miles)
<p>Decisions:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 0.5 personnel years have been committed by Resources Agency to fund a Monitoring Council Coordinator, likely from Dept. of Water Resources, Environmental Services • Monitoring Council Members will get involved directly <i>(see commitments in Action Items below)</i> • Priorities for 2012: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Marketing – outreach to agencies and legislature, publicity related to 40th anniversary of Clean Water Act, engage public, integration with CEDEN 2. Advance monitoring coordination efforts – engage RMPs, document efficiencies realized by Monitoring Council efforts, what agencies are engaged and how? 3. Performance measures of success – website use statistics, examples of what is being done differently due to Monitoring Council efforts, who is participating in workgroups, data coordination efforts, public access to data that did not exist before
<p>Action Items:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration of Creek Watch mobile app at a future Monitoring Council meeting

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sarge Green will work on the Safe to Drink workgroup/portal effort • Sara Aminzadeh and Sean Bothwell will work to develop legislative hearing on portals • John Norton will work on the Healthy Streams workgroup/portal effort • Paul Collins will work on the Safe to Drink workgroup/portal effort • Mike Connor will work on the Safe to Eat workgroup/portal effort • Armand Ruby will work on the Data Management Workgroup and the Healthy Streams workgroup/portal effort • Steve Weisberg’s staff is already involved in all of the workgroup/portal efforts except Safe to Drink • Jon Marshack will “hit the road” to brief agencies and encourage engagement – after Sectary letters to Directors delivered • Schedule a ½ day at a future Monitoring Council meeting to discuss successful regional monitoring efforts and share information with formative RMPs – what do they need from Monitoring Council? Invite Brock Bernstein, who is involved in many of these efforts • Develop a fact sheet – What is happening differently at your agency due to Monitoring Council/workgroup/portal efforts? – will factor into triennial audit mandated by SB 1070 (first one is 3 years from publication of strategy) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Use of CEDEN in 303(d) list ○ State of the State Wetlands Report ○ State Water Board management changes? – policy, budget, biological objectives, GIS work, coordination of monitoring efforts among programs ○ Media interest in fish contamination data
--	--

ITEM:	7
Title of Topic:	MEETING WRAP-UP
Purpose:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Summarize meeting 2) Plan agenda for May 30, 2012 Monitoring Council meeting at SCCWRP – potential items include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Bioaccumulation Oversight Group Strategy (Jay Davis) b) 2nd Year Report on Bioaccumulated Contaminants in Coastal Sport Fish (Jay Davis) c) Successful Collaborative Monitoring Programs <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) San Gabriel River Regional Monitoring Program ii) Los Angeles River Watershed Monitoring Program iii) Stormwater Monitoring Coalition in Southern California d) Ocean Ecosystem Health <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Areas of Special Biological Significance (ASBS) monitoring (Ken Schiff)

	ii) Marine Protected Area (MPA) Monitoring Enterprise (Liz Whiteman) iii) Plans for new Ocean Ecosystem Workgroup and Ocean Health Portal e) Department of Water Resources grant project effectiveness monitoring (Laura McLean) f) Outreach strategy and publicity to increase portal usage g) Safe to Drink workgroup and portal development proposal	
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"> • Revisit inventory and prioritization of monitoring efforts in 2008 report • RMPs act as intermediaries between locals and state 	
Decisions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May meeting will include items (a), (b) and (c) above, plus either (d) or (g) depending on which is ready for discussion • ½ day session on successful regional monitoring efforts – item (c) above <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Southern California RMPs in May – add So Cal Bight, Santa Clara River, San Diego River, San Luis Rey ○ Northern and Central RMPs in August – include Klamath, Sacramento River, CCLEAN, San Joaquin River, Delta, San Francisco Bay ○ Include panel discussion with multiple group participation ○ Add the following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are measures of success? How are portals fitting into your programs? What agency data are being integrated? What do they need from the Monitoring Council? • Move item (e) above to August meeting 	

March 19, 2012
 approved May 30, 2012