

## CALIFORNIA WATER QUALITY MONITORING COUNCIL

### Monitoring Council Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, November 28, 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	(Paul Collins)	John Norton
(David Bolland)	Sarge Green	(Ken Schiff)
(Sean Bothwell)	(Karen Larsen)	(Stephani Spaar)

#### Others in attendance or (on the phone):

Steve Blecker, Delta Stewardship Council  
Dori Bellan, State Water Resources Control Board  
Danielle Blacett, Association of California Water Agencies  
(Caly Brandow, Department of Forestry and Fire Protection)  
Rich Breuer, State Water Resources Control Board  
(Linda Dorn, Sacramento Area Sewer District)  
David Duncan, Department of Pesticide Regulation  
Mark Emmerson, Department of Public Health  
Susan Fregien, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board  
(Cindy Garcia, Department of Water Resources)  
(Bruce Houdesheldt, Northern California Water Association)  
(Cristina Grosso, San Francisco Estuary Institute)  
Susan Lauer, Water Education Foundation  
Karl Longley, California Water Institute  
Sue McClurg, Water Education Foundation  
(Stella McMillin, Department of Fish and Game)  
Nancy Miller, Department of Water Resources  
(Kelly Moran, TDC Environmental)  
(Mark Pumbord, City of Oxnard)  
(Armand Ruby, Armand Ruby Consulting and California Stormwater Quality Association)\*  
(Rudy Schnagl, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board)  
Beth Stern, Water Education Foundation  
(Meghan Sullivan, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board)  
Melissa Turner, Michael L. Johnson, LLC  
(Lori Webber, State Water Resources Control Board)

\* Mr. Ruby is a Member of the Monitoring Council. However, due to noticing requirements of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, Mr. Ruby's participation in this meeting by phone was necessarily as a member of the general public.

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>INTRODUCTIONS AND HOUSEKEEPING</b>
<b>Purpose:</b>	1) Introductions 2) Review notes from August 29, 2012 Monitoring Council meeting 3) Review agenda for today's meeting
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	a) Approve August 29, 2012 Monitoring Council meeting notes

	b) Preview what will be covered today and overall meeting expectations c) Adjust today's agenda, as needed
<b>Attachment Links:</b>	<a href="#">Notes from August 29, 2012 Council meeting</a>
<b>Contact Person:</b>	Jon Marshack   <a href="mailto:jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov">jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov</a> , 916-341-5514
<b>Notes:</b>	After a significant delay, a quorum of Monitoring Council Members and Alternates was achieved, allowing the meeting to start
<b>Decisions:</b>	August meeting notes approved with November 1, 2012 amendments
<b>Action Items:</b>	Two presentation in Item #6 were postponed until the March 7, 2013 meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• San Joaquin Regional Monitoring Program</li> <li>• San Francisco Bay Stormwater Regional Monitoring Coalition</li> </ul>

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES</b>
<b>Purpose:</b>	These are brief informational items that could be expanded into more detailed discussions for future meetings: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sara Aminzadeh appointed as Executive Director of the California Coastkeeper Alliance</li> <li>Wetland Portal and EcoAtlas review postponed to March 7, 2013 meeting</li> <li>Update on the joint meeting of the Data Management Workgroup, the Wetland Monitoring Workgroup, and lead persons from Estuary and Healthy Streams workgroups</li> <li>Other announcements and updates related to the Monitoring Council's mission pursuant to Senate Bill 1070 (Kehoe, 2006)</li> </ol>
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	Information and feedback
<b>Background:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A new California Wetlands Portal and EcoAtlas GIS data system were to be reviewed at this meeting for potential approval of public release. Recent changes and staff time commitments necessitate moving this item to the first Monitoring Council meeting in 2013.</li> <li>At the August 2012 monitoring Council meeting, Eric Stein and Steve Steinberg provided an update on efforts of the Wetland Monitoring Workgroup and the Data Management Workgroup to address wetland and other aquatic resource mapping and data management needs. The Monitoring Council recommended that the two workgroups meet jointly to determine how each can assist the other in the areas of GIS and data management. That meeting was held on November 20. The Monitoring Council Co-Chairs also decided to pursue the issue of state stewardship for California's portion of the National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) and the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI).</li> </ol>
<b>Attachment Links</b>	c) <a href="#">Notes from the August 2012 Monitoring Council meeting</a> (see item 4)

<b>Contact Person:</b>	Jon Marshack	<a href="mailto:jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov">jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov</a> , (916) 341-5514
<b>Notes:</b>	<p>c) The following action items arose from the joint meeting of the Data Management Workgroup, the Wetland Monitoring Workgroup, and lead persons from Estuary Monitoring and Healthy Streams workgroups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers of the California Aquatic Resource Inventory (CARI) will release the draft CARI protocols, standards, and data to the other workgroups after the draft is release to the Wetland Workgroup and the Monitoring Council</li> <li>• The Estuary and Wetlands Workgroups will have a standing item on their agendas for a report from the Data Management Workgroup</li> <li>• Another joint workgroup meeting will be held after CARI standards are completed and approved by the Wetland Workgroup</li> </ul> <p>The following recommendations were made regarding development and use of a common aquatic resources thematic data layer (base-map):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a desire among the Monitoring Council's workgroups to develop common protocols and standards to share data</li> <li>• Create a list of existing and potential consumers (potential funders) of CARI data and standards. Focus on organizations that have programs and mandates which could benefit</li> <li>• Tie portal needs to agency mandates so that portal aspects directly satisfy agency needs (e.g., Delta Plan restoration tracking, performance measure tracking); this will ensure continued funding for portal development</li> <li>• Test CARI robustness by sharing data with 34 North for incorporation into the development of the Estuary portal</li> <li>• Share standards and protocols with interested groups to get feedback</li> <li>• The workgroups recognize the need for a shared set of mapping standards and protocols</li> <li>• The workgroups recognize that a common base-map will also maintain a common user experience between different portals</li> <li>• The workgroups recommend that each workgroup maintain a standing agenda item on data management</li> </ul> <p>The Monitoring Council Co-Chairs have not yet met to discuss stewardship for NHD and NWI.</p>	
<b>Action Items:</b>	<p>b) The new Wetlands Portal will be reviewed at the March 7, 2013 Monitoring Council meeting for potential public release</p>	

<b>ITEM:</b>	3
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>WATER QUALITY MONITORING AND DATA COLLECTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION</b>
<b>Purpose:</b>	David Duncan presented information on the surface water and groundwater monitoring programs and other data collected by the California Department of

	Pesticide Regulation that may be relevant to the work of the Monitoring Council	
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	<p>Information and discussion about how the Department's monitoring efforts could fit within the Monitoring Council's comprehensive monitoring program strategy. Potential topics for discussion include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) What questions is the Department addressing with these monitoring efforts?</li> <li>b) What is monitored where?</li> <li>c) How is data quality ensured and documented?</li> <li>d) How are the data assessed and what thresholds are used?</li> <li>e) How are the data managed? Could they be connected with CEDEN?</li> <li>f) What theme-specific workgroup efforts would benefit from including the Department's data?</li> </ul>	
<b>Background:</b>	<p>The California Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR), within the California Environmental Protection Agency, is the lead state governmental organization charged with protecting human health and the environment by regulating pesticide sales and use, and by fostering reduced-risk pest management. Associated with these responsibilities, the Department monitors surface water and groundwater to detect the migration of pesticides from their point of use to evaluate health and environmental threats.</p>	
<b>Attachment Links</b>	<p><a href="#">Department of Pesticide Regulation Environmental Monitoring Branch</a> – presentation by David Duncan</p>	
<b>Contact Persons:</b>	David Duncan	<a href="mailto:dduncan@cdpr.ca.gov">dduncan@cdpr.ca.gov</a> ; (916) 445-3870
<b>Notes:</b>	<p>DPR licenses pesticides using registration requirements and labeling to reduce the risks associated with pest management. Registered pesticides and new active ingredients are evaluated by a team of environmental scientist and research scientist staff through monitoring of air, surface water and groundwater. Monitoring priorities are focused on locations of greatest concern in both agricultural and urban areas. Surface waters (and sometimes sediment) are measured for pesticide levels. EPA benchmarks for sensitive vertebrate and invertebrate species are used to evaluate the surface water monitoring data.</p> <p>Monitoring for potential pollution of groundwater due to agricultural use of pesticides was mandated by statute in 1985. Agricultural crop production, in addition to parks, golf courses, and rights of way are included in the definition of agricultural use. Mobility and persistence are key features that indicate whether a pesticide may become a groundwater pollutant. DPR's Ground Water Protection List includes seven pesticides that are regulated as groundwater contaminants and 101 pesticides that have the potential to pollute groundwater based on their environmental fate and use patterns. DPR monitors shallow drinking water wells for the presence of these pesticides and others reported to DPR by public agencies also engaged in sampling groundwater for pesticides. Benchmarks include drinking water MCLs and health advisory levels. Sources of these pesticides in groundwater include leaching through course soils, dry wells, direct movement via abandoned wells or poorly constructed wells, and backflow.</p> <p>QA/QC procedures include web posted standard operating procedures, study protocols, standardized method development, reporting limits, measured recovery, sample storage requirements, blanks, blind spikes, and occasionally</p>	

	<p>split samples with other labs or with the pesticide registrant.</p> <p>Groundwater data are shared with the public and other agencies through GeoTracker GAMA. Most results are “non-detect” with only one well exceeding the MCL. DPR plans to share surface water data using Google fusion tables, into which data are easy to load and from which data are easy to sort, query, and download. Surface water data are currently posted to DPR’s website. Ken Schiff asked whether DPR’s surface water data could be made available in CEDEN. David Duncan responded that DPR’s data may not meet SWAMP QA requirements, including federal QAPP requirements. Karen Larsen responded that SWAMP’s current development of “minimum QA” requirements may help and add value to DPR’s programs. David indicated that “minimum QA” requirements may address what he characterized as the arduous bureaucratic requirements of a QAPP, and mentioned that DPR does not want to spend resources documenting sample metadata, as it would reduce actual staff field work and number of samples collected. Armand Ruby encouraged DPR to explore improvements to their QA procedures (e.g., converting SOPs into QAPPs) and providing data to CEDEN to increase public access. Mr. Ruby also expressed concern that the high number of “non-detect” results could be caused by inadequate analytical reporting limits, which may be able to be improved.</p> <p>In addition to data sharing with a number of other agencies, DPR collaborates in their monitoring activities with the Central Valley and Central Coast Regional Water Boards. Plans to measure the effectiveness of recent pyrethroid regulations are being developed through collaboration with Regional Water Board Assistant Executive Officers. DPR also has a management agreement with the Water Boards to share technical information.</p>
<p><b>Decisions:</b></p>	<p>DPR should explore improvements to surface water data access (e.g., through CEDEN) and QA procedures. SWAMP may be able to help.</p>
<p><b>Action Items:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Data Management Workgroup should explore the use of Google fusion tables to share data via the web</li> <li>• Rich Breuer and Karen Larsen will arrange a meeting between DPR and SWAMP staff through the Healthy Streams Partnership to explore making surface water data connections between DPR and the Water Boards and improving QA</li> </ul>

<p><b>ITEM:</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p>
<p><b>Title of Topic:</b></p>	<p><b>SAFE TO DRINK WORKGROUP AND PORTAL DEVELOPMENT</b></p>
<p><b>Purpose:</b></p>	<p>Mark Emmerson presented an update on efforts of the Safe to Drink Workgroup to coordinate drinking water related monitoring, assessment and reporting through the development of a Safe to Drink Portal</p>
<p><b>Desired Outcome:</b></p>	<p>Discussion and comment on progress made to date, and specifically on the Phase 1 questions that would drive navigation from the ‘Safe to Drink’ landing page, the data sets linked to each question, and the supplier</p>
<p><b>Background:</b></p>	<p>A workgroup and portal devoted to the safety of water for drinking and related uses were envisioned as part of the Monitoring Council’s recommended <i>Comprehensive Monitoring Program Strategy for California</i>. The Department of Public Health, Division of Drinking Water and Environmental Management has</p>

	<p>agreed to lead this effort. Initial seed funding is being supplied by the State Water Board for portal development assistance by staff of the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project and the Water Education Foundation. A workgroup has been assembled, drawing staff from CDPH, WEF, the State Water Board, Department of Water Resources, the Association of California Water Agencies, Environment Now, and the Carmichael Water District. A draft workgroup charter has been developed.</p>	
<b>Attachment Links:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">‘Safe to Drink’ Web Portal Development Status</a> – presentation by Mark Emmerson, Beth Stern, and Susan Lauer</li> <li>• <a href="#">Safe to Drink Workgroup web page</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Draft Charter for the Safe to Drink Workgroup</a></li> </ul>	
<b>Contact Persons:</b>	Mark Emmerson	<a href="mailto:memmerso@cdph.ca.gov">memmerso@cdph.ca.gov</a> ; (916) 445-6190
<b>Notes:</b>	<p>This effort was initiated through a contract from the State Water Board to the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project, part of which passed through to the Water Education Foundation. A workgroup was convened to help plan the development of the Safe to Drink portal and has met once. The portal will provide multiple levels of access to information, from general to more specific. A set of eight questions (see <a href="#">presentation</a>) will drive navigation and arrangement of the information. A content management service platform will allow non-technical personnel to easily update information in the portal through an arrangement of diffuse administration.</p> <p>Through UC Davis, CDPH is also working on a Drinking Water Intake Clearinghouse portal to receive data from regulated local water purveyors. This effort will be integrated with the Safe to Drink Portal.</p> <p>Raw surface water quality data will be supplied from samples taken by water purveyors as well as from CEDEN and the Department of Water Resources. Included will be drinking water system Consumer Confidence Reports (CCRs), boil water notices, and water use information. GeoTracker GAMA will be used to present raw groundwater quality information that is relevant to those who obtain their water from private wells. Users will be able to access water purveyor supplied information through a map interface that includes the boundaries of water systems. CCRs will be the primary information used to define water quality served to customers. The cost of water will be addressed in a future portal phase.</p> <p>It was suggested that there be a link for the public to ask questions.</p> <p>Concern over the sustainability of the portal was raised as an issue that needs to be addressed.</p>	
<b>Decisions:</b>	<p>The Monitoring Council approved the portal navigation questions, but expressed concern over the ability to deliver responses to all eight questions for the initial portal release</p>	
<b>Action Items:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A mockup of the portal will be presented to the Monitoring Council for review and comment on March 7</li> <li>• The completed portal will be presented to the Monitoring Council on May 29 with the goal of obtaining approval to go public</li> <li>• The Safe to Drink Workgroup should address the sustainability of the portal,</li> </ul>	

	focusing on partnerships, agency mandates and agency interdependency	
<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>5</b>	
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN 2013 UPDATE: OPTIMIZING DATA MANAGEMENT AND USE</b>	
<b>Purpose:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Karl Longley presented the results of a California Council on Science and Technology (CCST) survey of water related technology needs</li> <li>• Update on the California Water Plan Update 2013 water sustainability indicators and decision support tool web portal and potential collaboration with My Water Quality portals and EPA Healthy Watershed Initiative project</li> </ul>	
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	CCST requested that the Monitoring Council evaluate the attached draft memorandum, provide suggestions, and identify additional existing or emergent technologies and barriers to implementation	
<b>Background:</b>	<p>California Water Plan 2013 Update is currently being developed by staff from the Department of Water Resources (DWR) and other agencies through public involvement and State and federal agency coordination processes. It will build on the contents of the previous update – the five-volume California Water Plan Update 2009, which provided a strategic plan, a suite of resource management strategies, reports on California’s hydrologic regions, and reference and technical guides – and will introduce a number of key additions and enhancements in response to stakeholder recommendations and evolving decision-maker information needs.</p> <p>As a component of the California Water Plan 2013 Update, the California Council on Science and Technology (CCST) is seeking to determine how innovations in science and technology can be used to improve California's integrated water management. CCST has conducted an online survey regarding existing and proposed water related technology, targeting people with water expertise from a variety of sectors, and has pulled together lists of typical responses. CCST requested that the Monitoring Council evaluate the attached draft memorandum addressing water management issues developed from responses provided by the CCST survey, and provide suggestions as needed. CCST also asked Council members to identify existing or emergent technologies and barriers to implementation that have not been raised by their survey.</p> <p>Another component of the Water Plan Update involves the development of water sustainability indicators and a web-based decision support tool to help water resource managers ensure the sustainability of California’s water resources. Water quality and aquatic ecosystem health indicators are included in this effort. A November 21 meeting between staff of the State Water Board and DWR explored potential coordination with the Healthy Streams Portal and the EPA Healthy Watersheds Initiative California project.</p>	
<b>Attachment Links:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">i2i Water Phase II Report</a> – presentation by Karl Longley</li> <li>• <a href="#">Draft Memorandum: Optimizing Management and Use</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">California Water Plan 2013 Update brochure</a></li> </ul>	
<b>Contact Persons:</b>	Karl Longley Jon Marshack	<a href="mailto:karll@csufresno.edu">karll@csufresno.edu</a> ; (559) 278-8658 <a href="mailto:jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov">jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov</a> ; (916) 341-5514

<p><b>Notes:</b></p>	<p>Karl Longley presented information on CCST's contribution to the California Water Plan 2013 Update. CCST's mission is to bring technology from the research sector to the legislature. The Technology Caucus of the California Water Plan will release their draft final report in March 2013 before holding three workshops to receive input. Issues raised so far that could involve the Monitoring Council's efforts include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient funding as a barrier to data acquisition</li> <li>• Better access to and use of data and modeling</li> <li>• Using modeling to help direct monitoring</li> <li>• Improved QA/QC</li> </ul> <p>Jon Marshack reported on a meeting held on November 21 between Water Board and Department of Water Resources staff and Fraser Shilling of UC Davis regarding potential collaboration on water indicators. It was agreed that the Water Plan's Sustainability Indicators Project and through the USEPA Healthy Watersheds Initiative California Project should present indicator information in complementary ways. In addition, the Water Plan Information Exchange (Water PIE) being developed by DWR for collecting and sharing data and for networking existing databases and websites should be made compatible with the Water Data Exchange (WQX) of USEPA and USGS. Because the Water Boards' California Environmental Data Exchange Network (CEDEN) is already linked to WQX, this would allow WQX to be used as a common data connection between DWR and Water Board water quality data systems. Finally, a common base map of California's water resources would be beneficial to all agencies working in this area. Policy direction and sign-off from agency and departmental management will be needed to implement these recommendations. At the end of the November 21 meeting, Jon Marshack was tasked with writing up these three recommendations for inclusion in the California Water Plan 2013 Update.</p>
<p><b>Action Items:</b></p>	<p>Monitoring Council Members are to provide input to Karl Longley's draft memorandum, addressing impediments to data sharing and use and communication between potential partner organizations/agencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct input to Karl Longley one-on-one</li> <li>• Comments to Jon Marshack by mid-January for development of collective Monitoring Council input to Water Plan 2013 Update by the end of February</li> </ul> <p><i>Note: Jon sent a reminder message to Monitoring Council Members and Alternates on January 16.</i></p>

<p><b>ITEM:</b></p>	<p><b>6</b></p>
<p><b>Title of Topic:</b></p>	<p><b>COLLABORATIVE REGIONAL MONITORING PROGRAMS IN NORTHERN AND CENTRAL CALIFORNIA</b></p>
<p><b>Purpose:</b></p>	<p>This item was continued from the August 2012 meeting. Each of the following monitoring programs provided a short introduction, followed by a discussion guided by the questions below.</p> <p><b>Programs</b> (presenters/representatives)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sierra Streams Institute/Friends of Deer Creek (John Norton)</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Delta Regional Monitoring Program (Meghan Sullivan, Stephanie Fong)</li> <li>3. Central Valley Agricultural Waiver Monitoring Program (Susan Fregien, Parry Klassen)</li> <li>4. <del>San Joaquin River Regional Monitoring Program (Parry Klassen, Rudy Schnagl)*</del></li> <li>5. <del>San Francisco Bay Stormwater Regional Monitoring Coalition (Armand Ruby)*</del></li> </ol> <p><i>* Items 4 and 5 were postponed until the March 7 Monitoring Council Meeting.</i></p> <p><b>Questions</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What caused the coordination to occur?</li> <li>b. Why has it been successful?</li> <li>c. Has the coordination resulted in tools that would benefit coordination efforts by others?</li> <li>d. Would a tool like the <a href="#">Central Valley Monitoring Directory</a> have been helpful in getting the coordination going?</li> <li>e. How are the data being managed and made available?</li> <li>f. What are measures of success?</li> <li>g. How are portals fitting into your programs?</li> <li>h. What agency data are being integrated?</li> <li>i. What is the role of citizen volunteer monitoring?</li> <li>j. What do you need from the Monitoring Council?</li> </ol>
<p><b>Desired Outcome:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elucidate the reasons why some collaborative regional monitoring efforts are successful</li> <li>• Can those successes benefit or be transferred to other monitoring efforts and if so, how?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Background:</b></p>	<p>An agenda item on successful collaborative regional monitoring programs in Southern California was part of the May 2012 Monitoring Council meeting. This item was held as a consolidated panel discussion to enhance direct sharing of information between established monitoring programs and to include additional monitoring programs that are not yet fully developed.</p> <p>At the August 2012 Monitoring Council meeting, Item #7 similarly focused on collaborative regional monitoring programs in Northern and Central California. There was insufficient time for all programs to present. Presentations by the remaining programs were continued to the November meeting.</p>
<p><b>Attachment Links:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Sierra Streams Institute</a> – presentation by John Norton</li> <li>• <a href="#">Delta RMP</a> – presentation by Meghan Sullivan</li> <li>• <a href="#">2012 Pulse of the Delta report</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Delta RMP listserv</a> – select “Delta Water Quality Issues”</li> <li>• <a href="#">Monitoring and Reporting Program, Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board</a> – presentation by</li> </ul>

	<p>Susan Fregien</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Irrigated lands Regulatory Program Data Processing Chart</a> – handout from Susan Fregien</li> <li>• <a href="#">Central Valley Monitoring Directory brochure</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Notes of May 2012 Monitoring Council Meeting</a> (see Item 6)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Notes from August 29, 2012 Council meeting</a> (see Item 7)</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Contact Person:</b></p>	<p>Jon Marshack</p>	<p><a href="mailto:jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov">jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov</a>, (916) 341-5514</p>
<p><b>Notes:</b></p>	<p><b>Sierra Streams Institute/Friends of Deer Creek</b>– SSI seeks Monitoring Council support for citizen monitoring, including training and auditing efforts. SSI works in cooperation with the Lake Wildwood Association, sanitation and irrigation districts to monitor water chemistry, benthic macroinvertebrates, algae, and habitat characteristics at 16 stations in the Deer Creek watershed. They use SWAMP methods and their data are entered into CEDEN. <i>The Bug Book</i>, the widely used reference on macroinvertebrate taxonomy, was developed by Friends of Deer Creek/SSI. Citizen monitoring is a cost effective method to obtain water quality and aquatic ecosystem information.</p> <p><b>Delta Regional Monitoring Program</b> – The RMP technically does not yet exist. It is in the planning/development stages. The Pelagic Organism Decline in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta highlighted the need to coordinate monitoring between the Central Valley and San Francisco Bay Regional Water Boards and the State Water Board. The <a href="#">Central Valley Monitoring Directory</a> was helpful in getting the Delta RMP off the ground. The goal is to realign receiving water monitoring conducted by NPDES dischargers to build a more complete picture of Delta water quality. But the small number of NPDES dischargers in the Delta is making it difficult to get the RMP started. A draft framework document has been developed identifying monitoring questions, data needed to address those questions, and costs. The RMP hopes to have a Program Plan document developed by mid-2013. RMP data will be entered into CEDEN. Collaboration is occurring through the Interagency Ecological Program (IEP) and the Monitoring Council’s Estuary Monitoring Workgroup. Engagement with the Central Valley Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program has begun. With the help of SFEI, two editions of <a href="#">Pulse of the Delta</a> have been developed to report on Delta water quality status and trends. A <a href="#">Delta RMP listserv</a> has been developed to enhance communication between stakeholders and other interested parties.</p> <p><b>Central Valley Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program (ILRP) Monitoring</b> – Technically, this is not a “collaborative” monitoring program, since it is mandated through a waiver-of-waste-discharge-requirements regulatory program. Approximately 250 sites are currently being monitored with the Regional Water Board specifying spatial, temporal, and constituent requirements through a Monitoring and Reporting Program. The program has stable funding through grower-member fees paid to coalitions that actually conduct the monitoring. The program is successful in that it helps management make decisions. Quarterly monitoring data are submitted using an Excel template, reviewed by a Data Management Team, entered into CEDEN through the Central Valley Regional Data Center, and made available to the public through the <a href="#">CEDEN website</a>. Sufficient certified analytical lab capacity was an initial issue for the program that has largely been addressed. QA/QC procedures are the same as SWAMP, with slight modifications. Monitoring sites are georeferenced and photo documented. Data quality is well documented. The monitoring coalitions provide annual report</p>	

	<p>summaries for the regulators to use in determining compliance with waiver conditions and these are placed on the web for public access. Tools that make the program successful include Data Management Team tools, templates for large datasets, electronic QAPPs, data format standards, feedback loop to correct data errors, and coalition training on the on-line data checker. Several of these were derived from SWAMP. The Delta and San Joaquin River RMP efforts may benefit from these tools. What does the program need from the Monitoring Council? – support for CEDEN to be successful; it provides data to the public and to other agencies who rely on them. Coordination with the Rice Coalition and the Department of Water Resources has helped to address past monitoring redundancies. Coordination is needed between the Central Valley ILRP, POTWs, and stormwater monitoring efforts to reduce duplication and help with data collection. The <a href="#">Central Valley Monitoring Directory</a> was helpful to the program, including all coalition monitoring sites; but it has not been updated.</p>
--	---

<b>ITEM:</b>	7
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>CLEAN WATER ACT RETROSPECTIVE OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA OCEAN MONITORING DATA AND INFORMATION</b>
<b>Purpose:</b>	Ken Schiff will present a technical report prepared by the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project (SCCWRP) upon the 40 <sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Clean Water Act, providing a retrospective on water quality monitoring data and information for Southern California ocean waters.
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	Steve Weisberg recommended that the Monitoring Council understand how difficult it was to assemble the legacy data and discuss how to make available present and future data.
<b>Background:</b>	The Clean Water Act (CWA), enacted on October 18, 1972, brought forth many changes in management of the nation’s waterways. Primarily aimed at restoring the integrity of polluted waterways, one essential component of the CWA was implementing water quality monitoring programs in specific affected areas to guide decision-making and evaluate progress. In southern California’s coastal ocean waters, dozens of organizations have spent millions of dollars each year to take hundreds of thousands of water quality, toxicity, and biological indicator measurements. A mix of targeted monitoring around discharge sites, special studies, and collaborative regional monitoring to assess large-scale environmental changes has provided a strong foundation for environmental management specifically adapted to the region. At the same time, the region’s history and characteristics provide a unique opportunity to tell part of the CWA story. This document reflects on 40 years of change, while commemorating the dedication of many individuals and organizations to a fundamental change in ocean stewardship.
<b>Attachment Links:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Has the Clean Water Act Been Successful?: A 40-Year Retrospective Analysis of the Southern California Coastal Ocean</a> – presentation by Ken Schiff</li> <li>• <a href="#">SCCWRP Technical Report – Forty Years after the Clean Water Act: A Retrospective Look at the Southern California Coastal Ocean</a></li> </ul>
<b>Contact Persons:</b>	Ken Schiff   <a href="mailto:kens@sccwrp.org">kens@sccwrp.org</a> ; (714) 755-3202

<p><b>Notes:</b></p>	<p>The purpose of this presentation was to introduce the need to address historically collected data. One of the longest running records of monitoring in the U.S. has occurred along the Southern California coast. Historic data record the effect of various actions to alter POTW and other waste discharges as the result of protections in the Clean Water Act (CWA):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early point-source focus</li> <li>• Denitrification</li> <li>• Moving outfalls off-shore</li> <li>• Reductions in effluent pollutant concentrations</li> <li>• Clean Beaches Initiative grant funding</li> </ul> <p>Effluent reductions resulted in reduced fish tissue levels for many pollutants. CBI grant projects increased the number of beaches receiving A and B letter grades in Heal the Bay's Ocean Beach Report Card. The effect of the CWA on non-pipe pollution sources has been low (e.g., mercury in fish). The story is not always about chemicals (e.g., fin erosion in sanddabs) or water quality (e.g., kelp canopy area). And the CWA does not cover everything that affects ecosystems. Ancillary data can help to interpret what is occurring (e.g., flow and benthic macroinvertebrates), so linkages between data sets need to be explored and the Monitoring Council presents the opportunity to make this happen. Differences in methods can create apparent trends in the data that are not real (e.g., methods for determining kelp bed extent, from boats to planes to satellite images); so it is important for our data structures to record method information which CEDEN does. Constituents of emerging concern (CECs) are a huge new issue with many pollutants to analyze and track.</p> <p>The impact of nitrogen increases in ocean waters, including nutrients from POTWs and runoff from urban and agricultural source, appear to be dwarfed by nutrient inputs from deep ocean upwelling. But pollutants associated with harmful algal blooms, e.g., domoic acid, are increasing at river mouths and POTW outfalls. Are nutrient inputs from the land pre-seeding harmful algal blooms?</p> <p>This retrospective demonstrates the value of going back to locate and enter older data. Using student assistants can make the process quicker and less painful. But many sites do not have older data because either they were never collected or collected data were never entered.</p> <p>Should our web portals record economic activity and costs versus benefits (e.g., the avoided cost of illnesses avoided)?</p>
----------------------	--

<p><b>ITEM:</b></p>	<p><b>8</b></p>
<p><b>Title of Topic:</b></p>	<p><b>MEETING WRAP-UP</b></p>
<p><b>Purpose:</b></p>	<p>Plan agenda for March 7, 2013 Monitoring Council meeting in Sacramento. Potential items include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) 2012 Monitoring Council Annual Report to Agency Secretaries, including Workgroup reports</li> <li>2) Update on the USEPA Healthy Watersheds Initiative, California Project to assess watersheds throughout the state and identify healthy watersheds</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3) Update on potential state stewardship for California's portion of the National Hydrography Dataset and the National Wetlands Inventory (Jonathan Bishop and Dale Hoffman-Floerke)</li> <li>4) Possibility of holding an annual conference. A representative from the Maryland Monitoring Council should be invited to participate by phone (see <a href="#">May 2012 notes</a>, Item 2d)</li> <li>5) Water Board new effort to gather groundwater monitoring data in support of potential future programmatic actions (Eric Oppenheimer, John Borkovich)</li> <li>6) Potential endorsement by the Monitoring Council of a regional approach to monitoring, rather than end-of-pipe monitoring</li> <li>7) Department of Fish &amp; Game monitoring (Glenda Marsh, Adam Ballard, Robert Holmes, Josh Grover, Chad Dibble, Pete Ode)             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Coordination</li> <li>b) Financial support</li> <li>c) Flow</li> <li>d) Data Management – CEDEN for water quality data?</li> <li>e) Monitoring Council endorsement of collaboration?</li> </ol> </li> <li>8) Ocean Ecosystem Health             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Plans for Ocean Ecosystem Workgroup and new Ocean Health Portal</li> <li>b) Areas of Special Biological Significance (ASBS) monitoring (Ken Schiff)</li> <li>c) Marine Protected Area (MPA) Monitoring Enterprise (Liz Whiteman)</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	Develop agenda for the next Monitoring Council meeting
<b>Contact Person:</b>	Jon Marshack   <a href="mailto:jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov">jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov</a> , (916) 341-5514
<b>Decisions:</b>	Of the above topics, DFG (now Department of Fish and Wildlife or DFW) monitoring and Ocean Ecosystem Health issues are favored topics for the March meeting
<b>Action Items:</b>	<p>Add the following topics to the March meeting agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Wetlands Portal review and comment</li> <li>• Safe to Drink Portal mockup review and comment</li> <li>• Collaborative regional monitoring programs, continuation             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ San Joaquin Regional Monitoring Program (Parry Klassen, Rudy Schnagl)</li> <li>○ San Francisco Bay Stormwater Regional Monitoring Coalition (Armand Ruby)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>