

CALIFORNIA WATER QUALITY MONITORING COUNCIL

Monitoring Council Meeting Notes

Wednesday, August 28, 2013 – 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:

Sara Aminzadeh	Mike Connor	(Karen Larsen)	(Adam Walukiewicz)
Bruce Burton	Sarge Green	Armand Ruby	Stephen Weisberg
Beth Christman	Paul Helliker	(Dena Vallano)	

Others in attendance or (on the phone):

Sean Bothwell, California Coastkeeper Alliance
(Dori Bellan, State Water Resources Control Board)
(Carter Borden, University of Idaho)
Rich Breuer, State Water Resources Control Board, OIMA
(Jennifer Brown, City of Malibu)
(Val Connor, State and Federal Contractors Water Agency)
Kelsey Cowin, State and Federal Contractors Water Agency
Mark Emmerson, California Department of Public Health, Drinking Water Program
Terry Fleming, US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
Stephanie Fong, State and Federal Contractors Water Agency
(Vance Fong, US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9)
Joe Geever, Surfrider Foundation
Karen Gehrts, Department of Water Resources
(Peter Goodwin, Delta Stewardship Council)
(Tony Hale, San Francisco Estuary Institute)
(Sam Harader, Delta Stewardship Council)
Rainer Hoenicke, Delta Stewardship Council
(George Isaac, Delta Stewardship Council)
(Thomas Jabusch, San Francisco Estuary Institute)
Kris Jones, Department of Water Resources—Monitoring Council Coordinator
(Abdul Khan, Department of Water Resources)
Jon Marshack, State Water Resources Control Board—Monitoring Council Coordinator
(Kristy Morris, Council for Watershed Health)
(Anke Mueller-Solger, Delta Stewardship Council)
Amye Osti, 34 North
(David Osti, 34 North)
Tracy Skelton, Earth Law Center
(Alex Steele, Los Angeles County Sanitation District)

ITEM:	1
Title of Topic:	INTRODUCTIONS AND HOUSEKEEPING
Purpose:	1) Introductions (in the room and on the phone) a) Welcome Beth Christman, the new Monitoring Council Member representing Citizen Monitoring Groups b) Welcome Bruce Burton, the new Monitoring Council Member

	<p>representing the Department of Public Health</p> <p>c) Welcome Kris Jones, the new Monitoring Council Coordinator from the Natural Resources Agency</p> <p>2) Review draft notes from May 29, 2013 Monitoring Council meeting</p> <p>3) Review agenda for today's meeting</p>
Desired Outcome:	<p>a) Approve May 29, 2012 Monitoring Council meeting notes</p> <p>b) Preview what will be covered today and overall meeting expectations</p> <p>c) Adjust today's agenda, as needed</p>
Attachment Links:	Draft notes from May 29, 2013 Council meeting
Contact Person:	Jon Marshack jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov , (916) 341-5514
Notes:	Beth Christman was introduced as the new Monitoring Council representative for Citizen Monitoring Groups. Beth is the Director of Restoration Programs with the Truckee River Watershed Council. Bruce Burton was also introduced as the new Monitoring Council representative for the Department of Public Health. Paul is the Chief of the Northern California Drinking Water Field Operations Branch and Technical Operations Section. In addition, Kris Jones was introduced as the new Monitoring Council Coordinator for the Natural Resources Agency. Kris is a Senior Environmental Scientist (Specialist) with the Department of Water Resources.
Decisions:	Notes from the May 29, 2013 meeting of the Monitoring Council were approved without amendment.

ITEM:	2
Title of Topic:	ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES
Purpose:	<p>These are expected to be brief informational items that could be expanded into more detailed discussions for future meetings:</p> <p>a) MPA/ASBS monitoring coordination letter (Sara Aminzadeh)</p> <p>b) Ocean ecosystem health metrics (Jonathan Bishop, Steve Weisberg)</p> <p>c) Ocean Ecosystem Health Workgroup – Ocean Protection Council/Ocean Science Trust "Roadmap" Effort (Kris Jones)</p> <p>d) Safe to Drink Portal progress (Bruce Burton)</p> <p>e) Other announcements and updates related to the Monitoring Council's mission pursuant to Senate Bill 1070 (Kehoe, 2006)</p>
Desired Outcome:	Information, comments and questions
Background:	<p>a) MPA/ASBS Monitoring Coordination Letter—At the Monitoring Council's May 29, 2013 meeting, during the discussion of ASBS monitoring, Sara Aminzadeh was tasked with drafting a supportive letter from the Monitoring Council to the Ocean Protection Council regarding ASBS and MPA coordination, requesting that some of the funds for MPA monitoring be</p>

	<p>dedicated to integration between MPA and ASBS programs.</p> <p>b) <i>Ocean Ecosystem Health Metrics</i>—Also at the May 29 meeting, Jonathan Bishop and Steve Weisberg were tasked with initiating discussions on the development of ocean ecosystem health metrics. Steve Weisberg offered SCCWRP services for coordination. Paul Helliker offered to assist with respect to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Office of Spill Prevention and Response.</p> <p>c) <i>Ocean Ecosystem Health Workgroup and Portal Roadmap Effort</i>—In June and July, meetings were held with Natural Resources Agency staff to discuss leadership and support for an Ocean Ecosystem Health Workgroup and portal. The Ocean Protection Council and Ocean Science Trust are developing a plan to move forward.</p> <p>d) <i>Safe to Drink Portal Progress</i>—A mockup of the Safe to Drink Portal was to be presented to the Monitoring Council for approval at this meeting. A number of factors have conspired to postpone this until the Monitoring Council's December 12 meeting.</p>	
Attachment Links	<p>a & b) Draft notes from May 29, 2013 Council meeting (see item #5)</p> <p>d) Draft notes from May 29, 2013 Council meeting (see item #2f)</p>	
Contact Persons:	<p>Kris Jones</p> <p>Jon Marshack</p>	<p>kristopher.jones@water.ca.gov, (916) 376-9756</p> <p>jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov, (916) 341-5514</p>
Notes:	<p>a) <i>MPA/ASBS Monitoring Coordination Letter</i>—Sara Aminzadeh requested feedback from the Monitoring Council prior to drafting the letter regarding ASBS and MPA coordination and funding. She discussed that a request for funding for ASBS/MPA integration might be premature, and that it would be better received if it is made in the context of a more general letter suggesting ways to integrate State Water Board, Ocean Protection Council (OPC), and Ocean Science Trust (OST) work to sync up MPA and ASBS monitoring programs. Instead of submitting a letter requesting Monitoring Enterprise funds for ASBS monitoring integration, Sarah recommended that the letter highlight opportunities to break down the silos keeping these programs and data apart (including the need for funding to integrate MPA and ASBS).</p> <p>b) <i>Ocean Ecosystem Health Metrics</i>—Steve Weisberg and Jonathan Bishop will meet in two weeks to discuss this issue in the context of merging ASBS and MPA monitoring. Steve indicated that the Marine Protected Area Monitoring Enterprise and the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project (SCCWRP) are in the process of interviewing for a position for someone to work out of SCCWRP under Ken Schiff. The goal of this position is to examine whether the health of reefs is more affected by fishing pressure or water quality. Steve described that the person selected for the position will help develop an index for fishing pressure. In addition, they will use satellite imagery and POTW/stormwater plume tracking efforts of the Ocean Observing Systems to develop an index for wastewater and storm-induced plumes, which will be used to determine the effects on water quality. The Bight Regional Monitoring Program will also lend expertise. Mike Connor was invited to join the effort.</p> <p>c) <i>Ocean Ecosystem Health Workgroup and Portal Roadmap Effort</i>—Kris Jones and Jon Marshack recently met with Cat Kuhlman (the Natural Resources Agency) and Liz Whiteman (Ocean Science Trust, and Director of</p>	

	<p>the Marine Protected Area Monitoring Enterprise) to discuss their providing leadership support for the Ocean Ecosystem Health Workgroup and funding for portal development. Cat and Liz indicated that they recently received a grant from the Resource Legacy Fund Foundation to develop a long-term plan for the workgroup and portal and are in the process of outlining a phased approach for this plan (to be completed at the end of September 2013). In addition, Kris informed the Monitoring Council that Dr. John Hunt (UC Davis) has offered to lead the Ocean Ecosystem Health Workgroup, as long as funds are available to pay for 25% of his time.</p> <p>d) Safe to Drink Portal Progress—Bruce Burton indicated that after reviewing the mockup for the Safe to Drink portal, he and several other reviewers at the Department of Public Health (DPH) did not feel it was ready to be presented to the Monitoring Council. He informed the Monitoring Council that the workgroup is in the process of providing feedback and will make recommendations regarding how to move forward. The workgroup will then begin developing an updated mockup portal which is expected to be ready to present at the next Monitoring Council meeting. Bruce discussed that the updated portal will attempt to answer user’s questions by making use of existing datasets similar to the other My Water Quality portals. Bruce expressed concern over the level of effort that CDPH could feasibly support in both the short and longer term. Mike Connor had concerns regarding the level of effort involved in developing the portal, and made comment regarding the amount of data to be presented, particularly with respect to raw source water; he asked who the target audience would be for the portal and wanted to emphasize that the level of technical detail should be appropriate. Sarge Green followed up by suggesting that the workgroup should have an opportunity to develop an updated plan for the portal mockup, which could then be presented to the Monitoring Council for approval.</p> <p>e) Other Announcements and Updates— Karen Larsen mentioned that the State Water Resources Control Board’s data solicitation for the Clean Water Act 303(d)/305(b) Integrated Report will be released soon. New features will include continuous data solicitation, “readily available data” defined as data in CEDEN, and assessing only three Water Quality Control Regions in each cycle. Through efforts of SWAMP and the Monitoring Council, the new data solicitation will involve improved data availability, improved data comparability, and improved indices with which to interpret the data. Stephen Weisberg also discussed the need for stronger integration between CalEPA and Natural Resources Agency monitoring efforts relating to hypoxia and ocean acidification, and mentioned that an expert panel was recently developed to provide the Ocean Protection Council advice regarding these issues. The panel will serve California, Oregon, and Washington state. Steve suggested that the Monitoring Council have an agenda item at some point regarding these issues, as monitoring efforts relating to pH are currently weak. There may be a nexus between these issues and the development of ocean health indices.</p>
<p>Decisions:</p>	<p>d) Safe to Drink Portal Progress—The Monitoring Council agreed that a Safe to Drink workgroup should continue to develop the portal mockup and present their work at the next Monitoring Council meeting.</p>
<p>Action Items:</p>	<p>a) MPA/ASBS Monitoring Coordination Letter—Sarah Aminzadeh indicated that she would circulate a draft letter regarding MPA/ASBS monitoring</p>

	coordination and funding prior to the next Monitoring Council meeting.	
ITEM:	3	
Title of Topic:	CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN, SUSTAINABILITY INDICATORS FRAMEWORK	
Purpose:	On behalf of Fraser Shilling of UC Davis, Abdul Khan of the Department of Water Resources (DWR) will present the Sustainability Indicators Framework, which is part of the California Water Plan 2013 Update	
Desired Outcome:	Review and comment, specifically on how this effort would best be coordinated with related Monitoring Council and workgroup efforts. Fraser Shilling asks “that the Monitoring Council consider how to help develop a consistent water reporting system for California as a component of an overall annual and real-time sustainability reporting system for the state.”	
Background:	<p>The Framework is intended to support measurement of water sustainability in California, under the auspices of the inter-agency Water Plan. The Framework contains over 80 proposed indicators to measure sustainability, but local agencies could use a sub-set, or different indicators. The goal is a standard approach to developing, using, and reporting indicators of water sustainability to be used in Water Plan, Integrated Regional Water Management, water quality programs of the Water Boards and other agencies, and other forms of reporting on water sustainability.</p> <p>The 2009 Water Plan laid the ground-work for a set of indicators to measure sustainability. The DWR team was looking for an approach and came across DWR-sponsored indicator work that Dr. Fraser Shilling (UC Davis) had carried out in the Bay Area, Sacramento River Basin, and Southern California. They decided to pilot a similar approach at the state and regional scales. The Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority agreed to partner in this process as the regional scale entity. The USEPA became interested in the project because it aligned with their desire to develop comprehensive indicator systems for sustainability at the state scale. Dr. Shilling developed the system in collaboration with DWR and EPA partners, with input from the Water Plan Tribal Advisory Council and Public Advisory Council. The indicators will be reported in an online decision-support tool, which can be viewed now, but won't be complete until September, 2013.</p> <p>Fraser Shilling has also been involved with the Monitoring Council's Healthy Streams Partnership to guide the California Project of USEPA's Healthy Watersheds Initiative. That project is developing a multi-metric analysis to gauge health of California's watersheds, specifically to identify healthy watersheds and watersheds that are vulnerable to environmental and human-induced factors.</p>	
Attachment Links:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability Indicators and Web-based Reporting for the California Water Plan ... and Beyond – presentation by Fraser Shilling and Abdul Khan • Online decision-support tool 	
Contact Person:	Fraser Shilling Abdul Khan	fmshilling@ucdavis.edu ; (530) 752-7859 abdul.khan@water.ca.gov ; (916) 651-9660

<p>Notes:</p>	<p>Abdul Khan of the Department of Water Resources (DWR) presented the California Sustainability Indicators Framework, which is part of the California Water Plan 2013 Update. Their ongoing work, a joint effort DWR, UC Davis USEPA and the Pacific Institute, was developed to provide a multi-metric (economic, environmental, social) analysis to gauge the health of California watersheds; specifically, their analyses aimed to identify healthy watersheds and watersheds that are vulnerable to environmental and human induced factors.</p> <p>After presenting their work to the Monitoring Council, Paul Helliker pointed out that The California Water Plan is looking at many of the same questions as the Monitoring Council. Abdul mentioned that one of the benefits of reaching out to other agencies that are doing similar data collection and analyses is that such overlaps can be more readily identified. He emphasized that improved collaboration and coordination is essential for the development of a long term plan for sustainability in California.</p> <p>Stephen Weisberg asked who the audience was for this work, remarking that it was not clear in the presentation. Abdul responded by saying that the target audience for the California Water Plan included policy makers, resource managers, legislators, as well as the public. He mentioned that that was part of the reason for developing the resource tool, so that this information is accessible to multiple audiences. In terms of technical information, Stephen indicated that it was unclear how many of the parameters were selected or integrated, or how they related or connected to existing efforts at other agencies (e.g., SWAMP, CDFW etc.). With regard to data and analysis, Abdul mentioned that they want to make sure that the analyses are transparent. He mentioned the example of the water footprint for California, and that the user has the option to explore analyses at different levels, including getting into more specific details of the analyses (e.g., the data sources).</p> <p>Jon Marshack mentioned that there was a clear nexus with the USEPA Healthy Watersheds Initiative Project, which is developing a multi-metric analysis of the health of watersheds in California. He mentioned that Fraser Shilling is involved in the Monitoring Council's Healthy Streams Workgroup that is advising the effort, and indicated that they are currently examining many of the indicators discussed in Abdul's presentation; however, Jon acknowledged that the workgroup is not necessarily focusing on the sustainability of water supplies.</p> <p>Terry Fleming mentioned that both efforts need feedback loops and integration so they can improve over time. There may be a role in this for the Monitoring Council.</p>
<p>Decisions:</p>	<p>The Monitoring Council requested additional information regarding the nature of the report, including for whom it was intended, before making any recommendations.</p>
<p>Action Items:</p>	<p>Further discussion of this topic should be scheduled for a later Monitoring Council meeting.</p>

<p>ITEM:</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Title of Topic:</p>	<p>CALIFORNIA ESTUARIES PORTAL (BETA)</p>
<p>Purpose:</p>	<p>Stephanie Fong of the State and Federal Contractors Water Agency (SFCWA) will present the beta version of the California Estuaries Portal to be linked from</p>

	the My Water Quality website	
Desired Outcome:	Approval to publicly launch the portal	
Background:	<p>At the May 2013 Monitoring Council meeting, Stephanie Fong of SFCWA presented a mock-up of the California Estuaries Portal, that presented monitoring data and assessment information on the health of California's estuaries, with an initial focus on the San Francisco Bay-Delta Estuary. The Monitoring Council provided positive feedback on the efforts of the workgroup and the web-based tools they are using. However, there was concern that the portal may be too data centric, and that the plan for the portal was more complex than others. It was recommended that the workgroup begin building the portal; however, the Monitoring Council requested that workgroup return for additional critique at a later date.</p>	
Attachment Links:	Draft notes from May 29, 2013 Council meeting (see item #3)	
Contact Persons:	Stephanie Fong	SFong@sfcwa.org , (916) 400-4840
Notes:	<p>Stephanie Fong (SFCWA) and Amye Osti (34 North) presented a beta version of the California Estuaries Portal. During their presentation Stephanie discussed how in addition to the portal, there is a separate website called <i>California Estuary Workgroup Tools</i>, which was created to assist workgroup members develop stories for the portal by bringing together data, maps, technical documents, graphics and reports through a set of open-source visualization tools. In addition, she went over different aspects of the portal, and discussed that their initial focus was on the San Francisco Estuary. Specifically, the group initially focused on the living resources of the San Francisco Estuary and tasked specialists to develop certain sections of the portal for which they had expertise. Where possible, the portal presents visualizations of trends in key biological resources and allows users to drill down to more detailed questions and information. Information on water, habitat, ecological processes, and stewardship will be developed in greater detail in future portal iterations. The web-based Water Rights D-1641 Report, also developed by the workgroup, will also be incorporated into the portal at a later date. Armand Ruby suggested that "water" be expanded to "water quality and quantity."</p> <p>Mike Connor noted that there are currently no 'judgment calls' regarding the health of the Delta. Rich Breuer (State Water Resources Control Board) acknowledged that this is still a contentious issue, which is partly why this has not yet been incorporated. Stephanie Fong added that as the workgroup moves forward these performance measures will be incorporated.</p> <p>Mike Connor indicated that he felt that portal looks great, but mentioned that he would like to get Interagency Ecological Program (IEP) endorsement before moving forward. IEP members are involved in portal development and the draft portal is scheduled to be presented to IEP Coordinators on September 5. Terry Fleming responded by saying that if the purpose of this item was to evaluate whether the portal is in a good state to move forward and launch, he would support this. It was also suggested that additional links to existing technical reports be added to the portal.</p> <p>Sarah Aminzadeh also congratulated the workgroup for how appealing the portal looked, and added a suggestion that the workgroup consider modifying the name to incorporate the term 'bay' so that the portal will be more accessible (e.g.,</p>	

	<p>considering search engine optimization).</p> <p>Beth Christman asked about the next steps with regards to incorporating other California estuaries. Stephanie mentioned that the workgroup has already been in contact with researchers who study other estuaries in California; the workgroup hopes that once the portal is launched that there will be more interest in collaboration. She mentioned that other outreach efforts are planned, including presenting at the State of the Estuary Conference in October as well as press releases to highlight the launch of the portal. Karen Larsen mentioned that discussions regarding building collaborations are particularly important; however, she stressed that not all of the work is funded, and that it is important for the Monitoring Council to consider how the efforts of the workgroup can continue with limited funding. Terry Fleming suggested that the National Estuary Program may be a good source of future funding to extend to other estuaries.</p>
Decisions:	The Monitoring Council has approved the new California Estuaries Portal for public release, pending more detailed review.
Action Items:	Once the Estuaries Workgroup has finalized the initial portal, Jon Marshack will provide a link to the Monitoring Council Members so that they can review the portal prior to the October launch date.

ITEM:	5
Title of Topic:	ROCKY INTERTIDAL PORTAL (BETA)
Purpose:	Jon Marshack will present a beta version of the Rocky Intertidal Portal
Desired Outcome:	Approval to make the portal live for public viewing
Background:	<p>At the September 2009 Monitoring Council meeting, Mary Elaine Helix of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) presented information on the activities of Multi-Agency Rocky Intertidal Network (MARINe) to monitor California's rocky intertidal ecosystems. The Monitoring Council decided that MARINe's data was the most ready for future portal development of those organizations addressing aquatic ecosystem health. In August 2011, Jayson Smith of Cal State University, Fullerton (now of Cal Poly, Pomona) presented a mockup of a Rocky Intertidal (Tide Pool) Portal based on the work of MARINe. It was intended that the content of this portal be a component of a broader ocean ecosystem portal. But with the need to enter into a contract to migrate the content of the Rocky Intertidal Portal from Cal State Fullerton to a Water Board server and delays in establishing an ocean ecosystem workgroup and portal, it has become clear that release of this information should no longer be delayed. The proposed portal may be viewed using the link below.</p>
Attachment Links:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rocky Intertidal Portal (beta version) • Notes from August 24, 2011 Council meeting (see item #3)
Contact Persons:	Jon Marshack jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov , (916) 341-5514
Notes:	Jon Marshack presented a beta version of the Rocky Intertidal Portal, which is based on the work of the Multi-Agency Rocky Intertidal Network (MARINe) . Jon indicated that the content of this portal will eventually be a component of a

	<p>broader ocean ecosystem portal. However, he mentioned that it was important for the portal to go live (after being created nearly two years ago), as it might attract interest and attention to the work of the Monitoring Council and to the larger Ocean Ecosystem Health Workgroup.</p> <p>Jon went over the functionality of the portal, including the interactive map, which allows users to explore monitoring site specific survey data (e.g., long term trends monitoring and biodiversity data). However, he acknowledged that there is currently no score card assessment of tide pool health. Beth Christman asked whether the user can explore overall trends. Jon indicated that the portal only currently focuses on site specific trends.</p> <p>Stephen Weisberg indicated that he felt that the portal was ready for public launch. However, he discussed how little work has been performed on the effect of water quality on tide pool organisms, but suggested that the effect of water quality on tide pool organisms is relatively small (e.g., compared to physical effects such as storms or trampling). As such, he questioned whether it is appropriate to incorporate the Rocky Intertidal Portal in the My Water Quality website. He and Armand Ruby mentioned that data from the Mussel Watch Program, as well as data regarding the soft bottom ocean ecosystem indices are available, which are sensitive to water quality effects. These data should be incorporated in the Rocky Intertidal portal as a next step. Sarge mentioned that while the water quality effects might not be huge, he agreed that the overall benefit of launching this portal is that it might spur on more interest in the larger Ocean Ecosystem Health Workgroup. A number of Monitoring Council Members agreed that pH may be important to rocky intertidal health.</p> <p>Different members of the Monitoring Council suggested that the key words “tide pools”, be incorporated for search engine optimization.</p> <p>In addition, Karen Larsen commented that she felt that the term ‘rocky intertidal’ might not be as well understood as the term ‘tide pool’, and suggested that the term tide pool should be used consistently across the different portal pages. Jon Marshack and Steven Weisberg both indicated that rocky intertidal is more accurate, and recommended that this term should still be used; however, it was suggested that the distinction between these two terms should be made clearer in the text.</p>
<p>Decisions:</p>	<p>The Monitoring Council has approved the Rocky Intertidal Portal for public release; however, they recommend that the distinction between ‘tide pool’ and ‘rocky intertidal’ be made clear and that the map symbol be changed prior to launch.</p>

<p>ITEM:</p>	<p>6</p>
<p>Title of Topic:</p>	<p>DELTA SCIENCE PLAN</p>
<p>Purpose:</p>	<p>Rainer Hoenicke of the Delta Stewardship Council's Science Program will present information on the Delta Science Plan currently under development</p>
<p>Desired Outcome:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback on comments submitted by the Monitoring Council Coordinators and determine what additional comment should be made. • What is the appropriate role of the Monitoring Council, its workgroups and portals in the Delta Science Plan?

Background:	<p>In 2009, legislation was passed that established a new oversight and coordination entity in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. It also tasked this entity with developing a management plan and included certain requirements for that plan. Implementation of the Delta Reform Act and the Delta Stewardship Council's Delta Plan requires science support to achieve the legislation's coequal goals of water supply reliability and protecting, restoring and enhancing the Delta ecosystem. The Delta Stewardship Council, in its Delta Plan, recommends that a Delta Science Plan be developed to organize and integrate ongoing science and shared learning in the Delta. The Delta Plan further recommends that the Delta Science Plan address, among other items, effective governance for science in the Delta, strategies for addressing uncertainty and conflicting scientific information, the prioritization of research, near-term science needs and financial needs to support science.</p> <p>A first draft of the Delta Science Plan was released in June 2013 with a comment deadline of July 18. With insufficient time to bring this issue to the Monitoring Council before the comment deadline and understanding the substantial overlap between the goals of the Delta Science Plan and the Monitoring Council's Comprehensive Monitoring Program Strategy for California, the Monitoring Council Coordinators prepared and submitted comments to the Delta Stewardship Council calling for more integration between these two efforts.</p>	
Attachment Links:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on the Delta Science Plan – presentation by Rainer Hoenicke • Draft Delta Science Plan • Comment Letter from Monitoring Council Coordinators 	
Contact Person:	Rainer Hoenicke	rainer.hoenicke@deltacouncil.ca.gov ; (916) 445-4825
Notes:	<p>Rainer Hoenicke of the Delta Stewardship Council's Science Program presented information on the Delta Science Plan, which is currently under development. He was appreciative of the comments submitted by the Monitoring Council Coordinators on the first draft of the Plan. During the presentation, Rainer provided details regarding the background and goals of the Delta Science Plan. For example, they want to have a platform for the scientific community to speak with one voice regarding the relevant issues in the region. There should be a forum for bringing the key decision makers together to figure out a way to refine actions in a way to reduce uncertainties and learn from existing and ongoing research. They want to develop a means of documenting scientific disagreements and provide a framework for resolving these issues. Another objective of the Delta Science Plan is to play a key role in adaptive management. In addition, the Delta Science Plan wants to create key mechanisms for synthesis (e.g. how to make results and data accessible); Rainer highlighted the efforts of the Estuary Monitoring Workgroup and their portal. Rainer also acknowledged the clear nexus of the goals of the Delta Science Plan and the Monitoring Council, and hopes for ongoing discussions and coordination with the Monitoring Council regarding ways the two groups can pursue their mutual objectives.</p> <p>Armand Ruby said that the Science Plan's problem statement needed work. Rainer invited Armand to share his specific ideas.</p> <p>Terry Fleming mentioned that he was unclear regarding how agency leadership should get involved in the work of the Delta Science Plan (and the Monitoring Council). Rainer mentioned that there are examples of individuals, such as Paul</p>	

	<p>Helliker, who are involved in the Monitoring Council, but that are also involved as IEP stakeholders. Mike Connor made the suggestion that there should be more involvement by other stakeholders in IEP; he indicated that there is heavy involvement by water contractors, but that there has been a lack of involvement by the environmental and non-profit communities. Terry also suggested that there may be a tie to sustainability indicators of the Water Plan Update.</p> <p>Rainer went on to discuss that they are also hoping to incorporate outcome measures in their long term planning, so that researchers can assess the effects of management and restoration actions (e.g., does the system improve over time). Jon Marshack mentioned the existing work of the Monitoring Council (e.g., CEDEN, EcoAtlas), and stressed the need for long term financial support. Rainer mentioned that the group and the cooperation my allow funding opportunities to better be facilitated. He also stressed that details of coordination would be spelled out in the upcoming Science Action Agenda document, a three to five year implementation plan. Rainer stressed that he expects Monitoring Council to participate in development of that document. The Delta Science Plan is intended to be a living document, reviewed and improved over time.</p>
<p>Action Items:</p>	<p>Monitoring Council members were tasked to review the second draft of the Delta Science Plan and provide their comments to Jon Marshack and Kris Jones by September 4, 2013 so that those submitted comments can be assembled into a letter from the Monitoring Council to send to the Delta Stewardship Council by the September 16 comment deadline.</p>

<p>ITEM:</p>	<p>7</p>
<p>Title of Topic:</p>	<p>TRIENNIAL AUDIT OF THE MONITORING COUNCIL’S STRATEGY</p>
<p>Purpose:</p>	<p>Jon Marshack will present information on SB 1070’s requirement for a triennial audit of the effectiveness of implementing the Monitoring Council’s strategy</p>
<p>Desired Outcome:</p>	<p>Begin to plan how, when, and by whom this audit should occur</p>
<p>Background:</p>	<p>The Monitoring Council’s implementing legislation, SB 1070 (Kehoe, 2006), requires that the Monitoring Council’s efforts be periodically audited.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(h) (1) Commencing December 1, 2008, the Secretary of the California Environmental Protection Agency shall conduct a triennial audit of the effectiveness of the monitoring program strategy developed pursuant to subdivision (e). The audit shall include, but need not be limited to, an assessment of the following matters:</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">(A) The extent to which the strategy has been implemented.</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">(B) The effectiveness of the monitoring and assessment program and the monitoring council with regard to both of the following:</p> <p style="padding-left: 120px;">(i) Tracking improvements in water quality.</p> <p style="padding-left: 120px;">(ii) Evaluating the overall effectiveness of programs administered by the state board or a regional board and of state and federally funded water quality improvement projects.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(2) The Secretary of the California Environmental Protection Agency shall consult with the Secretary of the Resources Agency in preparing the audit, consistent with the memorandum of understanding entered into pursuant to subdivision (a).</p> <p>The Memorandum of Understanding, entered into by the Secretaries of Cal/EPA and the Natural Resources Agency, also addresses this audit.</p> <p>Under this MOU, the responsibilities of the Secretaries of Cal/EPA and Resources</p>

	<p>(collectively "the Secretaries") include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <p>4. The Secretary of Cal/EPA, commencing December 1, 2008, will conduct a triennial audit of the completeness and effectiveness of the comprehensive monitoring program strategy that has been recommended by the Monitoring Council. The Secretary of Cal/EPA will consult with the Secretary of the Resources Agency in conducting the audit.</p> <p>Considering that the Monitoring Council has received no formal endorsement (and no formal rejection) of the Comprehensive Monitoring Program Strategy from the agency secretaries, it is unclear how this audit should be initiated.</p> <p>SB 1070 and the MOU start the audit clock on December 1, 2008 the date of the Monitoring Council's initial recommendations to the agency secretaries. However, pursuant to the legislation, the Monitoring Council did not submit its recommended strategy to the agency secretaries until December 28, 2010.</p>
<p>Attachment Links:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CA Senate Bill 1070 (Kehoe, 2006) • Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) establishing the Monitoring Council
<p>Contact Person:</p>	<p>Jon Marshack jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov, (916) 341-5514</p>
<p>Notes:</p>	<p>Jon Marshack provided background on SB 1070's requirement for a triennial audit of the effectiveness of implementing the Monitoring Council's strategy. He indicated that the Monitoring Council's strategy was submitted three years ago and that it is now time to plan a Triennial Audit.</p> <p>He discussed how SB1070 and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) indicate that the Agency secretaries should conduct the audit; however, the Monitoring Council has not yet received a formal endorsement of the Comprehensive Monitoring Program Strategy from agency secretaries John Laird and Matthew Rodriquez, therefore, it is unclear how this audit should be initiated. Jon asked the members of the Monitoring Council whether we should move forward, considering we do not yet have the approval of the agency secretaries. Should we submit another letter for approval? Should we try and engage secretaries Laird and Rodriquez in a different way? Jon also mentioned that the Monitoring Council's strategy includes performance measures that should be used to conduct the audit. He also wonders whether the Triennial Audit should be contracted out to an independent review panel.</p> <p>Sarah Aminzadeh suggested that the coordinators (Jon Marshack and Kris Jones) might be best suited to conduct the audit, rather than an outside group. She added that we should initially conduct a condensed audit to elicit feedback. Mike Connor indicated that he did not feel that Jon and Kris would be able to give an adequate self-evaluation, particularly if the audit involved criticisms of their member agencies. Mike suggested that the Monitoring Council produce the annual report, which could then be evaluated by three outside independent reviewers (serving as the Triennial Audit). He stressed that the self-evaluation could be used as a marketing opportunity. Mike also suggested that Sara Aminzadeh be involved in producing the audit, since her organization (through Linda Sheehan) was instrumental in writing SB 1070 and that she can act as an advocate for what the Monitoring Council needs from the audit. A non-governmental entity could say things that agency representatives may be uncomfortable saying. Sarah Aminzadeh mentioned that the National Water Quality Monitoring Council and the upcoming conference might be well suited to evaluate the work of the Monitoring Council. Stephen Weisberg agreed, saying that this would not only serve to highlight the work of the Monitoring Council, but</p>

	<p>also allow us to compare the work of the Monitoring Council to that of other similar programs around the nation.</p> <p>Sarge Green reminded the group that the legislation explicitly mentions that the agency secretaries need to conduct the audit, and suggested that we need to get them involved. He added that he felt that we need to begin by drafting a letter to ask for their permission to conduct the audit. Jon Marshack expressed his concerns with drafting another letter, as previous letters to the agency secretaries have gone unanswered. Armand Ruby and Steve Weisberg suggested that the Monitoring Council move forward and conduct the Triennial Audit. Armand added that if the Monitoring Council submits the audit, that at least we will have done our due diligence (e.g., even though it's the Agency Secretaries responsibility). Steve stressed that the audit should be used to revisit where we are going, as a reevaluation of the strategy. The audit should point out the top five best coordination efforts, improvements to agency programs and processes, or other success stories; failures should also be discussed. Are users satisfied with access to data? Are we better able to answer questions? Have there been improvements in the quality of data, access to data, and use of data in management decisions? Other successes include synchronicity of available data, data integration, and communication. Recent changes in the Water Boards' 303(d)/305(b) process is one good example of how state government is acting better. Armand also favors the audit pointing out how the Monitoring Council's efforts have been extrapolated into improved processes and outcomes. Sarge also stressed that the audit should celebrate the efforts of the portal workgroups and those involved. Challenges also need to be stressed. Steve stated that the accomplishments were achieved on a shoestring budget. A sustainability analysis should also be included in the audit.</p> <p>The audience for the audit should not only be the agency secretaries, but also the legislature and the individuals who were responsible for the creation of the Monitoring Council (i.e., environmental interest NGOs and Linda Sheehan). It was suggested that a legislative hearing could be held as part of the process.</p> <p>Paul Helliker pointed out that the current annual report has already been submitted. Karen Larsen suggested that the Monitoring Council should use the next annual review as a Triennial Audit. She will consult with John Bishop regarding how to move forward. Stephen Weisberg emphasized that the audit should critically evaluate whether the Monitoring Council and its workgroups have met their goals, and if not, make recommendations for how they can improve.</p>
<p>Decisions:</p>	<p>The Monitoring Council agreed that Jon Marshack and Kris Jones will develop the Triennial Audit in place of the next annual report.</p>
<p>Action Items:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karen Larsen and Jonathan Bishop will consult with Cal/EPA Secretary Rodriquez regarding process for the audit. • Jon Marshack will resend his May 2013 annual progress notes to Monitoring Council Members. • Jon Marshack and Kris Jones will ask individual workgroups to provide their own self-evaluation by the first of December, which they will combine in one document for review by the Monitoring Council.
<p>ITEM:</p>	<p>8</p>

Title of Topic:	MEETING WRAP-UP	
Purpose:	<p>Plan agenda for December 12, 2013 Monitoring Council meeting in Sacramento. Potential items include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Confirm Monitoring Council meeting dates for 2014 – currently the 4th Wednesday of every 3rd month – Feb 26, May 28, Aug 27, Nov 26 2) Update on the USEPA Healthy Watersheds Initiative, California Project to assess watersheds throughout the state and identify healthy watersheds 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) 4) Safe to Drink Portal mockup review and request to build the site 5) Development of Monitoring Council recommendations to improve grant project monitoring, data management, assessment, and reporting 6) Water Board new effort to gather groundwater monitoring data in support of a future groundwater strategic workplan (Eric Oppenheimer, John Borkovich) 7) Delta Science Plan – comments on future drafts 8) Ocean Ecosystem Health (Liz Whiteman) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Plans for Ocean Ecosystem Workgroup and new Ocean Health Portal b) Marine Protected Area (MPA) Monitoring Enterprise 9) Triennial audit of the Monitoring Council’s strategy 10) Department of Fish & Game monitoring (Glenda Marsh, Adam Ballard, Robert Holmes, Josh Grover, Chad Dibble, Pete Ode, Tom Lupo) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Coordination b) Financial support c) Flow d) Data Management – CEDEN for water quality data? e) Monitoring Council endorsement of collaboration? 11) Possibility of holding an annual conference. A representative from the Maryland Monitoring Council should be invited to participate by phone (see May 2012 notes, Item 2d) 	
Desired Outcome:	Develop agenda for the next meeting	
Contact Persons:	Kris Jones Jon Marshack	kristopher.jones@water.ca.gov , (916) 376-9756 jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov , (916) 341-5514
Notes:	<p>The Monitoring Council agreed that further information is needed regarding the California Water Plan, Sustainability Indicators Framework (Item 3), and that this work should be discussed at a later meeting (date to be decided). Specifically, how the Monitoring Council can feed into it. Is there a true nexus with the Healthy Watersheds Initiative project?</p> <p>Abstracts for the National Monitoring Conference in April/May 2014 in Cincinnati, OH are due September 20. Potential topics for California to present include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring Council’s Triennial Audit (Jon Marshack) • New Wetlands Portal 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pesticide modeling effort with EPA (Rich Breuer)• Changes in California's Integrated Assessment Process (Karen Larsen)
Decisions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Item (1) – The Monitoring Council agreed to change the November 26, 2014 Monitoring Council meeting to December 10, 2014. All other dates were approved for meetings in 2014.• The Monitoring Council expressed interest in hearing Items (3 – reassign to Karen Larsen and Stephani Spaar), (4), (6), (7), and (9) above in December.• Items (2) and (8) were also of interest, but may not be ready to discuss in December. Ocean acidification should be added to Item (8) and Cat Kuhlman should be invited to attend.
Action Items:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Jon Marshack and Kris Jones will confirm 2014 meeting dates with Monitoring Council Members via email.• Karen Larsen and Stephani Spaar will discuss Item (3), above.

September 13, 2013
Approved December 12, 2013