Monitoring Council Annual Progress Report: Draft Outline

Executive Summary

Foreword

- Background
- Summary of problem
- Council’s efforts a response to the requirements of SB 1070
- Function of this progress report, which was called for in the Council’s December 2008 report
  - On an annual basis, beginning in December 2009, the Monitoring Council will report back to the agency secretaries on progress made in implementing the Council’s vision, and in a manner that supports Cal/EPA’s conduct of a triennial audit of the effectiveness of the comprehensive monitoring program strategy, as called for in the legislation. The first of these annual reports will contain the Monitoring Council’s recommendations for the development of the comprehensive monitoring program strategy.

Chapter 1: Review of 2008 Recommendations

- Fundamental vision of broader data access through theme-based web portals.
- Five-part solution:
  - An organizational structure built on decentralized, issue-specific workgroups that operate within common policies and guidelines defined by the Monitoring Council
  - A set of performance measures which each theme-based workgroup will use to evaluate, coordinate and enhance monitoring, assessment, and reporting efforts
  - A single, global point of entry to water quality data, and a design template for the complete set of theme-based web portals
  - Standardization of monitoring and assessment methods that achieves an appropriate balance between statewide consistency and regional flexibility
  - Database and data management standards necessary for more efficient data access and integration

Chapter 3: Progress to Date

Review progress for each of the five parts of the recommended solution. Provides the basis for an assessment of whether the five-part solution is going to be an effective way of moving forward.

- Organizational structure:
  - Council governance
    - Established procedure for empanelling new Council members as needed
    - Broadened Council’s working relationships with other state agencies
    - Defined scope of Council’s responsibility
    - Began establishing standards and procedures for developing portals
  - Have set up four workgroups operating under overall guidance of the Monitoring Council
    - Summarize progress of each workgroup (may use table format instead of text)
      - Safe to Swim portal up and running; collaborative relationship among State Water Board, U.S. EPA, monitoring agencies working smoothly; Beach Water Quality Workgroup has formally agreed to manage development, in conjunction with State Board and SCCWRP,
through a technical subcommittee; additional data sources (e.g., stormwater and watershed programs) identified and contacted; decision about delegating portal operation and maintenance to SCCWRP

- Safe to Eat portal up and running; collaborative relationship among State Water Board / SWAMP, OEHHA, SFEI working smoothly; BOG workgroup has formally agreed to manage development; additional data sources (e.g., stormwater and watershed programs) identified and contacted

- Safe to Drink portal up and running; collaborative relationship between Office of Information Management and Analysis and GAMA / GeoTracker groups within State Water Board and with DPH working smoothly; workgroup established (?) to enable user participation in portal development

- Wetlands portal (under heading of aquatic resources) up and running; collaborative relationship among State Water Board / SWAMP, California Wetlands Monitoring Workgroup, SFEI, and SCCWRP working smoothly; additional federal, state, municipal, and local programs involved; portal development and near-term maintenance led by SFEI

- Provide links to portals
- Council has begun outreach to other potential partners
  - Letter and follow-up contacts to broad range of managers in stage agencies listed in Act
    - List of contacts
    - Summarize responses
    - Summarize any agreements arising from outreach process
    - Map contacts onto list of portal priorities, revised from December 2008 report
  - Summarize unsolicited contacts to Council from other potential portal sponsors
  - Have identified candidates for next set of portals
- Council has developed draft policies and guidelines for establishing and managing workgroups
  - Workgroups must include technical experts as well as users
  - Workgroups must have ability to make or influence decisions about design and implementation of monitoring, assessment, data management and access
  - Workgroups must agree to Council’s basic portal design principles and goals for standardization, integration, access
  - Council will be flexible, within these constraints, in terms of the sorts of entities it works with (e.g., agencies, nonprofits, volunteer organizations, academics)
  - Illustrate with examples from each workgroup
- Identify needed additions for future

- Performance measures:
  - Describe how the set of six performance measures correspond to the ten monitoring program design elements used by U.S. EPA and SWAMP. The ten elements provide the focus for monitoring efforts designed and implemented by the State and Regional Water Boards, while the Council’s performance measures will guide a broader set of efforts within CalEPA, Resources, DPH, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Council performance measures</th>
<th>U.S. EPA / SWAMP design element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program strategy, objectives, design</td>
<td>Monitoring strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators and methods</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of assessment endpoints</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>QA/QC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Council has developed draft policies and guidelines for establishing and managing workgroups
  - Workgroups must include technical experts as well as users
  - Workgroups must have ability to make or influence decisions about design and implementation of monitoring, assessment, data management and access
  - Workgroups must agree to Council’s basic portal design principles and goals for standardization, integration, access
  - Council will be flexible, within these constraints, in terms of the sorts of entities it works with (e.g., agencies, nonprofits, volunteer organizations, academics)
  - Illustrate with examples from each workgroup
- Identify needed additions for future

- Performance measures:
  - Describe how the set of six performance measures correspond to the ten monitoring program design elements used by U.S. EPA and SWAMP. The ten elements provide the focus for monitoring efforts designed and implemented by the State and Regional Water Boards, while the Council’s performance measures will guide a broader set of efforts within CalEPA, Resources, DPH, etc.
• Program sustainability
  • Program evaluation
  • Program support

  o Describe progress in developing systematic approach(es) to dealing with the six categories of performance measures (condensed from the 10 USEPA elements of monitoring program design)
  o Describe how performance measures will be addressed by each workgroup and the overall strategy for ensuring coordination across themes
  o Specifically address Act’s requirements re indicators, QA/QC, analysis and integration, data management, and reporting

• Single point of entry:
  o Council has established its website as the central access point to a set of portals focused on specific themes
  o Council has developed design criteria for its website and for main portal pages
    ▪ Striving for consistent look and feel
    ▪ Must be question driven, following general structure of questions defined for first four portals
    ▪ Must include map-based query interfaces and data presentations
    ▪ Must follow basic structure of presenting higher-level assessment results first, with more detailed background information on lower levels
    ▪ Display multiple assessment thresholds if appropriate
    ▪ Portals can go “live” before all data gaps, inconsistencies, and other shortcomings are resolved
    ▪ In general, must follow other criteria used to evaluate portals in the December 2008 report
  o Describe degree of success at implementing consistent format guidelines, with a focus on more consistency at higher-level pages, and more flexibility at lower-level pages, which may link directly to other state, federal, etc. websites
  o Describe how organizing diverse information resources into one website is helping identify opportunities for improved standardization, coordination, integration, streamlining, filling data gaps
  o Describe how Council website promotes and depends on progress in database and data management (see below)

• Standardization:
  o Describe progress at standardization within each of the issue area workgroups
    ▪ Adherence to existing standards or guidance
    ▪ Development of new standards
    ▪ Needed balance between statewide standards and local/regional flexibility
    ▪ Additional level of standardization needed for cross-cutting issues and uses of data

• Database and data management:
  o Statewide infrastructure
    ▪ CEDEN mission, progress, and capabilities
    ▪ Data centers
    ▪ SWAMP role and progress
    ▪ Broad data format and QA/QC standards
    ▪ Links to other state systems
    ▪ Development of common tools applicable to multiple portals
    ▪ Relationships with other efforts, e.g., UC Berkeley
  o Portals
    ▪ Describe progress in establishing data management standards for each issue area
    ▪ Describe how recommended hierarchy of standards (e.g., international, federal, state, issue area) has been applied
    ▪ Degree of integration into Council’s website
  o Establishment of data management workgroup
• Longer-term direction
  o Broad funding requirements described in Comprehensive Strategy
  o Relationship to SWAMP

**Appendix 1: SB 1070 requirements**

Map specific requirements in the legislation onto the Council’s 5-part strategy, in order to support triennial review effort