

SRWP Watershed Monitoring Committee Meeting Summary

Monday May 7, 2007
SRWP Woodland Office

Meeting Attendees:

Kathy Russick, SRWP

Stephen Clark, Pacific EcoRisk

Chris White, Balance Hydrologics

Lynda Smithy, Metropolitan Water District

Karen Larsen, Central Valley Regional Board

Jerry Troyan, Sac. Regional County San. District

Steve Nebozuk, Sac. Regional County San. District

Fraser Sime, CA Dept. of Water Resources

Claus Suverkropp, Larry Walker Associates

Janet Parris, Sacramento County

Elaine Archibald, California Urban Water Agencies

Sam Harader, CALFED

G. Fred Lee, G. Fred Lee & Associates

Bill Chase, MGK Consulting

Sheryl Gill, Cal Dept. of Pesticide Regulation

I. SRWP Year 8 Monitoring—*Claus Suverkropp, Larry Walker Associates (see handouts 1 & 2 following this meeting summary)*

- SRWP has completed the first four events under Year 8 (Jan. 2007 – Aug. 2007). The SRWP has five more events to complete through Aug. 2007.
- Basically the same water quality monitoring parameters as Year 7. Note: analysis of pyrethroids in water was discontinued.
- SRWP is still wrapping up on fish tissue analyses from Year 7. This is being done in coordination with the CALFED-funded Delta Mercury Fish Project. The SRWP conducted analyses of legacy organochlorines (e.g., PCBs, DDT, dieldrin) and PBDEs for archived fish tissue samples collected in 2005.
- In Year 8, the SRWP is looking at possibly doing similar fish tissue analyses for samples collected and archived in 2006 by the CALFED FMP.
- SRWP is also investigating supplemental bioassessment monitoring work that SRWP could fund. Previously funded work has been focused on establishing bioassessment reference sites in the Sierra foothills and comparing methods for low-gradient streams.

II. Status Report on New Funding Approach—*Kathy Russick, SRWP*

- Kathy updated the committee on the progress the SRWP has made since the last committee meeting on pursuing a Sa Francisco Bay Area Regional Monitoring Program (RMP) model for funding a monitoring program in the Sacramento River Watershed.
- There are two fronts that the SRWP is pursuing in its effort—1. communicating with other interested organizations; 2. evaluating the current state of monitoring in the watershed. Kathy outlined what the SRWP is doing on these two fronts.

Communicating with Interested Organizations:

1. Regional Board

- Karen Larsen is acting as a liaison between the SRWP and the Central Valley Regional Board, helping arrange meetings and other communications.
- The SRWP has already presented the concept to Pamela Creedon, the Executive Officer, and the Regional Board itself. Thus far there is pretty unanimous support for such a regional monitoring program.
- However, the SRWP still needs to communicate directly with Regional Board permitting staff. That will be a next step in working with the Regional Board.

2. Surface Water Dischargers

- The Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District has offered support to the SRWP in its investigative efforts and continued monitoring support in the Sacramento metropolitan area through the Coordinated Monitoring Program.

- SRWP has contacted the Central Valley Clean Water Association (CVCWA) and received a positive response and an invitation to present a concept proposal for the SRWP's RMP investigation work plan at CVCWA's meeting in mid-May.
- SRWP has invited the Sacramento Valley Water Quality Coalition (SVWQC) to Monitoring Committee meetings but nobody from SVWQC has attended this calendar year. SRWP currently collects monitoring data for SVWQC at two sites.
- SRWP needs to also reach out to rice growers to check their interest.
- G. Fred Lee pointed out that ag waiver monitoring like that being done by the SVWQC could change significantly in 2008. Kathy agreed that tracking and trying to coordinate with any monitoring efforts is like trying to shoot a moving target.
- Fraser Sime suggested that the SRWP should be talking to Regional Board timber harvest folks who are currently looking into timber harvest plan monitoring requirements. Through monitoring requirements that are laid out as part of their timber harvesting plans, forestry operations monitor both on-site and off-site tributaries running from their operations.

3. San Joaquin Monitoring Team

- There is a team of EPA Region 9, Regional Board, and San Francisco Estuary Institute staff doing a similar effort in the San Joaquin River watershed. Kathy has talked to Carolyn Yale from that team about the need to cooperate and share resources between the two efforts.
- Kathy is hoping to meet with the team in May or June.

Evaluating Current State of Monitoring

Step 1. Compile and summarize existing on-going monitoring efforts that are occurring in the Sacramento River Watershed

- Larry Walker Associates conducted two similar exercises in 2004 for the SRWP and for the Central Valley Drinking Water Quality Policy Committee. That is a big chunk of this work but would need to be updated through the present.
- Regional Board is planning on hiring a post-graduate student to gather monitoring information for the 305(d) report and 303(b) list update and review process. This person could be used to do much of the work needed in this step.

Step 2. Evaluate existing monitoring activities and NPDES monitoring requirements in the Sacramento River Watershed to identify overlap, gaps, and inefficiencies in ambient receiving water monitoring.

- The SRWP needs to update the 1998 Pilot Study conducted by Larry Walker Associates which evaluated the feasibility of implementing a discharger-funded regional monitoring program in the Sacramento River Watershed.

Schedule—Steps 1 and 2 above would occur between July 1, 2007 and June 2008.

Step 3. Based upon the information gathered in Steps 1 and 2, the SRWP would work with the potential monitoring program contributors and other stakeholders (e.g., state agencies) to develop an RMP model for monitoring in the Sacramento River Watershed that:

- Is a much more cost-effective and efficient way of monitoring water quality in the watershed,
- Could be supported by dischargers and possibly other entities who have a major interest in water quality in the watershed.

Schedule—The group agreed that Step 3 could take anywhere between 1 to 3 years.

III. Regional Board Monitoring Assessment—Karen Larsen, Central Valley Regional Board

- The Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) within the Central Valley Regional Board is trying to improve their coordination with other monitoring efforts within the region.
- Regional Board must come up with a plan to coordinate all ambient receiving water type monitoring within the Central Valley Regional Board by February 2008. Regional Board is working to hire two additional staff to support this work.

- Region-wide water quality monitoring data assessment in 2007-08. This work is part of the effort to conduct their require 305(b) report and 303(d) list assessment. This assessment is due end of June 2008. Robert Holmes is the contact for this monitoring assessment effort.
- The SRWP will try to coordinate its monitoring assessment effort with that of the Regional Board to leverage resources as much as possible.
- As it turns out, DWR is funding a similar activity so Fraser Sime asked if the Regional Board will keep DWR apprised of their efforts. Some level of coordination between the two agencies is desirable.

IV. CALFED Water Quality Performance Measures—*Karen Larsen*

- The CALFED programs, including the Water Quality Program, have been directed to develop performance measures in order to measure improvement in conditions within the CALFED solution area. Each program will be proposing their performance measures to the Bay Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC) in June 2007.

<u>Drinking Water</u>	Water quality at Delta intakes Drinking water quality at the tap
<u>Toxicity</u>	Toxicity to aquatic test organisms (water or sediment) Causes and sources of toxicity identified Significance of contaminants in POD
<u>Mercury</u>	Mercury in fish consumed by humans Mercury in biosentinel species Mercury in water and sediment

- The SRWP needs to keep these water quality performance measures in mind when thinking about a future water quality monitoring program.

V. California Department of Water Resources (DWR) Water Quality Monitoring—*Fraser Sime, DWR—2 handouts*

- DWR Northern District encompasses the thirteen northern counties that DWR covers.
- The two major monitoring efforts in the Northern District—
 1. Lake Oroville FERC Relicensing which includes monitoring throughout the Feather River Watershed.
 2. DWR's Off-Stream Storage Investigation which, in recent years, has honed in on Sites Reservoir and surrounds, located west of Maxwell.
- DWR's Northern District typically looks more broadly at environmental monitoring rather than just a drinking water quality focus.
- The Northern District monitors well over 100 sites in their district at a frequency anywhere from quarterly to monthly, depending upon the site. They monitor for metals, trace elements, inorganic ions, nutrients, and conventional physical constituents; again this varies by site.
- Most of the last 10 years of water quality monitoring that has been conducted by DWR's Northern District is available on-line through DWR's Water Data Library at <http://wdl.water.ca.gov/> The Northern district has been collecting water quality data [FRS] for some 25+ years prior to the last 10 years but that data is in microfiche and paper form and DWR is currently not able to devote the time and resources to upload that data into their on-line data base.
- Only some of the water quality parameters collected by the Northern District tends match with those of interest to the SRWP.
- DWR still does some level of bioassessment work but sends their samples to DFG to analyze.

- Fraser is interested in coordinating with SRWP wherever possible on monitoring. At least 6 sites on Fraser's Northern District map match up with current SRWP monitoring sites. These are sites that they are currently monitoring 12 times per year. However, they do not currently analyze all of the same parameters as the SRWP.
- There is an opportunity to coordinate monitoring between SRWP and DWR. Possibly DWR could collect samples for SRWP at the common sites.