

# **EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN SURFACE WATER MONITORING FRAMEWORK EXPERT REVIEW PANEL**



**Facilitator: Stephen B. Weisberg**

**Southern California Coastal Water Research Project Authority**

**January 7, 2020**

# BACKGROUND

- **The Eastern San Joaquin River (ESJ) watershed growers were issued a waste discharge permit by the Regional Board in 2012**
  - The permit included a surface water monitoring program
- **Adequacy of the monitoring program was challenged by several groups**
  - The State Water Board recognized some merits in the petition
  - They ordered the Regional Board to convene a panel of experts to review adequacy of the monitoring program
- **SCCWRP was asked to facilitate the Review Panel**

# WHAT IS SCCWRP?

- **Water quality research institute located in southern California**
  - A joint powers agency founded in 1969
  - Formed by 14 water quality management agencies
  - Our mission: Provide an unbiased scientific foundation for ambient water quality management in California
- **SCCWRP has a long history with developing and implementing monitoring programs**
  - We are here as facilitators, not expert participants, in this case
- **Most of our work is conducted outside of Regional Board 5**
  - Provides a level of independence in implementing the Expert Panel

# STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY GROUP

- **Created a stakeholder advisory group to advise me**
  - Nine locals who have intimate familiarity with the issues
  - Ensure Panel members have all the information and perspectives necessary to understand the issues on which they will base their recommendations
- **I asked for their help with three activities**
  - Refining the Panel charge questions
  - Selecting Panel members
  - Setting the agenda and selecting speakers for today's meeting
- **They are advisory only**
  - They have been wonderful to work with

# STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY GROUP

- **Three from agricultural groups most affected by the outcome**
  - Parry Klassen
  - Michael Wackman
  - Sarah Rutherford
- **Three from NGO's that initiated the petition**
  - Sean Bothwell
  - Lisa Hunt
  - Richard McHenry
- **Three from the regulatory community that would be part of implementing the Panel's recommendations**
  - Patrick Pulupa
  - Adam Laputz
  - Brianna St. Pierre

# STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY GROUP

- **Created a stakeholder advisory group to advise me**
  - Nine locals who have intimate familiarity with the issues
  - Ensure Panel members have all the information and perspectives necessary to understand the issues on which they will base their recommendations
- **I asked for their help with three activities**
  - Refining the Panel charge questions
  - Selecting Panel members
  - Setting the agenda and selecting speakers for today's meeting
- **They are advisory only**
  - They have been wonderful to work with

# PANEL MEMBER SELECTION PROCESS

- **Identify the desired expertise of Panel members**
  - Monitoring program design and implementation
  - Regulatory program implementation
  - Agronomy and agricultural practices
  - Aquatic ecotoxicology
  - Environmental chemistry
- **I developed a list of candidates for each expertise slot**
- **Advisory group was asked for two levels of feedback**
  - Are there candidate they want to disqualify as biased or unqualified?
  - Provide rank order preference among candidates in each expertise slot
- **I then selected the Panel Members informed by their input**

# PANEL MEMBERS

- **Kevin Armbrust - Environmental chemistry**
- **John Hunt - Monitoring program design and implementation**
- **Jon Constantino - Regulatory program implementation**
- **Doug Parker - Agronomy and agricultural practices**
- **Charles Menzie - Aquatic ecotoxicology**



# PANEL AGENDA

- **This morning: Background and factual presentations**
- **This afternoon: Perspective presentations**
- **Tomorrow: Panel will go on a field trip to see the monitoring sites**
  - There is guide to the trip if you would like to meet us at any of the stops
- **Thursday: Panel deliberations followed by an afternoon report out**
  - The report out will provide you with the Panel's initial reactions
  - Will also describe their schedule for completing the review

# QUESTIONS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

- **Presenters have been asked to limit their talk to half the time allotted**
  - We want time for questions and comments
- **Panel will have opportunity for questions first**
  - Advisory Group will next be given opportunity for any corrections to the information presented
  - We will then take public comments
- **We have allocated time for public input at the end of the day If there is insufficient time associated with a particular presentation**
  - You also have the opportunity to provide written input
  - All written input will be placed on the Panel web site

# CHARGE QUESTIONS

- **Charge Question 1: Is there a clear linkage between the six surface water monitoring program questions and the decisions that will be made by the Central Valley Water Board, the ESJWQC, and the ESJWQC's members?**
  - Are receiving waters to which irrigated lands discharge meeting applicable water quality objectives and Basin Plan provisions?
  - Are irrigated agricultural operations causing or contributing to identified water quality problems? If so, what are the specific factors or practices causing or contributing to the identified problems?
  - Are water quality conditions changing over time (e.g., degrading or improving as new management practices are implemented)?
  - Are irrigated agricultural operations of Members in compliance with the provisions of the Order?
  - Are implemented management practices effective in meeting applicable receiving water limitations?
  - Are the applicable surface water quality management plans effective in addressing identified water quality problems?

# CHARGE QUESTIONS

- **Charge Question 2: Is the ESJ monitoring framework appropriate to answer the ILRP's questions?**
  - Subquestion 2a: Is the monitoring program design, including the reliance on use of representative and represented sites, a technically sound approach?
  - Subquestion 2b: Are the criteria presently being used to select representative sites appropriate?
  - Subquestion 2c: Are the monitoring sites of sufficient spatial density to identify general locations of potential pollution resulting from irrigated agricultural waste discharges?
  - Subquestion 2d: Are the monitoring sites of sufficient temporal intensity to identify potential trends in pollution resulting from irrigated agricultural waste discharges?
  - Subquestion 2e: Are the monitoring parameters and measurement methods suitable to address the six ILRP monitoring questions?

# CHARGE QUESTIONS

- **Charge Question 3: Is there a mutual understanding of how the monitoring data are going to be used by the Central Valley Water Board and the ESJWQC, individually and collectively?**
  - Subquestion 3a: Are the data submission requirements appropriate?
  - Subquestion 3b: Are the data integration approaches, and thresholds for assessment, appropriate?
  - Subquestion 3c: Is the translation process from data into potential actions clear, including the possible triggering of enhanced monitoring for source attribution or enhanced spatial/temporal pattern description?
  - Subquestion 3d: What iterative processes for evaluating monitoring program effectiveness could be implemented for continuous improvement?
- **Charge Question 4: If revisions to the program are recommended, are there steps that should be taken to incorporate compatibility with historic information?**