

**San Joaquin River Basin Monitoring Partnership Project - Workshop 1 – 11/15/07
Great Valley Center, Modesto, CA**

Workshop Feedback Summary

***Workshop Goal:** Foster discussions to help identify mechanisms to improve water quality monitoring in the San Joaquin River region through coordination and collaboration.*

***Outcomes:** Specific suggestions and options to guide development of mechanisms and tools for improving coordination of existing monitoring in the San Joaquin region*

Fifty three people participated in the workshop. Twenty participants returned completed feedback forms. The following are all the comments received from the returned feedback forms.

1. Do you have any additional suggestions or further comments regarding water quality monitoring in the San Joaquin River region?

- I greatly appreciate the efforts of those who are diligently working to improve the quality and coverage of data generated out of the various monitoring programs. It is very important that we are able to improve greatly standardization, collaboration, cooperation and accessibility of data. Given that great efforts are underway, funding is a key that must be addressed.
- I only hope that the formation of a data center, where wq monitoring could be coordinated and facilitated does happen. My experience has been that collaboration in data collection and data summarizing goes a long way to create mutual trust and consensus on problem prioritization.
- SJR region encompasses a large area and many different interests. May be valuable to divide the Region (i.e. Upper, middle, lower) in order to allow specific topic discussion to be targeted to each geography.
- Need more local people involved in the process, too dominated by state and Fed partners.
- Emphasize how to fund in any write-up – as this issue is critical to moving forward.
- You heard it all, except funding current efforts for longer periods.
- Monitoring directory is a great idea – keep us updated!
- Suggest you get input from DPR & other agencies that have overlapping water quality needs for various resources (make sure all BUs are covered).
- More public/private partnerships for monitoring surface water quality. Irrigation districts funding monitoring & have RB5 conduct sampling. Drawback would be staffing by RB5.
- Producing a management agency agreement between USEPA & SWRCB to strategically place funding as a top priority.
- The idea of a “living” directory with some means to update every 6 months or so is very good.
- Some requirements of flow and basin boundaries should be imposed where possible (e.g., with irrigated lands program).
- Provided to Brock over the phone.
- See water plan regional reports as this effort should be incorporated into this plan >>> I could reach legislative funding efforts.
- Establish a clear link between public funding used for WQ sampling and monitoring. Involving the regional framework and stakeholders for regional bodies, then the development of action plans will have more emphasis on analysis and interpretations. The public was not involved in this workshop and this is typical of the technical WQ aspect of public water system.
- USBR has much wq data, however, not web-savvy to publish it on line or in a useable format (i.e. PDF). We would contribute data in specific layout or format. Annual budgets cause arbitrary and unforeseen changes to wq programs. Reimbursable expenses are under greater scrutiny from water users.

- South Delta salinity – Old River and Vernalis. Is there any BMP put in place to manage the salinity issue?
- The cost of monitoring is already being borne by municipal agencies. They should not bear the cost of funding the data partnership.
- Involve monitored/regulated community more – greater access to monitoring data – regular updates.
- The expertise & enthusiasm collected here today has been breathtaking. Let's make sure the momentum doesn't fade. It needn't be expensive, but keeping the drum-beat in everyone's head as they go back to their routines is critical.
- Need to integrate this surface water-centric effort with ground water monitoring efforts. We know that GW-SW interaction occurs, and that associated constituent loads to SW can be substantial.
- Appreciated the method and format of the meeting but there may be a need to alleviate fears from other groups that the data will be used in the future for regulatory action. Need to focus on the benefits of data sharing and how a collaborative effort to develop this program will be useful for all in the basin.

2. Do you have any suggestions or further comments regarding today's workshop?

- Good event!!
- I would suggest that some funding support should be solicited from SWRCB through their Cleanup & Abatement funds or from Supplemental Environmental Project designation. It will take a bit of lobbying, but it could be done and is appropriate.
- It would have been valuable to provide each attendee the opportunity to discuss/disclose their particular interest in the topic of SJR WQ & why they attended.
- Format good. Follow-up critical, don't lose inertia.
- Better location may be Modesto ag center – better parking situation and larger room (felt cramped).
- Sending directions and more information emails leading up to the workshop would have been helpful.
- Excellent mix of skills & perspectives of attendees.
- It was a great experience – please keep us informed.
- Make certain attendees receive a report back via summary sheet or notes.
- Some more detailed formal [presentations would be a good idea.
- Valuable exercise. May be useful to have annual State of the Watershed meetings to keep parties knowledgeable and inter-connected.
- Very well run workshop – enjoyed the “round robin” breakouts in PM.
- Great format. Learned a lot and felt comfortable speaking from a relatively uninformed standpoint.
- ID users of data – regulators, academia. Subscriptions to pay for data? WQ sample collection calendar. ID held samples contact info?
- Today's workshop was great and I learned a lot.
- Follow-up summary of group findings. More info about SFEI. Thank you.
- The Great Valley Center was a good venue.
- Very well done. Thanks!
- Good turn out for the first meeting but also need to invite ELAP, DPR, DPH, DTSC, etc. & others in the basin collecting data that are not a state or federal agency.

This workshop is part of a project to encourage a public-private partnership to produce information for improved water quality monitoring throughout the SJR region. The project is technically directed and staffed by the San Francisco Estuary Institute (SFEI), with funding and participation from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and in consultation with the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board and other agencies. The Great Valley Center and Brock

Bernstein participate in meeting facilitation, stakeholder outreach, and project coordination.