



Water Information Strategies Workgroup Notes from Dec. 5, 2013

Attendees: Dave Chestnut, Jim Dorsch, Susan Holdsworth, Erik Host-Steen, Mike McDonald, Leslie McGeorge, Doug McLaughlin, Jeff Ostermiller, Pete Penoyer, Monty Porter, Tony Shaw, Mary Skopec, Glenn Skuta, Jeff Thomas, Steve Wolfe, Mike Yurewicz.

Discussion/Follow-up action items:

Leslie McGeorge: a poster will be presented at the conference on the integrated indices compilation. Indices represent varied types of monitoring data (sediment, macroinvertebrates, chemistry, etc).

Erik Host-Steen: Asian countries employ some different integrated indices.

Mary Skopec: what types of derivative products should the Council consider using what has been inventoried, such as a concept paper, or white paper? Could describe how the indices were developed, or what body or group sanctioned the development and use of the work.

Pete Penoyer: the National Park Service is also taking the direction of using integrated indices to use simplified visual display and communication of spatial or temporal trends (up/down arrows, as an example). Leslie will send the survey to Pete Penoyer. Leslie will send compilation to Mary who will send out to the WIS group.

Mary Skopec: Iowa does not have individual standards for sediment, nutrients, so there is a possible direction to use integrated indices in some way. Warren Kimble presented previously on Massachusetts's approach to use 'report card' approach.

Dave Chestnut discussed the mapping capability in South Carolina to display individual results for a monitoring site that conveys results of multiple parameters (green vs red dots) when you hover a mouse over a monitoring site). Steve Wolfe mentioned attempts to develop indices for the Gulf that cross State lines and the need to reach agreement among multiple agencies. A common issue is the ability to convey 303(d) results that are easily understood by the public...the visibility of release of State 303(d) lists is highly variable.

Susan Holdsworth: the value of indices is how they can be used as screening steps...helps to prioritize and target assessment or restoration work. Leslie McGeorge mentioned how Massachusetts's approach allows you to drill down into more detail..start simple but also delve into greater detail regarding the health of waterbodies (mercury vs sediment vs nutrient, etc). Erik Host-Steen displayed Malaysia's Water Quality Index (WQI) calculated on pH, DO, Ammonium, BOD, COD, TSS. Used to classify conditions on 5-level scale.

Follow-up action item: Mary Skopec will distribute the survey to the WIS workgroup

Mary Skopec: asked participants to review what has been compiled. Susan Holdsworth will forward to her regional monitoring coordinators.

Follow-up action item: consider doing a webinar on indices compilation when ready. Could do a webinar on an individual State's use of indices. Focus on the use/application of the indices.

Mary Skopec will plan to do a webinar on a couple types of applications. Also consider developing a Council fact sheet on this. Dave Chestnut volunteered to help.

Webinar: Leslie McGeorge could do intro; Dave Chestnut could showcase applications and lessons learned and challenges. Mary Skopec could take the key points we have discussed and use it to develop a possible fact sheet outline. Jeff Thomas discussed ORSANCO's approach on their monitoring program.

What My Manager Needs To Know. Gary Kohlhepp developed a draft document. Need to decide the audience for this document. Thought it would be good to focus on probabilistic design to help gain additional support and knowledge of it's use in State monitoring programs.