Delta Regional Monitoring Program
Stakeholder Kickoff Meeting
30 September 2008
Meeting Notes

In accordance with the Strategic Workplan for Activities in the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary, the State and Regional Water Boards (collectively Water Boards) have initiated an effort to develop and implement a comprehensive regional monitoring program (RMP) for the Delta. Recognizing the need for early involvement of stakeholders in such a process, a public kickoff meeting was held on 30 September 2008. The purpose of this meeting was to provide an overview of the impetus for the Delta RMP planning effort, obtain stakeholder input, gauge stakeholder endorsement of and commitment to this process, and begin a participatory process designed to foster participation of stakeholders in the development of the Delta RMP.

The majority of questions and comments voiced during the meeting could be grouped into the following categories (core issues): governance structure, monitoring questions, data integration, coordination with existing monitoring programs, and cost savings. Stakeholder workgroups were formed to help the Water Boards address each of these core issues during the Delta RMP planning process. Next steps include development of straw-man proposals for each of the core issues by Central Valley Regional Water Board and Aquatic Science Center staff, which will be provided to the workgroups for review and comment; and development of an inventory of existing monitoring programs in the Delta.

SESSION I – This session was attended by Executive-level management and their staff designees from agencies and stakeholder groups interested in Delta monitoring. Desired outcomes of this session were to identify key issues that will need to be overcome during the Delta RMP planning effort and to gauge stakeholder endorsement of and commitment to this planning effort.

Introductions
Karen Larsen (Central Valley Regional Water Board) welcomed attendees to the Stakeholder Kickoff Meeting and introduced Pamela Creedon (Executive Officer, Central Valley Regional Water Board) and Dorothy Rice (Executive Director, State Water Board).

Opening Remarks
Pamela Creedon and Dorothy Rice provided opening remarks that touched on a number of topics including the identification of the Delta as the Regional Water Board's highest priority; the State and Regional Water Boards commitment to developing a regional monitoring program (RMP) for the Delta; the importance of stakeholder involvement and coordination to the success of this effort; and the State Boards' intention to support the Regional Water Boards throughout this process.

Impetus for the Regional Monitoring Program Planning Effort
Presenter: Karen Larsen, Central Valley Regional Water Board

Why are we here?

A multi-agency team was created in 2005 to evaluate the potential causes of the Pelagic Organism Decline (POD): water exports, contaminants, and invasive species. The ability to assess the relative importance of contaminants has been hampered by the lack of a comprehensive assessment of water quality/contaminants data being collected in the Delta. There are a number of existing monitoring programs in the Delta that collect water quality data. However, the level of assessment, reporting, and access to the data varies widely among these programs. In addition, there is a general recognition that significant data gaps exist, notably with respect to contaminants. The sporadic nature by which contaminants monitoring has and continues to be conducted impedes our ability to ascertain baseline conditions and to compare against such conditions. Based on the currently available contaminants data, we are unable to characterize potential population effects as part of species life history models or to support modeling efforts for source identification.

There is also a lack of coordination between existing monitoring programs, which may result in inefficiencies and duplication of effort. If we took the funds currently being spent on toxics monitoring and prioritized information needs on which to spend it, would the monitoring program look the same as it does today?

How will this effort be different from previous efforts?

The Regional Water Board is fully supportive and committed to developing a RMP for the Delta and is willing to negotiate regulatory requirements to achieve integrated monitoring. We recognize the limitations and shortcomings of previous efforts to develop a comprehensive monitoring program for the Delta. The lessons learned from these previous efforts, as well as existing RMPs (e.g., San Francisco Bay and Southern California Bight), will be used to develop a feasible, sustainable, and fundable Delta RMP. The Regional Water Board intends to develop the program through a phased planning approach, in close cooperation with stakeholders. The purpose of the initial phase is to establish a framework for regularly compiling, synthesizing, and reporting water quality data from existing, ongoing monitoring efforts. The second, longer-term phase will be to develop and implement an integrated RMP that coordinates monitoring being conducted in the Delta.

Stakeholder involvement and coordination are critical elements in this effort. An all inclusive, tiered stakeholder approach will be implemented, with the intent to form a manageable structure for obtaining stakeholder input. The project will also coordinate with other similar initiatives such as the CALFED Science Program's project to develop a strategy for Delta monitoring, assessment and research; the Sacramento River Watershed Program's pilot project to develop a RMP; and the USEPA's efforts to develop a monitoring directory and strategy for monitoring in the San Joaquin River basin.

What will the Water Boards do with the information?

The RMP could be designed to address a broad suite issues including:

- Identification of water quality problems,
- Improved management decisions,
- Measuring success of control programs,
- Report status and trends, and
- Support ability to predict changes is water quality due to changes in Delta conveyance or operations.

The Water Boards intend to develop the program, such that there are clear links between the data and management decisions.

Timeline

The Strategic Workplan for Activities in the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary, which has been adopted by the State Water Board and Central Valley Regional Water Board, commits the Water Boards to the following timeline (see Figure 1).

- **September – October 2008:** Establish stakeholder process.
- **December 2008:** Toxics Synthesis Report. The State Water Board executed a contract with the University of California, Davis to synthesize all readily available data on contaminants in the Delta and produce a report summarizing the analysis and recommending next steps, including improvements to existing Delta monitoring. Michael L. Johnson, Ph.D. is the project lead. Upon completion, a public meeting will be scheduled to discuss the report.
- **September 2008 – January 2009:** Utilize stakeholder process to develop the goals, objectives, scope, and strategy for the Delta RMP. Compile and synthesize information on existing regional monitoring programs. Deliverables from this phase include a strategy report and a summary of existing RMPs.
- **February – June 2009:** Develop options for the structure and administration of the short-term assessment and reporting framework and the long-term Delta RMP including management entity(ies), peer review and stakeholder input processes, and funding. Deliverables include an alternatives report, identifying the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative and needed resources.
- **September – December 2009:** Present options and associated resource needs for the Water Boards' consideration.

Eight Elements of a Successful Regional Monitoring Program
Presenter: Steve Ritchie, California Coastal Conservancy

1. Identify a clear, tractable need for the regional monitoring program.
2. Identify reliable funding sources that can be readily utilized (e.g., for contracts, staffing, etc.). Federal appropriations are likely to be unreliable.
3. Be prepared to give something back in return for funding. You don't get something for nothing. Seek opportunities for more effective use of resources.
4. Be committed at the highest organizational level. Management must be visibly obsessed with the program. Success requires absolute commitment at the highest organizational level.

5. Identify mechanisms to use the findings to make management decision-making more effective. Show how the data will be used.
6. The ability to communicate program-related information to stakeholders, general public, and others is vital. Identify clear mechanisms to assess and integrate the findings and report these to the public (e.g., summary statements about the system's status and whether it is getting better or worse).
7. Make the results and processes accessible and transparent. If people can't see it for themselves, they won't trust it.
8. Institute a governance mechanism to ensure the monitoring addresses the highest priorities. Develop priorities and regularly review them, including external review.

Overview of Existing Delta Monitoring Programs
Presenter: Thomas Jabusch, Aquatic Science Center

Thomas Jabusch provided a general summary of existing water quality monitoring programs in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. There are a number of on-going monitoring programs in the Delta, including, but not limited to:

- Environmental Monitoring Program (EMP),
- Municipal Water Quality Investigation (MWQI),
- Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program monitoring,
- U.S. Geological Survey flow stations,
- monitoring conducted by wastewater and stormwater dischargers, and
- studies conducted to address the Pelagic Organism Decline.

Based on very rough, preliminary estimates, it appears that in excess of $7 million is currently being spent on water quality monitoring activities in the Delta.

"Drivers" of these monitoring activities include:

- The State Water Project and Central Valley Project water diversions – Compliance with Water Right Decision 1641. Monitoring programs include the EMP and operations monitoring. Funding is provided by the California Department of Water Resources and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. The EMP is conducted under the auspices of the Interagency Ecological Program (IEP).
- Water Board regulatory programs, such as the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program.
- Issues, baseline conditions, trends, and variability – an example would be the POD contaminants study.
- Regional/local water supply.

"Big Issues" – there are a number of issues of concern within the Delta, the following are a few examples:

- Pelagic organism decline – the role of water quality/contaminants;
- All water uses – salinity, X2;
- Non-point source (NPS) runoff – sources and prevention;
- Drinking water quality – disinfection byproducts;
- Publicly owned treatment works (POTWs) – Pharmaceuticals and personal care products; and

- Mercury in fish.

Data Access – Many, but not all, Delta water quality data are available online. However, the data are distributed across several public databases (e.g., CEDEN, DWR Water Data Library, NWIS).

Summary

- There are a number of existing monitoring programs collecting water quality data in the Delta, the majority of which are associated with the water projects (i.e., SWP and CVP) and regulatory programs (e.g., NPDES).
- Based on preliminary estimates, total annual monitoring costs are in excess of $7 million.
- Many, but not all, data are available online, through several public databases.

Questions Following Presentation

For the purposes of the RMP, do the Water Boards intend to gather data collected by existing programs, without modifying the programs, or will additional monitoring requirements be imposed?

> Response: The Water Boards have proposed a phased approach under which the RMP would be implemented. The first phase is to establish a framework for compiling, analyzing, and reporting data collected by existing monitoring programs on a regular basis (e.g., annually). The initial phase will provide a foundation upon which to develop and implement additional aspects of the monitoring and assessment program. The second, longer-term phase will include development and implementation of a RMP, with an emphasis on water quality, which coordinates, and as needed expands, monitoring being conducted in the Delta. Stakeholder involvement and coordination will be essential to both phases of this process.

Regional Monitoring Models
Presenter: Brock Bernstein

This does not represent the first attempt at a regional monitoring program. Other successful RMPs exist, which serve as sources of insight and cautionary lessons. Stakeholders provide a wealth of information. The existing RMPs provide multiple examples of how the elements of the program can be implemented. Given the variety of options for how the RMP could be framed, we should not be constrained to any one particular model. There are a range of possible solutions.

San Francisco Bay Regional Monitoring Program

- Initiated with the Regional Board issuing a California Water Code section 13267[1] letter
- Funding based on formula & loads
- 1st year cost neutral
- Clear governance structure

[1] Water Code section 13267 authorizes the Water Boards to request dischargers monitor for potential problem pollutants and submit that information to the Water Board.

- Initial focus on toxics, then adapted and expanded over time
- Results used in management, especially Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)

Southern California Bight Program

- Motivated by earlier National Research Council (NRC) study (late 1980s). It was noted that although a large amount money and effort were being spent, there was no clear view of overall conditions
- Program extends from Point Conception to the Mexican border
- Both permit-mandated and voluntary partners
- Funded by compliance monitoring offsets (compliance monitoring is not conducted during the Bight Program monitoring period, and the funds that would have supported the compliance monitoring are redirected to Bight Program) and partner contributions
- Partners active in planning, implementation, and reporting
- Initial focus on POTWs, then expanded over time
- Results used in compliance and broader regional assessment

Interagency Ecological Program (IEP)

- Established by water rights decision in 1971
- Formal but flexible governance structure
- Coordinates efforts of several partners
- Focus on impacts of water withdrawals
- Unique, long-term datasets that are spatially extensive

Los Angeles and San Gabriel Watershed Programs

- Mandated by permit conditions
- Funded by permanent compliance offsets (e.g., removal of duplicative monitoring requirements, reduced monitoring intervals)
- Focus on specific questions at regional scale
- Directed by stakeholder workgroup
- Managed by an independent non-governmental organization (NGO)

Lake Tahoe Regional Monitoring Program

- Prompted by Regional Water Board's pending TMDL
- Program is currently in planning stages
- Inform regional trading program, improve models, track performance
- Planning conducted by stakeholder workgroup
- Funding from federal grants

<u>Questions Following Presentation</u>

Do any of the other existing RMPs have an agricultural component?

Response: Not to our knowledge.

Of the existing RMPs, were Agencies conducting monitoring prior to implementation of the RMP?

Response: Yes, depending on the area in question and the types of monitoring, a variety of public agencies (e.g., U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Geological Survey, and Water Boards) have been involved in monitoring activities prior to implementation of the RMP.

In regards to the Southern California Bight Program, did the Regional Water Board formally amend the permit requirements to allow relief from compliance monitoring and redirection of the funds during the Bight Program monitoring period? Also, did compliance concerns limit the ability of the Regional Water Boards to modify the monitoring requirements?

Response: In its initial stages, the Bight Program was "financed" by temporary offsets that traded compliance monitoring during the summer period for participation in the regional program. Thus, a POTW was allowed to suspend certain monitoring for a period of time in return for effort allocated to the regional program.

Compliance concerns were lessened by the fact that the regional program samples around discharges. In fact, while the regional program is generally based on a probabilistic survey design, there is a high degree of local intensification around major discharges. So, there was really no significant loss of data that could be used to track compliance. In addition, there is so much compliance monitoring, and major patterns are well enough understood, that the gap in routine monitoring data once every four years was not considered significant.

At this point, as permits have come up for renewal over time, participation in the regional program is included as a permit requirement as a routine matter. However, the type and extent of participation is generally left up to the permittee to negotiate with the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project (SCCWRP), sometimes with input from the Regional Water Board.

During the discussion, Brock Bernstein noted that monitoring can generally be broken down into the following three types:

- Routine compliance monitoring
- Regional monitoring – for which a portion of the resources can be used constantly to fund the RMP (e.g., San Francisco Bay RMP) or portions of the resources can be allocated occasionally to support the RMP (e.g., So Cal Bight)
- Special studies – studies that are focused on a particular problem(s)

The lead in times for other existing RMPs (e.g., Southern California Bight Program) were quite long, might we expect a similar duration to develop and implement a RMP for the Delta?

Response: Based on previous experience and as more RMPs are implemented, the processes are accelerating.

What types of decisions have been made based on existing RMPs?

Response: San Francisco Bay RMP – Total Maximum Daily Loads. Another benefit of this RMP is the trust in the data that has developed across parties.

Los Angeles and San Gabriel Watersheds – monitoring conducted further upstream within the watershed has provided enhanced information regarding background conditions (e.g., metals) and better comparison of benthic macroinvertebrate studies.

Following the presentations, Brock Bernstein facilitated a discussion regarding the potential constraints associated with implementing the Delta RMP and potential benefits should the Delta RMP be successfully implemented. This discussion is summarized below.

Facilitated Discussion Regarding Potential Constraints Associated with Implementing a Regional Monitoring Program

Comment	Response
Program Design	
What is the purpose of the Delta RMP? Issues involving funding, governance, and stakeholder participation. What are the specific questions that the program will be designed to address? Broad repository or hypothesis-focused?	These types of questions/concerns will be addressed during project planning.
What will participation in the Delta RMP process involve (e.g., financial, attending meetings, etc.)? Will stakeholders have ability to attend planning meetings?	The Water Boards intend for this to be a collaborative process, as stakeholder involvement and coordination will be critical to the success of this effort. At this stage, participation entails taking part in the planning process, for instance being willing to provide input and attend meetings.
What is the boundary of the program? How will entities along the periphery of the Delta be incorporated into the program, if at all? Linkage from external to regional impacts.	Initially, the geographic scope of the Delta RMP is the legal Delta, including those portions of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers within the legal Delta and the Yolo bypass upstream from the Delta. Coordination with entities along the periphery of the Delta will be addressed during project planning.
What are the constituents that will be monitored? Will program focus on biologically-relevant constituents? What are the questions we are trying to answer? Will the focus be directed towards water quality constituents, but not benthic macroinvertebrates, fisheries, etc.?	The initial focus of the Water Boards efforts will be water quality, but specifics will be determined during the future planning. The planning effort will be coordinated with the broader Delta monitoring strategy being developed through the CALFED Science Program (Sam Luoma).
Need to recognize importance of the tides, locations where samples are collected, and to ensure that other supporting information needed to assess the data is available.	Specifics regarding monitoring design and data reporting requirements will be addressed during the planning phase.
Delta serves as a source of drinking water and an important ecosystem. The “drivers” of the drinking water and ecosystem monitoring programs may be different. Drinking water needs vs. ecosystem needs.	Specific program needs will be considered during project planning.
There are differences in monitoring what comes off of Delta islands versus what is in the main channels.	Specifics regarding monitoring objectives and design will be addressed during the planning phase.
Does the focus on water quality help us address the big picture? Will this really address the POD? Is focusing on a crisis issue the proper foundation for a long-term monitoring program?	Hence the need to coordinate closely with IEP and the broader Delta monitoring strategy being developed through the CALFED Science Program (Sam Luoma).
Costs have continually increased for POTWs. Compliance costs (monitoring and capital) will be a critical issue.	Funding is a critical element of the RMP and will be addressed during the planning phases in cooperation with stakeholders.

Data Compilation, Analysis, QA/QC	
Concerns were raised regarding the processes by which the data would be analyzed and used.; the potential for monitoring entities to lose some control over the data assessment process; potential for misinterpretation during data assessment; and that these issues may affect management decisions. Need to ensure that a scientifically credible process is put in place for interpreting the data. Do we know enough to interpret the data?	In order to develop trust in the program, monitoring and reporting procedures and linkages to management decisions must be transparent. Issues regarding the roles and level of involvement on the part of monitoring entities and other stakeholders will be addressed during the planning phase.
Database considerations, including access to the data (e.g., who has access and at what level), use of the data, integration with other databases, software compatibility (e.g., GIS),etc.	To be addressed during project planning. The Southern California Bight Program has a specific rule set regarding when and how data can be used, including a specific process by which the data is made available to the public.
Questions regarding the mechanisms for data transfers from project specific monitoring requirements (e.g., monitoring associated with mitigation/minimization measures implemented in accordance with the Endangered Species Act) to the regional monitoring database; potential opportunities to provide linkages between databases; and potential issues regarding data integration. Coordination with outside agency requirements.	The Water Quality Monitoring Council is working to address data management issues.
What criteria will be used for determining which are allowed into the regional monitoring database (QA/QC standards)? System-wide QA/QC requirements.	The Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) is developing a tiered QA/QC process (tiered based on use of the data).
There may be issues associated with confidentiality of data sources associated with drinking water locations.	These types of potential constraints will be addressed during the planning phase.
Coordination with Existing Monitoring Programs and On-going Planning Efforts	
In regards to incorporation of the monitoring associated with irrigated lands, concerns were raised regarding the level of effort that has been expended to implement the existing program, incorporation of this program into the RMP framework may affect their ability to assess the data and determine monitoring site locations, and potential loss of control, or portions thereof, with respect to the program. The Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program is moving upstream to identify and address specific issues. How will these efforts relate and/or be linked to the RMP efforts? Will agricultural understanding be lost?	The specific program needs of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, as well as other existing monitoring programs, will be considered during the planning phase in order to determine how best to coordinate these efforts.

Are there other programs (in addition to the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program), which have specific monitoring requirements that will cause integration issues?	Many of the current monitoring programs in the Delta are conducted in accordance with specific mandates (e.g., NPDES permit requirements, Water Rights Decision 1641 requirements) that may cause integration issues. The specific needs and requirements of each program will be taken into consideration during the planning process.
Issues regarding coordination between the Delta RMP and Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) planning processes. Program should be well coordinated with BDCP efforts.	Water Board staff are involved in the BDCP process at many levels, including participation in the Steering Committee, working groups, and technical teams. Coordination between the Delta RMP and BDCP will be addressed during the Delta RMP planning phase.

Facilitated Discussion Regarding Potential Benefits of a Regional Monitoring Program

Comments received during the discussion regarding the potential benefits of a RMP could generally be organized into the following four categories.

1. Improved Understanding of Water Quality
   - Opportunities for improved understanding of baseline conditions.
   - Opportunities for improved understanding of transport and fate of contaminants through the system.
   - Ability to draw a more complete picture of current conditions.
   - Improved understanding regarding drinking water treatment requirements.
   - Potential to have an early warning system that may be able head-off the next crisis.
   - Better analysis of trends and ability to address cyclical issues, annual variability, etc (need long-term data set).

2. Improved Efficiency and Coordination
   - Identify and possibly eliminate duplicative efforts and improve efficiency.
   - If we started from a clean slate and had resources similar to what are currently being spent on existing monitoring programs, how might we improve the monitoring program design?

3. Improved Linkages to Management Decisions
   - Better management decisions on the part of the State Water Board, Regional Water Boards, and other regulatory agencies.
   - Opportunity to collect data that are relevant to decision-making process for other resource agencies, such as USEPA, NOAA-NMFS, and CDFG.

4. Data Availability
   - Centralized data source.
   - Opportunity to provide improved and more efficient public access to water quality data.

SESSION II – This session was to be attended by staff designated to participate in the RMP planning effort and consisted of a discussion facilitated by Brock Bernstein. Desired outcomes of this session included identification of a process for determining the composition of stakeholder workgroups and developing a preliminary set of milestones and associated deadlines for the planning process moving forward.

Many of the questions and comments raised during the initial session of the meeting were related to the following topics (core issues):

- Governance – Develop options for program governance, including who will operate the program, program organization, and stakeholder participation.
- Monitoring questions – Establish a clear set of questions around which to build the program.
- Data integration – How do we take advantage of existing programs [e.g., SB1070, SWAMP (tiered QA), CEDEN, EPA formats]?
- Cost savings – Evaluate opportunities for cost savings (e.g., duplicative efforts, over monitoring, constituents that no longer need monitoring).

- Monitoring program coordination (e.g., Irrigated Lands, MWQI, EMP) – Evaluate program-specific requirements and opportunities to improve integration and/or coordination.

It was recommended that stakeholder workgroups be formed to assist the Water Boards in the effort to address these core issues during the Delta RMP planning process. Stakeholders were provided an opportunity to sign-up for one or more of the workgroups. The meeting sign-in sheet will be used to develop the initial distribution list for this project. All individuals on the distribution list will be kept informed of workgroup meetings, etc.

Regional Water Board and Aquatic Science Center staff will develop straw-man proposals for each of the core issues, which will be provided to the workgroups for review and comment. Suggestions for how to prioritize issues and move the planning process forward are appreciated.

The following are a series of comments/questions that were raised during continued discussion about the "core" issues.

An inventory of the current monitoring programs (what is monitored, at what frequency, and where) in the Delta will be an important early step in the planning process, in order to gain an improved understanding of the current monitoring activities.

> Response: The Regional Water Board, in cooperation with the Aquatic Science Center, is developing an inventory of current water quality monitoring programs in the Delta.

The Delta RMP planning effort will need to coordinate with other existing and planned local RMP efforts, in an effort to prevent data gaps and overlap in monitoring efforts.

> Response: This project will be closed coordinated with other similar, ongoing efforts such as the San Francisco Bay RMP; the CALFED Science Program's project to develop a strategy for Delta monitoring, assessment, and research; the Sacramento River Watershed Program's pilot project to develop a RMP; and the USEPA's efforts to develop a monitoring directory and strategy for monitoring in the San Joaquin River basin.

It is difficult to assess whether there are opportunities for cost savings without first knowing the Delta RMP's goals, objectives, questions, etc.

> Response: During the initial phase, the effort would likely be directed towards determining if there are opportunities to reduce duplicative monitoring activities (if any exist). Later, as the program is further developed, may begin to assess potential changes to monitoring requirements that could result in savings.

Under current conditions, there are a limited number of wastewater dischargers (e.g., POTWs) within the geographic scope of the Delta RMP planning effort and existing monitoring is primarily conducted in accordance with Water Right Decision 1641. This is a different situation than the ones under which most other RMPs were established. Cooperation with, and involvement on the part of, the Interagency Ecological Program (IEP) agencies will be critical to the success of the program.

Response: The Delta RMP planning effort will be coordinated closely with IEP and the broader Delta monitoring strategy being developed through the CALFED Science Program (Sam Luoma).

The following entities were identified during a discussion regarding potential stakeholders in the Delta RMP planning process:

- Wastewater Dischargers (e.g., POTWs)
- Stormwater Dischargers
- Various State Agencies, including DWR, DFG, CALFED, DPH, DPR, Water Boards, Boating and Waterways, Resources Agency, Delta Protection Commission, State Lands Commission
- Various Federal Agencies, including USGS, USEPA, USBR, NOAA-NMFS, USACE
- Water Agencies, Districts and Contractors
- Ports and Marinas
- Counties
- Industry
- Reclamation Board / Reclamation Districts
- Non-governmental Organizations, such as environmental groups
- Environmental Justice Organizations
- Agricultural Coalitions
- Academia / Scientist

Figure 1. Timeline for Development of the Delta Regional Monitoring Program