

San Diego Regional Stormwater Copermittees Regional Program Planning Subcommittee

Meeting Notes

Chairperson Stephanie Gaines

1
2

Date / Time	Agenda Summary
07/20/2017 Start time: 1:30 PM End time: 3:30 PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting Summary • Old Business • Report of Waste Discharge Update • Southern California Bight '18 Regional Study • Workgroup Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Land Development ○ ERS ○ Annual Reporting Ad Hoc Committee • Trash Amendments • Stormwater Capture / Use Feasibility Study Update • Announcements • Next Meeting
Location County of San Diego 5510 Overland Avenue, 4th Floor, A-451, Large Conference Room San Diego, CA 92123	

3

Voting Members in Attendance: (one vote per watershed)			Number of Voting Copermittees at this Meeting: 8		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Santa Margarita Watershed:</i> County of San Diego Stephanie Gaines Jo Ann Weber	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Mission Bay Watershed:</i> City of San Diego Jim Harry	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Carlsbad Watershed:</i> City of San Marcos Reed Thorberry
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Los Peñasquitos Watershed</i> Melody Rocco	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>San Dieguito Watershed:</i> City of Escondido Helen Davies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>San Luis Rey Watershed</i> Justin Gamble via phone
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>San Diego River Watershed:</i> City of Santee Cecilia Tipton	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>San Diego Bay Watershed:</i> City of Chula Vista Boushra Salem	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Tijuana Watershed:</i> City of Imperial Beach
Non-Voting Members and Members of the Public in Attendance					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	City of Chula Vista Boushra Salem	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Riverside County Watershed Rebekah Guill via phone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Larry Walker Associates Paul Hartman
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Dr. Brock Bernstein				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Secretary Madison Roberts (Michael Baker International)				

4

1 **1. Call to Order**

2 Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) called the meeting to order.

3 **2. Roll Call**

4 Stephanie completed roll call for voting members.

5 **3. Announcements**

6 Clem Brown announced that July 20th would be his last day as a copermittee and he will
7 be joining the City of Del Mar. He stated that all comments and questions regarding the
8 City of San Diego should be forwarded to Jim Harry.

9 It was announced that the County of San Diego is currently recruiting a Planner III
10 position. The ideal candidate would have background that includes both monitoring and
11 planning.

12 Stephanie stated that she will send out the save the date for Bight '18. More
13 information on this event is available in Section 8 below.

14 All copermittees were asked to notify Stephanie or Ruoya if they are not receiving the
15 CASQA newsletter.

16 Stephanie inquired about the whereabouts of the "All the Way to the Ocean" DVDs and
17 asked copermittees to notify her if they currently have a copy. She also asked all
18 copermittees to fill in list that she sent out. The list will identify the showings that have
19 occurred throughout the County. She added that "All the Way to the Ocean" will be
20 shown at four "Movies in the Park" event throughout the County.

21 JoAnn announced that there will be a Cost Benefit Analysis Public Meeting for the
22 bacteria TMDL on August 17th from 9:30 a.m. to noon in the County of San Diego hearing
23 room. Stephanie will send out additional information.

24 **4. Time for public to speak on items not on the agenda**

25 No members of the public requested time to speak about items not on the agenda.

26 **5. Meeting Summary from May 18, 2017**

27 Approval of the May 18th meeting summary was tabled to the August meeting, with
28 general concurrence, following requested edits from Helen Davies:

- 29 • Page 4, Line 9: Change "he" to "the".
30 • Page 6, Line 20-21: Clarification requested.

31 Stephanie will edit the meeting summary, provide clarification and recirculate the
32 summary prior to the August 17th meeting.

1 **6. Old Business**

2 Stephanie presented a completion summary of action items from the May 18th meeting.
3 This summary was reported as follows:

Action Item		Completion Summary
1.	Stormwater Capture Feasibility Study; the jurisdictions who wish to participate in cost sharing for the study will reply via email.	There was agreement from some copermittees to participate in cost sharing. Stephanie will send out a document for signatures from those interested copermittees.
2.	ERS Workgroup; Via email, decide on promotional items to be purchased	The ERS Workgroup plans to purchase promotional items, including 15,000 neighborhood guides, 30,000 pet waste dispensers and bags. The quotes for these items have been received and the funds have been secured. The ERS Workgroup will need to approve the movement of funds from one Fiscal Year to another.
3.	Send email on new legislative information to Copermittees.	Email was sent out.
4.	Provide information on the Industrial General Permit.	Andre quickly summarized the email sent out regarding compliance options. He stated that the State board is working on incorporation of the TMDLs into the Industrial General Permit (IGP) and finalization of IGPs. The IGP is not currently available for comment, but the copermittees can provide input via email. Once the IGP is finalized it will go through a formal public review and adoption process. Stephanie will send the draft IGP out to all copermittees.

4

5 **7. Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) Update (Paul Hartman and Dr. Brock Bernstein)**

6 Paul Hartman provided the table below to illustrate the ROWD Progress to date. He
7 added that copermittees provided comments on Section 2, 4, and 5. Overall, there were
8 no comments on the JRMP program. Paul stated that they are currently working on the
9 Introduction and Conclusion and a complete draft is expected on **September 8th**.

Section	Description	Status			
		Workshop	Draft #1	Comments	Draft #2
ES	Executive Summary			N/A	09/08/17
1	Introduction	11/01/16		N/A	09/08/17
2	WQIP Status/Evaluations/ Proposed Changes		05/22/17	Rec'd	09/08/17
3	JRMP Modifications		N/A	N/A	09/08/17
4	Permit Modifications	02/15/17 02/16/17	04/24/17	Rec'd	09/08/17
5	TMDLs and New Regulations	03/15/17	06/12/17	Rec'd	09/08/17
6	Conclusions			N/A	09/08/17

1
2
3

Paul provided a summary of the seven comments on *Section 2* and how they were addressed, as follows:

Comment	Summary of how it was addressed
1. Add a note that some recommendations may result in permit modifications – reference Section 4	This addition will be made.
2. Evaluation vs. Re-evaluation	Re-evaluation is the terminology used in the permit and this word will be continued to be used.
3. Additions/Edits to Language – often directly from RMAR WMA Section (e.g., no new PWQCs based on re-evaluation, but data gaps identified new PWCs)	This item required discussion; see below.
4. Reduce redundancy in sections where multiple watersheds made similar recommendations	After discussion, all were in agreement to maintain the language as it is.
5. How does streamlining/consolidating RW assessments into one section improve assessments?	All streamlining was removed. No longer an issue.
6. Should Caltrans be listed as a Copermittee in all WMAs?	Caltrans should be listed as a responsible party in the TMDL for those watersheds in which they participate as such.
7. Conclusion – revise to include only the big picture recommendations that are consistent across WMAs (e.g., assessment revisions)	Conclusions will only include those that relate directly to the ROWD and are absolutely necessary.

4
5
6
7

For comment #3, Paul explained that the language in the ROWD is taken directly from each watershed's WMA section. If the language is changed in the ROWD, then each watershed will need to update that language in their WMA in order to maintain

1 consistency. It was decided that Paul will send out the ROWD draft with all comments
2 for each watershed to address any inconsistencies.

3 Paul provided a summary of the copermittees' comments on *Section 5* and how they
4 were addressed, as follows:

Comment		Summary of how it was addressed
1.	Terminology – Clarify “Responsible Copermittees”	Will be addressed.
2.	Clarify language related to TMDL amendments automatically superseding Permit TMDL requirements	New modifications to TMDL will be included in the permit.
3.	Ensure bacteria TMDL section accounts for updated REC-1 objectives amendments	This will be added in a high-level, straight-forward manner.
4.	Location of Trash Amendments in Permit – Attachment A seems the most reasonable and concise	The regulations will not be split up and will be included in Attachment A with reference in other sections and appendices as needed.
5.	Clarify language in trash amendments related to the 10% implementation/year requirement for Track 1 and Track 2 implementation measures	This will be addressed through discussion in each watershed's implementation plan.
6.	Add language stating Permittees can switch Trash Amendments compliance Tracks without a permit amendment	This will be added.

5 Dr. Brock Bernstein provided a summary of the copermittees' comments on *Section 4*:

Comment	
1.	Justify need for flexible, customized programs at watershed scale
2.	Align Monitoring and Assessment Program better with WQIPs
3.	What would customized programs look like?
4.	Define a consistent and credible approach to program design
5.	Connect monitoring, assessment, and reporting
6.	High priority – key issue

6 Brock stated that *Section 4* will layout the basic principles in the ROWD and will attempt
7 to provide methods for watersheds to personalize the monitoring processes to their
8 needs. The monitoring program will provide items that assist in decision making and link
9 the program directly to reporting and data analysis. It will provide consistency in basic
10 approach across all watersheds and will address compliance concerns.

11 This monitoring program will rely on a question-driven approach, in which decision
12 makers will frame questions that technical staff can answer and will set up a clear
13 process to ensure that this question-development process occurs before actual
14 monitoring begins. It will also capture the USEPA data quality objectives with the
15 understanding that the data must help each watershed make the correct decision and

1 that sometimes it is acceptable to sacrifice resolution in the lab to answer the desired
2 question.

3 Brock stated that three guidance documents, the EPA's "Guidance for the Data Quality
4 Objectives Process," the "SWAMP Assessment Framework," and the "A Framework for
5 Monitoring and Assessment in the San Diego Region," will provide guidance in the
6 creation of the monitoring program.

7 He discussed the USEPA's detailed set of technical guidance, which includes: Define the
8 problem; Identify the problem; Identify information needed for decision; Define study
9 boundaries; Develop a decision rule; Specify limits on decision errors; and, Optimize the
10 design for obtaining data. He stated that each watershed will use these steps as a
11 framework and customize them to their needs. Technical detail will be deferred to a
12 later step when a custom monitoring program will be created. He confirmed that all
13 approaches will look and feel the same and will work the same and all consultants will
14 receive the same guidance.

15 The structured monitoring design process will: Improve efficiency and return on
16 investment; Ensure data analysis methods will address core questions; Provide basis for
17 adaptation; and tighten linkages between assessment and reporting.

18 Paul asked how much do you see the assessments and permit driving the process and
19 whether they should start with the watershed needs and then complete the monitoring.
20 Brock responded that that's up to you. He recommended starting by defining what it is
21 that you need to make your programs run effectively.

22 Helen asked what the monitoring section in the ROWD will look like. Brock stated that it
23 will not provide details for each watershed, but instead will list principles and make a
24 limited number of illustrative recommendations as examples. Jo Ann clarified by adding
25 that this monitoring program is to help support the option to have a customized
26 program if the watershed wants. She stated that she recognizes that there are a lot of
27 monitoring that can't just stop, but MS4 monitoring could take shape using this process.

28 Helen asked if the document will provide examples of why the watersheds need this
29 monitoring program. Paul stated that this type of monitoring program seems to mimic
30 the evolution of monitoring programs, from receiving waters to outfalls, and serves as
31 the natural next step. JoAnn stated that she has a meeting with the Regional Board on
32 **August 8th** and will need examples to make the case for this program and explain why it
33 will be useful.

34 Paul concluded by providing a schedule below and stating that the final submittal will
35 occur on **December 17th**.

Responsible Group	August	Sept
Consultant Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ES/S1 Draft Development S2 Revisions S3 Removed (no JRMP Mods) S4 Reporting Revised Draft 8/4 S4 Monitoring Draft 8/14 S5 Revisions Conclusions Draft Development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete Draft 9/8
Copermittees		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review Complete Draft Comments due 9/29
All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting with Regional Board (8/8 or 8/10) PPS Section 4 Discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PPS Section 4 Discussion

1

2

3

4

5

He also stated that Section 4 will be send out for a new review on **August 4th**, the draft of the monitoring section will be available on **August 14th** for review and any needed updates will be included in an updated draft to be completed on **September 8th**. The comments on this draft will be due **September 29th**.

6

7

8

Jo Ann stated that Brock’s scope will be sent out soon and is in line with what was budgeted in the PPS budget. Stephanie stated that they will be looking for comments on things aren’t in concurrence. All comments should be provided to Jo Ann.

9

8. Southern California Bight ’18 Regional Study (JoAnn Weber)

10

11

JoAnn announced the Southern California Bight ’18 Regional Study and began by providing a brief explanation of what the Bight Study is.

12

13

14

15

16

She stated that the Bight study is a collaboration of over 50 agencies that happens once every five years and is facilitated by SCCWRP. Historically the copermittees have conducted lagoon monitoring, which fulfills the sediment quality objectives (SQO) requirement outlined in Prov D. 1. e,(2). In the past, 10 lagoons have been sampled; 3 of which are currently studied by Weston and 7 of which are currently studied by AMEC.

17

18

19

JoAnn explained that if the total budget for Bight ’18 is \$125,000 and if it is assumed that 10 lagoons will be studied then 30% (\$37,500) will be allocated to Weston and 70% (\$87,500) of the budget will be allocated to AMEC.

20

21

22

The Bight ’18 Kick off Meeting is **September 14th at SCCWRP** and it is a good idea for technical focused researchers and water representatives be present at this meeting. Stephanie will send out save the date.

23

24

25

26

27

JoAnn continued by stating that historically the copermittees have participated to meet the SQO requirements, but Bight serves as a good opportunity to complete other studies. There are two popular topics that different groups have discussed studying. They include sewage exfiltration studies and a reclaimed water study to study the contribution of HF183.

1 JoAnn stated that she does not know if getting positives for contaminants in reclaimed
2 water is a big issue for copermittees in San Diego County. She acknowledged that some
3 watersheds use reclaimed water and others do not. She suggested that the watersheds
4 determine whether they are interested in the special study opportunities and clarified
5 that only one watershed can participate if only one is interested.

6 JoAnn summarized the Bight '18 Schedule, as follows:

- 7 • September 2017: Kick off Meeting (At the meeting individuals will split up based
8 on themed areas)
- 9 • October – March 2017: Each theme area develops a workplan and works on
10 QA/QC through many technical meetings.
- 11 • June 2018: Submit San Diego Region Work Plan to SDRWQCB by June 2018
- 12 • July 2018: Lagoon sampling begins (some may be complete in July 2019)
- 13 • SD Report to be completed by our consultants and the Bight '18 report will be
14 out in 2022.

15 Copermittees can sign up to participate at the kick off meeting or with JoAnn.

16 Helen asked what the copermittees need to consider for budgeting. JoAnn responded
17 that previous SQOs should have prices for the lagoons. However, watersheds need ask
18 consultants for costs. The costs for the HF183 study would be harder to determine, but
19 if watersheds want to do something in a different theme area all copermittees could put
20 money in a common pot and decide the theme area as a group.

21 Boushra asked if water companies participate. JoAnn responded that they may not
22 participate in the Bight '18 as they are not a part of a bacteria TMDL. Brock added that
23 SCCWRP is open to having others (such as water companies) involved in the Bight study.
24 Cecilia mentioned that Padre Dam is interested in doing studies and have conducted
25 studies in Santee. She thinks that it is a good idea to invite them. Stephanie suggested
26 that she could address this at the member agencies meeting and will try to get onto the
27 next meeting's agenda.

28 JoAnn finished by explaining why watersheds should participate. These reasons include
29 leveraging limited resources, having additional brain power and leveraging expertise
30 that we don't have, the Bight study results more readily accepted since it is a
31 transparent and long process, the regional board is more likely to add it into the permit
32 process, academics participates, and it is a permit requirement to participate. The
33 Riverside watershed mentioned that they need additional help and are interested in
34 getting involved.

35 **9. Land Development Workgroup Update (Rene Vidales)**

36 Rene provided an update on the Model BMP Design Manual. The workgroup and those
37 contracted through the associated task orders are finishing work from the last Fiscal
38 Year for bio retention soil media, the help desk, and the model ad hoc group meetings.

1 The workgroup is expecting a deliverable from the consultant, including supplemental
2 guidance and updates on appendices. The appendices updates will include updated
3 hydromodification sizing factors and will replace those in Project Clean Water currently,
4 as well as, a complete revamp of Appendix C and D. The next Model Ad Hoc Meeting will
5 be in August.

6 The SHDM Training was a success and SHDM 3.1 is now available for free.

7 The next Land Development Workgroup meeting will be **July 25th**.

8 Helen Davies asked how the new sizing factors will affect city processes and when the
9 cities and watersheds should update relevant manuals. Renee said that the new sizing
10 factors will be ready for incorporation into manuals in fall 2017. Boushra Salem added
11 that all cities will need to include the factor in annual reporting.

12 **10. ERS Workgroup Update (Cecilia Tipton)**

13 Cecilia Tipton stated that the ERS Workgroup has not met since the last copermittee
14 meeting. There has been discussion regarding updating strategies and the group has
15 funding to do surveys to guide these updates. The group will also be hosting “All the
16 Way to the Ocean” at Movies in the Park.

17 The Santee Watershed Stewardship program has not received any applications. Cecilia
18 speculated that the low response may have been because much of the publicizing was
19 done at the beginning of the summer. Cecilia may coordinate with the San Diego River
20 Conservancy to build off existing network of river monitoring volunteers and she stated
21 that she has considered sending out a call for applicants to all copermittees to see if
22 there may be interested individuals in other cities.

23 Stephanie suggested that Cecilia reach back out to school groups when school is back in
24 session this fall and Helen added that the Boy and Girl Scouts may be a good group to
25 reach out to.

26 **11. Annual Reporting Ad Hoc Committee Updates (Stephanie Gaines)**

27 Stephanie asked the Annual Reporting Ad Hoc Committee if they felt there is a need to
28 meet this year. Not hearing a consensus, Stephanie asked those on the committee to
29 notify her by the August 17th meeting if there is a need to convene a meeting.

30 **12. Trash Amendments (Stephanie Gaines)**

31 Stephanie provided a brief follow up from the special meeting regarding Trash
32 Amendments and stated that presentations shown were sent out with the meeting
33 summary. She asked the copermittees if they have a desire for regional coordination
34 and if there is a volunteer to lead the work group. Melody stated that she will ask to see
35 if anyone is interested in co-leading at the Los Peñasquitos Watershed. Cecilia stated
36 that any work with Caltrans and bulk purchasing will require collaboration. A workgroup

1 would be helpful to determine a mechanism to coordinate with Caltrans. Malik
2 volunteered to lead or co-lead the workgroup and stated that the workgroup will have
3 until December 2018 to complete implementation.

4 **13. Stormwater Capture / Use Feasibility Study (Stephanie Gaines)**

5 Stephanie provided a brief update on the Stormwater Capture / Use Feasibility Study
6 and stated that a number of people came to TAC meeting, which included an overview
7 of the project and a call for data to complete data gaps. **August 8th** is the deadline to
8 provide data. Boushra asked exactly what flood control system data is needed. She
9 asked if they are simply asking for GIS data or if they are also asking for data related to
10 flood conveyance studies in each city. She asked Stephanie to send an email detailing
11 exactly what data is needed. Stephanie will ask for an email to be sent out that provides
12 guidance for what is needed and will resend information that was distributed after the
13 TAC meeting to the copermittees. She stated that this information will also be on the
14 Project Clean Water website.

15 Stephanie concluded by stating that the study's next steps are to collect data and
16 complete the existing conditions report. The second TAC meeting will be a webinar that
17 will explain modeling and assumptions, then at a following meeting in December the
18 initial results will be presented and comments will be taken for the second technical
19 memo.

20 **14. Next Meeting:**

- 21
 - Thursday, August 17th 1:30-3:30

Action Item		Responsible Party
1.	Distribute Bight '18 Save the Date to copermittees	Stephanie
2.	Let Stephanie or Ruoya know if you have not received the CASQA newsletter	All Copermittees
3.	Fill in "All the Way to the Ocean" showing list and notify Stephanie if you have a copy of the DVD	All Copermittees
4.	Send out information about Cost Benefit Analysis Public Meeting	Stephanie
5.	Provide Clarification on May 18 th Meeting Summary	Stephanie
6.	Obtain signatures from those copermittees interested in cost sharing.	Stephanie
7.	Send State Board Draft Industrial General Permit (IGP) out to all copermittees.	Stephanie

Action Item		Responsible Party
8.	Send out ROWD with all comments and inconsistencies highlighted	Paul
9.	Provide comments on Brock's SOW to JoAnn.	All Copermittees
10.	Sign up to participate in Bight '18 by attending Kickoff Meeting or notifying JoAnn	All Copermittees
11.	Inquire about getting on the Member Agencies Meeting agenda	Stephanie
12.	Notify Stephanie if there is a need to convene an Annual Reporting Ad Hoc Committee Meeting.	Annual Reporting Ad Hoc Committee Members
13.	Resend Information distributed following the Stormwater Capture / Use Feasibility Study TAC Meeting.	Stephanie

1
2