

**WURMP Workgroup  
Meeting Summary**

**Wednesday, April 20, 2005  
Metro Biosolids  
5240 Convoy**

---

**Participants:**

Joe DeStefano – County of San Diego  
Maria Garcia – City of Imperial Beach  
Jon Van Rhyn – County of San Diego  
Todd Snyder – County of San Diego  
Erik Steenblock – City of Santee  
Mikhail Ogawa – MOE  
Robin Miller – City of Poway  
Arsalan Dadkhah – D-Max Engineering

Rosanna Lacarra – PBS&J  
Karen Helyer – Port of San Diego  
Drew Kleis – City of San Diego  
Mo Lahsaie – City of Oceanside  
Meleah Ashford – City of Encinitas  
Kelly Barker – County of San Diego  
Julie Hampel – City of El Cajon

---

**Purpose of WURMP Workgroup** – the workgroup has not met on a regular basis in quite some time. The original purpose of this workgroup was to develop a WURMP template and Annual Reporting template. It was proposed that the WURMP Workgroup meet on a quarterly basis to discuss Regional WURMP issues. If activities or issues were brought up that required more frequent meetings then specific sub-workgroups could be formed. The sub-workgroups would report back to the Regional WURMP Workgroup with any relevant outcomes/decisions/products. The WURMP workgroup is also a good forum for the individual WURMP workgroups to provide status updates and share projects, lessons learned, successes, etc. with the other watersheds.

During the discussion it was also noted that there is a distinction between jurisdictional, watershed, and regional activities. A determination of what activities are beneficial at certain levels needs to be made, and the distinction needs to be clearly stated.

There was also some discussion regarding watershed approaches and jurisdictional boundaries. One item to note is that there appears to be a cost savings in working together in a watershed. For example the Carlsbad Watershed Copermittees were able to produce numerous brochures at a lower cost due to the high number of brochures needed for the 8 Copermittees within the watershed. It was then mentioned that it is important to try to consolidate efforts whenever possible. There are many groups that are trying to develop brochures, maps, etc. It may be more beneficial to put together things that could be distributed and implemented regionally. For example, developing brochures that are specific to pollutants of concern. Then each watershed could distribute the brochures that address the high priority pollutants of concern in the respective watershed. This is a collective, regional, watershed activity that could result in cost savings and have the same effectiveness.

Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) were discussed in regards to the permit re-issuance and watersheds. There have been many options discussed as to the role and location of the TMDL: MS4 Permit, separate permit. The group felt that it is important to be proactive on the TMDL. It was also agreed that the TMDL is a really big issue for the region and it should be included in the Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD).

### **WURMP Workgroup Updates:**

**Santa Margarita:** The Santa Margarita Watershed Management Plan has been finalized. The County of San Diego is continuing to meet with the County of Riverside, Temecula, Camp Pendleton, and Santa Margarita Ecological Reserve (SMER) to discuss watershed issues. Furthermore, the County of San Diego is involved with the Riverside County Copermitees under the Riverside Permit.

**San Luis Rey:** conducted 2 watershed beach and creek clean-up events. The City of Oceanside is continuing to conduct additional monitoring monthly in the watershed and the County of San Diego is conducting additional field screening monitoring monthly and laboratory monitoring quarterly. The Gregory Canyon Landfill is continuing to be an issue for the watershed in regards to the landfills impact to water quality. The City of Oceanside is still trying to encourage the Native Americans to become active participants in the watershed.

**Carlsbad:** the North County Stormwater Programs (NCSWP) is continuing to meet and is the education “arm” of the Carlsbad WURMP. The group placed a series of 3 advertisements in the Union Tribune, produced construction brochures, and the group has found that their promotional items have been a success ex) pens. The WURMP group will be doing or have done 3 earth day events and clean-up events. The group has also looked at teaming opportunities with non-profit groups such as the Carlsbad Watershed Network (CWN). In regards to the planning portion of the WURMP the workgroup is developing a template presentation for planner training. The jurisdictions within the watershed will conduct planner workshops/training. The group is also looking into a data management system.

**San Dieguito and Los Peñasquitos Watershed:** currently in the process of hiring a consultant to assess water quality activities and help with the implementation of the WURMPs. They are conducting interviews next week.

**San Diego River Watershed:** The group has been meeting on a monthly basis and will continue to meet. The Watershed Management Plan has been “finalized”.

**Mission Bay Watershed:** The City of San Diego has been updating their list of activities and constituents of concern. They are developing a table for cost benefit analysis of the water quality activities as a means to prioritize the activities for things such as applying for grants. The City will be attending a public meeting in June or July to present a working draft of the table.

**San Diego Bay Watershed:** The WURMP workgroup will be meeting tomorrow (April 21). The Copermittees in the watershed helped to sponsor the I Love a Clean San Diego clean-up event.

**Tijuana River Watershed:** the Watershed Management Plan/Binational Vision document has been “finalized”. The Binational Watershed Advisory Council that was formed during the development of the Vision document will continue to meet for at least the next year to prioritize and discuss the activities that were developed as part of the plan. The County is continuing to move forward with the invasive species removal grant along Cottonwood Creek and is currently in the mapping phase. The WURMP workgroup will be meeting some time in May but a meeting has not been finalized.

**Additional Discussion:**

As part of the WURMP workgroup updates there was extensive discussion on data management projects and the overall need for some sort of regional data management system coordination. There are many current and upcoming data management projects, which are summarized below:

- The Carlsbad watershed is interested in getting a data management system for the watershed that would help to analyze the different watersheds within the Carlsbad Hydrologic Unit.
- It was mentioned that John Robertus of the Regional Board has called the Copermittees within the San Diego River Watershed to discuss some sort of GIS data management grant although it is not quite clear as to the entire role or scope of the project.
- It was also noted that through the coastal monitoring workgroup and the dry weather monitoring workgroup, coastal and dry weather data templates have been finalized for standard and cohesive data sharing. There is a push to move that group forward into looking at data management systems. The data templates can be organized by watershed and sub-watersheds.
- There is also the Common Ground Project that has been implemented in the San Diego Bay watershed. The City has applied for Proposition 50 funding in order to expand the Common Ground project to other watersheds within the San Diego region.

The group felt that it is very important to consider all of the data management work that is already going on throughout the region in order to be able to dovetail or merge the systems. There should be coordination at a regional level to avoid numerous databases that may not be compatible with one another. It was also suggested that a sub-workgroup be formed to have the database developers come in and present their systems. The sub-workgroup could then develop ideas and come up with consolidated strategies for a possible regional database management system. It was suggested that this issue be raised

at the next Copermittee Management Meeting. Numerous people volunteered to be a part of the sub-workgroup.

Jon VanRhyn – County of San Diego

Meleah Ashford – City of Encinitas

Karen Helyer – Port of San Diego

Meleah also mentioned that there would be other Copermittees from the North County who would be interested in participating in the sub-workgroup.

It was emphasized that it is important to look at the database in the long-term and make sure that it can be used as an assessment database, not just a monitoring data collection database. The database should also be able to have commercial businesses, industrial facilities, construction sites, and BMPs added to it for programmatic assessment purposes.

During the discussion it was also noted that perhaps we should look at the management structure of the Carlsbad watershed. There is a subregional group that has been successful – the North County education workgroup. It was suggested that perhaps we need subregional working groups: North County, East County, and South County. Many felt that this is a good idea that should be explored.

### **Collective Watershed Projects:**

Showed the poster developed by the County of San Diego for education and outreach events that is used in conjunction with the watershed map. It was stated that any individual WURMP workgroups were welcome to use the poster and could insert a picture of their watershed on the poster. If anyone is interested they can email Kelly Barker at [Kelly.barker@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:Kelly.barker@sdcounty.ca.gov) to coordinate the use of the poster.

There was also some discussion on cost sharing and funding for watersheds. It was brought up that perhaps there should be a sub-workgroup formed that would find grant opportunities and apply for them.

### **Watershed Related Permit Re-Issuance Discussion:**

There was a handout distributed which contained information to be included in the Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) and summaries from communication (verbal and/or written) with the Regional Board regarding Permit re-issuance. The handout was utilized for discussion.

Some of the discussion items were:

The Copermittees have discussed developing an approach to combine jurisdictional and watershed reporting. The Regional Board has agreed to review such a proposal.

Should the permit assign WURMP leads? - The leads can be designated in the Permit but there should be leeway for the leads to be able to change.

WURMP meeting frequencies – the group decided that the meeting frequency should be determined by each group and not detailed in the Permit.

Should pollutants of concern (POC) for each watershed be identified in the Permit? - The group felt hesitant about putting the POCs into the Permit because it would be hard to remove the pollutants or add new ones dependent upon the monitoring data. If the POCs are in the Permit and your monitoring determines that one should no longer be considered high priority you may need to go back to the Board to request that it be removed or changed. This would be a detriment to program development and implementation.

In the 13267 letters, the Regional Board sent a list of recommended water quality activities for each watershed. There was a question as to whether the activities should be addressed in the Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD). The group felt very uncomfortable about including it in the ROWD and recommended that it be left out. Each watershed should address the activities.

The possibility of tracking JURMP activities by watershed was also brought up in discussion. It was stated that Copermittees should look at the data sets jurisdictionally and determine whether or not it would be useful to track the data via watersheds.

Other issues brought up:

- Monitoring workgroup – specific watershed issues coming out
- Regional Board – recommended to use the same approach for the new Permit (Jurisdictional and Watershed sections) but to still make sure there is a balance (trade-offs between jurisdictional and watershed).
- TMDLs – a significant issue that is not identified strongly enough in the ROWD outline yet. Issuance of a TMDL may alter and drive water quality activities within the specified areas. Therefore, the group felt that it is imperative to ensure that jurisdictions or watersheds can get credit for TMDL activities in the JURMPs or WURMPs.
- Proposition 50 process – the group felt that it was not necessary to include this information in the ROWD
- WURMP updates - the group felt that if we are required to do a WURMP update or revamping of the WURMP that we do not have to do an Annual Report for that year. If there are no updates required by the Permit then we will continue to do our Annual Reports.

A question was raised regarding the defined boundaries of the watersheds and whether or not Copermittees would like to see a change in the boundaries. It was suggested that perhaps the watersheds would be expanded to cover three areas: North, Central, and South. Then there would be 3 sub-regional reports that would be turned

in rather than 9 individual reports. The group seemed to want to keep the watershed boundaries defined as they are now.

**Other Issues:**

In closing Joe DeStefano from the County of San Diego, DPLU gave an update on the status of the Land Use Planner's Manual and DPLU's stance on cost sharing.

---

The Next Regional WURMP Workgroup meeting is scheduled for July 13, 2005.