

**Meeting Notes from  
Regional Monitoring Workgroup  
April 26, 2005  
Port of San Diego  
Administration Building  
3165 Pacific Highway  
San Diego, California 92101**

**1. Two-Year Pilot Project (2 dry- 2 wet at 8 MLS stations)-**

The RWQCB has requested public comment on the Copermittes' request and the Board at the June 8th meeting will hear the item.

**2. SMC Model Municipal Storm Water Program**

Five questions from the SMC Model Stormwater Program will be considered in improving the Regional Monitoring Program. These questions are:

- (1) Are conditions in receiving waters protective, or likely to be protective, of beneficial uses?
- (2) What is the extent and magnitude of the current or potential receiving water problems?
- (3) What is the relative urban runoff contribution to the receiving water problem?
- (4) What are the sources to urban runoff that contribute to receiving water problems?
- (5) Are conditions in receiving waters getting better or worse?

The group agreed to keep these questions in mind as we discuss options on improving the regional monitoring program.

**3. Results of the statistical evaluation of the historical mass loading station data addressing the following questions:**

1. If we stagger stations does it effect ability to detect trends and how?
2. If we do them all in the same year vs. alternate years is there a difference?
3. How many years out for trends below a WQO does that push the program?
4. With stations that show an increasing trend, what does changing the sampling regime to the new proposal due to ability to detect those changes upward?

Art Barnett of Weston Solutions presented the results of the statistical analyses. Handouts with the graphs are attached.

The general discussion included the following points:

- Based on the statistics, there was only a slight increase in the number of years to verify a long-term trend if one cuts from 3 storms a year to 2 storms a year per station. (See attachment for details and also Request for Pilot Project sent to RWQCB in October 2004 and is Agenda Item #1).

- The statistical analysis supported conducting long-term trend monitoring every other year as opposed to every year. This only slightly increases the time to confirm a long-term trend slightly, but is a more cost-effective approach. (See attachment for details).

#### **4. Draft Regional Monitoring Program for Discussion including Mass Loading Stations, Ambient Bay and Lagoon Monitoring, and Bioassessment Monitoring**

Three draft conceptual Regional Monitoring Program Approaches for the Municipal Stormwater Permit 2006-2011) are being considered for the mass loading stations (potential modifications to the bioassessment and Ambient Bay & Lagoon Program are still being considered):

Option (1) In year 1 of the permit we plan to have a pilot project (the 2005-2006 pilot project is on RWQCB June, 2005 docket), such that all watersheds will have dry (2 24-hour composite samples) and wet weather (2 storms) samples collected at the 10 existing mass loading stations located near the mouth, but upstream of tidal influence.)

In year 2 through 5, collect more upstream samples by having temporary mass loading stations (collect 2 wet weather and 1 dry weather composite sample), but don't do all the watersheds each year, instead do each watershed twice during the permit cycle (the ABLM and Bioassessment monitoring would be concentrated only in the watersheds where mass loading stations are sampled). Therefore, samples would not be collected in every watershed in years 2 through 5 of the Permit.

Option (2) In year 1 collect samples from the 10 existing mass loading stations (2 storm events and 2 dry events). In years 2 to 5 collect samples annually at the 10 mass loading stations (2 storm and 1 dry event) and collect one upstream mass loading station (2 wet events and 1 dry event) in each watershed twice during the permit cycle. In this scenario- samples would be collected annually from each watershed, and limited upstream mass loading station data would be collected.

Option (3) Years 1 through 5, collect 2 wet weather and 2 dry weather samples at the existing 10 mass loading stations. No upstream mass loading station data would be collected. This is most similar to the current design of the program.

#### **Other discussions:**

Most in the group supported that TMDLs were a watershed issue and not a regional monitoring issue. However, if overlap exists, then the design and program results should benefit all. Generally, the group agreed that the regional program could include upstream mass loading stations (composite sample collected over a storm event or a 24-hour dry weather composite), but not likely grab samples, as the group felt that grab samples best fitted a watershed activity.

## **5. Request Further Direction on contacting SCCWRP re: ABLM**

The group discussed the ABLM program. Dr. Barnett indicated that the design of the program was to analyze contributions from sediment generated from the previous year's storms and deposited in the bays and lagoons. Weston will further evaluate this program, but some in the group felt that it might be too early to modify the design (this summer will be the third year of data collection). Dr. Barnett of Weston Solutions indicated that using sediment data only and not water column data was a scientifically acceptable approach to characterizing ambient water quality in bays and lagoons.

No clear direction was given as to if SCCWRP should be contacted at this stage, as the group did not have a clear proposal in mind. In Bight 2003- no dischargers were allowed to trade-off permit requirements for participating in Bight. The group was unclear on where funds for Bight 2008 would come from if a trade-off with the ABLM requirements for several years were not permissible.

## **6. Wrap-up and Review of Action Items (11:50 to Noon)**

- Weston was directed by the group to continue appropriate statistical analysis of bioassessment data and to continue evaluation of the ABLM program. There are meetings on May 12 (County of San Diego) and May 17 (City of Carlsbad). The goal is to have a finalized proposal at the conclusion of the May 17<sup>th</sup> meeting. This will then be presented to the Permit Reissuance Group in late May, and after incorporating their comments, the draft proposal would be presented to the RWQCB in a meeting scheduled with the Permit Reissuance Workgroup.
- County of San Diego will request input from the WURMP watershed leads on potential upstream monitoring locations.

Attendees:

Jay Shrake, MACTEC  
Din Daneshfar, City of National City  
Kathy Weldon, City of Encinitas  
Nancy Gardiner, Brown and Caldwell  
Adrienne Huber, Nautilus Environmental  
Mayela Padilla, SD County Regional Airport Authority  
Khosro Aminpour, City of Chula Vista  
Cora Long, City of Lemon Grove  
Jayna Nystrom, Port of San Diego  
Karen Helyer, Port of San Diego  
Elaine Lukey, City of Carlsbad  
Art Barnett, Weston Solutions  
Lisa Kay, Weston Solutions  
Ruth Kolb, City of San Diego  
Jo Ann Weber, County of San Diego