

**General Comments:**

1. This format was very easy to read and the graphics are well done.
2. (P.8) Responsible agencies developed goals both collaboratively and individually to best address the sources and stressors within the watershed and individual jurisdictions. Will the individual interim goals for each jurisdiction (being used to attain the same final goal for the WMA) be provided in the final Water Quality Improvement Plan deliverable?
3. (P.9) Language in the last bullet appears to be an incomplete thought: “Resource impacts consideration as RAs balance geographic.” Review of the language is needed.
4. All Tables – The Copermittees should considering including Partnership Programs to create leverage of resources with other agencies and/or non-profit organizations as an Optional Strategy. Non-profit organizations may have access to other sources of funding not available to a jurisdiction or be privy to certain expertise or access not otherwise available to a Copermittee.
5. All Tables – Footnote 1 addresses the fact that the baseline for the percent reduction goals are currently based on professional judgment and that the goals “may be” adapted as monitoring data/information is gathered, analyzed and baselines are establish. It would appear that the RAs “will” adapt these numeric goals once monitoring data/information is gathered, analyzed and baselines are established, not only to change the percent reductions (if necessary), but to document the fact that there is now a base line developed from in situ monitoring or infield information.
6. A strategy listed in all the tables is called “Inspections.” It is unclear what the difference is between the other strategies listed in the table that conduct inspections within certain land uses and this general strategy category. Further clarification is needed.
7. Appendix A – Appendix A should be reevaluated to list only those HAs where the County will implement the strategies, making clear that the County will not be spending resources in HAs (e.g. Loma Alta, Encinas) because they are so small, or negligible, a contributor to the conditions .

**Loma Alta HA –**

8. It is unclear how much, if any, land area the County of San Diego has in this HA. However, Table 3 shows the County conducting strategies 3-18 HA Wide. Appendix A *County of San Diego Additional Strategies* include BMPs such as focused inspections and ordinance changes. The full Water Quality Improvement Plan should explain work the County of San Diego is preparing to do HA Wide within the Loma Alta HS so that it is clear to the reader. If the County has no, or minimal land area then the document should identify that the County will not be implementing strategies within the HA.
9. (P.23) Strategy 16 is titled, Inspections – What is meant by these “inspections?” There are other types of inspections listed in the strategies Table 3 with more description in their title. Further explanation of this strategy is needed.
10. (P.23) Strategy 4 is titled, Administrative BMPs – This title is misleading. The term BMP is so strongly associated with in the ground structural management practices or non-structural management practices rather than administrative tasks associated with managing a storm water program. However, administrative work to conduct a storm water program can, and should be given credit for addressing target pollutants. It is noticeable that target pollutants are not identified for these BMPs. However, administrative work can be considered a non-structural strategy to address certain target pollutants. For example, prioritizing inventories may be done to address a specific pollutant or group of pollutants. Therefore, this line item strategy should be reevaluated to give it a more appropriate name and then given credit to the strategy addressing a particular target pollutant(s).
11. (P.23) Strategy 3 –Assuming the County of San Diego would be contributing to perhaps education strategies or some other non-structural BMP strategy HA Wide, it appears that the “additional strategies” provide by the County in Appendix A could fit within the listed strategies within Table 3. It appears that Appendix A was added to provide examples of what each strategies means for the County of San Diego, information that can be expressed in the County’s JRMP.
12. (P.23)Strategy 8, 9, 10, and 11 list different types of inspections as a strategy type but does not describe the actual strategy as say does street sweeping in strategy number 13. Construction site inspections, municipal facilities inspections, residential area inspections, and commercial/industrial inspection are all required jurisdictional program elements; therefore it is not clear what the “strategy” is. For example, will there be increased inspection frequency in focused areas? Additionally, strategy number 16 is

called, “Inspections.” It is unclear what the difference is between the strategies listed in 8-11 and strategy 19. Further clarification is needed.

13. Appendix A - Appendix A provided by the County of San Diego listed sixteen strategies as their additional strategies. There is concern that attention to all of these strategies may be trying to do everything, everywhere and some thought should be given to conducting focused strategies in those areas that are truly yielding water quality improvement outcomes. This is especially true since it appears that county plans on conducting all 19 strategies listed in Table 3 plus those described in Appendix A as indicated in strategy 3. This is even more concerning since the County does not have that much land area within the Loma Alta HA contributing to the HPWQC and PWQC. It would be expected that the County be contributing to less, if any efforts at all within this HA and more in the other HAs and/or other WMAs where their land area is contributing to more of the priority water quality conditions.

#### **Buena Vista HA –**

14. It is unclear how much, if any, land area the County of San Diego has in the Buena Vista HA. However, Table 5 shows the County conducting strategies 9-24 HA Wide. Appendix A *County of San Diego Additional Strategies* include BMPs such as focused inspections and ordinance changes. The County should focus its efforts on implementing strategies in those HAs where the County’s jurisdictional land area is contributing to the target pollutants. The Carlsbad WMA Water Quality Improvement Plan should explain work the County of San Diego is preparing to do within its jurisdictional boundaries HA Wide within the Buena Vista HA so that it is clear to the reader. If the County has little, or no land area within the Buena Vista HA contributing to the HPWQC, then Table 5 should indicate the County is not contributing to strategies within this HA because they are conducting strategies in other HAs or WMAs where they have more land area and are contributors targets pollutants. It is expected that a jurisdiction focus on those HAs and WMAs were they contribute to the sources of the priority and highest priority water quality conditions and not in those areas where they don’t.
15. (P.43) CB-PA2 Focus Area Strategies 4(c). The enhanced strategies listed include the City of Carlsbad working with residents and property owners to educate through various means, which may include school programs , block parties or one-on-one meetings. Block parties are a type of “out of the box” creative strategy that hasn’t typically been deployed to address pollutant reductions, but may be exactly the sort of small group education that could affect real change in a neighborhoods, and ultimately individual

residents behavior. This strategy certainly takes education a step beyond handing out pamphlets at a village fair.

**Agua Hedionda HA -**

16. (P. 58) Supplemental strategies include the Irrigation Runoff Reduction Program (IRRP) within the City of Vista for the AH04 Basin Focus Area, of which, a core element is “collaboration with City Public Works Department to address (emphasis added) municipal property irrigation systems. This element is vague and it would be expected that the City could collaborate with itself to reduce runoff, retrofit antiquated irrigation systems, etc, using a more proactive approach on those areas owned and operated by the City to achieve the goals listed in Table 12.
17. (P.59) This section describes City of Vista’s IRRP strategy and its core components. One of the components is “*Consider developing municipal codes that prohibit irrigation runoff.*” The San Diego Water Board has found that discharges of over-irrigation are a source of pollutants and are to be effectively prohibited (Provision A.1.b of Order R9-2013-0001 (Order)). Provision E.1 of the Order requires each Copermittee to establish, maintain, and enforce adequate legal authority within its jurisdiction to control pollutant discharges into and from its MS4 through statute, ordinance, permit, contract, order or similar means. It is unclear why the City of Vista is merely “considering” the development of an over-irrigation prohibition ordinance as a core component of the IRRP strategy.
18. (P61) This section describes the IRRP within the City of San Marcos. See Comment 16, the same comment applies to bullet 6 in the core elements.

**Encinas HA** – It is noted that no goals were submitted during this first draft Interim and Final Numeric Goals, Final Strategies, and Schedules submittal. The only strategies put forth were the program elements required in Order R9-2013-0001.

**San Marcos HA** –

19. (P.71) Regulatory Drivers - “*Based on analysis conducted in 2012, it was determined that the Pacific Ocean shoreline at San Marcos HA would not have qualified for REC-1 beneficial use impairment at any time. Therefore, the HA was inappropriately included*

*in the TMDL. The San Marcos HA Responsible Parties are not responsible for any further Bacteria TMDL action, including preparation and submittal of a Load Reduction Plan or Monitoring plan, as long as monitoring data continues to support compliance with water quality standards. Therefore, the HA was inappropriately included in the TMDL.*” Regional Board staff disagrees. Appendix E to Order R9-2013-0001 applies the Bacteria TMDL to the San Marcos HA for the Pacific Ocean Shoreline with a listing at Moonlight Beach. It is unclear what is meant by “it was determined that the Pacific Ocean shoreline at San Marcos HA would not have qualified for REC-1 beneficial use impairment **at any time** (emphasis added), and who made that determination. Further clarification is needed.

Additionally, as stated in this section, *“as long as the monitoring data continues to support compliance with water quality standards, no additional work to comply with the TMDL by the San Marcos HA Responsible Agencies is necessary.”* This statement says that the best management practices implemented by the Responsible Agencies are effective and therefore conditions in the receiving water are “in compliance with water quality standards.” Since monitoring data supports compliance with water quality standards for the Pacific Ocean Shoreline at Moonlight Beach, indicator bacteria is therefore, no longer the HPWQC and the San Marcos HA Responsible Agencies should re-evaluate their HPWQC for the San Marcos HA, choosing the next highest from the list of PWQC and develop numeric goals for it. Section 2.5.2.1 states “the goals identify both receiving water and MS4 targets in order to provide opportunities to demonstrate progress toward or achieving of the goals.” It is unclear why the Responsible Agencies would develop numeric goals for a condition in the receiving water for which compliance (with the TMDL and the water quality standards) have already been met. ( i.e. *“as long as the monitoring data continues to support compliance with water quality standards, no additional work to comply with the TMDL by the San Marcos HA Responsible Agencies is necessary.”*)

Note. If nutrients in Lake San Marcos or phosphorous in San Marcos Creek were to be chosen as the HPWQC, the City of Encinitas would need to develop its own separate HPWQC to work on within its jurisdiction because the City of Encinitas does not have any part of its jurisdiction that drains into San Marcos Creek or Lake San Marcos.

20. Table 18 includes a footnote “c” on the year 2021 in the second column, titled Interim Goad (2018-2023). It is unclear what information this is referring to. The ‘c’s” in the Note A and B do not apply. This may be a typo. Further evaluation of this table is needed.

21. (P. 82) Cottonwood Creek Drainage Basin Interim and Final Numeric Goals. See comment 19.
22. (P.84) City of San Marcos Focus Area – Since drainage from the four San Marcos sub-basins “*nearly all drain through Upper San Marcos Creek to Lake San Marcos*”, it appears that goals for this upper portion of San Marcos HA should be designed to address the priority water quality conditions of phosphorus and nutrients in San Marcos Creek and Lake San Marcos not bacteria at Moonlight Beach. The Responsible Agencies should consider establishing a HPWQC for the portion of the WMA that drains to San Marcos Creek and is impounded by Lake San Marcos so that the strategies and schedules are designed to address the reductions in phosphorus and nutrients not bacteria. Many of the strategies listed on pages 86, 87, and 88 may reduce the amount of phosphorus, nutrients, and bacteria since they are focused on effectively prohibiting non-storm water discharges (i.e. IRRP, property based inspections, and Irrigation Runoff/Water Waster Program) however, the highest priority water quality condition should be bacteria for this portion of the HA.
23. (p.98) See comment 17 as the same applies to the IRRP in the City of Solana Beach.
24. (P.99) Stormwater Treatment CDS Unit – This BMP is listed as a strategy that will “supplement its core jurisdictional program.” This BMP has been in operation since 2004. The Regional Board considers operation and maintain of this unit as part of its “core jurisdictional program” facilities and not a strategy that “will supplement” its core jurisdictional program.
25. (P.103) San Elijo Dry Weather Diversion - This BMP is listed as a strategy that will “supplement its core jurisdictional program.” This BMP has been in operation since 2013. The Regional Board considers operation and maintain of this unit as part of its “core jurisdictional program” facilities and not a strategy that “will supplement” its core jurisdictional program.
26. Table 24 La Granada Drainage Area, Interim and Final Numeric Goals – Interim and Final Goals are to, maintain the 5% reduction in dry weather flows and expand to other neighborhoods. Why isn’t the goal to go beyond 5% reduction of dry weather flows (a prohibited discharge per Order R9-2013-0001). La Granada was selected for its persistent flows from a major outfall, therefore why wouldn’t the efforts be continued to further reduce dry weather flow volume or number of storm drains with dry weather flows until all were eliminated?

27. Since the HPWQC is indicator bacteria for all of the focus areas in the Escondido Creek HA, and all of the goals Tables use the “general” schedule associated with TMDL accounting for preparation time to prepared, be reviewed and accepted, and begin implementation of the Water Quality Improvement Plan. Since Escondido Creek is not a water body (or any segments of it) identified in the TMDL why isn’t the schedule shorter? Most of the strategies listed to reduce concentrations of indicator bacteria in the MS4 discharge are associated with reductions in non-storm water discharges, focused inspections, HOA programs, incentive program, and irrigation reduction programs. It is expected that these programs shouldn’t take 24 years to implement and see results. Tying accomplishment of these goals to the TMDL compliance schedule should be reevaluated.