San Diego Regional Stormwater Copermittees
Land Development Workgroup

Meeting Notes

Date	Location	Agenda Summary
February 27, 2018 Start time: 9:00 a.m. End time: 11:00 p.m.	County of San Diego 5510 Overland Avenue, Room 471 San Diego, CA 92123	• Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes • Announcements and Future Events • Non-Agenda Public Comment • LDW Program Updates and Action Items 　○ BMP Design Manual Task 　○ Alternative Compliance Tools Task 　○ FY 17-18 Second Quarter Expenditures

Meeting Attendance:　　　　　　　　　　　Number of Voting Copermittees Represented: 12

☒	City of Escondido **Juan Magdaraog**	☐	City of Chula Vista **Boushra Salem**	☒	City of Coronado **Rosanna Lacarra**	☐	City of Del Mar **Francesca de Leon**
☒	City of Santee **Scott Johnson**	☐	City of Lemon Grove **Malik Tamimi**	☐	City of San Marcos **Doug Dowden**	☒	City of Poway **Tracy Beach**
☒	Port of San Diego **Christian Braun**	☐	City of Vista **Michael Hilker**	☒	City of National City **Tad Nakatani**	☒	City of El Cajon **Craig Bonner**
☒	City of San Diego **Raymond Ngo**	☒	City of Carlsbad **Jeremy Riddle Kyrenne Chua Jennifer Horodyski**	☒	City of Oceanside **Ryan Rodman Mike Strizic**	☒	County of San Diego **Jon Van Rhyn René Vidales Sheri McPherson Charles Mohrlock Reynaldo Pellos**
☒	City of Encinitas **Jesse Owens**	☐	Amec Foster Wheeler* **David Arthur**	☒	Contech* **Noel Thurston**	☒	Excel Engineering* **Samuel Bellomio**
☒	Geosyntec* **Venkat Gummadi**					☒	Michael Baker Int'l* **Miguel Avalos (Secretary)**

One vote per Copermittee.
*Indicates non-voting representative

1. Introductions

Attendees introduced themselves. René Vidales (County of San Diego) stated that these meetings will most likely continue to be conducted on a bimonthly basis from here on out.

1   **2.   Approval of the Minutes for the November 28, 2017 meeting**

2   A single edit to the previous meeting notes was proposed which involved replacing Charles'
3   name with Christian as the correct representative referenced on page 4, line 30.

4   *MOTION:* Approve of the November 28, 2017 meeting minutes as amended **(APPROVED)**

5   ◆   Moved by: Mike Strizic (City of Oceanside)
6   ◆   Seconded by: Rosanna Lacarra (City of Coronado)
7   ◆   Vote: 11-0 in favor, 0 abstention (note that one voting representative arrived after the
8   vote)

9   **3.   Announcements & Future Events**

10   René announced the 2018 Creek to Bay Cleanup event is scheduled for Saturday April 21st from
11   9 AM to 12 PM. Registration for this event opens April 1st.   Information is available at:
12   http://www.creektobay.org/index.php?option=com_wrapper&view=wrapper&Itemid=2

13   **4.   Non-Agenda Public Comments**

14   None

15   **5.   LDW Program Updates and Action Items**

16   *a.   BMP Design Manual and Help Desk Task*

17   Several cities were well-represented at the previous Ad Hoc meeting on February 20th. The
18   previous public review period spanned January 8th to February 8th and the public workshop was
19   very well attended with about 200 people. The responses to comments generated during the
20   public review period have already been finalized. A preliminary timeline was established to
21   outline the schedule for the remaining tasks. Under this schedule, a final draft of the BMP
22   design manual will be approved on March 19th, and the final version is expected to be ready for
23   distribution by April 11th. The County clarified that despite these deadlines, the implementation
24   of the manual within each individual jurisdiction is up to the discretion of the respective party.

25   Venkat Gummadi (Geosyntec) further elaborated on recent developments. He noted that, due
26   to the concentrated efforts to address the public review comments, additional comments
27   submitted to the Help Desk will be responded to in a timely manner following the end of the
28   BMP design manual review. Venkat explained among the major issues presented were pollutant
29   control, onsite alternative compliance, and hydromodification flow control. The manual was
30   prepared to allow for added flexibility and inclusiveness, ultimately granting jurisdictions more
31   discretion, especially in matters that vary widely. Additionally, updates to the geotechnical
32   sections aim to clarify that full infiltration is not required at every site. After discussion with
33   Regional Board staff, varying soil conditions are more widely considered for infiltration
34   purposes; this would be particularly beneficial for smaller jurisdictions.

1   René added to the other topics addressed at the meeting. The BMP sizing calculator will again
2   be updated to reflect the updated requirements in orifice size. The update is expected along
3   with the April 11th deadline, which will allow for the revisions to also be reflected on the manual.
4   As for the BSM Survey Memo distribution to supplier, Venkat added that the main issue with the
5   media is the export of nutrients. The current aim is to update the soil media used to avoid this
6   issue. The study has been conducted and will be distributed to the supplier.

7   René touched base on the issue of applying updated requirements to projects currently under
8   review and how it should be handled. The group agreed it should be at the discretion of each
9   individual jurisdiction. The topic is further complicated due to the differing County and City
10 manuals. The County clarified that the new manual is less restrictive, but it would be challenging
11 to have two sets of manuals that would include the current and the updated manual. The group
12 discussed that projects already in the pipeline would be particularly affected and ultimately
13 agreed some sort of grace period for implementation should be granted.

14 Venkat provided a handout that highlighted the items that vary throughout different
15 jurisdictions. The handout is meant to clearly identify these areas of conflict. Sheri McPherson
16 (County of San Diego) mentioned it would be beneficial to include this document in the finalized
17 manual as a reference; the group agreed.

18 Venkat clarified that BMP design manual is not enforceable but rather simply serves as a model
19 to be built upon. The enforceable version would be the jurisdictions' own, after they update the
20 model to reflect their standards.

21 Jeremy Riddle (City of Carlsbad) asked if there is any sample language available to be
22 implemented now, particularly for the areas of conflict. He suggested providing a template for
23 the model with fill-in boxes that would facilitate the adoption process. The group agreed that
24 could be helpful.
25
26 Sheri touched back to the recent updates, noting that developers will have a difficult time
27 dealing with the inconsistencies. René agreed and suggested the final model must clearly state
28 that developers will need to contact individual jurisdictions for their specific requirements. This
29 emphasizes the need to agree on an implementation schedule that will avoid these
30 complications for developers.

31 Rosanna Lacarra (City of Coronado) suggested the group determine a "bottom line" final date
32 for implementing changes, and that Copermittees be allowed to implement on more aggressive
33 schedules if they choose to do so. This approach will allow those jurisdictions not yet ready or
34 unable to adopt the new model with more time to integrate it. However, it would not impede
35 those that are ready. The group agreed there should be a final deadline for adoption.
36 Copermittees are to provide an estimate of their jurisdiction's expected adoption date at the
37 next meeting when the discussion is continued.

1   Sheri asked if anyone not planning to update their manuals. Jesse Owens (City of Encinitas)
2   explains that they will opt to not update due to the lack of resources, noting that it is not a
3   Regional Board requirement. He hopes the City of Encinitas can begin the adoption process late
4   in the year.

5   Jon Van Rhyn (County of San Diego) also asked if anyone is planning to provide more extensive
6   updates. He brought up the issue in case setting a deadline will not allow for any greater
7   revisions. The County is the only jurisdiction that is contemplating it. In that case, Jon agreed it
8   would be best to phase the County's plan for integration as to not hinder the other groups.

9   *b.   Alternative Compliance Tools Task*

10   Raymond Ngo (City of San Diego) provided an update of the City of San Diego's Alternative
11   Compliance Program. The discussion included the need to process a Program Environmental
12   Impact Report (PEIR), which could delay the schedule until next fiscal year due to funding. The
13   scope is currently being prepared. René asked if a public scoping meeting would be organized,
14   noting that it is an opportunity for the public to give input into the scope and state any
15   concerns; also the PEIR allows for impacts to be analyzed and mitigation measures to be
16   implemented. Raymond stated he would need to verify, and he would provide an update soon.
17   The City of San Diego explained that they are working on additional updates, including
18   improvements to maintenance sections. Additional templates are also being incorporated. A
19   multi-department review would be required which more than likely would have the draft be
20   eventually amended.

21   Charles Mohrlock (County of San Diego) continued with an update on Water Quality Equivalency
22   and TAC, explaining they are in the process of finalizing the document. It is planned to be
23   released for a 30-day review period early in April. A workshop is scheduled for April 9th, in
24   anticipation of a May 2nd deadline. Comments are planned to be addressed thereafter,
25   ultimately finalizing the document in early June. Sheri asked if it will be submitted to the
26   Regional Board at that time. Charles explained it is uncertain because their review depends on
27   the comments received during the public review period. A conservative estimate will have the
28   document finalized early in the next fiscal year, which will require an additional month for the
29   board to review.

30   *c.   FY 17-18 Second Quarter Expenditures*

31   Expenditures for the second quarter include meeting support, the BMP Design Manual, Help
32   Desk Support, and the Alternative Compliance Tools.

33   *MOTION:* Approve FY 17-18 Second Quarter Expenditures for $45,069.70 **(APPROVED)**

34   ◆   Moved by: Jeremy Riddle (City of Carlsbad)
35   ◆   Seconded by: Tracy Beach (City of Poway)

1   ♦ Vote: 12-0 in favor, 0 abstention

2   **6.   Action Items**

Action Item	Responsible Party	Timeline
1. Copermittees to provide an estimate of their respective jurisdiction's adoption timeline of the update to the BMP Design Manual to be discussed at the next meeting.	All Copermittees	04/24/2018

3   **7.   Next Meeting**

4   The next LDW meeting is scheduled for Tuesday April 24th, 2018. These meetings will be shorter
5   and less frequent through the end of the fiscal year as the majority of the group's work is
6   coming to a close.