

**SAN LUIS REY WATERSHED MANAGEMENT AREA**  
**WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN WORKGROUP**

**MARCH 15, 2016, 10:00 – 12:00, MEETING SUMMARY**

---

MEETING ATTENDEES (\* indicates voting member)

- Jonathan Nottage\*, City of Vista
- Cynthia Mallett\*, City of Oceanside
- Amber Rogers\*, County of San Diego
- (absent – Caltrans)

---

AGENDA ITEM 3, APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 16 2016 MEETING SUMMARY (VOTE)

- VOTE – Cynthia moved to approve the February 16, 2016 meeting summary without revision, seconded by Jon; vote passed (3, 0, 1; yay, nay, absent) to approve summary without revision.

---

AGENDA ITEM 4, WQIP STATUS (DISCUSSION)

- Amber updated the group that the final WQIP has been prepared (i.e., the Errata items approved by the RWQCB have been incorporated into the WQIP), and is ready for submittal, pending receipt of signed certification pages from all PAs and getting the cover letter signed.
- ACTION ITEMS
  - Amber to route cover letter internally for signature
  - Vista to provide certification page

---

AGENDA ITEM 5, DRAFT FY16-17 WATERSHED WORKPLAN (DISCUSSION)

- Amber discussed the revisions to Task 2.5 Bacteria Monitoring that were made after the February meeting discussion – during review of the revised task, the group noted that additional text changes would further clarify the intent and details for two new subtasks (2.5.1 Bacteria TMDL Monitoring and 2.5.1 Bacteria Monitoring to Show Progress toward Achieving Lower River Goal).
- Amber noted that the cost for Task 3.1 Stormwater Resource Plan needs to be updated to match the decision made in January that we will assume that the County won't be awarded grant funding (so that the project may be funded regardless of grant funding).
- Amber noted that Task 4.5 should be retitled: San Luis Rey Watershed Management Area Section of Regional Monitoring and Assessment Report (i.e., switch the words "monitoring" and "assessment" to match the Permit's title for this report).
- As follow up to the February meeting (and subsequent email) regarding the differences between the approved budget and work plan budget, Amber solicited additional questions.

The following list was emailed on February 25 in response to the questions raised at the February meeting:

- In the approved budget worksheet, the erred formulas for %-share calculations were corrected for the workplan budget (for example, some rows used Oceanside 65%, Vista 5%, and County 35%, when the correct shares are Oceanside 64.94%, Vista 4.47%, and County 30.59%)
- In the approved budget worksheet, Oceanside's and Vista's *Sub-Total for All Tasks* values erroneously didn't include the Task 3 Sub-Total costs.
- The cost for Task 2.5 is greater because of the two additional monitoring sites needed to show progress towards our lower river goal.
- The cost for Task 3.1 is greater (doubled) because we're not assuming that the County will receive grant funding to support Stormwater Management Plan development.
- The cost for Task 4.4 is greater because the scope of work received from the consultant includes both "Data Quality & Management" and "CEDEN data formatting and submittal", whereas the approved budget only included costs for the latter part of this task.
- During discussion on the workplan Budget table in the workplan:
  - Amber noted that "TMDL" should be omitted from the Task 2.5 title
  - Amber asked the group whether we should omit the contingency line because it may confuse what the actual amount that can be billed to Oceanside and Vista is. Amber explained that the budget approved at the January meeting caps the amount that can be billed to Oceanside and Vista, and a subsequent vote would be required to increase the amount that can be billed; therefore, regardless of what the total cost in the budget table (includes sub-total for all tasks, plus 5% contract administration fee, plus 15% contingency), the voted/approved cap is what can be billed. Cynthia recommended that we vote by email regarding whether the 15% contingency line should be removed, and the group concurred.
- ACTION ITEMS
  - Amber to make edits discussed and re-send workplan to the group in Word file format
  - Amber to initiate email vote regarding keeping/omitting the 15% contingency line from the budget
  - Everyone to thoroughly review workplan and provide suggested edits in the Word file as tracked changes by April 11, 2016 so the workplan can be finalized at the April workgroup meeting

---

#### AGENDA ITEM 6, MONITORING UPDATES (DISCUSSION ITEM)

- No monitoring updates were reported.

---

#### AGENDA ITEM 7, PROGRAM PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES (DISCUSSION ITEM)

- Cynthia noted that she anticipates discussion on the Bacteria TMDL “reopener” at the upcoming PPS meeting (scheduled for March 17, 2016), and requested that this be added as an agenda item for the April meeting.
- The Bacteria TMDL “reopener” discussion segued to the topic of related studies including the related cost-benefit analysis and wet-weather surfer epidemiological study. The workgroup requested a link or copy of the epidemiological study report. [Amber followed up with Jo Ann – the epi study report will be shared once it is public; anticipated timing – later this summer]
- ACTION ITEMS
  - Amber to add Bacteria TMDL “reopener” to April agenda

---

#### AGENDA ITEM 8, OTHER ISSUES

- Amber announced that the March workgroup meeting would be her last, as she has resigned from the County, and that she anticipates that Ruth De la Rosa will take over, at least in the interim.
- Jon asked if other agencies are having trouble with the flow of the regional SWQMP template. He specifically asked if others plan to use the regional template, and noted the following issues they’re having with it as examples:
  - There’s a site design requirement to determine the feasibility of onsite stormwater reuse, but the order of the manual makes it awkward (calculation worksheet is at the end of manual)
  - Since most of the hydromodification BMPs and treatment control BMPs overlap, they’re finding it awkward that the sections of the manual on their selection are separated
  - The subject of critical course sediment comes up at the end of the steps, but it can redirect project scope/options early in planning.

---

#### AGENDA ITEM 9, NEXT RECURRING WORKGROUP MEETING

- The next workgroup meeting will be on April 19, 2016