

1 Program Planning Subcommittee

2 WQIP Ad Hoc Subcommittee

3 Meeting Summary

4 March 4, 2020

5 Chairperson – Stephanie Gaines

Meeting Participants					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	County of San Diego <b>Jo Ann Weber</b> <b>Stephanie Gaines</b> <b>Ruth de la Rosa</b> <b>Brianna Martin</b> <b>Chelsea McGimpsey</b> <b>Neil Searing</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	City of Coronado <b>Jessie Powell</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Port of San Diego <b>Stephanie Bauer</b>
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	City of El Cajon <b>John Phillips</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	City of Imperial Beach <b>Chris Helmer</b>
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	City of San Diego <b>Jim Harry</b> <b>Brianna Menke</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cities of Del Mar and Solana Beach <b>Kelly Ogawa</b>
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	City of San Marcos <b>Reed Thornberry</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	City of Poway <b>Tracy Beach</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	City of Carlsbad <b>Tim Murphy</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	City of Escondido <b>Alicia Appel, Juan Magdaraog</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	City of Oceanside <b>Justin Gamble</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	City of Santee <b>Cecilia Tipton</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	City of Chula Vista <b>Marisa Soriano</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District <b>Rebekah Guill</b>				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Larry Walker & Associates <b>Paul Hartman</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dudek <b>Bryn Evans</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Wood <b>Matt Rich, Kristina Hysler, Sarah Seifert, Katherine Sharp</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	D-Max Engineering, Inc. <b>John Quenzer</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Weston Solutions <b>Sheri Dister</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Secretary <b>Miguel Avalos (Michael Baker International)</b>

6 Meeting Called to Order at 1:03 PM

7 Purpose and Goals of Meeting

8 Purpose of the meeting is to provide a forum to review and discuss Regional Board comments contained  
9 in Attachment 1 of the FY 17-18 Water Quality Improvement Plan Annual Report Review letters to  
10 evaluate the best ways to approach each comment.

11 The goals of the meeting are to identify:

- 12 • Appropriate scale to address each comment (i.e., jurisdictional, watershed, regional);
- 13 • Adaptive Management Topics already addressed in the FY18-19 WQIP Annual Reports;
- 14 • Comments to potentially be addressed by other groups (e.g., Regional Monitoring Ad Hoc);
- 15 • Comments that may require strategic, regulatory, and/or technical support;
- 16 • Future topics of discussion for the WQIP Ad Hoc Subcommittee (Subcommittee).

17 If this meeting runs long, an additional meeting can be set up.

18 [Review of Attachment 1 Comments Table](#)

19 Discussion revolved around the WQIP Adaptive Management Topics table, which is a tool for the  
20 Copermittees to use moving forward. Stephanie Gaines reviewed the table headings (columns) for the  
21 Copermittees:

- 22 • “Regional Board Clarification” contains information from the Regional Board.
- 23 • “Addressed in FY 18-19 WQIP AR?” indicates whether the topic was addressed during last year’s  
24 annual report; please review to ensure topics were addressed in the last WQIP Annual Reports.
- 25 • “JUR,” “WMA,” and “REG” indicate the scale at which the issues are anticipated to be  
26 addressed. The Ad Hoc Subcommittee will focus on those that are identified as regional in  
27 context.
- 28 • “Support Required” includes both technical and political support and is intended to identify  
29 support needed for the action. Response is expected on these.
- 30 • Rows that are shaded grey are assumed to be completed as they were covered in the FY18-19  
31 WQIP Annual Reports.

32 [Strategy](#)

33 It was determined best to review the table by Topic (row) and identify the scale and priority each topic  
34 should be addressed:

- 35 • Topic 1: Adaptive Management General Topics (Att. 1, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph): Completed.
- 36 • Topic 2: Coordination with Water and Sewer Agency Planning and Projects (Att. 1 – Section 10):  
37 Address at Watershed and jurisdictional scale, not regional.
- 38 • Topic 3: Identification of Controllable and Uncontrollable Sources (Att. 1 – Section 2): Identified  
39 on table as jurisdictional, but Copermittees identified there is value in analyzing at a regional  
40 scale to ensure consistency in interpretation.
- 41 • Topic 4: Agricultural Orders Update and Assessment (Att. 1 – Section 3): Address at a Watershed  
42 or Jurisdictional scale, as noted:
  - 43 ○ Include Geotracker Information: Jurisdictional and Watershed
  - 44 ○ Assessment of facilities in Agricultural Orders: Jurisdictional and Watershed
  - 45 ○ Inspections: Jurisdictional
- 46 Agriculture topics will not be addressed in this Ad Hoc Subcommittee.
- 47 • Topic 5: Coordination of WQIP HPWQCs, PWQCs, and Strategies with WMA Ecological Reserve  
48 Goals and Projects (Att. 1 – Section 4): Address at Jurisdictional and watershed scale.
- 49 • Topic 6: Storm Drain Biofilms Source of Bacteria (Att. 1 – Section 5): Identified at a Regional  
50 scale, and as a topic that will be covered by the Regional Monitoring Ad Hoc Subcommittee to

51 determine the right course of action. Will not be addressed further in this Ad Hoc  
52 Subcommittee.

- 53 • Topic 7: Update of 303(d) Listings (Att. 1 – Section 6): Address at Watershed and Regional scale.  
54 Ad Hoc Subcommittee identified this topic as potentially addressing at a Regional scale, using  
55 consultant support.
- 56 • Topic 8: Over-Irrigation Findings (Att. 1 – Section 7): Some deficiencies were addressed within  
57 the Annual reports (see grey items in table). As this topic is a specific, non-structural BMP, it is a  
58 Jurisdictional or Watershed topic, not to be addressed at a Regional scale.
- 59 • Topic 9: Persistent Flow in MS4 Outfalls – Groundwater or Water Agency Maintenance Source  
60 Identification (Att. 1 – Section 8): Address at a Watershed or Jurisdictional scale.
- 61 • Topic 10: Monitoring Inconsistencies – Use of C Value (Att. 1 – Section 9.a): This topic has  
62 already been referred to the Regional Monitoring Ad Hoc Subcommittee. No need to discuss  
63 further at this meeting.
- 64 • Topic 11: Monitoring Inconsistencies - Fecal Indicator Bacteria (Att. 1 – Section 9.c): Address at a  
65 Watershed scale.
- 66 • Topic 12: Monitoring Inconsistencies – Appropriate Use of Surfer Health Study (SHS) Results (Att.  
67 1 – Section 9.d): Address at a Watershed scale.
- 68 • Topic 13: Homeless Encampments (Att. 1 – Section 1): Address at a Jurisdictional and/or  
69 Watershed scale, not to be addressed at regional scale.

#### 70 *Topics for Regional Discussion*

71 The topics identified for regional discussion were:

- 72 • Controllable and uncontrollable sources
- 73 • Update of 303(d) listings
- 74 • Storm Drain Biofilms Source of Bacteria (referred to Regional Monitoring Ad Hoc Subcommittee)
- 75 • Monitoring Inconsistencies – Use of C Value (referred to Regional Monitoring Ad Hoc  
76 Subcommittee)

#### 77 *Controllable and Uncontrollable Sources*

78 One way to address the issue is to use alternative language (e.g., not use the specific word  
79 “uncontrollable”). Current drafts already include the term “uncontrollable” and have made a specific  
80 distinction in controllable and uncontrollable sources. In JRMPs, uncontrollable sources must be listed;  
81 therefore, it is difficult to change the language used. JRMPs can be specific to what is uncontrollable and  
82 watersheds can decide which ones should be considered uncontrollable. One example that was  
83 discussed was discharges from facilities enrolled in the Agricultural Orders; these sources were  
84 previously considered to be uncontrollable, but based on recent correspondences with the Regional

85 Board, they are considering these to be controllable. Other uncontrollable sources could include Phase 2  
86 MS4 properties or sources covered by other permits in the watershed.

87 One potential “uncontrollable” source is groundwater. Some jurisdictions are working with water  
88 agencies, but find they are only required to cite discharges one acre-foot (43, 560 gallons) or more.  
89 Some discharge a lot of water but do not reach the acre-foot quantity.

90 Private property is within its own authority. This may need to be clarified regionally or rely on the  
91 Regional Board’s definitions.

92 The Santa Margarita River WMA WQIP does not include the words “controllable” and “uncontrollable.”  
93 The Permit requires assessment to categorize discharges but does not discern between controllable or  
94 uncontrollable.

95 The question is two-fold: where are these uncontrollable sources located, and what strategies can be  
96 implemented to eliminate them? Watersheds could reference the Permit section for uncontrollable  
97 sources, show work and coordination with other agencies, and identify allowable ones. Paul Hartman  
98 will help gather a list of what is already identified as uncontrollable in the WQIPs or WQIP Annual  
99 Reports, check the Permit language, and give cases on how to handle it. He will provide an update either  
100 at a future Subcommittee meeting or Program Planning Subcommittee (PPS) meeting.

#### 101 *Update of 303(d) Listings*

102 The 303(d) listing in the WQIP is to be updated to the most current OAL approved 303(d) list as of  
103 January 31, 2021, and the WQIP must include an assessment of potential changes to the selected  
104 priority water quality conditions or highest priority water quality conditions based on the revised list.  
105 Because of ongoing debate, the Copermittees reached consensus to address this by completing  
106 assessment this year based on approved lists and including a placeholder to update it in the future once  
107 updated lists are approved. Upcoming approvals can be anticipated and indicated they will be  
108 implemented via adaptive management.

109 The next WQIP annual reports need to start looking at new constituents and have them, whether they  
110 are high or regular priority, to provide a conservative approach.

111 It is possible some 303(d) list updates may result in regional issues for discussion. Paul Hartman will  
112 follow up.

#### 113 *Potential Topics for Future Meetings*

- 114 • Review Regional Board comments in the bodies of the FY17-18 WQIP Annual Report Review  
115 letters. Paul Hartman to report findings from first task identified.
- 116 • Annual report formatting, with potentially a new approach at the regional or watershed level.
  - 117 ○ Regional Board input would be helpful to make sure annual reports include what the  
118 Regional Board really wants to know.
  - 119 ○ Copermittees could provide examples from around the State where reporting has been  
120 streamlined (e.g., Central Valley, Los Angeles).

- 121       • Possible discussion of updates to WQIP that are not annual. This would be an appropriate  
122           agenda item for a PPS meeting of at a future Subcommittee meeting.
- 123    Email or call with questions, or add items to next meeting.
- 124    **Meeting adjourned at 2:36 PM.**