Program Planning Subcommittee
WQIP Ad Hoc Subcommittee

Meeting Summary
September 2, 2020
Chairperson – Stephanie Gaines

MEETING ATTENDANCE		
☒ County of Orange **Cindy Rivers**	☒ City of San Marcos **Reed Thornberry**	☒ City of Poway **Tracy Beach**
☐ City of Santee **Cecilia Tipton**	☒ City of Imperial Beach **Wbaldo Arellano**	☒ City of Oceanside **Justin Gamble**
☒ City of Escondido **Alicia Appel**	☒ City of San Diego **Jim Harry, Brianna Menke**	☒ City of Chula Vista **Marisa Soriano**
☒ County of San Diego **Stephanie Gaines Ruth de la Rosa Bri Martin Andrea Araujo Chelsea McGimpsey**	☒ City of Coronado **Jessie Powell**	☐ Port of San Diego **Stephanie Bauer**
	☒ City of El Cajon **John Phillips**	☒ Cities of Del Mar and Solana Beach **Kelly Ogawa**
	☒ City of Carlsbad **Tim Murphy, Vivi Stevens**	☒ City of National City **Carla Hutchinson**
		☒ Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District **Rebekah Guill, Matt Yeager**
☒ Wood **Matt Rich, Brenda Stevens, Sarah Seifert, Kristina Hysler, Francesca de Leon, Roshan Christoph**	☒ City of Vista **Jon Nottage, Jillian Amaya**	☐ City of Encinitas **Paul Maechler**
☒ Larry Walker Associates **Paul Hartman**	☒ Dudek **Bryn Evans**	☒ Tetra Tech **Alison Vargas**
☒ D-Max Engineering, Inc. **John Quenzer**	☒ Weston Solutions **Sheri Dister**	☒ Michael Baker International **Sophia Barron (Meeting Secretary)**

1.   Call to Order

Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) called the meeting to order at 1:04 PM.

2.   Roll Call

Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) asked meeting attendees to use the chat function on WebEx to enter their name and affiliation for roll call.

3.   Opportunity for Members of the Public to Speak (1:05)

No members of the public requested to speak at the meeting.

4.   Review/Accept June Meeting Summary

For the June meeting summary, no one requested revisions or opposed acceptance of them. A total of ten approvals were tallied via the chat function for approval of the June Meeting Summary.

17   **MOTION: Approve June Meeting Summary. (APPROVED)**

18   • Moved by: Alicia Appel (City of Escondido)

19   • Seconded by: John Phillips (City of El Cajon)

20   **5.   Regional Reduced WQIP Annual Reporting**

21   Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) provided background on the requested reporting relief from the
22   Regional Board, which was granted to some degree and was discussed at the last Program Planning
23   Subcommittee (PPS) meeting in August. The Regional Board explained in an email that Copermittees can
24   reduce the overall narrative in Water Quality Improvement Plan (WQIP) Annual Reports and already
25   have the autonomy to do so according to the MS4 Permit. Thus, Copermittees can be more focused and
26   strategic with how they report by being more direct with key provisions of the Permit. The Regional
27   Board also provided relief of conducting land use/C-value calculations. They agreed that Copermittees
28   can provide the necessary data but do not currently need to perform any extrapolations, saving time
29   and effort. It was agreed at the last PPS meeting in August to use this WQIP Ad Hoc Subcommittee
30   meeting as an opportunity to discuss how to strategize for and streamline the WQIP Annual Report this
31   year.

32   The primary goal of this meeting is to:

33   *Develop approach that describes areas in the Annual Reports that can be developed in a reduced,*
34   *strategic, and focused manner, and respond to comments received from the Regional Board.*

35   Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) explained that this is a space to discuss/share ideas to
36   streamline Annual Reporting, but each watershed's Annual Report is not meant to be mirror copies of
37   each other. Stephanie went through the Permit Provisions attachment that was sent out to the group, to
38   discuss any proposed revisions or ideas for streamlining reporting of Provisions A – F of the Permit, in
39   addition to the Executive Summary, Body, and Appendices of the Annual Report.

40   **Provision A:** No comments from the group.

41   **Provision B:**

42   Kristina Hysler (Wood) spoke about the summary of goals tables of the Annual Report, and how it would
43   be beneficial for each jurisdiction to showcase their progress in a tabular format, as well as to decrease
44   the narrative before the goals tables.

45   Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) suggested that adding a column for adaptive management in
46   either the strategies table, priority water quality conditions (PWQCs) table, or other similar table, could
47   help streamline the Adaptive Management section of the Annual Report, remove redundancy and better
48   integrate information, rather than having siloed sections. Kristina Hysler (Wood) asked if having
49   adaptive management columns in tables would replace information that is provided in the Adaptive
50   Management section. Stephanie answered that it could potentially replace information if that is what
51   Copermittees decide to do. An additional column for adaptive management could make the strategies
52   table more useful and streamline the process by directly tying a strategy to what needs to be changed in
53   the adaptive management process, instead of having an entire additional section.

54   A member from the group mentioned that changing a PWQC does not seem like it occurs often enough
55   to report in an Annual Report. Kelly Ogawa (Cities of Del Mar and Solana Beach) agreed with this
56   statement and responded that it is not appropriate to report on potential changes to PWQCs on an annual
57   basis, due to a need to look at pollutant data on a longer timescale.

58   Sheri Dister (Weston Solutions) agreed with Stephanie's approach to Adaptive Management and spoke
59   about the idea of not compartmentalizing the Annual Report, but rather integrating sections for
60   increased cohesion of the report by reducing the redundancy in the presentation of information.

61   **Provision D:**

62   Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) explained that Permit Provision D is the bulk of the Annual
63   Report, and that the regulatory relief granted by the Regional Board partly pertains to Provision D (i.e. C-
64   value calculations).

65   Sheri Dister (Weston Solutions) asked if Copermittees can assume that the audience is primarily the
66   Regional Board, so that background and context can be cut out of the Annual Report. She suggested to
67   reduce background that is found in the Permit, WQIP, or information that is understood by regulators.
68   Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) responded that when the Permit was reissued, it seemed like
69   there was a strong desire from regulators that reports be publicly readable/acceptable. With new staff
70   at the Regional Board, it now seems like regulators would rather only see data and results, rather than
71   all contextual background (i.e. watershed description), so Stephanie agrees with Sheri on reducing the
72   public narrative.

73   Kristina Hysler (Wood) spoke with Jim Harry and Brianna Menke of the City of San Diego the morning of
74   this meeting about the idea of having the monitoring section consist of 2-3 tables for the current
75   monitoring period and a primary table that summarizes all monitoring conducted over the last 5 years,
76   with a link to the section in the monitoring appendix that provides all details. A separate table would
77   have details for monitoring of the highest priority water quality conditions (HPWQCs). Stephanie Gaines
78   (County of San Diego) asked the group if this approach seems more feasible, which aims to reduce
79   overall narrative and background, and instead presents data in a tabular format. Kristina Hysler (Wood)
80   agreed that this approach made sense, and that all monitoring information would be located in the
81   monitoring appendix. Tables in the narrative would contain references to the location with the details of
82   the data, whereas only results would be presented in the tables in the narrative. Stephanie agreed with
83   this approach but acknowledged that this should not take away the autonomy and creativity of
84   Copermittees implementing their own unique techniques or key projects. However, it is clear that
85   regulators seem to be more interested in the data and results.

86   Brianna Menke (City of San Diego) said that the City spoke with Kristina Hysler (Wood) about preliminary
87   calculations provided by Wood staff about the additional request from the Regional Board regarding the
88   graphical presentation of historical loading of persistently flowing outfalls (flows lasting more than 2
89   years). This is currently not required by the Permit, but the Regional Board included this task in their
90   email response to regulatory relief. Wood estimate that the level of effort required to complete this task
91   would be substantial, making any thought of cost savings moot. Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego)
92   noted that the County performed a similar assessment. Matt Rich (Wood) said that this request would
93   result in numerous additional graphs (in the thousands), and that combining pollutants of concern onto
94   the same graph would need to be done manually. If this is so, there would be thousands of graphs,

95   which would not have much benefit for regulators to look at or for Copermittees to produce (increases
96   level of effort and costs). Sheri Dister (Weston Solutions) does not think there is value in graphing the
97   calculated pollutant loads for every outfall, in particular for wet weather. She suggested a compromise
98   by giving the Regional Board raw data so they can manipulate the data how they see fit, rather than
99   viewing static graphs and tables. Matt Rich (Wood) does not think the Regional Board intended for
100   additional level of effort from the Copermittees. Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) will work with
101   Sheri Dister (Weston Solutions), Kristina Hysler (Wood), and Matt Rich (Wood) on a response to Regional
102   Board regarding a request for clarification of data required for historical loading at persistently flowing
103   outfalls (flows lasting more than 2 years).

104   **Provision E:** This is already a small section with no information to realistically streamline. No comments
105   from the group.

106   **Provision F:**

107   Brianna Menke (City of San Diego) suggested that the jurisdictional highlights section could be handled
108   in-house with each respective jurisdiction and watershed groups writing their own highlights, rather
109   than having consultants write them, reducing hand-off and communications between jurisdictions and
110   consultants. Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) provided three options with regards to the
111   jurisdictional highlights:

112   1) Remove completely from the Annual Report;
113   2) Have an abridged version and refer to the strategies appendix for details; or
114   3) Keep highlights but complete in-house for cost savings.

115   Stephanie explained that there is a lot of narrative in highlight tables that can be reduced. She showed
116   the group an example highlights table from John Quenzer (D-Max). The highlights table contains an
117   image, brief description, associated strategy number, and high priority water quality condition
118   addressed. The County proposed using an approach similar to this for their Annual Report. John clarified
119   that the text in the table Stephanie showed can be reduced even more, and be around 1-2 pages total
120   depending on the watershed.

121   Scott Norris (County of San Diego) voiced his support for this table, as he worked with D-Max to create
122   it. Last year the strategies document was 15-20 pages so this is definitely a reduction. Scott said the
123   Regional Board seems like they have been swinging back and forth from wanting to showcase project
124   highlights to having a dense and detailed presentation of projects. Therefore, Copermittees need to be
125   cautious of having too little or too much information, and should rather aim for a balanced approach.
126   Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) also chimed in, noting that the Regional Board wanted the
127   Annual Report to be publicly accessible and easy to digest, which was the purpose of the project
128   highlights. With new staff at the Regional Board, it now seems like regulators would rather only see data
129   and results, as discussed previously. Stephanie suggested that now Copermittees can primarily focus on
130   presenting the data, rather than narrative. The goal is for the main body to present the highlights with a
131   reduction in the general narrative, whereas all of the details can be captured in the in appendices.

132   Jessie Powell (City of Coronado) asked via the chat function if this sample strategy list could be sent out
133   to the group. Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) will distribute the project highlights table
134   developed by D-Max to Copermittees.

135 **Attachment E**

136 Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) assumed that there would be no suggestions for TMDL
137 streamlining since it is required.

138 Sheri Dister (Weston Solutions) wished to discuss the April 2020 interim deadline among other
139 watersheds. Because of the April 4th interim compliance date, which does not match the monitoring
140 year, the entirety of the dry season will not be assessed. She asked, "How are other watershed groups
141 approaching this or presenting data? Will groups perform both kinds of assessments (entire monitoring
142 year and dry weather)?"

143 Roshan Christoph (Wood) responded that they will not be conducting additional assessments, but will
144 complete annual assessments normally as done in previous years. Cindy Rivers (County of Orange) also
145 said that Orange County will not be doing anything different and will continue to complete assessments
146 as they have done in the past. Rebekah Guill (Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation
147 District) said that Riverside does not have this TMDL requirement, but has an Investigative Order, in
148 which they provide monthly reports, however, they do not need to provide anything for the interim
149 deadline.

150 **Executive Summary**

151 Sheri Dister (Weston Solutions) said there is still value to have narrative and background of the
152 watershed, however, everyone has different opinions on this and it is more a matter of preference.

153 Rebekah Guill (Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District) asked if there needs to be
154 a reference in the introduction of the Annual Report that Copermittees have allowance from the
155 Regional Board to streamline/reduce narrative. Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) responded that
156 the decision is up to the respective watersheds, however, the Regional Board articulated in their email
157 response that Copermittees are within their own right (based on the permit) to do so. However, with
158 regards to the C-value relief, it should be acknowledged that the Regional Board provided this regulatory
159 relief, as described previously relief. Rebekah said it is a good reminder to state in the report that it is
160 not a typical reporting year, and that there are changes in how they are reporting compared to past
161 reports.

162 Ruth de la Rosa (County of San Diego) said the San Diego River watershed had a meeting after reporting
163 relief email, and discussed the Executive Summary on a watershed level. For the San Diego River
164 watershed, they plan to streamline the Executive Summary for watershed background (i.e. size of 3
165 square miles), as well as reduce redundancy (have links to goals tables), streamline strategy highlights,
166 and reduce the monitoring section in the other parts of the Annual Report.

167 Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) suggested that the November PPS meeting be held as a forum
168 to discuss a few Annual Report examples from different watersheds and to see what various watershed
169 approaches and reductions look like in respective Annual Report. Stephanie will add WQIP Annual
170 Report Copermittee streamline examples to the November PPS meeting agenda.

171 **Examples of reduced reporting:**

172 • Dashboard approach

173   o   Kristina Hysler (Wood) spoke with the City of San Diego on ways to present monitoring data.
174   Looking at the current permit requirements will dictate how to report and present data. The
175   new permit will dictate how the reporting process will change.

176   •   Tabular approach
177   o   Sheri Dister (Weston Solutions) agreed with Kristina Hysler (Wood) to create a more tabular
178   view with monitoring elements (i.e. results in columns, with reference to details in
179   appendix) as previously discussed.
180   o   Rebekah Guill (Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District) asked if the
181   tabular approach would be shown in the body or appendices. The idea is that a high level
182   summary would be provided in the body with links to details located in the appendices.

183   •   Strategies tables
184   o   Rebekah Guill (Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District) and Stephanie
185   Gaines (County of San Diego) said the strategies tables is the same concept as the goals
186   tables, with the tabular approach and having an Adaptive Management column.
187   o   Cindy Rivers (County of Orange) spoke on Orange County's approach. Orange County uses
188   the main body for a high level summary of strategies, with combined highlights from all
189   jurisdictions. The appendices have tables listed by jurisdiction and HPWQC, and include a
190   more detailed summary. Cindy will send an example of Orange County's WQIP Annual
191   Report jurisdictional strategies and highlights to Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego), for
192   distribution amongst Copermittees.

193   •   WQIP Letter/adaptive management responses for 2021 – which topics are being addressed?
194   o   Kristina Hysler (Wood) spoke on behalf of the City of San Diego; San Dieguito watershed
195   responses are due in 2021, while Los Peñasquitos watershed responses are due in 2022, so
196   the City may withhold a response for Los Peñasquitos this year.
197   o   Ruth de la Rosa (County of San Diego) spoke for the San Luis Rey and San Diego River
198   watersheds; both watershed groups agree with tackling the simpler items early (to be
199   included in this year's Annual Report), even though responses are not due until 2022. Topics
200   include regional items, ecological reserves, homeless encampments, biofilms, surfer health
201   study, etc.
202   o   Sarah Seifert (Wood) spoke for the San Diego Bay and Tijuana River watersheds; responses
203   are due in 2021. Watershed-specific responses will be completed this year, while regional
204   topic responses are being gathered and are due in 2022.
205   o   Carlsbad watershed responses are due in 2021. Responses are focused on the WQIP update
206   and Annual Report, but responses will be included for all items

207 **6.   Action Items and Next Steps**

208 Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) reviewed the action items for this meeting.

#	Action	Responsible Party(ies)	Due Date
1	Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) to work with Sheri Dister (Weston Solutions), Kristina Hysler (Wood), and Matt Rich (Wood) on response to Regional Board regarding clarification of data required for historical loading at persistently (> 2 years) flowing outfalls.	Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego)	ASAP
2	Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) to distribute project highlights table developed by D-Max to Copermittees.	Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego)	ASAP
3	Cindy Rivers (County of Orange) to send example of WQIP Annual Report jurisdictional strategies and highlights to Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego), to distribute amongst Copermittees.	Cindy Rivers (County of Orange) and Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego)	ASAP
4	Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) to add WQIP Annual Report Copermittee streamline examples to November PPS meeting agenda. Copermittees to inform Stephanie and Bri Martin if they are interested in providing an example from their watershed.	Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego)	11/11/20

209

210 **7.   Future Meetings and Ad Hoc Subcommittee Support**

211 The next Program Planning Subcommittee meeting is scheduled for September 17 from 1:30 to 3:30 PM.

212 Copermittees are asked to provide agenda topics well in advance of the meeting, not later than close of

213 business on September 10 (one week before the meeting). Copermittees that are interested in

214 addressing certain topics can do so at PPS meetings without incurring additional costs for separate

215 meeting topics.

216 The meeting was adjourned at 2:59 PM.