

**San Diego Regional Stormwater Copermittees  
Land Development Workgroup**

***Meeting Notes***

<b>Date</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Agenda Summary</b>
April 24, 2018 Start time: 1:00 p.m. End time: 3:30 p.m.	County of San Diego 5510 Overland Avenue, Room 472 San Diego, CA 92123	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes</li> <li>• Announcements and Future Events</li> <li>• Non-Agenda Public Comment</li> <li>• LDW Program Updates and Action Items               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ BMP Design Manual Task</li> <li>○ Alternative Compliance Tools Task</li> <li>○ FY 17-18 Third Quarter Expenditures</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**Meeting Attendance:**

Number of Voting Copermittees Represented: 12

- |   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of Escondido<br><b>Juan Magdaraog</b>  | <input type="checkbox"/> City of Chula Vista<br><b>Boushra Salem</b>                             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of Coronado<br><b>Jessie Powell</b>                       | <input type="checkbox"/> City of Del Mar<br><b>Francesca de Leon</b>   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of Santee<br><b>Scott Johnson</b>  | <input type="checkbox"/> City of Lemon Grove<br><b>David DeVries</b>                             | <input type="checkbox"/> City of San Marcos<br><b>Doug Dowden</b>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of Poway<br><b>Tracy Beach</b>  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Port of San Diego<br><b>Christian Braun</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> City of Vista<br><b>Michael Hilker</b>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of National City<br><b>Tad Nakatani</b>                   | <input type="checkbox"/> City of El Cajon<br><b>Craig Bonner</b>   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of San Diego<br><b>Walter Gefrom</b><br><b>Amanda Mansour</b><br><b>Eric Mosolgo</b><br><b>Raymond Ngo</b> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of Carlsbad<br><b>Kyrenne Chua</b><br><b>David Rick</b> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of Oceanside<br><b>Ryan Rodman</b><br><b>Mike Strizic</b> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> County of San Diego<br><b>Sheri McPherson</b><br><b>Charles Mohrlock</b><br><b>Reynaldo Pellos</b><br><b>Nancy Richardson</b><br><b>Taylor Ryan</b><br><b>Jon Van Rhyn</b> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of Encinitas<br><b>Jesse Owens</b>   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of Imperial Beach<br><b>Wbaldo Arellano</b>             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contech*<br><b>Noel Thurston</b>                               | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excel Engineering*<br><b>Samuel Bellomio</b>   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geosyntec*<br><b>Venkat Gummadi</b>   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amec Foster Wheeler*<br><b>David Arthur</b>                  |  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michael Baker Int'l*<br><b>Miguel Avalos</b><br><b>(Secretary)</b>   |

*One vote per Copermittee.*

*\*Indicates non-voting representative*

1 **1. Introductions**

2 Sheri McPherson (County of San Diego) led the meeting in lieu of René Vidales (County of San  
3 Diego). The other attendees introduced themselves, as usual.

4 **2. Approval of the Minutes for the February 27, 2018 meeting**

5 No edits proposed.

6 *MOTION:* Approve of the February 27, 2018 meeting minutes **(APPROVED)**

- 7 ♦ Moved by: Tracy Beach (City of Poway)
- 8 ♦ Seconded by: Mike Strizic (City of Oceanside)
- 9 ♦ Vote: 9-0 in favor, 0 abstention (note that three voting representatives arrived after the  
10 vote)

11 **3. Announcements & Future Events**

12 The 2018 CASQA Annual Conference is scheduled for October 15-17<sup>th</sup> this fall in Riverside, CA.  
13 Abstract submittals are now being accepted through Monday, May 21<sup>st</sup>. More information can  
14 be found online.

15 APWA San Diego Chapter recently helped host the annual Creek to Bay Cleanup volunteer event  
16 on Saturday, April 21<sup>st</sup>. Several volunteers were in attendance, helping in the I Love a Clean San  
17 Diego campaign. Event details are available online at creektoabay.org.

18 APWA San Diego Chapter will be hosting an Inaugural North County Networking and Stormwater  
19 Presentation, at the Old Spaghetti Factory San Marcos, on Thursday, April 26, from 12 PM – 1  
20 PM.

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

22 No comments were made by members of the public. Amanda Mansour (City of San Diego), did  
23 however bring up the classification issues for green streets in context of the “full depth  
24 replacement” discussion item on the agenda. Jon Van Rhyn (County of San Diego) explained that  
25 the issue – separating street classifications (i.e. PDP, non-PDP, Green Streets, etc.) has been  
26 discussed with the regional board, and although the LDW does not anticipate any changes that  
27 will allow this, the group does agree it would be beneficial. Eric Mosolgo (City of San Diego)  
28 asked if this also applies to non-contiguous projects. That will need to be clarified by the  
29 Regional Board.

30  
31 The County added that the Regional Board may extend the administrative draft deadline by  
32 approximately six months. The expected date will now likely be around summer of 2019.

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

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

3 *i. Presentation on "Sediment Loading" as currently proposed Fact Sheet SL in*  
4 *Appendices*

5 Charles Mohrlock (County of San Diego) presented on the topic described above. The latest  
6 Model of the BMP Design Manual includes a new fact sheet added to Appendix E, regarding  
7 sediment loading and BMP maintenance frequency. The current BMP Design Manual requires a  
8 minimum footprint sizing factor of 3 percent by default. However, smaller BMPs may be  
9 permitted if the supporting calculations show a 40% annual runoff retention and/or a minimum  
10 acceptable BMP footprint. With this update, BMPs of any size may be allowable so long as they  
11 satisfy three primary requirements: major maintenance frequency (MMF), annual retention, and  
12 pollutant removal.

13 Under this proposed methodology, all pollutant control BMPs will now require MMF  
14 calculations, which will now be the governing BMP design parameter, rather than a minimum  
15 BMP footprint. The calculations have been restructured for this purpose and include a new  
16 steep slope land use designation to account for high sediment loads from these areas.

17 The default BMP clogging timeframe is 10 years. However, Charles noted that not all 3% BMPs  
18 last 10 years. He opened the discussion and asked about the group's comfortability with this  
19 new method. The primary consideration, he noted, is the BMPs' lifetime, which varies per BMP  
20 size, pretreatment strategies, and vegetation cover.

21 Mike Strizic (City of Oceanside) asked for clarification to which Charles replied, simplifying his  
22 explanation: the update will require MMF calculations for all BMPs to ensure a minimum 10-  
23 year life.

24 In addition to MMF, annual retention would also be a new requirement. The annual retention  
25 requirements will now be determined with sliding scale curves from the City/County of San  
26 Diego. These are based on retention that would have been provided with a 3% BMP at the site's  
27 infiltration rate. Charles explained that this allows for flexibility in BMP type and size, provided  
28 that the retention requirements are still being met. The last requirement, pollutant removal,  
29 remains unchanged from the current model.

30 Charles continued to explain, adding the MMF methodology allows for flexibility in BMP design  
31 as well, depending on how one characterizes the land use of the proposed BMPs. In his example,  
32 a 4-acre commercial development consisting of a 1-acre building, a 2-acre parking lot, and 1 acre  
33 of open space draining to a BMP, could be split into different land use categories. When  
34 assigning the "commercial" land use to the entire development, the standard 3% BMP would

1 not work, resulting in a MMF less than 10 years. However, when the development was  
2 split/weighted into distinct land coverages, the standard 3% BMP would work.

3 Venkat Gummadi (Geosyntec) clarified that the calculations presented in the example were  
4 based on 19 inches of annual rainfall, whereas the majority of the City of San Diego receives 10  
5 inches. He added that the rationale behind adding this fact sheet was to discourage poor site  
6 design practices, including draining from steep slope and open space areas.

7 Eric Mosolgo (City of San Diego) agreed that this topic needs to be discussed and agreed upon  
8 prior to approving the Final Model BMP Design Manual. He would first like to see the impact on  
9 coastal communities, which he believes would be minimal due to the low rainfall quantities.  
10 Charles agreed, stating that conditions under 16" of rainfall should not experience any issues,  
11 assuming proper site design is followed.

12 The County of San Diego also expressed some concern, explaining that they are uniquely  
13 characterized by steep slopes and higher rainfall amounts. They all coincided that the steep  
14 slope issue should be stressed in the site design principles presented in the manual. Jon Van  
15 Rhyn (County of San Diego) added that it is not explicitly stated in the County's current manual.

16 Sheri McPherson agreed that this is an appropriate area to introduce these new requirements.  
17 However, she asked the group if they were comfortable with it being a requirement, rather than  
18 an option (as it currently stands).

19  
20 Venkat brought up the issue that the only design control is MMF. He is concerned that  
21 developers might pay the maintenance costs to comply with the lower frequencies rather than  
22 using the methodology as intended. Mike also asked where this limits the sizing requirement. He  
23 too anticipated this to be troublesome for developers. Mike proposed that a minimum  
24 threshold needs to be included with the requirements to avoid manipulation.

25  
26 The County proposed that this be included as a grey box in the Final Model, allowing the  
27 individual jurisdictions to adopt and adapt the new requirements accordingly. Encinitas agreed,  
28 stating they have never had any issues when proper site design and maintenance were  
29 implemented.

30 Venkat concluded that the new fact sheet will include a clause stating that BMP design will  
31 ultimately be at the discretion of the City Engineer. The group agreed that would solve many of  
32 the issues brought up.

33 *ii. Discussion on "Full Depth Replacement" as currently proposed to be removed from*  
34 *Table 1-2: Applicability of Permanent, Post-Construction Storm Water Requirements*

35 Eric Mosolgo presented on the topic described above. The new changes omit full depth  
36 replacement from the requirements described in Table 1-2. Amanda Mansour (City of San

1 Diego) made that the argument that the change will cause a lot of heartache for major cities,  
2 including San Diego. She explained routine maintenance of damaged pavement in most cases  
3 involves full depth replacement. The group argued that the MS4 permit does not include  
4 requirements for full depth replacement and therefore that language should not be included in  
5 the Model. The County argued that the item should instead be clarified in each jurisdictions'  
6 respective manual.

7 Jesse Owens (City of Encinitas) attested that full depth replacement has been a major issue for  
8 the City of Encinitas, particularly, when dealing with native soil. He stated that outdated  
9 infrastructure makes routine maintenance very burdensome, especially in cases requiring full  
10 depth replacement, and therefore this issue should be considered by the Manual. Amanda  
11 added that project size constraints should also be considered.

12 Jon asked for clarification on the Regional Board's actual stance on the matter. Eric explained  
13 that the Regional Board seems to agree but clarified that all correspondence on the topic has  
14 been mostly verbal. Therefore, although Jon understands the argument, he could not support it  
15 without (written) authorization from the Regional Board. The City of San Diego stated that this is  
16 such a frequent issue that a threshold needs to be defined, especially for full streets that are not  
17 being used as intended.

18 Mike Strizic suggested tying street replacement maintenance to local projects so that the  
19 individual jurisdiction can enforce the necessary requirements. This would allow for additional  
20 compliance within the project site to compensate for the losses in the street.

21 Eric suggested that alternative compliance could also serve as a solution, but he noted that HMP  
22 requirements could complicate that route. He explained that the only current solution is Green  
23 Street Exemption. Improvements to water quality can be achieved by installing devices in  
24 agreement with the green street guidelines. Venkat agreed, clarifying that the permit language  
25 ultimately states to do what is feasible.

26 The group decided to strikeout the language, opting for ambiguity rather than specificity.  
27 Copermittees should still understand that despite it not being explicitly stated in Table 1-2, full  
28 depth replacement as discussed will remain as an underlying requirement. Ultimately, each  
29 jurisdiction will implement the requirement as they best see fit.

30 *iii. Update on Deliverables*

31 There was only one change proposed to the current draft Model BMP Design Manual, which  
32 involves the grey boxed sediment loading fact sheet. The final Model BMP Design Manual will be  
33 finalized and distributed on May 31<sup>st</sup>. Jon suggested there be one last review before then. The  
34 group agreed to have comments on the Final Model sent in by May 22<sup>nd</sup>.

1 Venkat informed the group that the red text highlighting the changes in the Model draft updates  
2 is not used in the BMP fact sheets because the changes are too extensive. The updated draft,  
3 which will include the revisions discussed at the meeting, will be distributed by May 15<sup>th</sup>.

4 There will ultimately be two versions of the model: a blank version published online for the  
5 public and another complete version with recommendations and grey box content for  
6 copermittees. The later will be available on Project Clean Water through the respective  
7 copermittee login accounts.

8 *iv. Schedule*

9 The County continued the discussion from the previous meeting, again explaining the potential  
10 need for an adoption timeline to facilitate the transition for the public. The City of San Diego  
11 stated that they are currently implementing updates to their Storm Water Standards Manual  
12 and would need as much time as possible to adopt the new manual.

13 The City of Carlsbad added that they too updating their engineering standards, but will require  
14 coastal commission approval because the standards are part of the City's ordinance. Carlsbad  
15 will likely wait for the MS4 permit update to adopt. The City of Oceanside stated they would like  
16 to move forward in conjunction with the County to facilitate the transition for developers.

17 The group agreed that a final date is not required. Instead, individual jurisdictions will take it up  
18 on their own to adopt the new Model BMP Design Manual.

19 *v. Help Desk and Q&A Log*

20 Nancy Richardson (County of San Diego) provided an update on the Help Desk and Q&A log. She  
21 informed the group that a draft is complete and it will be distributed with the Final Model BMP  
22 design manual on May 31<sup>st</sup>. Venkat explained that although most of the questions had already  
23 been reviewed and answered, the responses had been on hold while the rest of the model was  
24 updated. He covered some of the existing questions and responses including one from Walter  
25 Gefrom (City of San Diego). Walter was present to follow up on his question regarding the  
26 requirements for ADA compliance and how to present proof of compliance, implying that this  
27 issue should be clarified once the Regional Board provides some direction. Venkat agreed but  
28 mentioned that these requirements should be jurisdiction specific. Walter concurred and added  
29 that he would prefer a blanket all-inclusive statement on the matter rather very specific  
30 language in the manual. Most of the group agreed.

31 *b. Alternative Compliance Tools Task*

32 *i. City of San Diego's Alternative Compliance Program*

33 Eric Mosolgo provided an update on the City of San Diego's Alternative Compliance Program,  
34 briefly summarizing a meeting with the internal advisor of the program on the morning of this

1 LDW meeting. The discussion included topics such as the program’s applicability in industrial  
2 areas, the parties responsible for implementation, and a credit tracking tool. It is still uncertain  
3 as to how to define the credits but discussions are underway.

4 *ii. Water Quality Equivalency Update & Technical Advisory Committee*

5 Charles Mohrlock provided a brief update on this item. He informed the group that all the  
6 updates have been uploaded to Project Clean Water. The red text highlights the  
7 changes/updates. The group is to Email any comments regarding the Water Quality Equivalency  
8 Update to Charles by May 2nd. The comments will be reviewed and addressed by June. Another  
9 review will follow before the final update is completed in September.

10 *c. FY 17-18 Third Quarter (Q3) Expenditures*

11 Expenditures for the third quarter include meeting support, the BMP Design Manual, Help Desk  
12 Support, and the Alternative Compliance Tools.

13 **MOTION:** Approve FY 17-18 Third Quarter Expenditures for \$50,035.41 **(APPROVED)**

- 14 ♦ Moved by: Eric Mosolgo (City of San Diego)
- 15 ♦ Seconded by: Juan Magdaraog (City of Escondido)
- 16 ♦ Vote: 12 - 0 in favor, 0 abstention

17 The group discussed the need for additional funds to complete the last remaining changes to the  
18 Model BMP Design Manual. Venkat estimated an additional \$5,000 would be required. The  
19 group agreed that left-over funds from the Help Desk task may be moved to the BMP Design  
20 Manual task to bring it to completion.

21 **6. Action Items**

Action Item	Responsible Party	Timeline
1.	Comments on the final model of the BMP design manual are due by May 22 <sup>nd</sup> . The final model manual will be finalized and distributed by May 31 <sup>st</sup> .	All Copermittees  05/22/2018 05/31/2018
2.	The Help Desk Q&A Log is to be distributed along with final model of the BMP Design Manual on May 31 <sup>st</sup> .	Nancy Richardson (Et al.) Venkat Gummadi  05/31/2018

Action Item	Responsible Party	Timeline	
3.	Email any comments regarding the Water Quality Equivalency Update to Charles Mohrlock (County of San Diego) by May 2 <sup>nd</sup> .	All Copermittees	05/02/2018

1 **7. Next Meeting**

2 The next LDW meeting is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday June 26, 2018.