

San Diego Regional Stormwater Copermittees Regional Program Planning Subcommittee

Meeting Notes - DRAFT

Chairperson Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego)

Date / Time	Agenda Summary
4/11/2019 Start time: 1:30 PM End time: 3:15 PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Call to Order • Roll Call • Time for public to speak on items not on the agenda • Meeting Summary *VOTE* • Old Business • Quarterly Budget Update • Bioassessment and Biological Objectives; Technical and Policy Aspects (LWA) • Biological Objectives Speaking Points • Status of Regional Trash Study • Workgroup Updates • Announcements • Future Meetings
Location	
County of San Diego 5510 Overland Avenue Conference Room A-451 San Diego, CA 92123	

Voting Members in Attendance: (one vote per watershed)		Number of Voting Copermittees at this Meeting: 9/9	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Santa Margarita Watershed: County of San Diego JoAnn Weber	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carlsbad Watershed: City of San Marcos Rafe Cesan (on phone)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Los Peñasquitos Watershed City of Poway Tracy Beach (on phone)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> San Diego River Watershed: City of Santee Cecilia Tipton	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tijuana Watershed: City of Imperial Beach Wbaldo Arellano	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> San Luis Rey Watershed City of Oceanside Justin Gamble (on phone)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> San Dieguito Watershed: City of Escondido Juan Magdaraog	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mission Bay Watershed: City of San Diego Jim Harry	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> San Diego Bay Watershed: City of Chula Vista Marisa Soriano (on phone)	
Non-Voting Members and Members of the Public in Attendance			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> County of San Diego Stephanie Gaines Rouya Rasoulzadeh Jo Ann Weber	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of Coronado Jessie Powell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of Vista Jonathan Nottage (on phone)	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of El Cajon John Phillips	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unified Port of San Diego Stephanie Bauer	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of La Mesa Joe Kuhn	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of Del Mar/Solana Beach Neheimah Martinez	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Secretary Miguel Avalos (Michael Baker International)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wood Matt Rich John Rudolph	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Larry Walker and Associates Paul Hartman Karen Ashby (on phone)	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weston Solutions Michelle Mattson Damon Owen		

1. Call to Order

Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.

7 **2. Roll Call**

8 Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) completed roll call for voting members.

9 **3. Time for Public to Speak on Items Not on the Agenda**

10 No comments from members of the public.

11 **4. Meeting Summary**

12 The following revisions were requested for the March 14, 2019 meeting summary:

- 13 • PG 3, Line 31: Change “agreeance” to “agreement”
- 14 • PG 6, Lines 154 and 166: Change “sons” to “sondes”

15 **MOTION: Approve the meeting summary for March 14, 2019, as amended.**

16 **(APPROVED)**

- 17 ♦ Moved by: Wbaldo Arellano (City of Imperial Beach, Tijuana Watershed)
- 18 ♦ Seconded by: Juan Magdaraog (City of Escondido, San Dieguito Watershed)
- 19 ♦ Vote: 9-0-0 in favor

20 **5. Old Business**

	Action Item	Status
1.	Email cost share table which removes the City of San Diego from the Scope of Services pertaining to Basin Amendments. Email new costs which remove the City of San Diego from the Scope of Services pertaining to Basin Amendments	Completed
2.	Interested Copermittees to inform Tim Murphy (City of Carlsbad) if they would like more information on the study for Algal Blooms by Lawrence Berkeley.	Completed
3.	Jo Ann Weber (County of San Diego) to provide an update from the Bacterial workgroup meeting with the Regional Board	Jo Ann Weber; update provided at this meeting
4.	Notify Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) of any PPS agenda suggestions or ideas on presentations for work products, work plans, etc. to further collaboration among the Copermittees.	All Copermittees, ongoing

21 **6. Quarterly Budget Update**

22 Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) presented the quarterly budget update. She
23 explained that the purpose of these updates is to facilitate expense approvals at the end
24 of the fiscal year. She clarified that there is no action required from the subcommittee.

25 She covered the third quarter expenditures, explaining that they were substantially
26 greater than the first and second quarter expenses combined. The development of
27 regulatory support work and the Education and Outreach sources were the primary
28 contributors to the increased costs, particularly the recent calendar effort. In summary,
29 the total expenditures, after the third quarter, sum to \$127,909 with a remaining
30 budget of \$218,451 from an original budget of \$312,480 and a carryover of \$33,880. The
31 PPS will revisit the discussion following the fourth quarter expenditures.

32 **7. Bioassessment and Biological Objectives; Technical and Policy Aspects (LWA)**

33 Stephanie introduced representatives from Weston, Wood, and Larry Walker Associates
34 (LWA) and their presentation on Bioassessment and Biological Objectives. Matt Rich
35 (Wood) began the presentation and outlined the talking points which included
36 bioassessment techniques, technical considerations of bio-objectives, and the
37 implications to the Copermittees.

38 Damon Owen (Weston) spoke on the first topic. With over 15 years of relevant
39 experience, he detailed the how and why of stream bioassessment monitoring. Stream
40 bioassessment is required for compliance with the Municipal Stormwater (NPDES)
41 Permit and the Clean Water Act. The process involves monitoring the long-term
42 ecological health of streams and the effects of urban runoff. The biological integrity of
43 the stream is measured based on the health of the stream's Benthic Macroinvertebrates
44 (BMI) and algae. A bioassessment score is drawn out over the life span of these living
45 organisms. This parameter is used to identify impaired streams in conjunction with
46 chemical and toxicological approaches.

47 The Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) is the coordinating agency
48 for storm water compliance monitoring and has established a very specific scope of
49 work. The standard monitoring reach extends 150 meters along the stream and includes
50 11 transects every 15 meters, perpendicular to the stream flow. Potential reasons for
51 rejecting a stream include if it is inaccessible, dry, non-wadeable (deep-ponded), or if
52 access is denied by the property owner.

53 Damon continued to explain the sample collection procedures. There are three different
54 collection devices available depending on the substrate type (e.g. cobble, boulder, or
55 sand). BMI is typically collected with a one foot wide "D" frame kick net with 0.5 mm
56 mesh. Debris are other large materials are cleared before sampling. One sample is
57 collected at each of the 11 transects and then composited into a single sample
58 container. The composite sample is split up to conduct further analysis for diatom

59 taxonomy, soft bodied taxonomy, ash-free dry mass, and chlorophyll-a. The analysis
60 results in a list of species. The data is then evaluated, and a score is calculated based on
61 the CA Stream Condition Index for BMI (CSCI) and the Algal Stream Condition Index
62 (ASCI). These indices were developed to address the shortcomings of previous indices.
63 Overall, the CSCI and the ASCI provide better reference data which allows for more
64 comprehensive assessments of biological integrity. Additionally, they incorporate site
65 specific expectations and are applicable statewide. The data evaluation ultimately
66 combines two other indices: the multi-metric index (which measures ecological
67 structure and function) and the predictive (O/E) index (which measures taxonomic
68 completeness). This evaluation incorporates natural environmental factors including
69 geographic location, watershed size, climate, and geology.

70 John Rudolph (Wood) continued with the technical consideration of biological
71 objectives. He explained that the primary technical issue identified is the single bright
72 line threshold. The narrative objective is translated with single numeric criteria,
73 resulting in a 0.79 CSCI score. If subject to this criterion, most of the streams in the San
74 Diego Region would be out of compliance, despite the ability to sustain a healthy BMI
75 population. If the CSCI score is under the 0.79 threshold, alternative evidence of
76 compliance is allowed at the discretion of the Regional Board, if the effect is caused by
77 naturally occurring factors. Although this alternative is a possible means of compliance,
78 John explained it is very difficult to convince the Board otherwise.

79 Another primary issue involves modified/engineered channels. All streams are held to
80 the same numeric criteria, despite different material conditions. Modified channels
81 lined with concrete cannot provide the appropriate BMI environment. Despite that,
82 other alternative thresholds of impairment are not considered. John made the
83 argument that it is extremely difficult to establish a standard applicable across
84 modified/engineered channels. These inefficiencies lead to spending significant
85 resources to improve CSCI scores in areas where improvement is minimal or unlikely.

86 Another issue John identified involved the reference stream approach. The CSCI score
87 for individual streams is derived from a sub-set of analogous reference streams selected
88 from the statewide reference pool. The CSCI numeric objective threshold of 0.79 is
89 derived from the 10th percentile of the entire statewide reference pool data set, which
90 contains many non-analogous reference sites. Essentially, this skews the 10th percentile
91 numeric criteria upwards. He argued that a more appropriate CSCI numeric objective
92 should be derived from groups most similar to San Diego Region streams, which
93 typically have a score of 0.69 CSCI.

94 Lastly, John explained the issues with seasonal streams. As defined by the Regional
95 Board, seasonal streams include *“Any freshwater stream that is expected to be*
96 *inundated with flowing water for at least four weeks between the months of February*
97 *and October.”* Given the erratic hydrological conditions in Southern California, this
98 presents another challenge. It is very difficult to classify a stream given the gradient of

99 possible flow regimes and year-to-year variability. When conducting bioassessments,
100 the flow duration of a stream is typically not known – it is difficult to determine how
101 long a stream has been flowing. Studies have shown that an index score obtained near
102 the end of the seasonal flow cycle may not be representative of its true condition.
103 Additionally, the BMI habitat changes with the seasonal flow cycle as it dries. Therefore,
104 the location along the stream at which you sample affects the scores, particularly
105 downstream.

106 Jo Ann Weber (County of San Diego) inquired about the issue regarding the
107 modified/engineered channels. She referenced the Regional Board’s approach on the
108 matter, noting that as part of the CEQA analysis, they consider different alternatives.
109 The landscape model is said to be unsuitable. However, they do not consider site
110 specific parameters. Ultimately, their conclusion is that assessing specific instances
111 (such as the engineered channels) will require huge efforts to monitor. Jo Ann noted
112 that their discussion is very brief and does not provide a substantial justification. John
113 explained that the newer landscape model, which incorporates a more site-specific
114 approach, has been well received by the professional community; it was recently
115 presented at a local conference with a warm reception. He noted that tiered objectives
116 are also common across other states. In summary, the tool ultimately produces a range
117 of more applicable CSCI scores.

118 Jo Ann followed up about the statewide reference pool and asked if it considered
119 perennial, intermittent, and/or seasonal streams. John explained that intermittent and
120 seasonal streams are generally the same – they are generally defined as streams that
121 flow for a few months in a given year. The state definition is slightly different; it is a
122 combination of both. He mentioned that the reference pool does include intermittent
123 streams. However, the pool is not entirely accurate. The inclusion of a stream depends
124 on its flow cycle at the time of observation – if flow is present, it will be included.

125 Paul Hartman (LWA) continued the presentation and spoke on the policy implications of
126 biological objectives. Regarding the MS4 Permit, Paul covered the following provisions:

- 127 • Provisions A – Prohibitions and Limitations
- 128 • Provision B – Water Quality Improvement Plans (WQIP)
- 129 • Provision D – Monitoring and Assessment

130 In terms of Provision A, the receiving water limitations will likely need to be added.
131 Streams not meeting the 0.79 numeric objective will likely be immediately flagged.
132 Causal assessment may also be directed to prohibitions and limitations.

133 There are multiple ways that monitoring can be affected which may result in additional
134 requirements. The WQIPs may be affected in the highest priority. It may be required to
135 adjust the goals, or at least show incremental progress. The advantage of adding the
136 requirements to the WQIP is that the copermittees would control the timeline.

137 Paul continued with preliminary approaches for copermittee consideration. In general,
138 the recommendation has been to support the goal of the Biological Objectives Project. A
139 tiered approach, or modified antidegradation approach, should also be considered. This
140 would allow the flexibility to develop waterbody specific strategies, define objectives
141 based on highest attainable use for a waterbody, and prioritize protection of high-
142 quality waters, among other things. Another consideration includes removing the
143 probable threat language, which will likely require legal review. Lastly, Paul mentioned
144 that watershed-scale assessments are more appropriate and should also be considered.

145 The group discussed how the Regional Board has steered away from the State because
146 they believe the State policy will not fully support the region's goals. It appears that the
147 Regional Board wants to lead the effort and would rather be a step ahead of the state.
148 John Rudolph (Wood) mentioned the state process started back in 2010 but then stalled
149 for a few years shortly after. That stall may have also played into the reasoning.

150 Paul finalized the presentation by covering the deliverables and the next steps moving
151 forward. The deliverables include:

- 152 • Summary of Water Board Responses to Copermittees' 2018 Comments
- 153 • Summary of Proposed Basin Plan Amendment and Implications
- 154 • Talking Points and Testimony
- 155 • Comment Letter (draft due April 22nd, final due May 2nd)

156 A Water Board Workshop will be hosted on April 18th, after which the subcommittee will
157 need to review the draft comment letter. Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) will
158 set up a meeting with copermittees via email with the purpose to discuss and review the
159 2019 Basin Plans Amendment draft comment letter. Copermittees will agree on a date
160 between April 22nd and May 2nd.

161 **8. Biological Objectives Speaking Points**

162 Jo Ann Weber (County of San Diego) is working to finalize the set of talking points for
163 the Biological Objectives Workshop on April 18th. She encouraged the copermittees to
164 come and discuss the topics with the Regional Board. However, she noted that the
165 workshop will be more of an informal review opportunity. The comment letter will
166 provide the formal discussion. For that reason, there is likely no major items to come
167 from the workshop. When discussing, she recommended a mutual, inquisitive, and
168 positive tone as to avoid anything being misconstrued by the board.

169 The key issues last time around included the numeric objective. Jo Ann mentioned that
170 seasonal streams should be added to the discussion. The group agreed this topic would
171 be best presented in the comment letter. She also mentioned that they would be
172 coordinating with Orange County, Riverside County, and CASQA to avoid any conflicts in
173 the comment letter.

174 Jo Ann mentioned concerns regarding rapid causal assessment, particularly because that
175 topic has not been peer reviewed yet. John Rudolph (Wood) stated that Wood had
176 some involvement with the City of San Diego and Tetra Tech on the topic, but they have
177 not been involved with a separate assessment.

178 The group again discussed streams that would potentially be considered out of
179 compliance due to the single bright line objective. That figure could be well over half of
180 all streams (67%). That highlights the need to reassess engineered channels under more
181 appropriate criteria. The group agreed that this topic should be addressed in the
182 comment letter as well.

183 Jo Ann revisited the use of the landscape model. It is still unclear why the model is not
184 being implemented; perhaps the board can provide additional justification. She again
185 mentioned the comment letter would be the best way to investigate the options that
186 are available. The board has been reluctant to accept tiered aquatic uses and continues
187 to veto that proposition. Although the tiered approach would be favorable, Jo Ann is
188 unsure of how it will be received.

189 Karen Ashby (LWA) agreed with Jo Ann's statements. She clarified that the group must
190 present workable solutions. Implementing a phased approach that focuses on high
191 quality waters should be proposed. However, it is unclear how it will develop. There
192 should be strong copermittee support in addition to CASQA. She also highlighted on the
193 importance of County wide coordination.

194 Cecilia Tipton (San Diego River Watershed, City of Santee) asked if there were any legal
195 reviews/opinions on the I.O. yet and if we should have our attorneys involved further. Jo
196 Ann recommended against it at this point, because it usually is a lengthy process.
197 Additionally, each jurisdiction has a different attorney, so it can get very complicated. Jo
198 Ann encouraged to highlight items specific to the respective communities through a
199 jurisdiction specific comment letter. Justin Gamble (San Luis Rey Watershed, City of
200 Oceanside) added that they are preparing a comment letter for the City of Oceanside.
201 He also asked if there is any measure of the sites under the threshold that are
202 engineered channels. Currently, there is no comprehensive inventory for that.

203 The group again discussed the deadlines of the comment letter: the draft is due April
204 22nd, after which it will be open for review. The group will agree on a time to discuss and
205 review the draft prior to the May 2nd final deadline.

206 **9. Status of Regional Trash Study**

207 Jo Ann Weber (County of San Diego) provided an update on the status of the Regional
208 Trash Study. The written response developed by Michael Baker International (M. Baker
209 Intl.) was sent to Helen Yu (San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board). Despite a
210 few questions, she was impressed with the response and was not expecting a formal
211 letter. Helen is currently occupied with other tasks but will be providing questions soon.

212 Jo Ann anticipated the review process will be the same as the last: M. Baker Intl. will
213 draft a written response which will be circulated to all copermittees. More details to
214 come.

215 Marisa Soriano (San Diego Bay Watershed, City of Chula Vista) asked about any further
216 comments for Track 1 clearance. Jo Ann clarified that there are not any, and that they
217 are now not dealing with implementation plans. Marisa suggested that the group reach
218 out for some sort of preliminary approval on the plans. Her concern is planning and
219 budgeting with an unknown timeline. According to Jo Ann, copermittees are not
220 required to implement the plans yet, at least not until they go into the permit. This will
221 likely be early next year. Jo Ann recommended that Marisa contact the Regional Board
222 directly.

223 Justin Gamble (San Luis Rey Watershed, City of Oceanside) expressed similar concerns.
224 The City of Oceanside as a Track 1 copermittee has already began device installations,
225 having installed 10 in the last couple of weeks. Although the installations were done too
226 far past the substantial from the late seasons, the intent is to begin monitoring, have a
227 budget plan in place, and be prepared for a potential mid-fiscal year update.

228 Cecilia Tipton (San Diego River Watershed, City of Santee) added that the City of Santee
229 is also beginning implementation, which will be phased out over a 10-year plan.

230 Juan Magdaraog (San Dieguito Watershed, City of Escondido) mentioned they received
231 comments on the plans. Overall, the responses were just and thorough. The indication
232 was that Helen Yu would be providing additional feedback, however no timeline is
233 known or guaranteed.

234 **10. Project Clean Water Update**

235 Rouya Rasoulzadeh (County of San Diego) summarized the update to Project Clean
236 Water (PCW). She recently sent out an email asking for input from the watershed leads
237 but has not received a single response. She believes the Ad Hoc committee needs to be
238 reestablished in order to help coordinate the effort. The updates to the PCW Watershed
239 Management Area (WMA) website are intended to make the site easier to navigate and
240 read. Currently, the site contains an excessive amount of information including outdated
241 content that must be removed. The topic will likely be discussed at the upcoming WMA
242 meetings. Rouya will send out a second email asking for input on the PCW update as
243 well as on the need for an Ad Hoc committee. John Quenzer (City of National City) will
244 be part of the Ad Hoc Committee. Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) added that
245 although the watershed leads are the primary contacts as required by the Brown Act,
246 participation is open to all PPS members.

247 **11. Workgroup Updates**

248 ***MOU Update Ad Hoc Committee***

249 Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) reminded the group of the revised MOU that
250 was re-sent to Copermittees on February 4th. She specifically requested that the
251 signature page be completed and provided to her as soon as possible. She requested an
252 update from all copermittees that have yet to complete the signature forms.

253 ***Land Development Workgroup***

254 Due several conflicts with the original date (Tuesday, April 30th). the next LDW meeting
255 has been scheduled for Thursday, May 2nd. The meeting will include a presentation on
256 the Orange County Stormwater Tools that are being used for:

- 257 • Building and maintaining a consistent inventory of BMP assets
- 258 • Supporting field users and maintenance managers with rapid BMP condition
259 assessment and maintenance tracking, including prioritization of BMPs for
260 maintenance
- 261 • Tracking BMPs within private development parcels and performing O&M
262 verification
- 263 • Creating spatial linkages between drainage assets (i.e., pipes, inlets) and BMPs
264 and establishing the connectivity of these BMPs to their tributary watershed
265 and downstream drainage pathway
- 266 • Modeling the performance of built and planned BMPs
- 267 • Reporting progress and future projections intended to streamline annual
268 reporting

269 If there are any agenda items to be added, contact Rene Vidales (County of San Diego)
270 at rene.vidales@sdcounty.ca.gov

271 ***Education and Outreach Workgroup***

272 Rouya Rasoulzadeh (County of San Diego) summarized the February 5th Education and
273 Outreach Workgroup meeting held at the City of Escondido. The next meeting will be
274 held on Wednesday, May 8th.

275 Cecilia Tipton (San Diego River Watershed, City of Santee) added that Marketing
276 Campaign RFP Ad Hoc Committee is working to finalize the draft RFP. They recently met
277 to discuss comments early in the month.

278 **12. Announcements**

279 Justin Gamble (San Luis Rey Watershed, City of Oceanside) announced that a member of
280 his team is now employed by City of Encinitas. A new position at the City of Oceanside is
281 forthcoming. Stephanie offered to circulate the job posting once it is available.

282 Previously, PPS meetings provided updates on legislative discussions. As that the
283 subcommittee became less involved in legal matters, these items were no longer
284 discussed. Considering the groups recent developments, Stephanie proposed to include
285 the topic in future agendas as a discussion item and asked the group for their opinion.
286 Jonathan Nottage (City of Vista) mentioned that he would appreciate a download of
287 such meetings, like the recent call with CASQA, which Stephanie was a part of. The
288 group agreed to add an agenda item regarding legislative discussions for future
289 meetings.

290 Jo Ann Weber (County of San Diego) provided a summary of recent meeting with the
291 Regional Board regarding human source pathways to meet TMDL compliance held on
292 Tuesday April 2nd. There were two compliance pathways discussed. The preferred
293 alternative may not meet the TMDLs for all Fecal Indicator Bacteria (FIB) but will
294 ultimately remain under the threshold for human sourced constituents. Jo Ann
295 explained that if the sources are similar to those observed at the San Diego River, then
296 the Epi study done at the downstream stretch (beach) can be used to leverage the
297 results. A panel of experts will be working with Helen Yu (San Diego Regional Water
298 Quality Control Board) to investigate how this ultimately work out. SCCWRP is likely to
299 be involved providing technical support. Jo Ann concluded by noting that she is
300 optimistic in moving forward.

301 **13. Future Meetings**

302 The next meeting is scheduled for May 16th, 1:30 to 3:30 PM.

303 All Copermittees are asked to notify Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) when they
304 have PPS agenda suggestions or ideas on presentations for work products, work plans,
305 etc. to further collaboration among the Copermittees. Agenda items should be
306 submitted at least a week before the scheduled meeting.

307 Stephanie adjourned the meeting at 3:15 PM.

New Action Items	Responsible Party	Due Date
1.	Jo Ann Weber (County of San Diego) to finalize set of talking points for Biological Objectives Workshop being held on April 18 th .	Jo Ann Weber 4/18/2019
2.	Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) to coordinate meeting with copermittees via email with the purpose to discuss and review the 2019 Basin Plans Amendment draft comment letter. Copermittees to agree on a date between April 22 nd and May 2 nd .	Stephanie Gaines, All Copermittees 4/18/2019

New Action Items	Responsible Party	Due Date
3. Rouya Rasoulzadeh (County of San Diego) to send an email to watershed leads to start the Ad Hoc Committee for PCW.	Rouya Rasoulzadeh	5/31/2019
4. Copermittees to complete the signature page of revised MOU and provide the signed form to Stephanie Gaines as soon as possible.	All Copermittees	ASAP
5. Copermittees to send any agenda items for the May 2 nd Land Development Workgroup meeting to Rene Vidales (County of San Diego).	All Copermittees	4/29/2019
6. Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) to include a discussion item for legislative discussions in PPS meetings to come.	Stephanie Gaines	5/16/2019
7. Copermittees to notify Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) of any PPS agenda suggestions or ideas on presentations for work products, work plans, etc. to further collaboration among the Copermittees.	All Copermittees	Ongoing

308