

# San Diego Regional Stormwater Copermittees Regional Program Planning Subcommittee

## *Meeting Notes - DRAFT*

Chairperson Stephanie Gaines

Date / Time	Agenda Summary
03/16/2017 Start time: 1:30 PM End time: 3:30 PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting Summary</li> <li>• Old Business</li> <li>• Trash Investigative Order</li> <li>• Workgroup Updates</li> <li>• Report of Waste Discharge Update</li> <li>• Education and Outreach Presentation to Regional Water Quality Control Board</li> <li>• Ad Hoc Committee Updates</li> <li>• Legislative Updates</li> <li>• Announcements</li> </ul>
Location	
County of San Diego 5510 Overland Avenue, 4th Floor, A-451, Large Conference Room San Diego, CA 92123	

Voting Members in Attendance: (one vote per watershed)	Number of Voting Copermittees at this Meeting: 9
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Santa Margarita Watershed:</i> County of San Diego <b>Stephanie Gaines</b> <b>Ruth de la Rosa</b> <b>Joanna Wisniewska</b> <b>Tracy Cline</b> <b>Sheri McPherson</b> <b>Mark Stripp</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Mission Bay Watershed:</i> City of San Diego <b>Clem Brown</b> via phone
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Los Peñasquitos Watershed:</i> City of Poway <b>Melody Rocco</b> via phone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>San Luis Rey Watershed:</i> City of Oceanside <b>Justin Gamble</b> via phone
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>San Diego River Watershed:</i> City of Santee <b>Cecilia Tipton</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>San Diego Bay Watershed:</i> City of Chula Vista <b>Boushra Salem</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Carlsbad Watershed:</i> City of San Marcos <b>Reed Thornberry</b> via phone

*Note: San Diego River Watershed arrived after the vote on February meeting notes.*

Non-Voting Members and Members of the Public in Attendance			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of Carlsbad <b>Tim Murphy</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of Coronado <b>Jessie Powell</b> <b>Rosanna Lacarra</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of Del Mar and Solana Beach <b>Kelly Ogawa</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of El Cajon <b>John Phillips</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of Encinitas <b>Mayela Manasjan</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of La Mesa <b>Joe Kuhn</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of Vista <b>Cheryl Filar</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Port of San Diego <b>Stephanie Bauer</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Airport Authority <b>Richard Gilb</b> via phone	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Larry Walker Associates <b>Paul Hartman</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AMEC <b>Matt Rich</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Secretary <b>Hilary Ellis</b> <b>(Michael Baker International)</b>	

1 **1. Call to Order**

2 Stephanie Gaines (County of San Diego) called the meeting to order.

3 **2. Roll Call**

4 Stephanie completed roll call for voting members.

5 **3. Time for public to speak on items not on the agenda**

6 No members of the public requested time to speak about items not on the agenda.

7 **4. Meeting Summary from February 16, 2017**

8 The following changes were requested to the February 16, 2017, meeting summary:

- 9 • Page 8, Line 5, Change: "Other jurisdictions may not have that authority  
10 established..." to "Other jurisdictions may not have the obligation to conduct  
11 FOG inspections..."
- 12 • Page 9, Lines 31-32, Change: "...Copermittees should expect the same request."  
13 to "Copermittees may receive a similar request."

14 **MOTION: Approve the February 16, 2017, meeting summary as amended.**

15 **(APPROVED)**

- 16 ♦ Moved by: Helen Davies (San Dieguito Watershed)
- 17 ♦ Seconded by: Boushra Salem (San Diego Bay Watershed)
- 18 ♦ Vote: 8-0 in favor

19 **5. Old Business**

20 This is a review of actions listed on the previous meeting summary to ensure actions are  
21 completed.

22 *Action Item 1: Contact Stephanie Gaines if interested in partnering with the County on*  
23 *the Stormwater Capture Feasibility Study.*

24 The County is taking a different direction and is no longer seeking partnerships.  
25 Stephanie thanked those who did contact the County for potential partnering.

26 *Action Item 2: Distribute comment table to Copermittees for review of data sharing*  
27 *template for dry weather MS4 outfall data.*

28 The comment table was distributed.

29 *Action Item 3: Provide comments on data sharing template for dry weather MS4 outfall*  
30 *data to RMAR Ad Hoc Committee (Joanna Wisniewska) by the end of March.*

1 Joanna Wisniewska has not received any comments. Comments are requested  
2 to be provided by mid-April.

3 *Action Item 4: Circulate SWRP self-certification language to all Copermittees with a draft*  
4 *SWRP, in case the County cannot do a single signature per legal review.*

5 The County handled the signature. The SWRP has been certified and submitted.

6 *Action Item 5: Provide comments on five ROWD guiding themes to Paul Hartman with cc:*  
7 *to JoAnn Weber by February 24.*

8 Paul did not receive any comments.

9 *Action Item 6: Schedule an ROWD workshop in early March to discuss reporting,*  
10 *Attachment E, and other issues.*

11 The ROWD workshop was held. An update will be provided later in this meeting.

12 *Action Item 7: Re-send Copermittees the schedule for ROWD work efforts and comment*  
13 *deadlines.*

14 The schedule was sent.

15 *Action Item 8: Send a Doodle poll and re-schedule the Project Clean Water training*  
16 *session for Copermittees.*

17 The Project Clean Water training session has been conducted.

18 *Action Item 9: Assist John Quenzer with posting meeting agendas on Project Clean Water*  
19 *by Friday, February 17, 2017.*

20 Mark assisted John with posting materials.

21 *Action Item 10: Contact Mark Stripp (County of San Diego) to participate on the Project*  
22 *Clean Water Transitional Team by February 24, 2017.*

23 Helen Davies (City of Escondido) indicated her colleague Alicia is interested.

24 Stephanie will send out another announcement to get more participation.

25 *Action Item 11: Contact Sheri McPherson (County of San Diego) if interested in*  
26 *participating in LDW meeting with Regional Board Staff on Thursday, February 23, 2017*  
27 *at 10 AM.*

28 The meeting has been held.

29 **6. Trash Investigative Order**

30 JoAnn Weber (County of San Diego) discussed the Trash IO with Christina Arias (Regional  
31 Board). The Trash IO is expected to be posted in June and should be consistent  
32 throughout the State. This will be the Final Investigative Order. The release of the Final  
33 IO should not start the compliance clock; however, JoAnn will confirm this. The release  
34 will start the 90-day compliance period for Permittees to select Track 1 or Track 2. If

1 Track 2 is selected, then the implementation plan must be done within 18 months. The  
2 10-year compliance period will reach to early 2019.

3 **7. Workgroup Updates**

4 ***Land Development Workgroup (LDW)***

5 The LDW will meet next Tuesday. The majority of the meeting will focus on comments  
6 for the Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD). The LDW is working on issues that will  
7 dovetail into the regional ROWD development process. Sheri McPherson (County of San  
8 Diego) expects draft materials will be out to the Copermittees tomorrow for discussion  
9 at the meeting. The goal is to provide Paul Hartman (LWA) with materials to be  
10 integrated into the first ROWD draft that goes to the Copermittees for comments.

11 LDW members met with Regional Board Staff a few weeks ago to go through a list of  
12 items initially identified by the LDW related to Permit reissuance. Some items were  
13 removed from the list because they are not urgent issues to address with this Permit  
14 reissuance. Regional Board Staff suggested a few items could be covered through  
15 clarifications in the definitions or fact sheets.

16 The LDW voted by email last week to move \$315,000 out of their workplan and back to  
17 the PPS. The funds had been budgeted in case more hydromodification monitoring was  
18 required by the Regional Board after submittal of the final report in December. No  
19 additional monitoring is required. Those funds are being relinquished to the PPS.  
20 Stephanie will add this as an agenda item to the next PPS meeting. As initial thoughts on  
21 how to utilize the available budget in the PPS, JoAnn mentioned the Regional Board is  
22 planning to issue biological objectives this Spring, separate from the State Board effort.  
23 The funds could be used for the Copermittees to comment on the regional biological  
24 objectives. Another option for using the funds would be for reviewing the Final Trash IO  
25 and providing recommended language for inclusion of the IO in the Permit.

26 **8. Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) Update**

27 Paul provided an overview of the workshops and the planned path forward. He will  
28 email the presentation to the PPS.

29 Four workshops have been held. The November 2016 workshop focused on concepts,  
30 was followed by a survey, and helped complete the draft technical memo. The first  
31 February 2017 workshop focused on monitoring and assessment (Provision D). The  
32 second February 2017 workshop involved discussions on JRMP programs. At the March  
33 2017 workshop, Copermittees discussed reporting, TMDLs, and other Permit Provisions  
34 and comments. The key outcomes were summarized as follows:

35 *Monitoring and Assessment Workshop*

- 36
- 37 • One idea is to suggest customized, watershed-based monitoring programs in  
38 lieu of Provision D. Certain minimums for receiving water monitoring, outfall  
monitoring, and special studies would be necessary, with the remainder of the

- 1 customized program to be established to best serve the objectives of each  
2 WQIP. The Los Angeles Region has taken this approach with customized  
3 monitoring in watersheds with Enhanced Watershed Management Plans.
- 4 • Transitional monitoring requirements need to be integrated into the current  
5 requirements. This is a relatively simple administrative issue.
  - 6 • For receiving water assessments, Provision A.4.a could be better linked to  
7 Provision B.5.a as it relates to re-evaluating priorities due to persistent  
8 exceedances. The evaluation of persistent exceedances should be used as part  
9 of the priority water quality conditions evaluation. There may be constraints  
10 with Permit language changes in Provision A due to Federal standards.
  - 11 • For receiving water assessments, the term “critical beneficial uses” is mentioned  
12 only in Provision D.4.a. The recommendation is for assessment to focus on  
13 trends in High Priority Water Quality Conditions to support WQIP needs, rather  
14 than the broad term of “critical beneficial uses.”
  - 15 • For MS4 outfall monitoring, there should be more flexibility in the monitoring  
16 program. Some agencies may want to keep the term “major outfalls,” but  
17 others would benefit by being able to take credit for monitoring at outfalls that  
18 are not major outfalls. Flexibility with prioritization in monitoring would be best.
  - 19 • The Copermittees would like a more specific off-ramp for discharges that should  
20 be permitted by the Regional Board. If flows cannot be eliminated and the  
21 discharges causing those flows are supposed to be permitted by the Regional  
22 Board, then there should be an off-ramp for those flows from the prioritization  
23 process.
  - 24 • The consultant team is working on analyses to determine how wet weather  
25 monitoring could be reduced to allow re-focusing of the wet weather  
26 monitoring to better serve WQIPs.
  - 27 • For watershed assessments, there are concerns about the validity of  
28 extrapolating loading estimations to build a model of the whole watershed.  
29 Loading estimations should be used on the monitored outfalls, not on outfalls  
30 that are not monitored.
  - 31 • Assessments should be used to characterize MS4 outfall discharges, understand  
32 land use discharge characteristics, understand dry weather flows, and focus on  
33 program effectiveness. Assessments should be detailed analyses of the  
34 information provided by monitoring data. The assessments prescribed now are  
35 not focused enough to provide feedback adequate for improving programs. It  
36 would be a large effort to describe in detail what type of assessments are best  
37 for different types of monitoring data and in different watersheds. If monitoring  
38 programs are customized, then the assessments also need the flexibility to be  
39 customized. One suggestion for Permit language would be to add to the  
40 assessment requirements something similar to: “or implement customized  
41 assessment program by watershed.” Another option would be to modify the  
42 Permit language associated with customizing monitoring to also require an

1 appropriately customized assessment. Copermittees continued discussion on  
2 whether to recommend detailed changes to the assessment portion of the  
3 Permit or recommend a flexible statement be added to the Permit to allow for  
4 customized assessments with details to be determined on a case-by-case basis.  
5 The overall goal is for monitoring assessment programs to better serve the  
6 watershed programs.

7 *JRMP Workshop*

- 8 • IDDE and dry weather monitoring requirements currently overlap. Monitoring  
9 provisions, including field screening and investigations, should all be in Provision  
10 D. There are no proposed changes to the field screening and investigations;  
11 however, if they are included in Provision D and customized monitoring and  
12 assessment is allowed, then the customization could also include the field  
13 screening and investigations.
- 14 • There are flows that Copermittees must consider illicit discharges because they  
15 are not currently authorized by a separate NPDES Permit but they should be  
16 under a separate permit. These flows should be included in the exemptions for  
17 the MS4 Permit as they are not the responsibility of the municipalities.
- 18 • For existing development inspections, there should be a focus on problem sites  
19 or areas instead of the requirement to inspect everything once during the  
20 Permit term. A specific language change could allow for an equivalent number  
21 of inspections matching the inventory number during the Permit term. For  
22 example, if there are 1000 existing development sites in the inventory, then  
23 1000 inspections would be done but those inspections could include different  
24 levels of inspection at the same locations.
- 25 • When Copermittees find sites that should have permit coverage under the  
26 Industrial General Permit or Construction General Permit but do not, the  
27 Copermittees currently have five days to report the site to the Regional Board.  
28 The Copermittees would prefer to have ten business days. Rosanna Lacarra  
29 (Coronado) mentioned this revision may have been suggested during the  
30 previous Permit revision and may be determined by Federal law.

31 *Reporting/TMDL Workshop*

- 32 • Following the method used in Central Valley, the recommendation is to reduce  
33 annual report content in years 1, 3, and 5 of the Permit to include only the  
34 minimum Federal requirements. A "WQIP Lite" would be done for year 2 of the  
35 Permit to focus on adaptations to strategies or steering programs. A full Report  
36 of Waste Discharge (ROWD), including the Regional Monitoring and Assessment  
37 Report (RMAR), would be done for year 4 and would substitute for the annual  
38 report that year.
- 39 • Recommended modifications related to TMDLs are targeted. Those concerned  
40 will be providing supporting documents.

- 1                   • For Provisions A and B, the comments from the last Permit reissuance that were  
2                   not addressed in the Permit will be preserved. These relate to streamlining,  
3                   flexibility, and the MEP standard.

4                   Regional Board Staff has indicated they do not want large-scale changes for the next  
5                   Permit. The Copermittees have about 40 items on the full list of recommended  
6                   modifications. The approach for the ROWD will be to include the top two or three key  
7                   issues in the main body of the report. Those key issues will be presented with  
8                   constructive, defensible arguments. The other over 30 items will be captured in a  
9                   bulleted or other concise form in an appendix to the ROWD.

10                  Paul identified three potential key issues: reporting, monitoring and assessment, and  
11                  program implementation. The ROWD will not propose many programmatic changes but  
12                  it will recommend changes to monitoring and assessment and reductions in reporting  
13                  requirements. Copermittees discussed that reducing funds and resources expended on  
14                  reporting and being able to customize monitoring are significant. Program  
15                  implementation is important, but the other two issues are more important. In meeting  
16                  with Regional Board Staff to review potential modifications, the suggested approach  
17                  would be to discuss the desired reduction in reporting requirements first. The Regional  
18                  Board has expressed a desire for reporting to be streamlined, but the reporting  
19                  framework developed last year was 110 pages. If reporting requirements are reduced,  
20                  that could easily lead into customizing monitoring and assessments. Paul and JoAnn will  
21                  coordinate a meeting with Regional Board Staff to discuss these top three issues, as  
22                  appropriate, starting with streamlined reporting. Other Copermittees may attend.

23                  LWA has been working on the ROWD Introduction and Section 4 (Permit Modifications).  
24                  A draft of Section 4 will be distributed to Copermittees in mid to late April. Comments  
25                  on Section 4 are due back to LWA by May 12. LWA will begin the WQIP Status Evaluation  
26                  section in April as well as the section on new regulations and recommendations.  
27                  Jurisdictional modifications and justification should be provided by Copermittees to  
28                  LWA by April 21 for LWA to complete Section 3 of the ROWD. The scope of work does  
29                  include one more workshop, but it is not necessary at this time and will be held for a  
30                  later purpose if necessary.

31                  **9.            Workgroup Updates**

32                  ***Education and Residential Sources (ERS) Workgroup***

33                  Stephanie relayed that Anthony (City of San Diego) is still pulling together the next ERS  
34                  Workgroup meeting.

35                  The County has education and outreach materials in their storage area. Stephanie will  
36                  send out a table showing what materials were allotted to each Copermittee, what has  
37                  been picked up, and what is still remaining in storage. Copermittees have been informed  
38                  that their allotted materials are available for pick up for over a year. Any materials that  
39                  are not retrieved by March 31 will be released to any Copermittee who wants them.

1 Cecilia asked about the final electronic materials that were developed for the watershed  
2 stewardship program. Stephanie will coordinate with Cecilia and John Quenzer to  
3 ensure the final deliverables are available.

4 Copermittees asked if the public telephone survey will be repeated in the future. Cecilia  
5 replied that the public telephone survey is likely the sole expense in FY2017-18 for the  
6 ERS Workgroup. Funds have been budgeted for the effort.

7 **10. Education and Outreach Presentation to Regional Water Quality Control Board (3/15)**

8 The Copermittees presented at the Regional Board meeting yesterday in response to a  
9 request from the Regional Board to bring an informational item on the education and  
10 outreach implementation of the MS4 Permit. Several Copermittees commended the  
11 presenters on their briefing at the Regional Board meeting.

12 One issue highlighted by a Board member was collaboration across counties. This is  
13 difficult since the three counties entered the Permit at different times and are at  
14 different points in the implementation process. Also, the Board seemed most responsive  
15 to Community Based Social Marketing (CBSM) and more modern techniques for  
16 education and outreach. Helen shared that her colleague has suggested hiring a  
17 marketing firm to create a work plan for effective, inexpensive, modern techniques for  
18 education and outreach. Jurisdictions would still be responsible for implementation. A  
19 region-wide strategy could be developed that would then be implemented on a  
20 watershed-level based on priorities.

21 The Copermittees discussed their observations of the Regional Board meeting, finding  
22 that one Board member's behavior was less than professional and seemed disrespectful  
23 at times. Stephanie will do a standard follow-up with Laurie Walsh (Regional Board) and  
24 may mention the observations of the Copermittees. She will also review the possibility  
25 of raising the behavior concerns to the State, if appropriate.

26 **11. Ad Hoc Committee Updates**

27 ***Regional Trash Study***

28 The second quarter of monitoring has been completed. It included visual and qualitative  
29 monitoring of all devices for the regional program. The rain in January and February did  
30 significant damage to 11 of the 40 devices, due to sediment deposits. As a result, the  
31 consultant did some supplemental monitoring. In areas that are mostly developed,  
32 there were no noticeable issues with sediment. In the County and in smaller, rural  
33 jurisdictions, there were issues with sediment. The table available [here](https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0k0vLfE4TkXWEQ1MjU4bXYxckk&usp=sharing)  
34 ([https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0k0vLfE4TkXWEQ1MjU4bXYxckk&usp=shari](https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0k0vLfE4TkXWEQ1MjU4bXYxckk&usp=sharing)  
35 [ng](https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0k0vLfE4TkXWEQ1MjU4bXYxckk&usp=sharing)) lists the damaged devices. Four of the devices required full replacement from  
36 damage; the rest required repairs. Photos are available at the link provided above.  
37 Repairs should be done by the end of March. The contract for the devices includes one  
38 full replacement for each device; therefore, all replacements and repairs are covered.

1 The potential for sediment deposits should be taken into consideration when  
2 determining the placement of full capture devices. Additional measures or increased  
3 inspections prior to and after rain events may be necessary to ensure screens are not  
4 clogged and prevent flooding of surrounding areas. These are the same type of devices  
5 used in Los Angeles, but Los Angeles is mostly developed and they use guards with  
6 retractable screens to allow through flow in case of high flow events.

7 The next cleanouts are scheduled for May. Visual monitoring is scheduled for the end of  
8 March.

9 ***Regional Monitoring & Assessment Report (RMAR)***

10 The RMAR is on schedule. The watershed portions are currently being reviewed. All  
11 comments are due by tomorrow. The watersheds will have a second draft for review.  
12 Final versions of the watershed sections are scheduled to be done by the end of April.  
13 Weston will prepare the regional section next.

14 ***Storm Water Resource Plan (SWRP)***

15 The draft final SWRP is available at <http://sdirwmp.org/IRWM-planning>. It was  
16 submitted to the State on March 1. Comments are being accepted through March 22  
17 and can be sent to Ruth de la Rosa (County of San Diego). The final SWRP is expected to  
18 be submitted to the State on March 30 and presented at the IRWM April 5 meeting for  
19 adoption.

20 ***Project Clean Water***

21 Login information and training videos for Project Clean Water were distributed several  
22 weeks ago. If Copermittees or consultants have not received the information, they  
23 should contact Joanna Wisniewska (County of San Diego). Also, those interested in  
24 participating in the new ad hoc committee to address the next phase of Project Clean  
25 Water improvements should contact Joanna. The FY2017-18 budget will be used to  
26 develop items not included in the original scope, including the pollution reporting tool  
27 and back-end document sharing features.

28 **12. Legislative Update**

29 Stephanie will continue sending out the CASQA meeting summaries.

30 Sheri McPherson (County of San Diego) mentioned that Copermittees should keep  
31 advised of SB589 and HR465, the State and Federal legislation that will potentially allow  
32 the development of integrated stormwater and wastewater management plans to  
33 comply with Clean Water Act requirements.

1 **13. Announcements**

2 Stormwater Finance Forums are being held in Alhambra on April 3 and Oakland on April  
3 5. Several Copermittees will be attending. The City of San Diego and the Regional Board  
4 will be presenting at the forums.

5 Todd Snyder and JoAnn Weber (County of San Diego) have been working on the TMDL  
6 reopener and cost benefit analysis with several other agencies. Some regulators are  
7 attempting to validate their arguments by saying TMDL implementation is already part  
8 of the normal jurisdiction budgets. To counter these arguments, all Copermittees are  
9 asked to review their JRMP Annual Report costs and provide JoAnn by April 3 the costs  
10 related to Bacteria TMDL implementation. Even those jurisdictions not covered by the  
11 Bacteria TMDL are asked to provide their related monitoring costs.

12 Stephanie announced that Mark Stripp will be leaving the County and returning to New  
13 Zealand. Ruth de la Rosa will cover his previous responsibilities related to the  
14 Copermittees.

15 Marsha Cook is retiring from the County. March 28 will be her last day.

16 The next PPS meeting is scheduled for April 20, 1:30 to 3:30 PM.

Action Item		Responsible Party
1	Provide comments on data sharing template for dry weather MS4 outfall data to RMAR Ad Hoc Committee (Joanna Wisniewska) by mid-April.	All Copermittees
2	Send an email for Copermittees to contact Joanna Wisniewska (County of San Diego) to participate on the Project Clean Water Transitional Team by February 24, 2017.	Stephanie Gaines
3	Add the \$315,000 relinquished by the LDW to the PPS to the next PPS meeting agenda for discussion.	Stephanie Gaines
4	Email the ROWD Update slides to the PPS members.	Paul Hartman
5	Coordinate a meeting with Regional Board Staff to discuss the top three ROWD issues, as appropriate, starting with streamlined reporting. Other Copermittees may attend.	Paul Hartman and JoAnn Weber
6	Email the education/outreach materials table to the PPS.	Stephanie Gaines
7	Coordinate with Cecilia Tipton and John Quenzer to ensure the final deliverables of the watershed stewardship program are available electronically.	Stephanie Gaines

<b>Action Item</b>		<b>Responsible Party</b>
8	Follow-up with Laurie Walsh on the outcomes and observations of the March 15 Regional Board meeting and informational presentation by the Copermittees.	Stephanie Gaines
9	Contact Joanna Wisniewska if the login information for Project Clean Water was not received.	All Copermittees
10	Review JRMP Annual Report costs and provide TMDL information to JoAnn by April 3.	All Copermittees