

Meeting Summary: Dry Weather Monitoring Workgroup

Meeting Date:	Wednesday, April 22, 2009
Meeting Time:	10:00 AM – 12:00 noon
Meeting Place:	Port of San Diego 3165 Pacific Highway San Diego, CA 92101

Meeting Attendees

Name	Jurisdiction/Organization
John Quenzer	D-Max, for City of National City
Arsalan Dadkhah	D-Max Engineering
Jessica Erickson	City of San Diego
Courtenay White	City of San Diego
Steve DiDonna	County of San Diego
Chris Helmer	City of Imperial Beach
Blake Behringer	City of El Cajon
Garret Williams	Weston Solutions
Christa Zacharias	Nautilus Environmental
Phil Gibbons	Port of San Diego
Damon LaCasella	Port of San Diego
Jeff Warner	EDAW, for City of Escondido
Krista Schneider	MACTEC
Jeff Higbee	City of Carlsbad
Helen Perry	City of Santee

Action Items

- Arsalan Dadkhah: email a pdf of presentation slides to Helen Perry for distribution to the group.
- Helen Perry: email group members to request their jurisdictions' votes for what set of numbers they prefer to use as the updated bacteria action levels. The pdf of the action level presentation will be attached to the email.
- All Copermittees: email your jurisdiction's preferred choice for action levels to Helen Perry.
- Helen Perry: provide an updated trash assessment form to the Regional Monitoring Workgroup for consideration at its next meeting.
- Next meeting: Tentatively scheduled for October 13, 2009 between 10 am and 12 pm at the City of Santee. An update email confirming the location will be sent prior to the meeting.

Overall Meeting Summary

1. Introductions
2. The minutes from the last meeting were approved.
3. Dry Weather Action Level Presentation (Arsalan Dadkhah)
 - Arsalan Dadkhah of D-Max Engineering presented the results of statistical analyses of total coliform, fecal coliform, and Enterococcus bacteria data from the 2002 through 2007 dry weather monitoring programs. Content included the following:
 - Discussion of data acquisition and quality control process. Only routine site visit data was used. Data points at or above the maximum

quantification limits set by the workgroup (1.6 million MPN/100 mL for total coliform, 160,000 for fecal coliform and Enterococcus) were flagged, and jurisdictions were called to determine if the jurisdiction had any reason that the data should be removed from the data set (for example it was not a routine site visit data point). Data from about 25 sites was removed from the overall data set as a result of this process.

- Discussion of analysis methods and results of analyses. Methods included ranked percentiles, confidence intervals for the mean, mean plus one standard deviation, and median plus one standard deviation. All analyses except percentile were based on log-transformed data; the transformation was done so that the analyses could be done on a data set with a normal distribution. Percentile data would be more easily updated and be less likely to be skewed by extreme outliers.
 - The results of most of the analyses methods resulted in total coliform values above the existing action level (50,000 MPN/100 mL) and fecal coliform and Enterococcus values below their existing action levels (20,000 and 10,000 MPN/100 mL, respectively).
 - In general, the group thought this outcome made sense because total coliform bacteria is typically not as good of an indicator as fecal coliform and Enterococcus bacteria, and practically doing upstream investigations related to the latter two indicators would likely be a better use of time than doing total coliform upstream investigations.
 - Also, it was mentioned that the numbers presented were relatively close to the action levels used for coastal monitoring, although the specific action levels used for coastal monitoring were not provided.
 - The concept of using combination action levels based on an "and" type of statement was raised. This type of approach would take into consideration levels of multiple bacterial indicators at the same time and run them through an equation or flow chart to determine if an upstream investigation was necessary.
 - Some group members expressed interest in seeing if one set of action levels could be used for both dry weather and coastal monitoring.
 - Helen Perry let all group members know that the item would be put to vote through email, and that a pdf of the presentation slides would be sent out along with the email that requested a vote.
4. Modifications to the Trash Assessment Form: Threat to Aquatic Health, Threat to Human Health
- The County of San Diego received comments from the RWQCB suggesting that more specific definitions for two items on the trash assessment form, threat to aquatic health and threat to human health, would be beneficial.
 - Helen Perry presented some draft suggestions for definitions based on the program used in the San Francisco Bay region, the City of San Diego's trash assessment program, and some comments provided previously by workgroup members.
 - Several people suggested that defining criteria for when to check the box on the form was the most straightforward way to proceed rather than attempting to create a gradient system with several potential outcomes. The group decided to take this approach.

- "Pet waste" was changed to "animal waste" on the form because it was brought up that some people may have a difficult time distinguishing between pet waste and wildlife waste.
- The definition of "batteries" was changed to "vehicle batteries" to clarify the meaning.
- The draft language was clarified to indicate which items trigger a threat when more than 50 are present and which trigger a threat when more than one are present, as some felt the original wording was not completely clear.
- Language was added to clarify that overall best professional judgment is also a factor in the evaluation.

5. Other Items

- The City of San Diego brought up the idea of potentially suggesting (for the next Permit cycle) that dry weather monitoring could be conducted during dry weather conditions during both the wet and dry seasons. The main potential benefits mentioned was that it would help detect IC/IDs that occur outside the dry season period.
- Garret Williams brought up that Weston had noticed that some of the proposed random MS4 outfall monitoring locations were essentially natural channels rather than typical outfalls to water bodies. Steve DiDonna explained that the reason for this is that the MS4 monitoring workplan allowed using maintained channels as sites so that jurisdictions that have few outfalls can still meet the requirement to monitor the appropriate amount of sites. Garret indicated that Weston would look into it further to see what effect it might have on analyzing the data from the program.
- The City of National City mentioned that it had been stated that targeted dry weather MS4 monitoring data must be submitted by August 1, but the MS4 monitoring workplan states that monitoring can be done up to August 1. If monitoring can be done by August 1, can the data potentially be submitted slightly after August 1 to allow for data processing and entry? Helen Perry suggested that this was a question that should be referred to the Regional Monitoring Workgroup.

6. Future Meetings

- The next meeting is tentatively set for October 13, 2009.