

Regional WURMP Workgroup

Meeting Notes

Wednesday, August 19, 2009, 1:30 – 3:30 p.m.

**County of San Diego
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite P**

1. Introductions

No action items.

2. Administrative Issues

Research Projects. An email was distributed regarding the UC-Riverside Water Science & Policy Center. The Center is seeking input on topics for research in water quality.

Consultant Request. Malcolm Pirnie is interested in submitting proposals for TMDL or related work, and would like to be included in any RFP lists.

3. Issues from the Monitoring Workgroup

The group will be putting out two contracts: one for field work and one for data analysis and reporting (including gathering data sources, watershed assessment). We need to form two selection committees. Interested parties should contact Todd Snyder or Jo Ann Weber. The group noted that it could be possible for one consultant to receive both contracts, or they could be awarded to two different consultants. Strict timelines will need to be built into the contracts.

4. Watershed Activities Database Demonstration

Mikhail Ogawa gave a presentation of the database, which was originally developed for use in data reporting in the Penasquitos, San Dieguito, and Carlsbad watersheds. The database can be used to create automated Watershed Activity Sheets. Mikhail is still looking at individual data fields such as pollutant activities and pollutant types to find the proper balance between detail and data roll-up. The database will be refined more before it is ready for general distribution for comments. It does not have “Sharepoint”-like document sharing/document control functionality. Mikhail is investigating how to get the system to create two different types of output: activity sheets and the annual update of each activity sheet.

5. Budget and Workplan for FY 09-10

A motion was made to reassign the funds from Subtask 2F to the Watershed Activities Database. This motion was approved. The funds will be allocated as \$10,000 consultant cost and \$10,000 staff time. The current subcommittee, minus Mikhail Ogawa, will continue with this activity.

6. Update on South Orange County MS4 Permit

An update on the 6th edit of this permit renewal was provided based on information from the July 1, 2009, meeting of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Some of these items may be subject to change. Notable features of the permit include the following:

- All non-stormwater discharges are prohibited except items that are specifically exempted in the Permit.

- Exempt non-stormwater discharges shown by monitoring to exceed numeric limits must also be prohibited.
- Overirrigation is prohibited.
- Numeric limits are needed.
- Municipal action levels are changed to “upset levels” to prioritize based on fund availability.
- The watershed language is similar to that now being proposed in San Diego (item 7, below).

7. Proposed Changes to WURMP Permit Language

Copies of the draft language were distributed for discussion. Regional Board staff presented the draft language and responded to questions.

- Board staff presentation: The language revision was performed in response to the EPA consultant’s audit comments. The intention is to eliminate double reporting and direct efforts toward benefiting water quality. The plan is to focus on receiving water problems and then work backwards. The revised language will provide more flexibility in approaching problems and more control in developing the work plan. “Activity” requirements have been removed. The first draft was reviewed by the Copermittee Workgroup Subcommittee and by Coastkeeper. Coastkeeper liked it overall, and wants the process to remain transparent and to have more access to raw data. Many of Coastkeeper’s comments have already been incorporated.
- Proposed timeline: There is no firm timeline for adoption. Board staff hopes to move this along fairly quickly within this Permit cycle. The Copermittees will combine their comments into a unified set at their September 16 meeting and provide the unified comments to Regional Board staff by September 18. Board staff will then evaluate the comments and determine the timeline based on the scope of the comments.
- Q(section 1e): Many programs are not site-specific or mappable. How does this fit? A: Map the specific locations of on-the-ground BMPs.
- Q(section 1e): What is the purpose of the map? A: To provide the Board and the public a visual impression of what is going on.
- Q(section 1e): Does the map show all BMPs? A: It should show BMPs used to address high-priority water quality issues.
- Q(section 1e): Should the map include jurisdictional BMPs? A: Yes, if they address high-priority water quality issues.
- RB staff: The “workplan” concept is meant to identify the highest priority water quality problem and how it is/will be addressed. The goal is to focus effort, resources, and reporting on the highest priority. The workplan will be “looked at closely”. It is a different tool than the annual report.
- Q(section 1e): How much detail should be shown for lower-priority issues? A: The intent is to focus on the highest priority water quality problem. There is recognition that

- Q(section 1f-h): Must “characterization” be performed for high-priority water bodies or all water bodies? A: Focus on high priority. This is similar to the Source ID program up within the watershed. Board staff feels not enough is being done currently.
- Q(section 1i): The draft language notes that BMPs not contributing to improvements shall be “removed and replaced”; does this include JURMP requirements? A: No, only WURMP requirements.
- Copermittees: The language inconsistency between sections 1i and 1j needs to be fixed.
- (section 1j)Copermittees: It is very difficult to link BMP effectiveness and receiving water quality improvement. The suggestion is to look at these collectively.
- Q(section 1j): Can effectiveness measurements be focused on discharge quality? This is more practical. A: It is very important to have receiving water monitoring and demonstrate effectiveness.
- Q: Does section 1j replace the assessment section of the WURMP? A: Yes. “If (a BMP) works, everybody do it.”
- Copermittees: The wording of section 1j needs to be tweaked to address the specific concerns of the watershed, as well as practicality.
- Q(section 2): What happens if the workplan is not approved? A: Negotiation. “We realize resources are not unending, so we want them to go toward the highest priority problem.” “We expect to be involved in the development of the workplan.:
- Q(section 3): How are updates processed? A: They will be reviewed and comments will be returned.
- Copermittees: Language should be added to sections 3 and 4 regarding the timing of the review and comment process for updates, similar to the SUSMP language.
- Copermittees: Request a time frame for notification before a review is conducted, preferably 60 days. There is also a need to look at the dates in section 3.
- Q: Is the intent to focus on TMDLs? A: Yes. Board staff is not entirely averse to the idea of revising the Copermittee monitoring programs to address these issues.

Copermittee comments are due to Todd Snyder by September 9, 2009. The subworkgroup will synthesize the comments for review at the next Workgroup meeting on September 16. The unified comments will be sent to Regional Board staff on September 18. Individual jurisdictions can still submit comments during the public review period.

8. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Regional WURMP Workgroup will take place on Wednesday, September 16, 2009, from 1:30 – 3:30 p.m. at the County of San Diego Offices, 5201 Ruffin Road, Suite P, San Diego, CA 92123.