

STORMWATER QUALITY STANDARDS TASK FORCE

MEETING SUMMARY

January 7, 2010

PARTICIPANTS

Joanne Schneider (via conference call)
Gerry Thibeault
Dave Woelfel (via conference call)
Hope Smythe
Richard Meyerhoff
Steven Wolosoff
Dan Bounds (via conference call)
Susan Paulson
Maria Elena Kennedy
Chris Crompton
Maryanne Skorpanich
Ray Hiemstra
Marsha Westropp
Autumn DeWoody
Kevin Street
Albert Martinez
Larry McKenney
Tim Moore
Bobby Gustafuson
Matt Yeager (via conference call)
Val Housel
Sandy Caldwell
Jessica Chin
Rod Cruze
Jeff Beehler
Dawna Munson

REPRESENTING

Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
CDM
CDM
CDM
Flow Science
Quail Valley Task Force
County of Orange
County of Orange
Orange County Coast Keeper
Orange County Water District
Inland Empire Water Keeper
City of Riverside
Riverside County Flood Control and WCD
RBF (Consulting for County of Orange)
Risk Sciences
San Bernardino City Water Co.
San Bernardino County
City of San Bernardino MWD
Southstar Engineering
Consultant

Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority
Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority

Introductions & Opening Comments

The Stormwater Quality Standards Task Force meeting was called to order by Larry McKenney at the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority, Riverside, California. Brief introductions were made by the participants.

Task Force Meeting Summary

Task Force Updates

- Joanne Schneider said that according to State Board staff, the questions specific to the Task Force continue to be in management review, and that process has been slowed by the furloughs.
- The CEQA Scoping Meeting is scheduled for January 28th from 10 a.m. – noon at SAWPA.

Technical Task Update (CDM)

Dan Bounds asked if the four technical tasks and recreational use survey (DeAnza and San Diego Channels) information on the Website is at a point where CDM can finalize the document. It was agreed that everyone has until January 21 to comment. It will be finalized after that.

Task Force Staff Report (Risk Sciences)

Tim Moore said the Draft Staff Report will be ready to present at the CEQA hearing on the 28th. The implementation plan and a portion of the monitoring plan will be ready next week. The 13241 section will be done last, after the CEQA Scoping Meeting, to allow for comments and input.

He suggested providing as appendices items such as CDM's Report and a chronological view of the science behind how the group arrived at the objectives. The Staff Report will serve as a summary and then will reference the original science/appendices. It's also important is to cite the EPA Bacteria Implementation Guidance of 2004.

He reviewed his goals for preparing the Draft Staff Report for the Regional Board, as well as formatting considerations and how to best layout the arguments. He said that then perhaps the Regional Board could take it from that point. Joanne Schneider suggested that CDM is better positioned to detail how we arrived at high flow suspension criteria. She continued that the report also needs an explanation of the technical basis for how we reached the consensus (for clarity), and the documentation. It's critical that people understand the health risks related to gastro-intestinal illness. We can encapsulate the scientific basis of the objectives in CDM's report and refer to it, but everyone needs to understand the scientific basis of health risk decisions.

It also would be helpful to have greater discussion of the Task Force process, including consideration of scientific basis, studying what other states have done, reviewing beneficial use designations, and whether or not the underlying uses of REC-1 were accurately portrayed. All this led us to look at beneficial use designations and a host of other considerations and studies. She noted that this Task Force should take credit for the remarkable work it has done, and should lay it all out even if it means making the staff report more voluminous. There are many components that need to be addressed, but all the decision points need to be thoroughly explained. CDM needs to focus on high flow suspension and make a compelling case for why we arrived at the high flow suspension criteria – explaining the different considerations that led us through our thought process. Organizationally, she suggested including regulatory background for those not as familiar with it, and then the Task Force summary of its formation, activities, ground rules, and cross references to reports.

Extensive discussion ensued on formatting the report and assuring that it is thoroughly documented and referenced to make a strong case for why the objectives should be changed. An Executive Summary will be prepared after it's assembled for those who don't want to delve into all the details and process. In terms of the actual amendments, the group concurred that the place to start the narrative is with the objectives.

It was agreed that before Tim Moore turns over the report to Joanne Schneider, he will do another revision that will reflect the input from today's meeting as to more detailed descriptions of the overall process, organization of the text, the task force process and activities, and allow him to receive feedback on the best use of the appendices and/or other particular issues. CDM will lend their technical support, particularly with high-flow suspension. Tim Moore noted the importance of getting each foundational principal of the report in the logical order before proceeding with writing the next sections. Richard Meyerhoff and Tim Moore will discuss the best way to get the outline done. A suggestion was made to include site specific data.

Joanne Schneider will prepare the outline and will put together the water quality standards section. Richard Meyerhoff suggested that when writing the outline, to note places that may call out for graphics.

Tim Moore reviewed the remainder of the draft staff report, noting that page five lists the most salient recommendations. He queried the group as to consensus on the topics, and asked for any comments. The Task Force suggested some changes in the Summary of Recommendations:

No. 2: delete words "believed to be"

No. 5: more detail is needed

No. 12: clarification is needed regarding TMDLs: Where there are additional bacteria-related TMDLs, we would consider revisions to this comprehensive monitoring plan to address any needs that may arise.

Discussion ensued on some of the definitions and the alternative categories, if any were missed, and how much detail is needed. The Task Force concurred that there were no other major alternatives.

A question arose about the discussion of REC-2. It was agreed that even though there were no changes made to it, that all the discussion and work on it should be reflected in the report.

Tim Moore noted that he needs to add discussion on the idea that one should measure pathogens directly. It needs to be addressed because the language in the Basin Plan states that alternate methods may come along that more directly measure pathogens, and at that time, the Board may consider using those instead.

Further discussion ensued regarding potential additions and language for the Draft Report.

Compliance Engineering/Cost Analysis (CDM/Risk Sciences)

Steve Wolosoff of CDM gave a presentation on the objectives of the compliance engineering study done in San Bernardino County. He reviewed a map of the waterbodies in the County for REC-1 use protection; criteria for identifying outfalls from MS4s; the diversion facility concept; the planning level cost estimate including the costs for diversion and conveyance, estimated at \$1.8 million per diversion facility (City of LA, 2009); the key assumptions in developing an estimate of POTW capacity and treatment costs; the planning level cost estimate – summary of potential costs for San Bernardino County MS4s within the Santa Ana River Watershed, and the limitations of the analysis.

Tim Moore noted that this is to be taken as a pilot, and asked the group for comments. He suggested that the Task Force provide bullet-list comments as to what they would like to see in the first cut of the cost analysis.

13241 Socio-Economic Analysis: Outline (Risk Sciences)

Deferred.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 11, 2010; 9:30 a.m.