

# STORMWATER QUALITY STANDARDS TASK FORCE

## MEETING SUMMARY

June 2, 2011

### PARTICIPANTS

Joanne Schneider  
Dave Woelfel  
Mike Adackapara  
Allison Mackenzie  
Dan Bounds (via conference call)  
Pavlova Vitale  
Susan Paulson  
Marsha Westropp  
Ray Hiemstra  
Chris Crompton  
Tim Moore  
Jason Uhley  
Robert Vasquez  
Mike Roberts  
Nancy Sansonetti  
Jennifer Shepardson  
Bobby Gustafson  
Jessica Chin (via conference call)  
Larry McKenney  
Dawna Munson

### REPRESENTING

Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Babcock Labs  
CDM  
City of Corona  
Flow Science  
Orange County Water District  
Orange County Coast Keeper  
Orange County  
Risk Sciences  
Riverside County Flood Control and WCD  
Riverside County Flood Control and WCD  
City of Riverside  
San Bernardino County  
San Bernardino Municipal Water District  
San Bernardino Municipal Water District  
Consultant  
Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority  
Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority

### 1. Introductions / Opening Comments

The Stormwater Quality Standards Task Force meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by Larry McKenney at the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority, Riverside, California. Brief introductions were made.

### 2. Task Force Updates

- **State Board REC Use Proposal Update:** Dave Woelfel reported that this still is being reviewed by the State Board and they hope to have a CEQA document by the end of the year.
- **New Task Force Agreement:** Larry McKenney reported that a new Task Force Agreement must be prepared soon. He will schedule a conference call with the partners for Monday.
- **Regional Board Workshop:** The Regional Board is going to schedule an informational presentation on July 15 in Loma Linda, where the newer Regional Board members can be brought up to date. Joanne Schneider and Tim Moore will discuss the agenda and who'll take the lead on the formal presentations. They'll review the agenda at the next Task Force meeting.

### 3. Implementation Plan Issues

Larry McKenney said that the Task Force had discussed at last month's meeting the major concepts that would guide how the implementation part of the documents would be prepared. Some of that will be reviewed today, and the rest will be sent via email to the group for their review.

Dan Bounds briefly reviewed CDM's Anti-Degradation Analysis memo, pointing out the two different sample calculation methods, and the three analysis methods applied to the data and the results. Extensive discussion ensued about clarifying the Table 1 Analysis Results regarding the sample method numbers one and two, comparing the two methods; potentially dispensing with method two; the significance of having four out of 90 compliant data sets; the potential for using antidegradation targets; having high-flow suspension numbers for wet and dry weather for REC2 water bodies; focusing only on dry weather

conditions for REC2 water bodies and controllable versus non-controllable; and using a specific period of the year like the TMDLs. It was decided that the focus will be on dry weather data for the purposes of antidegradation, and that dry weather is what is considered dry using the same methodology that was used to determine the high-flow suspension; we're using the same method that we're already using for other purposes. Dan Bounds will prepare a revised memo for clarity.

Tim Moore reviewed the first few pages of the Draft Implementation Plan. He noted the challenges of preparing the document in terms of real-world implementation. It is particularly important, with regard to defining compliance, to express the objectives correctly so that the allocations and permit limits are expressed correctly, so that compliance is determined as the Task Force intended. He discussed the problem of controllable vs. non-controllable sources, and the lesser problem of using a surrogate indicator of pathogens. The distinction needs to be drawn that the primary concern is what's pathogenic to humans, so that decisions can be made as to the studies that need to be done. He noted that he also will tie into the document that the purpose of the implementation program is to make certain that we describe our assumptions made when adopting the objectives and that dramatically affected the 13241 analysis. He provided examples and further highlighted points on the document.

Discussion ensued about the extent and thoroughness of the explanatory language that will reflect the thinking of the Task Force and convey the essential points. Joanne Schneider suggested that we need to have the 2010 version of the Basin Plan Amendment and see how our language fits into it.

Tim Moore will email an annotated conceptual outline of the key concepts to the group, and then Joanne Schneider will let him know how much more or little needs to be added. The same approach will be used for the 13241 section; the narrative style issues will be discussed later. The Task Force members need to notify Tim Moore as soon as possible with any comments, particularly if they believe that any of the key concepts are missing. Joanne Schneider will provide the expertise of how the Basin Plan Amendment should be written. It's the Task Force's job to assure that it includes all the key concepts that have been agreed to.

#### **4. Peer Review**

Joanne Schneider said that the reviewers are all set assuming that they get the package by July 12. This date allows for three weeks of comments and responses prior to the Regional Board hearing. However, it is not certain yet that the July schedule is viable, and there's the option to go to the October date if necessary. If the Task Force must revise the schedule, she'll need to verify that the identified peer reviewers are available.

#### **5. Monitoring Program and Agreement**

Tim Moore and Joanne Schneider have worked on the Monitoring Program and Agreement, but it hasn't yet come back to this Task Force. The Monitoring Plan draft will be uploaded to CDMs Website. Larry McKenney noted that there was agreement at the last Task Force meeting that one of the things that needs to go with that is some form of agreement by which the MS4's would manifest their commitment to implementing this program, and developing the first program and submitting it.

**6. Next Meeting Date:** The next Task Force meeting is set for June 30, 2011, 9:30 a.m.

The meeting adjourned at 11:46 a.m.

#### **Handout Materials**

- Anti-degradation Analysis Memo – CDM
- Draft Program Implementation (first pages) – Risk Sciences