

STORMWATER QUALITY STANDARDS TASK FORCE

MEETING SUMMARY

March 1, 2012

PARTICIPANTS

Joanne Schneider (via teleconference)
Dave Woelfel
Richard Meyerhoff
Amanda Carr
Marsha Westropp
Chris Crompton
Ray Hiemstra
Maryanne Skorpanich
Susan Paulson
Tim Moore
Jason Uhley
Jennifer Shepardson
Jessica Chin
Allison McKenzie
Larry McKenney
Dawna Munson

REPRESENTING

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

Introductions / Opening Comments

The Stormwater Quality Standards Task Force meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m. by Larry McKenney at the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority, Riverside, California. Brief introductions were made.

1. Task Force Updates

A. Status of Statewide REC Standards Project – Dave Woelfel said at the State Board meeting in December, staff indicated that they would wait for the EPA to come out with their final draft guidance.

2. Review of Comments Received on Proposed Basin Plan Amendment

A. Support Letters:

Joanne Schneider said that those interested in seeing the support letters received to date can look on the website under Attachment E. Some very thoughtful comments were received from Ray Hiemstra, and these issues can be readily addressed. Ray Hiemstra reviewed his comments and concerns about the high flow suspension, and concerns about the maps potentially being misused for other things. Discussion ensued with an exchange of comments and agreeable solutions to these concerns.

B. US EPA Comments: Joanne Schneider said that a letter also arrived from the US EPA with very disappointing comments considering the meticulous work this Task Force has done. The group must work through these comments today, as this will have a large impact on how to proceed. She had asked the EPA to withdraw the comment letter; however, they will stand by their comments. Therefore, today's discussion will focus on changes to consider.

3. March 16 Public Hearing

A. Discussion re: EPA Comments:

Tim Moore outlined the EPA's major issues, and the workgroup discussed potential adjustments, solutions, and in some areas, rebuttal language to help clarify the Task Force's position on the issues:

- The EPA is uncomfortable with the maps and the number of streams presented to be eligible for high flow suspension. They believe it should apply only in concrete channels, and that the list of engineered channels named was overly broad and it could be abused and excessively applied.

The Task Force has had many discussions over the years, and purposely was more aggressive in designating the channels thought to be modified; however, it was decided to redefine it to only the concrete channels and to those that are “heavily modified.” It also should be clearer that it’s a multi-factor, suite of factors. The best course of action is to again verify the list of channels against the suite of factors, such as the example for Reach 3.

- The Task Force must consider how long any adjustments may take. It is more important from the EPA’s view to go back and clarify; emphasizing “engineered or heavily modified channels.”
- The group concurred about changing the language for natural channels to say “modified to a degree that it significantly increases the hazard.”
- The group concurred as to including the words “substantially” or “significantly” modified.
- A suggestion was made to color-code the creeks and streams per the criteria met in order to demonstrate more of the strength of cause.
- There needs to be emphasis that safety is of paramount concern prior to detailing how it all works.
- It was suggested that the maps be labeled as well.
- The focus needs to be on changes to the Basin Plan Amendment itself, and not to the Staff Report.
- Regarding the EPA’s dissatisfaction with how the antidegradation targets were done for the REC-2 locations, an idea is to drop back to the 75th percentile, and trade concentration for frequency; it more closely matches how the EPA does the calculations. We have the data to recalculate those 75th percentages and establish a new table. Tim Moore will ask Steve Wolosoff to do this.
- Regarding the EPA’s comments that the Task Force “not revise the definition of REC-1, in the interest of State-wide consistency”, the Task Force’s position is that it is not changing the original definition, but *clarifying* it to avoid misinterpretation; we’re using more precise language.
- The group discussed the Task Force’s position regarding the EPA proposing that a statistical threshold value be in the standards, and that the value be calculated only on the default data variability log standard deviation.

B. Coordination of Presentation:

- The Task Force concurred to go forward with the Public Hearing on March 16.
- Larry McKenney commented that the Regional Board staff and Joanne Schneider will address the EPA, and this Task Force is there to support them.
- The high flow suspension assignments given out today need to be finished within a week.
- Joanne Schneider reviewed the upcoming schedule; it would be ideal to get an errata sheet ready so it can be mailed to the Board at the end of the week. One errata sheet should capture as much of the changes at one time as possible.
- Larry McKenney noted that it would be beneficial for the Regional Board to hear from this Task Force, and he encouraged Task Force members to attend the Public Hearing and be prepared to speak about their participation in the Task Force efforts.

The meeting adjourned at 4:31 p.m.

Handout Materials

None.