

# STORMWATER QUALITY STANDARDS TASK FORCE

## MEETING SUMMARY

April 26, 2012

### PARTICIPANTS

Joanne Schneider  
Dave Woelfel  
Dan Bounds (via teleconference)  
Chris Crompton  
Maryanne Skorpanich  
Daniel Orr  
Susan Paulson  
Dean Kirk  
Sat Tamarabuchi  
Marsha Westropp  
Tim Moore  
Claudio Padres  
Bobby Gustafson  
Matt Yeager  
Larry McKenney  
Dawna Munson

### REPRESENTING

Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board  
CDM  
County of Orange  
County of Orange  
Department of Fish & Game  
Flow Science  
Irvine Co.  
Irvine Co.  
Orange County Water District  
Risk Sciences  
Riverside County Flood Control & WCD  
San Bernardino City Water  
Yeager Environmental  
Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority  
Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority

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.

### **1. Review of EPA Hearing**

Tim Moore provided a brief recap of the EPA hearing held in March. The hearing date has been extended to April 27. In the meantime, other comments had come in. He had held discussions with several people on how to best respond to the comments. He quickly reviewed all the concerns. The EPA had several issues, but after further explanation, they had a much better understanding of the Task Force's position.

Tim Moore reviewed the Task Force definition of REC-1. He said that the EPA's objection was that it would allow less protection, and there also were concerns of maintaining statewide consistency. In the discussion at EPA, they focused on clarifying that it wasn't a big change and it is consistent with the Federal definition.

Tim Moore reviewed the EPA's comments regarding the errata to the proposed amendment to the water quality control plan for recreational uses. Larry McKenney reviewed the State's definition of REC-1 from the EPA Region 9 comment sheet, and Joanne Schneider reviewed the errata sheet and the EPAs objections.

### **2. Review of Presentation**

Joanne Schneider reviewed the presentation that she would be giving on the Proposed Basin Plan Amendments. It began with the purpose, the additional documentation – supplemental staff report, and then the proposed revised narrative to the amendments (errata). They will first clarify the nature of activities considered REC1 vs. REC2, and the associated likelihood of ingestion. She reviewed the California definition of REC1 and REC2, and then continued reviewing the presentation and the individual points of the errata sheet and the proposed modifications. The presentation will conclude with a summary of the proposed amendments and the supportive criteria for recommending that the Board adopt the Resolution No. R8-2012-0001.

The Task Force members provided suggestions for minor changes to the presentation. Tim Moore noted that it may be prudent to include the precedential decision.

### **3. Review of EPA's Comment Letter**

The Task Force finished reviewing the EPA's comments and last refinements to the responses. Joanne Schneider said that all the comments—initial and supplementary—will be merged and posted online.

### **4. Closing Comments**

Larry McKenney said that both CDM and Risk Sciences still are under contract to get the Task Force through the final approval, and we're carrying forward with the money SAWPA has from the partners. However, the current Task Force agreement recently expired. In the event that more money must be added to the contracts, a new agreement must be created and in place. Another consideration is to think about preparing the monitoring plan and having the Task Force's input on that. He will make a few revisions to the draft agreement that he had prepared a few months ago, and re-circulate it among the Task Force.

The meeting adjourned at 11:21 a.m.

### **Handout Materials**

- EPA Region 9 Comments to the SARWQCB Regarding the Errata to the Proposed Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for Recreational Uses
- Draft Responses to Heal the Bay's Supplemental Comments Concerning the Use Attainability Analysis