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PART A
SAN DIEGO REGION STAFF ACTIVITIES (Staff Contact)

1. Public Outreach/Conference – 16th Annual West Coast Conferences on Soils, Sediments and Water (John Odermatt) (Attachment A-1)
   During March 13 to 16, 2006; the Regional Board staffs from the Tanks Site Mitigation and Cleanup, DoD/SLIC, and Land Discharge Units attended the Association of Environmental Health and Sciences (AEHS) 16th Annual West Coast Conference on Soils, Sediments and Water at the Mission Valley Marriott. The AEHS web site can be found at: www.aehs.com. Participants at the AEHS conference included an international group of consultants, dischargers, and regulatory agency staff. Kelly Dorsey (Regional Board Tanks Unit) and Dr. Margaret Eggers (Eggers Environmental, Inc.) co-authored a presentation entitled “Overview of the Development and Maturation of a Large MTBE Plume – Lessons to Learn” (see attachment A-1). The presentation contained an update of work on investigation and cleanup of pollution from discharges of fuel pollutants (including MTBE) from the Mission Valley Terminal located in proximity to Qualcomm Stadium. The AEHS sponsored an evening session concerning implementation of the California Accelerated Cleanup Program (CACP). The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the State Water Resources Control Board and the County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health (DEH) jointly hosted the CACP session. The Regional Board staff also attended a technical workshop on the development, review, and use of US EPA’s updated Johnson and Ettinger (J&E) model spreadsheet. The J&E model is widely used to assess potential for vapor intrusion from releases of volatile pollutants from leaking underground storage tank (UST) sites across the U.S.

2. Southern California Wetlands Recovery Project (Bruce Posthumus)
   The Southern California Wetlands Recovery Project (WRP) (http://www.scwrp.org/) is a partnership of eighteen federal and state agencies, including the SDRWQCB, working cooperatively with local governments, businesses, non-profit organizations, and other stakeholders to acquire, restore, and enhance coastal wetlands and watersheds in southern California.

   The WRP Wetlands Symposium 2006 was held March 8-10 in Santa Barbara. In conjunction with the symposium, the WRP Board of Governors (http://www.scwrp.org/governing_board.htm) and the WRP Public Advisory Committee (http://www.scwrp.org/PAC.htm) met on March 8 in Santa Barbara.
The Board of Governors received and expressed particular interest in a report on "Evaluation of Wetland Mitigation Project Success," presented by Dr. Richard Ambrose, a Professor in the Department of Environmental Health Sciences and Director of the Environmental Science and Engineering Program at UCLA. The wetland mitigation projects evaluated were implemented to comply with conditions of Clean Water Act (CWA) section 401 certifications issued by water boards in California. The evaluation found that such mitigation projects typically fell substantially short of fully providing the wetland functions lost as a result of the activities for which the CWA section 401 certifications were provided. This finding is important for the WRP, since the finding suggests that wetlands functions continue to be lost, even as the WRP works to recover wetlands functions. This finding is also important for the water boards, since the water boards are responsible for issuing CWA section 401 certifications that ensure attainment of water quality standards, including protection of beneficial uses associated with wetlands. This finding is also consistent with the results of a recent study of CWA section 401 certification sites in the upper Santa Margarita Watershed. A written report of the Santa Margarita study, which was conducted by one of the SDRWQCB’s watershed protection units, will be presented to the SDRWQCB in the near future.

The Board of Governors also received a report on activities of the Public Advisory Committee. The Public Advisory Committee report indicated that work has begun to explore how county governments can use their authorities to better protect wetlands. Increased protection of wetlands by counties - and cities - would be an important positive step for the protection of wetlands, water quality, and beneficial uses.

The Board of Governors also received reports on implementation of WRP projects and the work of the Science Advisory Panel (http://www.scwrp.org/SAP.htm). The Board of Governors took action to make the Wildlife Conservation Board (http://www.wcb.ca.gov/) a WRP member agency, revise the WRP Five Year Implementation Plan, and approve new members of the Science Advisory Panel.

The Public Advisory Committee meeting included reports on a “summit” meeting of the five county supervisors who serve as co-chairs of the WRP county task forces; measures being considered in the current legislative session that may affect wetlands, watersheds, and coastal resources; and the future of the WRP local assistance program.

Topics of sessions at the WRP Symposium included (among others):

- Anticipating impacts of climate change on southern California coastal wetlands and watersheds;
- Applying landscape ecology to wetland and watershed management in southern California;
- Low impact development in land use planning;
- Invasive plant control;
- Diversifying the restoration movement;
- Strategies to restore steelhead to southern California streams; and
- Linking habitat condition and water quality evaluations.
Bruce Posthumus attends meetings of the WRP Wetland Managers Group (http://www.scwrp.org/managers_group.htm) and the San Diego County and Orange County task forces of the WRP (http://www.scwrp.org/county_task_forces.htm) on behalf of the SDRWQCB.

3. Multi-Media Enforcement Training (Mark Alpert)
Regional Board staff recently attended the following Enforcement training courses. Training of regulatory staff across all of California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA) Boards, Departments, and Organizations is an important element of Cal/EPAs focus on improving awareness of those dischargers that violate multiple environmental laws:

**Advanced Environmental Crimes Training Program**
Mark Alpert of the of the Compliance Assurance Unit attended the two-week course “Advanced Environmental Crimes Training Program” held at the California Specialized Training Institute in San Luis Obispo from January 23 – February 3, 2006. The course is offered by USEPA Criminal Investigation Division and is typically taught at the Federal Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) in Glynco, Georgia. The purpose of the course is to train criminal investigators to work collaboratively with environmental regulators to prosecute environmental crimes, particularly those involving cross media violations. A cross section of many of the Cal/EPA Boards, Departments, and Organizations attended the course. The Western States Project provided scholarships for all 25 students through a settlement of prosecution against People v. 7 Eleven Inc., for underground storage tank violations.

**Interviewing For Regulators**
On March 24, 2006, Vicente Rodriguez, Rebecca Stewart, and Frank Melbourn of the Compliance Assurance Unit attended "Basic Interviewing for Regulators" training in Riverside, CA sponsored by the Western States Project and the California Environmental Protection Agency. This daylong course was developed to improve interviewing skills for environmental regulators during their inspections and other contacts with the regulated community. The course involved student involvement and utilized role players to illustrate the effective interview techniques, particularly: verbal and nonverbal communication and active listening skills. Representatives of most of the Cal/EPA Boards, Departments, and Organizations attended the class.

4. Presentation at California Water Environment Association (CWEA) P3S Conference (Frank Melbourn)
CWEA held its 33rd Annual P3S (Pretreatment, Pollution Prevention, and Stormwater) Conference on February 27th through March 1st, 2006 in Burbank, California. During the EPA Stormwater Training session, Frank Melbourn of the Compliance Assurance Unit presented a synopsis of a recent construction enforcement case heard by the Regional Board.
5. World Water Day, March 22, 2006 (Frank Melbourn)
Frank Melbourn of the Compliance Assurance Unit and Edward Jabari of MWH Global, Inc. made a World Water Day presentation to 60 kindergartners of Francis Parker Lower School about the lack of water and sanitation for many people worldwide. According to the International Rescue Committee (IRC), there are still almost 1.1 billion people without adequate access to water and 2.4 billion without adequate sanitation. The annual international observance of World Water Day is an initiative that grew out of the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro. This year's World Water Day theme was 'Water and Culture' under the leadership of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

This was a great opportunity to increase the children's appreciation for clean water and the necessary infrastructure that we all enjoy here in the Region.

6. San Diego River Conservancy—Adoption of the Five Year Strategic and Infrastructure Plan 2006-2011 (Michael McCann)
On March 24, 2006, the Governing Board of the San Diego River Conservancy adopted a 5-year strategic and infrastructure plan for 2006 through 2011. The adoption of this comprehensive plan caps the excellent progress achieved by the conservancy in the first three years of its existence. The adopted 5-year plan can be accessed on the conservancy's website http://www.sdrc.ca.gov

In the plan, the conservancy's numerous objectives are grouped into the following four program areas: 1) land conservation; 2) recreation and education; 3) natural and cultural resources and restoration; and 4) water quality and natural flood conveyance. For the water quality program, the conservancy's goal is to promote and implement projects that maintain and improve water quality and the natural flood conveyance of the San Diego River. A project study to assess the hydrology of the San Diego River watershed is proposed. Future water quality projects will be based on the recommendations from this hydrological assessment study.

A major topic of discussion at the annual conference of CWEA in Sacramento on April 5-7, 2006 was the State Board's efforts to develop and adopt general waste discharge requirements to wastewater collection agencies in the state to reduce sewage overflows. Bryan Brock of the State Board addressed a number of sessions at the conference about the proposed requirements that will be before the State Board for adoption at the State Board's meeting scheduled for Wednesday, May 3, 2006 starting at 10:00 a.m. The State Board requests all comments on the tentative requirements and the proposed fee schedule no later than April 24, 2006. Attached is a copy of the public notice for the May 3 hearing. The tentative requirements are available on the State Board website at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov
PART B
SIGNIFICANT REGIONAL WATER QUALITY ISSUES

1. Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSO) (Eric Becker, Charles Cheng, Cade Johnson, Joann Lim, Melissa Valdovinos, Victor Vasquez) (Attachment B-1)
From March 1 to March 31, 2006, there were 24 sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs) from publicly-owned collection systems reported to the Regional Board office; 16 of these spills reached surface waters or storm drains, three of which resulted in closure of recreational waters. Of the total number of overflows from public systems, seven were 1,000 gallons or more. The combined total volume of reported sewage spilled from all publicly-owned collection systems for the month of March 2006 was 125,912 gallons.

There were also 14 sewage overflows from private property reported in March 2006. Six of these spills reached surface waters or storm drains, one of which resulted in closure of recreational waters. One of the overflows from private property was 1,000 gallons or more.

The total rainfall amount for March 2006 recorded at San Diego’s Lindbergh Field was 1.36 inches. For comparison, in February 2006, 1.11 inches of rainfall was recorded at Lindbergh Field, and 27 public SSOs were reported. Also for comparison, in March 2005, 2.12 inches of rainfall was recorded at Lindbergh Field, and 15 public SSOs were reported.

Attached is a table titled “Sanitary Sewer Overflow Statistics,” updated through March 31, 2006, which contains a summary of all SSOs by fiscal year (FY) from each agency since FY 2001-2002.

Additional information about the Regional Board’s SSO regulatory program is available at the Regional Board’s website at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/programs/sso.html.

There was no Notice of Violation (NOV) issued in March for significant overflows.

2. Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification Actions Taken in March 2006 (Chiara Clemente) (Attachment B-2)
Section 401 of the Clean Water Act requires that any person applying for a federal permit or license which may result in a discharge of pollutants into waters of the United States, must obtain a state water quality certification that the activity complies with all applicable water quality standards, limitations, and restrictions. The majority of project applications are submitted because generally applicants are also applying for a Section 404 permit from the Army Corps of Engineers, for filling or armorining of creeks and streams. See attached table (B-2).
Public notification of pending 401 Water Quality Certification applications can be found on our web site at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/programs/401cert.html.

3. Grants Update (Chiara Clemente)

Status of State Bond Act and Federal 319(h) Grant Program Projects
Regional Board currently manages 35 grant-funded contracts worth approximately $51 million. These grants are managed to ensure conformance with the grant agreement terms and conditions. Upon recommendation of the Grants Unit, on March 15, 2006, two notices of termination were sent from the State Board’s Division of Financial Assistance (DFA) to the Los Penasquitos Lagoon Foundation, terminating two grants, totaling $2.5 million. Unspent grant funds will revert to the State’s Proposition 13 budget to be re-awarded.

Proposition 40 and Proposition 50 Consolidated Grants Program
The Concept Proposal Solicitation Notice was released on January 5, 2006, and applications were due electronically by February 9, 2006. Over 470 Concept Proposal applications were received and screened for eligibility. SWRCB is working with all Regional Boards to complete reviews and develop the invite-back lists for the non-ocean protection projects.

At least $10 million of the Proposition 50 Coastal Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program funds are reserved for ocean protection projects that meet the mutual priorities of the SWRCB and Ocean Protection Council. The Regional Board participated in the development of an invite-back list for the ocean protection projects. Invitations to submit Full Proposals for the ocean protection project funds were sent to 14 applicants on Tuesday, March 14. Three of these applicants are in Region 9. The Ocean Protection Project invite-back list and Full Proposal Solicitation Notice are available on-line at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/funding/cg_ocean.html.

Proposition 50 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program
The IRWM public meeting to discuss the results of Step 1, and the Step 2 call-back, was held March 17 at the CalEPA Building in Sacramento. In Region 9, one application (County of Orange, PIN #6504) was called back to submit a full proposal. Additional information on the Step 2 call-back is available on-line at http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/funding/irwmgp/irwm_imple.html#announcements.

The San Diego County IRWM application (PIN #4136) was not invited back to submit a full proposal. A meeting with the San Diego County Water Authority, County of San Diego, and City of San Diego was held on March 29 to discuss comments on their application. The applicants will be eligible to submit their revised plan during the next round of IRWM grant awards.

Clean Beaches Initiative Grant Program
The Clean Beaches Task Force (CBTF) met on February 22, 2006 to review project proposals. To date, 15 projects, totaling approximately $17.4 million have been
recommended for Proposition 40 funding, leaving a balance of approximately $4.8 million available. DFA continues to accept applications for Proposition 40 funds for projects on the Competitive Location List (CLL) and for projects that provide justification for placement on the CLL.

4. Status Report on Rainbow Creek Total Nitrogen and Total Phosphorus TMDLs (Lisa Honma)
The Rainbow Creek Total Nitrogen and Total Phosphorus TMDLs are now incorporated into the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Region (Basin Plan). The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency granted final approval of the TMDLs on March 22, 2006. The Basin Plan amendment incorporating the TMDLs was previously adopted by the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board on February 9, 2005, and was subsequently approved by the State Water Resources Control Board on November 16, 2005 and the Office of Administrative Law on February 1, 2006.

5. San Diego County Municipal Storm Water Permit Available and Public Workshop on April 26, 2006 (Phil Hammer) (Attachment B-5)
Tentative Order No. R9-2006-0011, which is proposed to be issued in replacement of Order No. 2001-01 (the San Diego County Municipal Storm Water Permit), was made available for public review and comment on March 13, 2006. Tentative Order No. R9-2006-0011 contains provisions that require San Diego municipalities to develop and implement programs to manage urban runoff within their jurisdictions and watersheds. The public comment period will remain open until June 14, 2006, which is the date of the Regional Board’s hearing on the Tentative Order.

A “Fact Sheet/Technical Report” and “Summary of Modifications to the Directives of Order No. 2001-01 Found In Tentative Order No. R9-2006-0011” have been developed to identify and explain the new or modified requirements. Tentative Order No. R9-2006-0011 and supporting documents are available for review at:


On Wednesday, April 26, 2006, a public workshop has been scheduled for review of the Tentative Order and to facilitate public comment. The workshop will begin at 1:00 PM at the Regional Board’s Meeting Room at 9174 Sky Park Court, Suite 100, San Diego. Please see the attached “Notice of Public Workshop and Hearing” for more details on the dates, times, and locations of the public workshop and the public hearing. The “Notice of Public Workshop and Hearing” also contains information regarding the public comment period for Tentative Order No. R9-2006-0011.

6. Landfill Gas Migration from Poway Landfill (Kelly Dorsey/John Odermatt) (Attachment B-6)
Background: On February 3, 2006, Regional Board staff met with representatives of the County of San Diego Department of Public Works Landfill Management (County DPW) and the County of San Diego Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) to discuss pollution and nuisance conditions adjacent to the Poway Landfill (landfill, location map attach. B-6a).
The meeting was convened to discuss the migration of waste constituents (via soil vapor and groundwater) into the surrounding area. Preliminary results from a recent investigation of landfill gas indicates the presence of volatile organic constituents (or VOCs) vapors, including benzene, tetrachloroethene (PCE), and trichloroethene (or TCE) in soil vapors located in proximity to single-family residences located on Dehia Street (see attachment B-6b). Landfill gas samples were collected from temporary probes located on the landfill property and within the public right-of-way on Dehia Street in front of the homes (attachment B-6c). Permanent landfill gas monitoring probes were installed on the landfill property to better assess the VOC results previously obtained from the temporary vapor probes. The permanent vapor probes detected similar, and in some cases higher, concentrations of vapors including VOCs.

**Issues:** At this time, it appears that landfill gas constituents have migrated from the landfill into soils located beneath the off-property residential neighborhood. The primary concerns regard the migration of landfill gas/vapors that may create hazards and/or potential exposure of the public from vapors and VOCs. An additional concern is the impact of the landfill gas and VOCs upon groundwater quality in proximity to the facility. On March 23, 2006, the evening broadcast on Channel 10 (http://www.10news.com/news/8233591/detail.html) included a story on this topic, and newspaper articles have been published in the North County Times (http://www.nctimes.com/articles/2006/03/25/news/inland/20_35_523_24_06.txt) and San Diego Union Tribune (http://www.signonsandiego.com/news/northcounty/20060329-9999-1mi29poway.html).

**Actions to Date:** The County DPW has prepared an updated Report of Waste Discharge for the Poway Landfill. The report contains results from the recent landfill gas investigation as well as an updated site conceptual model and corrective action plan. The County DPW is currently performing a pilot study for the possible application of dual phase extraction technology at the landfill as part of their source removal feasibility study. On February 28, 2006, the County DPW convened an internal meeting to discuss the developing situation and alternative course of action to address potential impact of the landfill gas upon the nearby homes. On March 10, 2006, the Regional Board issued a notice of violation (NOV R9-2006-0035) to the County of San Diego for discharges of wastes in violation of waste discharge requirements (Order 94-165). During the week of March 20, 2006, the County DPW and LEA distributed a fact sheet and public notice to the local residents of their findings to date and inviting them to a local public meeting. On March 30, 2006, over 200 residents attended the public meeting convened by the County DPW and LEA to give the residents a public forum to further discuss the developments at the Poway Landfill. The Regional Board staff also attended the public meeting with the County of San Diego. The San Diego Union-Tribune published an article about the public meeting (http://www.signonsandiego.com/uniontrib/20060401/news_1mi1benz.html) that is also included as attachment B-6d) to this item. Public access analytical data and technical reports associated with the Poway Landfill are available on-line from the Geotracker database at the following web site:
**Future Actions:** The County of San Diego plans to conduct the following activities in the near future:

- Implement a public participation program, which began with the distribution of a fact sheet to the residences in the vicinity of the landfill. The fact sheet notified the residents of the soil vapor issue and the work planned by the County. The County will continue to develop their Public Participation Plan to include additional elements in the future.

- Install approximately 11 permanent soil vapor-monitoring wells in the streets located in proximity to the Poway Landfill to better evaluate the extent and nature of the soil vapor, and the source of the benzene in the soil vapor.

- Develop a plan to collect air samples from selected residences located adjacent to the landfill in general accordance with DTSC guidance.

- Use the additional data to update the human health risk assessment.

- Continue the engineering feasibility analysis of the effectiveness of remedial measures to control the off site migration of soil vapors from the landfill.

- Conduct a landfill gas extraction analysis to determine the effectiveness of modifying the existing landfill gas extraction system to capture the soil vapors and prevent further off-site migration of soil vapors from the landfill.

Finally, the County DPW, LEA, and Regional Board staffs have agreed to meet on a regular basis to follow the progress of the investigation, mitigation of nuisance conditions, and cleanup of pollution from the landfill. The Regional Board staff will update the Board regarding the Poway Landfill in future Executive Officer Reports.

7. **U.S. Marine Corps Camp Pendleton, Las Pulgas Landfill** *(Brian McDaniel) (Attachment B-7)*

On January 27, 2006, the Regional Board Executive Officer issued Cleanup and Abatement Order No. R9-2006-0016 (CAO) to the United States Marine Corps (USMC) at Camp Pendleton. The CAO was issued to address construction deficiencies within the Phase I landfill liner system at the Las Pulgas Landfill, Camp Pendleton. The construction deficiencies violate the applicable Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR Order 2000-54) for the Las Pulgas Landfill.

The Regional Board staff requested input from the USMC on the due date identified in a draft version of the CAO as it relates to their Federal fiscal cycle and funding processes. The USMC responded to the RWQCB with comments via email on January 25, 2006.
The RWQCB staff established the due date for the final Corrective Action Plan (CAP) and issued CAO R9-2006-0016 to the USMC on January 27, 2006. The CAO required the USMC to submit a Corrective Action Plan (CAP), by December 1, 2006, for identification and correction of all the deficiencies or clean close the existing Phase 1 Unit in compliance with California Code of Regulations, Title 27. In response to the revised CAP due date identified in the CAO, the USMC sent a representative (Major Entingh) to the Regional Board meeting on February 8, 2006. Major Entingh requested that the submittal date for the CAP be reset to December 31, 2006. After further discussion with the Executive Officer and senior management, it was decided to revise the due date for the CAP to December 31, 2006. The RWQCB re-issued a revised version of CAO R9-2006-0016 to the USMC on February 24, 2006. The Regional Board and public were notified of the issuance of the CAO in the Notifications section of the Regional Board meeting agenda for March 8, 2006. A copy of CAO R9-2006-0016 and the technical staff report are available on-line at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/rb9board/Mar-06.html.

In addition, on March 30, 2006, the San Diego Union-Tribune published an article on the Las Pulgas Landfill (http://www.signonsandiego.com/news/military/20060330-9999-1mc30landfill.html), which is included as an attachment (see attachment B-7) to this item.

8. San Luis Rey River Vegetation Clearing (Jeremy Haas) (Attachment B-8)
On March 15, 2006 the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) completed a vegetation clearing project within the lower San Luis Rey River. The project involved mowing a 100-foot wide, five-mile long corridor within the City of Oceanside (City). Many of the plants removed were non-native, invasive species (including Arundo donax). Removal techniques involved mowing and chipping in place; techniques that are not commonly believed to sufficiently eradicate for A. donax. A Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification (401 Certification) was issued to the Corps and City on March 3, 2006 for the project. In accordance with the 401 Certification, the Corps will begin submitting quarterly monitoring reports on June 1, 2006 describing physical habitat and water chemistry within the project area. The Corps and City are expected to submit another 401 Certification application in Fall 2006 for a long-term maintenance project that will involve repeated mowing of the flood control channel. The results from the quarterly monitoring reports will help the Regional Board evaluate the long-term project proposal. It is likely that the 401 Certification for this long-term project will stipulate the use of removal techniques that are commonly believed to successfully eradicate non-native, invasive plants.

9. Complaint – Construction Site at 31401 Mar Vista Ave., Laguna Beach (Jimmy Smith)
The Northern Watershed Unit received a written complaint about a hillside construction project at 31401 Mar Vista Avenue, Laguna Beach. The two primary allegations are: (1) that the City of Laguna Beach (City) failed to comply with the Municipal National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit requirements by failing to enforce construction storm water Best Management Practices (BMPs) and approving inadequate post-construction storm water BMPs in the project’s Water Quality
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Management Plan (WQMP); and (2) that the project site is larger than reported by the developer and should be subject to the general Construction NPDES Permit. Other issues include the extension of a water supply line that was not considered in the project’s California Environmental Quality Act review and the appropriateness of the project’s hydrological information.

Jeremy Haas of the Northern Watershed Protection Unit is conducting an investigation of this complaint. A site inspection on March 13, 2006 did not reveal any construction storm water violations. Following a review of the WQMP approved by the City, additional clarification has been requested regarding the design of structural treatment BMPs. The project falls under the “Hillside Development” priority project classification in the Municipal NPDES permit because it creates over 5,000 square feet of impervious surface in an area with known erosive soil conditions, and will grade a natural slope that is 25 percent or greater. As such, the City is required to ensure adequate post-construction BMPs, including structural treatment, and also the prevention of downstream erosion.

Research into the grading permits shows that the site is authorized to expose 0.97 acres and therefore, would not be subject to coverage under the general Construction NPDES Permit. Dischargers whose projects disturb one or more acres of soil are required to obtain coverage under the Construction NPDES Permit. Additional information has been requested from the developer regarding plans to expose acreage for utility connections outside of the residence’s footprint.

10. Supplemental Environmental Project Status: JRMC Real Estate, Inc. & City of Escondido (Frank Melbourn)
On December 14, 2005, the Regional Board approved a $225,000 Supplemental Environmental Project (SEP) as part of the $450,000 ACL Order No. R9-2005-0237 issued against JRMC Real Estate, Inc. and the City of Escondido for violations at the Escondido Research and Technology Center construction site. The SEP, entitled Escondido Creek Watershed Invasive Species/Erosion Control Program (ISECP) - Stormwater SEP consists of four tasks:

- Provide $70,000 to the San Elijo Lagoon Conservancy (SELC) for exotic invasive plant species removal. This was completed on December 14, 2005.
- Allocate $70,000 to inventory stream erosion problems and develop a bioengineering tool kit. This task includes: development of a work plan (submitted to the Regional Board on March 8, 2006); field inventory of channel erosion; characterization, ranking and prioritization of areas to be stabilized; development of a bioengineering tool kit; and preparation of a report summarizing the task. A final report is expected July 2006.
- Allocate $75,000 to elect and implement a demonstration project. This task includes: Selecting a suitable demonstration site; finalizing engineering plans; obtaining necessary permits; and implementing the project. This project should be completed by October 2006.
• Allocate $10,000 to monitor and evaluate the performance of the demonstration site over a five-year period and to submit a final report. This project should be completed June 2011.

11. Power Washing by the City of Chula Vista (Ben Neill)
On January 11, 2006, the Watershed Protection Southern Unit (WPSU) investigated alleged violations of the Municipal Permit, Order No. 2001-01, by the City of Chula Vista that were reported by Mr. Marvin Winters, a power washing contractor. Specifically, Mr. Winters provided the WPSU with photographs taken on December 8, 2005 of a City work crew discharging power-washing water into the municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4). As a result of the complaint, the City of Chula Vista has taken several steps to prevent water pollution from their power washing crews.

On January 23, 2006, the City of Chula Vista conducted a special training session for power washing crews on the proper practices to minimize storm drain pollution during power washing activities. On April 3, 2006, Mr. Ben Neill, of the Watershed Protection Central Unit, conducted an inspection of the City’s power washing crews. The inspection noted that the City’s power washing crews are knowledgeable about preventing storm drain pollution, and adequate best management practices were being implemented on the day of inspection. On April 11, 2006, the City Council of Chula Vista will consider a special purchase requisition for enhanced power washing machines that will further assist the City crews in preventing storm drain pollution. The City has informed Mr. Winters about the purchase of new power washing equipment. The City is continuing to develop a standard operating procedure document (SOP) for power washing crews specifying the best management practices to be implemented. The City anticipates that the SOP will be completed by next rainy season. The WPSU will continue to monitor the City’s progress on this issue. In addition, the draft reissuance of the MS4 Permit, Order No. R9-2006-0011, includes power washing as a high priority municipal activity whereas the current MS4 permit does not acknowledge power washing as a municipal activity to be addressed.

12. La Costa Estates Construction Site in Encinitas (Ben Neill)
On March 12, 2006, the Watershed Protection Central Unit (WPCU) received a third complaint regarding sediment laden water discharges from the La Costa Estates construction project on Gascony Road in Encinitas. The project consists of the construction of four homes on one acre of land on a hillside that naturally drains to the complainant’s property. Previously on January 18, 2005 as a result of the first complaint, the construction site received a Notice of Violation for the discharge of sediment laden water and for inadequately implemented best management practices. On January 2, 2006, a second complaint of sediment laden water discharges from the construction site resulted in the City of Encinitas issuing a $100 administrative citation to the construction site.

In response to the initial discharge of sediment laden water, the construction project has implemented a basin and pump system to divert storm water from the complainant’s property to Gascony Road. In addition, the construction site has installed additional
gravel bags and erosion control blankets on the site to minimize sediment pollution to the municipal separate storm sewer system. As part of the WPCU investigation into this complaint, Investigative Order No. R9-2006-0040 was issued on April 3, 2006 to the City of Encinitas requesting a technical report that describes the City’s actions taken at the site to be in compliance with the Municipal Storm Water Permit, Order No. 2001-001.

13. **Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for City of San Diego Downtown Community Plan Update** (*Bruce Posthumus*) (*Attachment B-13*)
At the February 8, 2006 meeting of the SDRWQCB, Mr. Jim Peugh expressed concern that the subject EIR indicated that implementation of the updated plan would result in cumulative, unmitigated water quality impacts. Attached is a copy of a letter from Mr. Peugh (on behalf of the San Diego Audubon Society) to the City of San Diego city council about the plan update and associated EIR.

The SDRWQCB permit for discharges of municipal storm water and urban runoff (municipal storm water permit) for San Diego County requires that pollutant discharges from new development be reduced to the “maximum extent practicable” and not cause or contribute to violations of water quality standards. Implementation of a plan that “...would reduce but not avoid an increase in cumulative water pollution effects" in San Diego Bay could result in increases in pollutant discharges to impaired areas of the bay, which could be a violation of the permit. A report on whether a permit violation may have occurred and/or under what circumstances a permit violation might occur in the future will be provided at a future SDRWQCB meeting.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provides tools and processes (such as EIRs) that could and should be used by CEQA lead agencies (including municipal storm water permittees) and other agencies (including the SDRWQCB) to help protect and restore the quality and beneficial uses of waters of the state. The SDRWQCB municipal storm water permit for San Diego County requires permittees (including the City of San Diego) to update their environmental review processes to consider water quality impacts from new development. Although these required updates apparently have been made “on paper,” additional SDRWQCB oversight may be needed to ensure appropriate implementation in practice.

During the Public Forum portion of the December 2005 Regional Board meeting, Mr. Richard Opper (Opper & Varco LLP) requested that the Regional Board look into the development of guidelines to address the disposal, and reuse of lead impacted soil. As a follow-up to the December 2005 meeting, the Executive Officer held a meeting on March 29, 2006. The meeting was attended by Site Mitigation & Cleanup Unit and Tanks Site Mitigation & Cleanup Unit staff, Richard Opper and Linda Beresford of Opper & Varco LLP and Stephen Beck with Ninyo & Moore. At the meeting, Mr. Opper further discussed the need for clarification of existing Regional Board regulations and policies pertaining to the disposal, and reuse of lead impacted soil. Mr. Opper indicated that the lack of clarity often leads to increased cleanup costs when lead impacted soils are
unnecessarily sent to regulated landfills that may otherwise be suitable for appropriate reuse. Staff discussed the possibility of establishing a conditional waiver of waste discharge requirements for lead impacted soils suitable for reuse as one means of addressing the issue. The Regional Board conditionally waived regulation of a number of specific types of waste discharges in 2002 and these waivers will be up for renewal by the Board in 2008. The Board might consider adoption of an additional waiver for lead impacted soils suitable for reuse at that time. Mr. Opper and Mr. Beck volunteered to provide soil data collected from various downtown redevelopment projects and could provide limited resources to help the Regional Board develop such a waiver. It was agreed to at the meeting that all parties would think about the discussion, review internal resources, and meet again in the next several weeks to determine logistics for developing guidance. Periodic progress updates will be provided to the Regional Board in subsequent Executive Officer’s Reports.

15. Navy Point Loma Fuel Farm Leak Update (Laurie Walsh)
Site Mitigation & Cleanup Unit staff continue to provide updates on the activities at the Point Loma Fuel Farm Site to representatives from Dianne Feinstein’s office, Susan Davis’ office, the United States Library of Congress, representatives of Councilman Kevin Faulkner, reporters from the Union Tribune and Beach and Bay Press, and concerned neighbors from the La Playa Community. Councilman Faulkner and the Navy held a Town Hall Meeting on March 20, 2006 to update the neighboring community on the Navy’s effort to address the Point Loma Fuel Farm release. Approximately 225 interested parties attended to hear Captain Mark Patton, Laurie Walsh, and a Shaw Toxicologist report on the status of current and future mitigation and cleanup of the fuel plume, potential risk to human health, water quality issues, the proposed future cleanup schedule, and the anticipated military construction project (MIFCON P-401) to replace the existing fuel tanks with new state-of-the-art above-ground storage tanks. As a result of the public comments received at the town hall meeting, the Navy started a website from which the public can get updated information on the fuel plume and the Navy’s investigation and cleanup efforts. The website address is www.cnrswnavy.mil. Captain Patton’s presentation given at the Town Hall meeting has been posted on the website.

Recent Newspaper Articles can be found at
http://www.sdnews.com/vnews/display.v/SEC/Peninsula%20Beacon%20News

And
http://www.signonsandiego.com/uniontrib/20060222/new_1n22leak.html
And
http://www.signonsandiego.com/uniontrib/20060208-9999-6m8plume.html

The Navy continues their pollution characterization and free product extraction efforts to address the plume of fuel that lies beneath the Point Loma Fuel Farm. The Navy personnel at the Fleet Industrial Supply Center (FISC) and Defense Energy Support Center (DESC) are working with Laurie Walsh of the Site Mitigation and Cleanup Unit in the efforts to define, characterize, and remediate the discharge of fuel to soil and ground
water. FISC and DESC personnel will provide written updates on Site activities every two weeks, which will be routinely posted in Geotracker for public access. The Geotracker web address can be obtained from our website. The most recent Fact Sheet, dated March 22, 2006, is included as an Attachment to this EOSR.

16. SB 68 San Diego Bay Advisory Committee Report (Peter Michael)
The SB 68 (Alpert) San Diego Bay Advisory Committee issued its report with recommendations for the protection of San Diego Bay habitats, wildlife, and water quality. The SB 68 report also addresses storm water technology to control toxicity in runoff from some shipyards and boatyards. Under the bill introduced by Senator Dede Alpert and signed in 2003, member organizations of the committee represent a wide variety of interests, and the Port of San Diego has sponsored committee activities. Peter Michael represented the Regional Board at the committee meetings. The committee issued its report to the Legislature and to the San Diego Regional Board. A short summary of the report follows and the full report has been distributed to the Regional Board members.

Report recommendations:
1) Form an organization, such as a San Diego Bay Ecosystem Restoration Partnership, to seek funding and to allow the natural resources work of the SB 68 committee to continue;
2) Promote cooperation among organizations with interests in San Diego Bay to identify habitat enhancement projects;
3) Develop a tool, such as a Biological Indicator Development Program, to link species abundance and diversity to water quality and sediment quality.

Trends in water quality findings:
1) Water and sediment data trends are mixed. Metals and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) [found in urban runoff and fuel spills] may be decreasing, while toxicity still exists in some areas of the bay.
2) Pollutant levels tend to be higher in areas of urban runoff and in industrial areas.
3) Physical water quality measures are predictable. Bay salinity, dissolved oxygen, temperature, and pH have not shown changes from historical measurements. Higher temperatures and salinity are found more frequently in the southern reaches of the bay.
4) Dissolved copper levels exceed chronic, and sometimes, acute water quality criteria, especially along the shore. The highest dissolved copper levels are found in northern reaches of the bay.

Storm water management findings:
1) Acute toxicity standards exist for runoff from U.S. Navy facilities and for three shipyards: NASSCO, BAE Systems San Diego Ship Repair (formerly Southwest Marine), and Continental Maritime.
2) Further testing will be needed to identify the ways for these facilities to comply with toxicity standards that are feasible and economically practical.
3) It is uncertain how much longer the City of San Diego will allow diversion of storm water runoff flow into the sanitary sewer system. The three shipyards now capture and divert flows from most storms, and the current means of compliance may not be available in the future.

Other water quality findings:
1) Sediment quality objectives need to be developed and adopted.
2) Data gaps exist for pollutants in shallow mudflats and salt marshes, in tissues of food web organisms, and for pollutants from new products not presently monitored.
3) Additional long-term studies are needed to characterize bay water and sediment quality trends. Site-specific or focused studies are needed to (a) identify pollutants not yet characterized, (b) assess the ability of pollutants in water and sediment to enter and accumulate in food web organisms, (c) determine if pollutants are present in sediments and biota at levels of concern, and (d) develop a strategy to protect the safety of those who frequently consume fish taken from the bay.
4) Models are needed to link native species abundance and diversity and indicators of water and sediment quality.
5) Better collaboration is needed to reach consensus among stakeholders for collecting usable field and lab data.
6) Watershed planning efforts should be more consistent between cities and should take bay water quality into account.
7) Water and sediment quality data should be understood and quantified and be related to protection of natural resources.

The report was submitted by Mr. David Merk of the Port of San Diego on behalf of the San Diego Bay Advisory Committee for Ecological Assessment.

17. City of Coronado Transbay Sanitary Sewer Force Main Project (Melissa Valdovinos)
On March 16, 2006, the City of Coronado held a meeting from 1:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. at Coronado City Hall to give an update on their proposed Transbay Sanitary Sewer Force Main Project. Eric Minicilli, Associate Engineer for the City of Coronado, requested that Regional Board staff attend to learn about the project as the City of Coronado is interested in securing economic resources through the State Revolving Fund.

Mr. Minicilli explained that currently, sewage from Coronado, including Naval Air Station North Island, flows by gravity and pumping to the Transbay Sewage Pump Station at the Coronado Ferry Landing. The Transbay Pump Station transfers the sewage through a 24-inch diameter ductile iron force main under San Diego Bay to the City of San Diego’s sewage collection system for ultimate treatment at the City of San Diego’s Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant. A sonar evaluation of the existing transbay sewer line indicated that the 24-inch force main is only providing the capacity of a 19-inch diameter pipe. This line is the only exit route for sewer from Coronado and due to its age and compromised capacity, the City of Coronado considers the installation of a reliable replacement sewer line a top priority.
The construction options have been narrowed down to the following alternatives:

- Drill two horizontal 45-inch boreholes and install two 30-inch outside/23-inch inside diameter high density polyethylene (HDP) pipes 25 feet apart. One pipe would be used as the designated sewer line for consistent sewage conveyance while the other pipe would be used for emergencies or when the designated sewer line cannot be in use while undergoing maintenance. Approximate cost: $11,000,000.

- Drill one horizontal 45-inch borehole and install a 30-inch outside/23-inch inside diameter HDP pipe to be used for sewage conveyance. Approximate cost: $7,000,000.

The first alternative is the preferred alternative. In addition, the existing 24-inch pipe may be cleaned and reused as a back-up sewer pipe, or for uses such as electrical conduit or to receive recycled water in the future if proven worthy once videoed and sampled. This would incur an additional cost of approximately $1,000,000.

The design is currently 50% complete and construction is planned to be complete by May 2007. Either one or two pipes will be installed under the San Diego Bay. The pipe(s) will enter in at the Coronado Ferry Landing and will be pulled over 3,000 feet across San Diego Bay (approximately 30 to 40 feet below ground surface) to Embarcadero Park North. From there, the line(s) will tie into a manhole at Seaport Village.

The City of Coronado Transbay Sanitary Sewer Force Main Project meetings are held the third Thursday of each month at 1:30 p.m. at Coronado City Hall.

PART C
STATEWIDE ISSUES OF IMPORTANCE TO THE SAN DIEGO REGION

1. Nutrient Numeric Endpoints for California (Cynthia Gorham-Test and Julie Chan)
   The California Nutrient Numeric Endpoints approach is being developed by the USEPA Region IX, and the State Water Board for use in several water quality programs at the Regional Water Boards. The approach provides a methodology for setting numeric limitations in NPDES requirements, setting numeric targets in nutrient TMDLs, and for those Regional Water Boards that choose to, developing numeric nutrient criteria. The nutrient numeric endpoints approach selects nutrient response indicators that can be used to evaluate risk of use impairment, rather than using pre-defined nutrient limits that may or may not result in nuisance algae growth or eutrophication for a particular waterbody.

A workshop on the California Nutrient Numeric Endpoints approach was conducted in Los Angeles on March 29, 2005. Julie Chan and Cynthia Gorham-Test of the San Diego Water Board attended. The workshop topics included an overview of the risk-based approach, rationale for secondary indicator ranges, and an introduction to the new spreadsheet tools that have been developed for easy use by staff. The tools include the
nutrient numeric endpoints for secondary indicators for each of seven different beneficial uses. Secondary endpoints are used because these are the environmental factors that impact aquatic life and other beneficial uses in response to nutrient enrichment. These secondary endpoints include: chlorophyll a in the water column, benthic algal density, water clarity, dissolved oxygen, and pH.

The spreadsheet tool predicts the response of secondary endpoints to changes in nutrient loading in a waterbody. The tool was designed by simplifying an EPA-approved model and by developing regression equations. The spreadsheet appears to be easy to use for Regional Board TMDL staff without modeling expertise.

The USEPA and State Water Board are in the process of responding to comments from the Regional Water Boards on the California Nutrient Numeric Endpoints. Scientific peer review of this method will be achieved through application of the method to five or six nutrient TMDL projects in the Regions. The method will be peer reviewed as part of the TMDL peer review. USEPA and the State Water Board are planning to provide support for these preliminary TMDL applications of the California Nutrient Numeric Endpoints.

2. Brownfields Statewide Status Update - California Land Reuse and Revitalization Act of 2004 (CLRRA) (former Montanez – AB 389) (John Anderson)

Brownfields cases are included in the Spill, Leaks, Investigation, and Cleanup (SLIC) Program, which is the Regional Water Board’s cleanup program where project proponents receive technical oversight and regulatory review of investigation and cleanup plans. The party pursuing the cleanup reimburses staff oversight costs incurred by the Regional Water Board. The outcome of the SLIC program process may range from a No Further Action (NFA) letter indicating cleanup is complete with no land-use restrictions, to the design and implementation of a remedial system.

Currently the San Diego Regional Water Board provides oversight to 11 brownfields/redevelopment cases through our SLIC Program. To date, the San Diego Regional Water Board has not received any CLRRA applications.

**CalEPA Status of Statewide Brownfields Applications Since July 1, 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memorandum of Agreement Application Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Applications Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications Received by Regional Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications Received by DTSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determinations Made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determinations Made to Regional Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determinations Made to DTSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determinations Not Yet Made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications Not Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current as of 3/21/2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. 2006 – 2007 State Revolving Fund Priority List (Melissa Valdivinos)
The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) manages and implements the State Revolving Fund (SRF) as one of its financial assistance programs. The SRF program provides low interest loans to address water quality problems associated with discharges of wastewater and water reclamation facilities, as well as for nonpoint source discharges and for estuary enhancement. The program has operated since 1989 and has issued over three billion dollars in loans to local agencies.

Because the number of applicants and requested loan amounts exceed the loan funds available, the SWRCB maintains a SRF Loan Program Priority List from which projects are chosen for funding. Each year, the SWRCB sends out a preliminary Priority List and requests input from Regional Boards and other interested parties. An updated Priority List, from which projects are chosen for funding in the fiscal year that follows, is usually adopted by the SWRCB in June.

The SWRCB Division of Financial Assistance sent a letter to the Regional Boards on December 29, 2005 requesting the Regional Boards to provide input on the State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2006-2007 SRF Loan Program Priority List in accordance with Chapter IV.A of the Policy for Implementing the State Revolving Fund. The San Diego Regional Board notified 41 agencies and organizations within its region that the SWRCB will continue to fund applicable projects in all priority classes during SFY 2006-2007. The Regional Board requested that the agencies submit information on new projects to add to the Priority List and to provide an update on their existing projects on the Priority List. The following 16 agencies in the San Diego Region responded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Coronado</th>
<th>City of Del Mar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Laguna Beach</td>
<td>Moulton Niguel Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Otay Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padre Dam Municipal Water District</td>
<td>City of Poway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Santa Fe Community Services District</td>
<td>City of San Clemente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>San Elijo Joint Powers Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Juan Capistrano</td>
<td>City of San Juan Capistrano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Orange County Wastewater Authority</td>
<td>Valley Center Municipal Water District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of those that responded, six agencies submitted information to add 19 new projects, ten agencies requested that 14 existing projects remain on the Priority List, and three agencies requested the removal of 20 projects. The project types were diverse and included improvements such as sewer line replacement, pump station upgrades, and recycled water distribution. Existing projects on the Priority List that pertain to agencies that did not respond will remain on the Priority List for the SFY 2006-2007 cycle. On April 4, 2006, the San Diego Regional Board submitted this input to the SWRCB Division of Financial Assistance.
For additional information concerning the SRF Priority List, visit the following SWRCB website: http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/funding/srf.html. Visit http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lyrisforms/swrcb_subscribe.html to subscribe to SRF email updates (Clean Water State Revolving Fund option).
CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
SAN DIEGO REGION

SIGNIFICANT NPDES PERMITS, WDRs, AND REGIONAL BOARD ACTIONS

April 12, 2006

APPENDED TO EXECUTIVE OFFICER REPORT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF PERMIT/WDR/RB ACTION</th>
<th>Action Type</th>
<th>Initial Document Application Complete</th>
<th>Draft Complete</th>
<th>Draft/RWQ Limits and Monitoring Plan Known</th>
<th>Public Rev. &amp; Comment</th>
<th>BOARD HEARING &amp; ADOPTION</th>
<th>Consent Item</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAY 10, 2006 RB MEETING</td>
<td>Adoption TMDL</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>May 10, 2006</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>TMDL Workplan FY 2005-06</td>
<td>Arias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Regional Board Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIONWIDE BACTERIA, TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD</td>
<td>Hearing; Admin.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>May 10, 2006</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ACL Complaint</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORMWATER VIOLATIONS</td>
<td>Civil Liability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF CARLSBAD CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>WDRs Update</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>May 10, 2006</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Master Reclamation Reqts</td>
<td>Vasquez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL BROOK PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT</td>
<td>Mast. Reclamation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL BROOK RECLAMATION PROJECT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 14, 2006 RB MEETING</td>
<td>Hearing: NPDES Permit</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>June 14, 2006</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NPDES Workplan FY 2005-06</td>
<td>Hammer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Regional Board Office</td>
<td>Permit Reissuance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN DIEGO COUNTY MUNICIPAL STORMWATER PERMIT</td>
<td>NPDES Permit</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>June 14, 2006</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NPDES Workplan FY 2004-06</td>
<td>Kelley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORMWATER PERMIT</td>
<td>Reissuance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARRILLO LLC ENCINA POWER PLANT CARLSBAD</td>
<td>NPDES Permit</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>June 14, 2006</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NPDES Workplan FY 2005-06</td>
<td>Valdivinos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SAN DIEGO SOUTH BAY WATER RECLAMATION FACILITY</td>
<td>Reissuance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY WASTEWATER AUTHORITY--ALISO CREEK OCEAN OUTFALL</td>
<td>NPDES Permit</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>June 14, 2006</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NPDES Workplan FY 2005-06</td>
<td>Valdivinos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHORITY--SAN JUAN CRK. OCEAN OUTFALL</td>
<td>Reissuance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSEIDON RESOURCES DESALINATION PROJECT CARLSBAD</td>
<td>New NPDES Permit</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>June 14, 2006</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NPDES Workplan FY 2005-06</td>
<td>Cheng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF ESCONDIDO WASTEWATER FACILITY AND DISCHARGE TO OCEAN OUTFALL</td>
<td>Hearing; Admin.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>June 14, 2006</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ACL COMPLAINT $1,797,150</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And Discharge to Ocean Outfall</td>
<td>Civil Liability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAKOTA RANCH DEVELOPMENT CO. 401 WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATION VIOLATION SANTEE</td>
<td>Hearing; Admin.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>June 14, 2006</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ACL COMPLAINT $140,500</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHORITY--SOUTH BAY WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATION VIOLATION SANTEE</td>
<td>Civil Liability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US NAVY REPORT ON TOXICITY AND STORM WATER DISCHARGES SAN DIEGO BAY</td>
<td>Status Report</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>June 14, 2006</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>McCann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACK AND MARK STEIFFEL DAIRY RIVERSIDE COUNTY</td>
<td>NPDES Permit</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>June 14, 2006</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NPDES Workplan FY 2004-05</td>
<td>Ghoram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK J. KONYN DAIRY SAN PASQUAL VALLEY</td>
<td>Reissuance</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>June 14, 2006</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NPDES Workplan FY 2005-06</td>
<td>Ghoram</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SIGNIFICANT NPDES PERMITS, WDRS, AND RB ACTIONS

**DATE OF REPORT**
April 12, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF PERMIT/WDR/RB ACTION</th>
<th>Action Type</th>
<th>Initial Document Application Complete</th>
<th>Draft Complete</th>
<th>Public Rev. &amp; Comment</th>
<th>BOARD HEARING &amp; ADOPTION</th>
<th>Consent Item</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST 9, 2006 RB MEETING</td>
<td>San Diego Regional Board Office</td>
<td>Adoption NPDES</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>August 9, 2006</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN DIEGO COUNTY MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>Ad Hoc Status</td>
<td>STORMWATER PERMIT</td>
<td>Permit Reissuance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUNDWATER EXTRACTION GENERAL</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>PERMIT FOR SAN DIEGO BAY</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>August 9, 2006</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NPDES Workplan FY 2004-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANCHO MISSION VIEJO DEVELOPMENT SAN</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>JUAN AND SAN MATEO BASINS ORANGE CO.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>August 9, 2006</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Flasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISMC CAMP PENDLETON REPLACEMENT OF</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>PLANT NO. 13 DISCHARGE TO OCEAN OUTFALL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>August 9, 2006</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NPDES Workplan FY 2005-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAK TREE RANCH MOBILE HOME PARK</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>FACILITY EXPANSION SAN DIEGO COUNTY</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>August 9, 2006</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Quach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEPTEMBER 13, 2006 RB MEETING**
San Diego Regional Board Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF PERMIT/WDR/RB ACTION</th>
<th>Action Type</th>
<th>Initial Document Application Complete</th>
<th>Draft Complete</th>
<th>Public Rev. &amp; Comment</th>
<th>BOARD HEARING &amp; ADOPTION</th>
<th>Consent Item</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCEAN DISCHARGER RECEIVING WATER</td>
<td>NPDES Permits</td>
<td>Monitoring Program Updates</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>September 13, 2006</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAMPEN BROS. (Irm DeJager &amp; Boersma)</td>
<td>NPDES Permit</td>
<td>RIVERSIDE COUNTY DAIRY</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>September 13, 2006</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. DAIRY (Van Tol DAIRY) RAMONA</td>
<td>NPDES Permit</td>
<td>Reissuance</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>September 13, 2006</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OCTOBER 11, 2006 RB MEETING**
Rancho California Water Dist., Temecula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF PERMIT/WDR/RB ACTION</th>
<th>Action Type</th>
<th>Initial Document Application Complete</th>
<th>Draft Complete</th>
<th>Public Rev. &amp; Comment</th>
<th>BOARD HEARING &amp; ADOPTION</th>
<th>Consent Item</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROUNDWATER EXTRACTION GENERAL</td>
<td>NPDES Permit</td>
<td>PERMIT FOR SAN DIEGO REGION</td>
<td>Reissuance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PENDING / UNSCHEDULED ACTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF PERMIT/WDR/RB ACTION</th>
<th>Action Type</th>
<th>Initial Document Application Complete</th>
<th>Draft Complete</th>
<th>Public Rev. &amp; Comment</th>
<th>BOARD HEARING &amp; ADOPTION</th>
<th>Consent Item</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED GREGORY CANYON LANDFILL</td>
<td>New WDRs</td>
<td>NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Public Workshop scheduled for May 19, 2005</td>
<td>Tamaki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of the Development and Maturation of a Large MTBE Plume – Lessons to Learn

Margaret R. Eggers and Kelly Dorsey

With the emergence of Methyl tert-Butyl Ether (MTBE) as a serious groundwater concern over the past decade, several unique sites with large MTBE plumes (>1000 feet) have broadened our understanding of the behavior and fate and transport of MTBE in the subsurface. While most MTBE plumes result from the common scenario of a leaking UST/gasoline station and are typically limited in extent, larger plumes provide robust data sets and a longer-term history which help us achieve a deeper understanding of the ultimate fate and remediation potential of MTBE in the subsurface. In San Diego, a large MTBE plume is present in Mission Valley which extends approximately one mile from a large fuel farm adjacent to Interstate 15, beneath Qualcomm stadium, and to the San Diego River. A review of the site history and over a decade’s worth of groundwater data provides insight into the role of fluvial sediment stratigraphy, vertical gradient changes, and local recharge in plume development. More recent data including analysis of Tertiary Butyl Alcohol (TBA) suggest multiple modes of natural degradation which vary within the plume, and may suggest the most favorable conditions for natural degradation of both MTBE and TBA.
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STATEWIDE GENERAL WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEM AGENCIES

Wednesday, May 3, 2006 – 10:00 a.m.
Coastal Hearing Room – Second Floor
Joe Serna, Jr. Cal/EPA Building
1001 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

The State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) will consider adopting a Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) for Wastewater Collection System Agencies on Wednesday, May 3, 2006, at 10:00 a.m. during a regularly scheduled Board meeting in the Coastal Hearing Room in the Cal/EPA Building in Sacramento. This revised draft WDR and reporting program addresses SSO reporting and proper collection system management and operation necessary to protect public health, water quality, and the public’s investment in the sewer system infrastructure.

BACKGROUND
The State Water Board adopted Resolution 2004-80, requiring staff to work with stakeholders in developing a regulatory program that will provide a consistent approach for reducing Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSOs). As a result, State Water Board staff organized and collaborated with a statewide SSO Guidance Committee composed of representatives from the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Water Boards), county environmental health departments, environmental groups, U.S. EPA, local public collection system owners, and other collection system experts.

As a result of this collaboration, State Water Board staff developed the following documents necessary for the successful implementation of a SSO Reduction Program:

- Draft Statewide General WDRs for Wastewater Collection System Agencies;
- Draft Monitoring and Reporting Program; and
- Draft Fact Sheet for the Draft Statewide General WDRs

The State Water Board conducted a public hearing on February 8, 2006, to receive oral and written comments on these documents. The State Water Board has revised these documents based upon comments received during this process.

The revised documents are available on the State Water Board’s website at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sso. All revisions to the above referenced documents have been tracked by underline and strikethrough.

California Environmental Protection Agency

Recycled Paper
SUBMISSION OF COMMENTS

The State Water Board encourages all interested persons to submit written comments on the revisions to the original document and the fee schedule. The State Water Board must receive all written comments no later than 5:00 p.m., April 24, 2006. Comments will be accepted by regular mail, email, or fax. If you plan to attend and provide oral testimony at the State Water Board meeting, all persons who submitted written comments are requested to briefly summarize their written comments. The State Water Board will also accept oral comments from individuals that have not submitted written comments. Time limitations on presentations may be imposed in order to allow all participants an opportunity to address the State Water Board. Persons with similar views are encouraged to make joint presentations.

The State Water Board may consider taking action on the revised draft WDRs and associated documents at the May 3, 2006, meeting. The State Water Board will consider all comments before taking final action on the proposed Statewide General WDR for Wastewater Collection System Agencies and associated documents.

When submitting written comments, please indicate in the subject line: “COMMENT LETTER - 5/3/06 BOARD MEETING – SSORP.” If you have specific questions about the proposed SSO Reduction Program, please contact Bryan Brock via e-mail at bbrock@waterboards.ca.gov or call (916) 341-5276.

Written comments should be submitted to:

Song Her, Clerk to the Board
State Water Resources Control Board
Executive Office
1001 I Street, 24th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
Fax: (916) 341-5620
Email: commentsletters@waterboards.ca.gov

PARKING AND ACCESSIBILITY

There is a parking garage across from the Joe Serna, Jr. Cal/EPA Building with entrances on 10th and 11th Streets between "I" and "J" Streets, and metered parking spaces are in the vicinity of the building. For a map of our building, see our web site at http://www.calepa.ca.gov/EPABldg/location.htm. The facilities are accessible to persons with disabilities. Persons with hearing or speech impairments can contact us by using the California Relay Service Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (TDD). TDD is reachable only from phones equipped with a TDD device. HEARING IMPAIRED RELAY SERVICE: TDD to voice 1-800-735-2929, Voice to TDD 1-800-735-2922. Individual who require special accommodations are requested to contact Adrian Perez at (916) 341-5880, two weeks prior to the scheduled public hearing.

All visitors are required to sign in and receive a badge prior to attending any meeting in the building. The Visitor and Environmental Services Center is located just inside and to the left of the Cal/EPA Building’s public entrance. Valid picture identification may be required due to the security level. Please allow up to 15 minutes for receiving clearance to proceed to the Coastal Hearing Room.

March 23, 2006
Date

Song Her
Clerk to the Board

California Environmental Protection Agency

Recycled Paper
### SANITARY SEWER OVERFLOW STATISTICS (Updated through March 31, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEWAGE COLLECTION AGENCY</th>
<th>SYSTEM SIZE&lt;sup&gt;B&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>NO. OF SEWAGE SPILLS [LISTED BY FISCAL YEAR (FY) - JULY 1 THROUGH JUNE 30]</th>
<th>SPILLS PER 100 MILES [LISTED BY FY]</th>
<th>SPILL VOLUME 2005-06&lt;sup&gt;A&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>MGD</td>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>02-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORANGE COUNTY:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL TORO WD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMERALD BAY SERVICE DISTRICT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRVINE RANCH WD</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAGUNA BEACH, CITY OF</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOULTON NIGUEL WD</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN CLEMENTE, CITY OF</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO, CITY OF</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARGARITA WD</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH COAST CWD</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRABUCO CANYON WD</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIVERSIDE COUNTY:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTERN MWD</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELSINORE VALLEY MWD</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURRIETA MWD</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANCHO CA WD</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAN DIEGO COUNTY:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUENA SANITARY DISTRICT</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLSBAD MWD</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHULA VISTA, CITY OF</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORONADO, CITY OF</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEL MAR, CITY OF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CAJON, CITY OF</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCINITAS, CITY OF</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPONDO, CITY OF</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRBANKS RANCH COMM SERV DIST</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALLBROOK PUBLIC UTILITY DIST</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERIAL BEACH, CITY OF</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA MESA, CITY OF</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEMON GROVE, CITY OF</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SANITARY SEWER OVERFLOW STATISTICS (Updated through March 31, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEWAGE COLLECTION AGENCY</th>
<th>SYSTEM SIZE&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>NO. OF SEWAGE SPILLS [LISTED BY FISCAL YEAR (FY) - JULY 1 THROUGH JUNE 30]</th>
<th>SPILLS PER 100 MILES [LISTED BY FY]</th>
<th>SPILL VOLUME 2005-06&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>MGD</td>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>02-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN DIEGO COUNTY (continued):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEUCADIA CWD</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL CITY, CIVIC</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEANSIDE, CITY OF, WTR UTIL DEP</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLIVENHAIN MWD</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTAY MWD</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADRE DAM MWD</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUMA VALLEY COMM SERVICE DIS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWAY, CITY OF</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAINBOW MWD</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAMONA MWD</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANCHO SANTA FE COMM SERV DIST</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN DIEGO CO, PUBLIC WORKS</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN DIEGO, CITY OF, MWWD</td>
<td>2,894</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLANA BEACH, CIVIC</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMC BASE, CAMP PENDLETON</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US NAVY</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALLEYS WO</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALLEY CENTER MWD</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISTA, CITY OF</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHISPERING PALMS COMM SERV DIS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Region 9 Total**: 9,615 363 445 427 275 266 169 444,059

- **Average**<sup>1</sup>: 4.6 4.4 2.9 2.8 1.8 11
- **Standard Deviation**<sup>2</sup>: 5.0 7.0 3.4 4.4 2.1 38
- **Median**<sup>3</sup>: 2.4 2.4 2.0 2.5 0.9 1

---

<sup>1</sup> Includes available preliminary data for July 1, 2004 through March 31, 2006, and may not include all spills less than 1,000 gallons that did not enter surface waters or storm drains during this period.

<sup>2</sup> As of June 2003.

<sup>3</sup> Volume of spills for the period in gallons divided by the amount conveyed for the period in million gallons.

<sup>4</sup> Included with Eastern Municipal Water District.

<sup>5</sup> The average is the sum of all values divided by the number of values.

<sup>6</sup> In a normally distributed set of values, 68% of the values are within one standard deviation either above or below the average value.

<sup>7</sup> The median is the middle value in a set; half the values are above the median, and half are below the median.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>PROJECT TITLE</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>WATERBODY</th>
<th>IMPACT (Acres)⁴</th>
<th>MITIGATION</th>
<th>CERTIFICATION ACTION²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/2/06</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Agua Hedionda Channel Dredging Project</td>
<td>Removal of 30,000 to 40,000 cubic yards of sediment in Agua Hedionda Creek and Calavera Creek</td>
<td>Agua Hedionda &amp; Calavera Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td>3:1 ratio by creation of 1.6 acres of wetlands (Agua Hedionda) and Temporary impact to 4.2 acres of jurisdictional streambed</td>
<td>Technically conditioned and Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/06</td>
<td>USACE (Los Angeles) &amp; City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Vegetation Clearing in the San Luis Rey River Flood Control Project</td>
<td>Conduct Vegetation Clearing activities within San Luis Rey River Flood Control Project.</td>
<td>San Luis Rey River</td>
<td>Temporary: wetland: 57 acres</td>
<td>Habitat (for vireo and flycatcher birds) mitigation of an in-lieu fee payment of $20,000 to the USFWS</td>
<td>Technically conditioned and Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/13/06</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Los Coches Creek-Sewer Replacement Project</td>
<td>Replace 1524-feet of existing sewer pipeline, install eight new manholes and connect three new sewer line laterals.</td>
<td>Los Coches Creek</td>
<td>Permanently impact (fill) 0.023-acres and temporarily impact (fill) 0.023-acre of Wetland Waters</td>
<td>On-site restoration and enhancement of 10.0 acres of wetlands</td>
<td>Technically Conditioned and Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/06</td>
<td>Southwestern Yacht Club</td>
<td>Southwestern Yacht Club Maintenance Dredging Project</td>
<td>Removal of 2,350 cubic yards of sediment from dredge areas 1 and 2.</td>
<td>San Diego Bay</td>
<td>Approx. 2,350 cubic yards of dredged volume</td>
<td>Materials dredged will be used for beach replenishment on Kellogg Beach</td>
<td>Technically Conditioned and Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 401 WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATION ACTIONS
FOR THE PERIOD OF MARCH 1, 2006 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>PROJECT TITLE</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>WATERBODY</th>
<th>IMPACT (Acres)^1</th>
<th>MITIGATION</th>
<th>CERTIFICATION ACTION^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/20/06</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>2nd Avenue Drainage Improvement Project</td>
<td>(I) Removal of weeds, silt and debris from an open concrete-lined drainage channel and (II) permanently undergrounding an existing section of concrete surface channel &amp; Realignment of underground drainage pipe west of Second Avenue.</td>
<td>Sweetwater River</td>
<td>(II) Permanently impact a remnant 0.02 acre of vegetated ACOE Streambed (tributary to Sweetwater River)</td>
<td>1.5:1 ratio by purchase of 0.03 acres of wetland creation at Rancho Jamul Mitigation Bank</td>
<td>Technically Conditioned and Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Wetland refers to vegetated waters of the U.S. and streambed refers to unvegetated waters of the U.S. (P) = permanent impacts. (T) = temporary impacts.
2. Low impact certification is issued to projects that have minimal potential to adversely impact water quality. Conditional certification is issued to projects that have the potential to adversely impact water quality, but by complying with technical conditions, will have minimal impacts. Denials are issued when the project will adversely impact water quality and suitable mitigation measures are not proposed or possible. Time expired refers to projects that may proceed due to the lack of an action by the Regional Board within specified regulatory timelines. Withdrawn refers to projects that the applicant or Regional Board have withdrawn due to procedural problems that have not been corrected within one year.
NOTICE OF PUBLIC WORKSHOP AND HEARING
CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
SAN DIEGO REGION

This notice is to inform interested persons that the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (Regional Board) will conduct a public workshop and public hearing concerning Tentative Order No. R9-2006-0011, the San Diego County Municipal Storm Water Permit. Upon adoption, Tentative Order No. R9-2006-0011 will replace the current San Diego County Municipal Storm Water Permit, Order No. 2001-01.

The Regional Board has made available Tentative Order No. R9-2006-0011 and its corresponding Fact Sheet/Technical Report for public review and comment. The documents are available by request from the Regional Board or at:


To facilitate public comment, a public workshop will be conducted concerning the Tentative Order. The public workshop will consist of presentations explaining the Tentative Order’s requirements, an opportunity for public comments and questions, and time for responses to public comments and questions. The public workshop will be held at the following time and location:

Public Workshop

April 26, 2006, 1:00-4:00 PM
Regional Water Quality Control Board
Regional Board Meeting Room
9174 Sky Park Court
San Diego, California

In addition, the Regional Board plans to conduct a public hearing to receive and consider oral comments at the Regional Board’s regular meeting on June 14, 2006 (date subject to change). The public hearing is scheduled to be held on:

Public Hearing

June 14, 2006, 9:00 AM
Regional Water Quality Control Board
Regional Board Meeting Room
9174 Sky Park Court
San Diego, California
The official public review and comment period for the Tentative Order began March 14, 2006 and will close on June 14, 2006. The official public review and comment period is the opportunity for interested parties to provide comment on the Tentative Order to the Regional Board; public comments will not be accepted following close of the official review and comment period. Written comments or testimony should be submitted to the Regional Board as soon as possible, but no later than June 14, 2006. Only written comments or testimony received by 5:00 PM on May 31, 2006 will be provided to the Regional Board members for their consideration prior to the June 14, 2006 public hearing. The Regional Board will consider oral statements at the June 14, 2006 public hearing.

If the public hearing on Tentative Order No. R9-2006-0011 is not held on June 14, 2006, the official public review and comment period will be extended accordingly. All interested parties will be notified of any extension of the official public review and comment period at the earliest possible date.

Consideration of Adoption

At this time, the Regional Board plans to consider adoption of Tentative Order No. R9-2006-0011 on August 9, 2006 at the regularly scheduled public Regional Board meeting. The location and time of the meeting are as follows:

August 9, 2006, 9:00 AM
Regional Water Quality Control Board
Regional Board Meeting Room
9174 Sky Park Court
San Diego, California

Please contact Phil Hammer at phammer@waterboards.ca.gov or 858-627-3988 if you have any questions.

JOHN H. ROBERTUS
Executive Officer
March 27, 2006
Soil, water tests at old landfill seek to ally fears

Results of ongoing studies due in July

By Diane D’Amore
SPECIAL TO THE UNION-TRIBUNE

April 1, 2006

POWAY – The county has presented an action plan to anxious residents after low levels of a cancer-causing chemical were found in the groundwater and soil of the old Poway landfill and in an adjacent neighborhood.

But there were no definitive answers about the source of the pollution or how dangerous it could be, leaving some people frustrated.

More than 200 people crowded into the Community Park Auditorium on Thursday night to hear officials outline the findings and explain what can be done.

The landfill – it was south of Poway Road, west of Espola Road and north of Dehia Street – was operated by the county from 1949 to 1975. It contains about 165,000 tons of garbage, including residential, commercial and agricultural waste.

Last year, routine semi-annual tests found low levels of trichloroethylene, or TCE, and tetrachloroethylene, or PCE, in groundwater near the landfill.

In an effort to identify the source of the solvents, which are common industrial compounds, further tests were conducted, leading to the discovery of benzene on and off the landfill.

Benzene, an organic chemical found in solvents, gasoline and plastics, is also a byproduct of forest fires and cigarette smoke. Longtime exposure at high levels primarily affects bone marrow and can lead to anemia and leukemia, according to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Testing at the southwestern corner of the landfill turned up 1 to 3 parts per billion of benzene, said Barry Pulver, a hydrogeologist for the county.

“Our concern was the solvents might be migrating up to the residences through soil vapors,” Pulver said. As a result, 20 soil-vapor samples, at a

http://signonsandiego.printthis.clickability.com/pt/cpt?action=cpt&title=Soil%2C+water+tests+at+old+landfill+seek+to+ally+fe...
depth of one to five feet, were taken on Dehia in the Garden Road neighborhood.

TCE and PCE levels were low to nonexistent, but benzene was present in all tests, with peak concentrations of 49 parts per billion on the west side of Dehia and steadily decreasing on the east side.

When asked if the Environmental Protection Agency had set any acceptable levels of benzene, Jack Miller, manager of the county's Solid Waste Local Enforcement Agency, said there are in drinking water, but none for soil.

The federal government limits benzene exposure to 1 part per million in the air for an eight-hour work day.

Miller emphasized that water supplies are not affected.

"Your drinking water is not from the water under the landfill," he said. "It's piped in from the city of Poway. There is nothing wrong with your drinking water."

Residents weren't sure what the findings meant, however.

"I'd like to know if it is considered safe to be living near Dehia Street," one asked.

Miller said: "I have no information to say it's not. We won't know that until July."

After verifying the testing, officials ran two health-risk assessment models. They indicated an increased cancer risk to residents of between one in one million to four in one million, assuming exposure to the the highest concentrations found 24 hours a day, 350 days a year for 30 years.

Some residents were disturbed by the mention of cancer. "Several of my neighbors have either had cancer or died from it," one woman said as others nodded.

"We're not sure if this is an anomaly," Miller said. "We need to know if we can replicate this data so we can understand what's really going on."

But the lack of clear answers frustrated many in the audience. Most of the concerns were about health issues and property values.

"I think they really need to be paying attention to the cancer thing," said Susan Rolfsen, a resident of Dehia Street who was planning to move next year when her youngest child graduated from high school. "I'd like to know who's going to buy my house now."

Other took a wait-and-see approach.

"I'm not that concerned," said Craig Byrd, who lives in the same neighborhood. "I think it's still premature to get upset since we don't know the source."

“There are many families in our neighborhood with small children,” said his wife, Sally. “It's easy to understand their concern. But we need to be level-headed about all this.”

Work is under way reviewing data from new wells installed last week along the base of the landfill. Twenty two permanent wells are scheduled to be installed in the neighborhood starting April 17th, enabling officials to collect multiple samples over time.

Residents are being asked to cooperate with tests scheduled to begin May 1 on private property.

A comprehensive report of findings will be completed by June 30 and presented in July. Updates will be posted at www.sdcdeh.org and at the Poway Library.

Officials admit to being caught off guard by the findings.

“We were surprised,” Candace Gibson, a county landfill supervisor, told the crowd. “We've checked our field methods and lab methods. We're dealing with such low levels that any changes in the environment can affect what we're seeing.

“We don't know where it's coming from. But we're assuming it's coming from the landfill.”

* Diane D'Amore is a freelance writer.

»Next Story»
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Water quality board orders Marines to fix landfill problems

By Rick Rogers
UNION-TRIBUNE STAFF WRITER

March 30, 2006

Late last year, water regulators suggested that Las Pulgas Landfill at Camp Pendleton was leaking high levels of pollutants due to shoddy construction.

Now the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board has ordered the base to fix what one of the board's inspectors calls the worst landfill failure of its kind in county history.

While repair costs for the dump are unknown, taxpayers likely will pay for what appear to be engineering errors that have forced the $3.2 million landfill to close.

“There has never been a cleanup order in this county that has dealt with construction deficiencies like what we've seen at Las Pulgas,” said John Odermatt, a senior engineering geologist for the water board. “I have never seen an engineering-related problem this large at another landfill.”

The most serious troubles have been the failure of a synthetic liner and the release of hundreds of thousands of gallons of contaminated leachate, the liquid that filters through garbage.

The Marines are storing about 280,000 gallons of leachate in large bladders and a metal tank at the dump. Some of that liquid has concentrations of zinc and nickel high enough to qualify it as hazardous waste.

Much of the leachate is also laced with tritium, a radioactive form of hydrogen. Base officials have not pinpointed the origin of the tritium, but have listed road signs and smoke detectors dumped at Las Pulgas as possible sources.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is working with Camp Pendleton on ways to dispose of the tritium, which is also produced by nuclear reactors and atomic detonations.
Camp Pendleton commanders acknowledge that cracks in the exposed slopes of the liner have allowed leaks to occur. But they believe the sides are sound now and hold out hope that the rest of the liner is intact.

A split bottom could force the Marines to remove 40,000 tons of garbage before they can fix the problem. Pending tests will determine if the liner's bottom is ruptured.

"The liner is not a completely defined problem," said Tracy Sahagun, who works on environmental issues at Camp Pendleton.

Edmund Rogers, facilities manager for the base, said removing the garbage would be a "worst-case scenario."

The 17-acre landfill opened in 1999, but closed in 2003 after leachate gushed from it during heavy rains.

In a 32-page cleanup and abatement order sent to Camp Pendleton in late January, inspectors for the water board said the landfill's liner "was not properly constructed."

The report also listed engineering inconsistencies.

The landfill was designed on paper one way but apparently built another way. For example, the builders created a liner system with rocks larger than those specified in the blueprint. These bigger rocks may have caused holes and rips in the liner, the water board said.

Scrupulous attention to engineering details mattered, Odermatt said, because the landfill was built with a relatively thin liner. While this option saved construction dollars, it also made the liner more prone to holes and tears.

"Somewhere between design and construction," Odermatt said, "things got fouled up."

The water board's actions against Las Pulgas have prompted other contractors building landfills in the county to propose using thicker liners.

"What happened at Las Pulgas has put other contractors on notice," Odermatt said.

The Navy, which contracted and supervised construction of Las Pulgas Landfill for the Marine Corps, is investigating what went wrong. It has not decided whether to seek financial damages from the builders, said Lee Saunders of the Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest in San Diego.

Camp Pendleton has until Dec. 31 to submit its repair plan to the water board, which has insisted on daily reports and visual images of the repair work.
“The way the order is written,” said Odermatt, “(Camp Pendleton has) to fix the defects, start over or come up with another acceptable alternative. I am telling the Marine Corps they are back to square one on this project.”

Problems at the landfill emerged early during its construction, according to the water board’s enforcement records.

In the late 1990s, the Marines wanted to add a 17-acre section to the 39-acre Las Pulgas landfill. On May 24, 1999, contractors finished installing a liner to keep contaminants from seeping into the ground.

The Marine Corps failed to submit an inspection report that summer. Then an incomplete report was submitted in December.

In April 2003, the water board cited Camp Pendleton for not controlling erosion and runoff from the landfill. By year’s end, the board’s inspectors began suggesting that the Las Pulgas liner was damaged – a contention they have repeated to base officials.

Since February 2005, Camp Pendleton has been cited four times over the leaking landfill.

The landfill isn’t the only environmental challenge facing Camp Pendleton. In September, the Marines announced that the base’s southern water system was contaminated with higher-than-permitted levels of lead.

Free medical screenings, bottled water and tips for minimizing exposure to lead have been offered to the system’s nearly 40,000 customers.

Additionally, the Corps has tested water samples from various sites on base and found no further contamination.

The base is installing a system to coat the water pipes with a phosphate so lead won’t leach into the drinking water.

*Rick Rogers: (760) 476-8212; rick.rogers@uniontrib.com
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San Luis Rey Vegetation Clearing *(Jeremy Haas)*

Figure 1. Example of area cleared of *Arundo donax* in January 2006. Photo taken February 16, 2006.

Figure 2. Example of the 100-foot wide corridor cleared of native and exotic vegetation in March 2006. Photo appeared in on-line edition of March 16, 2006 *North County Times* (http://www.nctimes.com/).
February 26, 2006

City Council Members
City of San Diego
202 C Street
San Diego, California 92101

SUBJECT: Downtown Community Plan Update and EIR for the February 28 City Council Hearing, comments on.

Dear Council Members:

The San Diego Audubon Society is very concerned with aspects of the Downtown Community Plan Update. Whether our Downtown will be a healthy, vibrant, and popular community or an costly and awkward liability will be largely decided by this Plan. The Downtown Community Plan must be consider in terms of its impacts on the region.

SMART GROWTH

We agree with the comments of the other members of the ACCORD Coalition that the Plan needs to include measures to insure that the families that work in the Downtown area can afford to live there. If Downtown workers have to live far from their workplace for economic reasons, the Plan will contribute to significant air quality, congestion, and sprawl impacts throughout our region.

However, if the Plan and implementation include adequate affordable housing for working families and good wages for workers, these workers will be able to live near their work places and the Plan and this should result in less vehicle use in our region. We urge that these transportation demand reduction and smart community measures be substantially improved in this Plan. Doing an adequate job of these can change many of the Plan's potential negative impacts to positive ones.

We also urge that large downtown projects be reviewed by the City Council and not just by the redevelopment agency since the form of downtown effects the entire City.

WATER QUALITY

San Diego Bay should be an important attraction for Downtown. The residents and visitors should be able to use it for fishing, kayaking, sailing, even swimming and diving. Unfortunately this Plan, as it is proposed will result in additional pollution to San Diego Bay. So the Bay is more likely to become a detriment for residents, perhaps a waterline marked by dead fish, dead birds, and trash. We do not think that this is acceptable. The Plan needs to be modified to include measures to help clean up the water from the project area.

The San Diego Bayfront downstream of this project area is listed as an Impaired Water Body by State and Federal Agencies. That means that progress must be made to improve it, and actions that would tend to degrade are not likely to be well received by regulatory agencies.
In the EIR's Executive Summary, Table 1.3-1, "Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures", under the Water Quality heading, states: "Implementation of federal, state and local regulations as well as proposed goals and policies are within the control of CCDC or future individual developments would reduce but not avoid an increase in cumulative water pollution effects." The wording is awkward but I think that it tells you that the project will increase the pollution that will flow into the Waters of San Diego Bay after the mitigation that they plan to do.

Table 1.4-1 indicates that there will be "Significant and not mitigable" Cumulative Water Quality effects. Though it states that the Direct effects are Not Significant. No information is given to explain the difference.

Section 1.5, "Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved" addresses four EIR issues. But, it does not address Water Quality, with its significant unresolved impacts. It is surprising that unmitigated runoff pollution is not considered to be an issue that needs to be resolved. We hope that the City Council will consider these Significant Unmitigated Water Quality Impacts as a problem that needs to be resolved within the Community Plan Update.

Strangely Section 5.9.3.4, SURFACE AND GROUND WATER QUALITY, states that "With adherence to state and local water quality controls discussed earlier (e.g. JURMP, SUSUMP, SWPPP, City Stormwater Standards, and Hazardous Materials Release Response and Inventory Plan) the contribution to urban runoff generated by new development would be reduced to below a level of significance. Long-term BMPs required by the SUSUMP and Stormwater Standard would similarly protect against long-term significant water quality impacts from future development." This sounds like good news, but conflicts with the Executive Summary.

Section 5.9. "Hydrology/Water Quality" is the section in which these Significant Unmitigable Water Quality impacts should be analyzed for decision-makers. But Section 5.9.5, the final conclusion is "No significant hydrology or water quality impacts would occur with approval of the proposed Plans and Ordinances as well as subsequent development in accordance with these Plans and Ordinances." This seems like a pretty clear contradiction.

This EIR is totally inadequate in terms of water quality and does not meet the minimum requirements of CEQA. The EIR needs to be consistent and it needs to tell decision-makers:

- what water pollution will be generated by the project;
- what specific measures they are taking to prevent or to capture it, and how much they will they remove;
- what pollutants will get past these measures;
- what is the ability of the bay is to safely assimilate each of these pollutants, and
- what sort of harm will be done when the assimilative capacity is exceeded.

The Plan and EIR need to show how it will reduce, not increase, the polluted runoff going into the Bay. It also needs to say what space will be required for these measures and where they will be located. And it needs to provide assurance that redevelopment funds will be provided to implement the stormwater quality measures that are needed.

CONCLUSION:
The Water Quality impacts of this project can clearly be mitigated, the Plan has chosen not to. It does identify infrastructure improvements needed to convey stormwater but not for stormwater quality. The Plan must be upgraded to include the measures needed to solve the
water quality problems. If the Redevelopment Agency is not required to resolve this, the City will have to come up with the funds to do it. We do not think that the rest of the City should have to contribute for this downtown infrastructure need.

Please require that the Plan be expanded to include the infrastructure needed to at least offset the water quality impacts that Downtown development will cause. Then require that the EIR be augmented to clearly show that the Plan modifications will satisfy that objective.

Please do not authorize a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" that includes increasing the pollution to San Diego Bay.

In case of questions or follow-up, the undersigned can be reached at 619-224-4591 or peugh@cox.net.

Respectfully,

James A. Peugh
Conservation Committee Chair