

San Diego Bacteria TMDL Meeting, 10/07/15

The meeting summary is organized around major points in the meeting agenda, which is included at the end of the meeting summary, along with a list of attendees. Agreements are **highlighted in bold**. Action items are listed at the end of the meeting summary.

1. Introduction and Purpose of Meeting

The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Review and finalize schedule
- Provide information and example analysis for the Creeks Reference Study
- Discuss draft TMDL target language

2. Schedule Overview

Participants agreed to an overall schedule for the process with the understanding that the time frames for each element could change and be shorter or longer than proposed now. **September 2016 was agreed to be a good goal for completion of the Technical Report with an adoption hearing for the TMDL sometime between December 2017 and April 2018.**

Participants also agreed that there are relationships between the Studies, Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) and TMDL reconsideration that have not yet been fully determined. Everyone agreed to be cognizant of this and work together through the process to include considerations across the various aspects of the project. Items from the TMDL reconsideration that should be considered in the CBA should be identified by January 2016.

Jimmy Smith (Board) requested a flow chart for the process that identifies decisions and links to the CBA and special studies.

Chris Crompton (Orange County) requested an outline of the Technical Report.

3. Creeks Reference Study Results/Analysis-Information Item

Dustin Bambic (Paradigm) provided a presentation on the results of the Creek Reference Studies with analysis that evaluated some of the key decisions regarding the targets (e.g. number of samples for calculating the geometric mean, geometric mean averaging period, interpretation of the Statistical Threshold Value (STV) in the 2012 USEPA criteria, etc.). The presentation also compared the use of the San Diego Region dataset to a larger dataset that incorporates historic reference data. Key conclusions from the presentation included:

- Enterococcus has a very high exceedance rate in creeks (>50%)
- E. Coli single sample exceedance rates are much lower than STV exceedance rates (<10% vs. about 25%)
- E. Coli geomean exceedances are common with a majority of sites exhibiting rates greater than 10%
- Important to consider all of the reference sites, particularly for dry weather, to avoid many reference sites not attaining TMDL targets.

Other considerations for analyzing the data include:

- How to address storm days vs. non-storm days when evaluating wet weather data

There was general agreement that using the combined historic and San Diego Region dataset was likely appropriate, but there needed to be justification in the technical report that all of the sites used were appropriate to be used for the TMDL analysis.

Jeremy Haas (RWQCB) requested a discussion in the write-up explaining whether the reference reach approach is still appropriate in the context of the risk-based framework being discussed for the TMDL targets.

Participants agreed that throughout the process, assumptions need to be documented and justified (both in deliverables and meeting minutes/decision records).

4. TMDL Targets-Discussion Item

A handout was provided that included draft TMDL Target language for consideration with decisions highlighted.

The discussion focused on using narrative risk-based language with a “default” numeric interpretation for TMDL targets. **Participants agreed that using a risk-based framework is appropriate for the TMDL.** The details of the language and decisions on the “default” values are still being discussed.

The majority of the discussion focused on the use of the 32 vs. 36 illness rate in the risk-based language. RWQCB staff requested additional information on the basis for 32 and 36 as the recommended illness rates from USEPA, how these illness rates were applicable to the San Diego Region and would be influenced by site-specific studies and future information. Chris Crompton requested continued consideration of the use of 36 as the illness rate, noting that this is the basis for the current objectives and therefore it would not require a 13241 analysis to use this illness rate. RWQCB staff noted that the selected approach should be validated by the local studies.

This agenda item was not completed and will be carried over to the next meeting along with agenda items 5 and 7.

5. Next steps

Agreed on next steps include:

- Team will prepare background information on the basis for the 32 vs. 36 illness rates
- Team will add language to draft TMDL targets memo to explain the applicability of the reference reach analysis in the risk-based framework
- Team will prepare a draft decision flow chart
- Team will prepare a draft Technical Report outline target date is December 10 meeting

See the Workgroup Action Items Report for a complete list of all action items and their status.

6. Next meeting date

The next workgroup meeting will be October 29, 2015, from 9:30 AM – 1:00 PM, per the agreed meeting schedule.

Attendees

Regional Board: Jeremy Haas, Michelle Mata, Jimmy Smith

San Diego City: Ruth Kolb

San Diego County: Todd Snyder, Jo Ann Weber

Orange County Public Works: Chris Crompton, Jian Peng

Team: Dustin Bambic, Clint Boschen, Ashli Desai, Chris Minton

Agenda
San Diego Bacteria TMDL Workgroup Meeting
San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board
Meeting #7-October 7, 2015 1:00 pm to 3:45 pm

1. Introductions and Purpose of Meeting (1:00-1:05 pm)
2. Schedule Overview and Process Overview (1:05-1:35 pm)
 - a. Purpose: Review proposed draft schedule updated by small group and clarify expectations
 - b. Handout: Meeting schedules and tentative agendas and overall project schedule
 - c. Relevant studies: None
 - d. Decisions: None
3. Creeks Reference Study Results/Analysis-Information Item (1:35-1:55 pm)
 - a. Purpose: Discussion of results and identification of information that will support decisions on use of study
 - b. Handout: None
 - c. Relevant studies: Reference Study
 - d. Decisions: None
4. TMDL Targets-Discussion Item (1:55-3:15 pm)
 - a. Purpose: Discussion of key decisions items presented at 9/10/15 meeting
 - b. Handout: Draft risk-based language, presentation on requested analysis
 - c. Relevant studies: USEPA 2012 Criteria, Reference Reach Study
 - d. Decisions: May be outgrowth of discussion
5. Wet Weather Epi Study Update-Information Item (3:15-3:30 pm)
 - a. Purpose: Information item update on study results
 - b. Handout: None
 - c. Relevant studies: Wet Weather Epi Study
 - d. Decisions: None
6. Next Steps (3:30-3:45 pm)












Agenda Items if Time Allows

7. Tecolote QMRA Overview
 - a. Purpose: Information item update on study
 - b. Handout: None
 - c. Relevant studies: Tecolote QMRA
 - d. Decisions: None

San Diego Bacteria TMDL Workgroup Action Items Report

Key to status colors:

- **Green** indicates a completed deliverable
- **Blue** indicates greater than 30 days until the deliverable is due
- **Yellow** indicates a deliverable is due within 30 days
- **Red** indicates an overdue deliverable

| Mtng Date | Deliverable | Assigned To | Due Date | Status | Comments |
|-----------|--|---|------------------------------|---|----------|
| 08/27/15 | List of studies, completion dates, value added, implications for reopener | Consultant team | 09/02/15 |  | |
| 08/27/15 | Distribute draft cost sharing agreement | Todd Snyder | 09/10/15 |  | |
| 08/27/15 | Review past MOUs to assess whether useful concepts or language can be borrowed for this MOU | Drew Kleis, Ruth Kolb | 09/10/15 |  | |
| 08/27/15 | Discuss cost sharing agreement | Workgroup | 09/10/15 |  | |
| 08/27/15 | Finalize MOU | Workgroup | 09/10/15 |  | |
| 08/27/15 | Michelle Mata to meet with small group to review planned overall approach and its relationship to schedule; develop picture of how pieces fit in logical progression | Michelle Mata, Clint Boschen, Chris Minton, Ashli Desai, key permittees | 10/7/15 meeting handout |  | |
| 09/0/15 | Evaluate implications of 32 vs. 36 illness rate using available monitoring data from creeks and beaches | Chris Minton, Dustin Bambic | 10/7/15 meeting presentation |  | |
| 09/10/15 | Frame a more formal description of how a risk-based framework could be used in the TMDL | Ruth Kolb | 10/7/15 meeting handout |  | |
| 09/10/15 | Develop options for calculating geomeans that account for varying intensities/frequencies of monitoring events | Chris Minton, Dustin Bambic | 10/7/15 meeting presentation |  | |
| 09/10/15 | Expand the example table (single sample vs. STV) to include a column showing how the geomean compares to the single sample and STV results | Chris Minton, Dustin Bambic | Undefined, but soon |  | |
| 09/10/15 | Prepare a set of scenarios showing a range of comparisons across the options presented | Chris Minton, Dustin Bambic | 10/7/15 meeting presentation |  | |
| 10/07/15 | Prepare background information on the basis for the 32 vs. 36 illness rates | Chris Minton, Dustin Bambic | 10/29/15 meeting | | |
| 10/07/15 | Add language to draft TMDL targets memo to explain the | Chris Minton, Dustin | 10/29/15 meeting | | |

| | | | | | |
|----------|---|----------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| | applicability of the reference reach analysis in the risk-based framework | Bambic | | | |
| 10/07/15 | Prepare a draft decision flow chart | Ashli Desai, Clint Boschen | 10/29/15 meeting | | |
| 10/07/15 | Prepare a draft Technical Report outline | Team | 12/10/15 meeting | | |

San Diego Bacteria TMDL Workgroup Decision Record

| Number | Date | Decision | Type | Yes | No | Abstain |
|--------|----------|---|-----------|-----|----|---------|
| 2015-1 | 09-02-15 | Allow two weeks for review of meeting notes | Consensus | | | |
| 2015-2 | 09-02-15 | Michelle Mata to take on central coordinating role | Consensus | | | |
| 2015-3 | 09-02-15 | Materials for discussion/review distributed minimum of 10 calendar days before meeting | Consensus | | | |
| 2015-4 | 09-02-15 | Meeting agendas to include decision points, discussion lead, intended outcomes, and reference to background documents | Consensus | | | |
| 2015-5 | 09-02-15 | Use 9/10 meeting as trial run for planned approach to more detailed discussion | Consensus | | | |
| 2015-6 | 09-10-15 | Future discussions of methods for calculating exceedance rates and related topics will account for different settings (freshwater, marine, bays) where this has important implications for the policy | Consensus | | | |
| 2015-7 | 10-07-15 | Overall schedule of completion between December 2017 and April 2018 with target of September 2016 for technical report | Consensus | | | |
| 2015-8 | 10-07-15 | Documentation and justification of assumptions will be provided in technical report | Consensus | | | |
| 2015-9 | 10-07-15 | Use of risk-based framework is appropriate | Consensus | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |