MRP 3.0 C.8 Water Quality Monitoring Workgroup

FINAL Meeting Summary (Internal Meeting) Monday, February 25, 2019 1:00 – 3:30pm EOA Conference Room 1410 Jackson Street, Oakland, CA 94612

Attendees:Bonnie de Berry (BASMAA facilitator)
Reid Bogert (SMCWPPP)
Lucile Paquette (CCCWP)
Michele Mancuso (CCCWP, Contra Costa County)
Amanda Booth (CCCWP, City of San Pablo)
Chris Sommers (SCVURPPP)
Paul Randall (SCVURPPP)
Paul Randall (SCVURPPP, City of San Jose) – by phone
James Downing (SCVURPPP, Valley Water) – by phone
Jim Scanlin (ACCWP)
Amy King (Solano County Permittees) – by phone

Overall Process.....Program Reps

Agreements:

- Need for consistent representation at this series of meetings.
- Attendees should represent their countywide program, rather than their individual municipality. Keep the overall big picture in mind.
- If trash receiving water monitoring is required in MRP 3.0, it should be included in provision C.8 as "ambient" monitoring rather than compliance monitoring in provision C.10.
- Monitoring costs in MRP 3.0 (including trash receiving water) should be less than (or equal to) MRP 2.0. Adding trash receiving water costs to the equation will result in a reduction in the level of effort required for other parameters.
- Monitoring should be meaningful to Permittees and tie into management actions.
- Permittees want to avoid end-of-pipe monitoring that has the potential to result in lawsuits from NGOs.
- Monitoring approaches in MRP 3.0 should be based on what was learned through MRP 1.0 and 2.0 monitoring. For example, PCB concentrations are not correlated with Hg; can these two POCs be disconnected?

Discussion:

- Some (but not all) Permittees would like to continue to improve our understanding of the condition of the resource (e.g., streams) itself in absence of State monitoring of streams in order to show NGOs and citizens that it is being protected. Is the resource condition staying the same, getting worse, getting better?
 - The current MRP requires less work to address this question than other regions.
- The Baykeeper lawsuit regarding San Mateo and Contra Costa Permittees (early 2000's) resulted in the requirement that either NPDES permits specify monitoring frequency, duration, and type, or individual monitoring plans are approved by the Water Board through a separate public process.

Next Steps and Action Items:

- This group (including RWQCB participants) should reach general agreement on a proposed monitoring approach in July, prior to the August BASMAA BOD meeting and the MRP 3.0 C.8-(monitoring) focused Steering Committee scheduled for September.
- Bonnie will circulate the regional monitoring cost summary that was developed for the previous IMR and participants can use to estimate current MRP 2.0 costs.

Review of C.8 ProvisionsProgram Reps

See the attached table for a summary of the discussion.

Discussion of Next Steps and Schedule.....Group

Agreements:

- The next meeting will be March 25, 1:00 3:30. It will be an internal meeting.
- RWQCB staff will likely be invited to the third meeting (in April?)

Next Steps and Action Items:

• Bonnie will inform RWB staff of this meeting (February 25) and let them know that we plan to have one additional meeting prior to requesting their participation. With this email, Bonnie will begin scheduling a meeting in late-April/early-May with RWB staff. This email will also ask RWB staff for their thoughts, ideas, and perspectives.

Provision	Agreements/Lessons Learned	Discussion	Next Steps
C.8.a. Compliance Options Summary: Permittees may choose to meet monitoring requirements through a Regional Collaboration, Area-wide Stormwater Program, and may use Third-party Monitoring.	 Regional monitoring design, SOPs, QAPP, and other coordination conducted under MRP 1.0 and 2.0 provided efficiencies and cost savings. 	 Do we still need RMC? Do benefits (i.e., less requirements) justify the costs associated with being in the RMC? If we want to know creek status trends (e.g.CSCI), is that best addressed at local or regional scale? What parts of our monitoring are benefitted from participation in the RMC? There are some unintended consequences (i.e., regional scale might not be interesting to local watershed groups). 	 Need to revisit the intent of this provision and its language. We will still have "efficiencies" in monitoring and reporting efforts (reduced number of samples and reporting) through collaboration (RMC) even if we focus on a watershed scale
C.8.b. Monitoring Protocols and Data Quality Summary: Data must be SWAMP comparable	 Change to CEDEN for data submittals is desired (however, this would require changes to regional database). 	 SWAMP provides SOPs and the data validation process - are there similar CEDEN protocols? What about regional database? How should trash data be validated? 	 Can we coordinate reporting in CEDEN? Decide if the regional database is serving the Programs/Permittees any longer (cost-benefit).
C.8.c. San Francisco Estuary Receiving Water Monitoring Summary: Permittees shall contribute financially to the RMP.	 MQs are dealt with through the RMP TRC – not the MRP. This provision and related funding requirements are unlikely to change. Permittees are generally supportive of this provision. 	 CECs are currently addressed through RMP monitoring. Prior statements by RWB staff suggest RWB does not want CECs in MRP. CCCWP would like to see RMP meeting efficiencies. 	

Provision Agreements/Lessons Learned Discussion	Next Steps
 C.8.d. Creek Status Monitoring Summary: Bioassessment survey protocol (BMI, algae, nutrient samples); chlorine; continuous temperature; continuous water quality (temp, DO, pH, specific conductance); pathogen indicators. Management Questions: Are water quality objectives, both numeric and narrative, being met in local receiving waters, including creeks, rivers and tributaries? This question was addressed by continuous monitoring, and whether it has been answered depends on which creek/reach Are conditions in local receiving waters supportive of or likely to be supportive of beneficial uses? This question has been answered through bioassessment monitoring – our urban streams We have a good idea of creek status (baseline based on bioassessment) on regional and countywide scales. FIB data not very useful – we could suggest eliminating this parameter. Fieduant of the prime of stream miles. Are conditions in local receiving waters supportive of or likely to be supportive of baneficial uses? This question has been answered through bioassessment monitoring – our urban streams 	 to tie temp/DO/chlorine/FIB stormwater management. Evaluate MQs. Current ones are too broad More discussion needed.

Provision	Agreements/Lessons Learned	Discussion	Next Steps
C.8.e. Stressor/Source Identification (SSID) Projects Summary: SSID projects followup on C.8.d and C.8.g trigger exceedances. SSID projects are intended to be oriented toward taking action(s) to alleviate stressors and reduce sources of pollutants. EO approval for completion of SSID projects that determine non-MS4 cause.	•	 How many SSID projects have resulted in tangible actions? RWB expectations for improved WQ may be too high given timeframes. Can SSID projects be an off ramp from 303(d) listings? (Probably not) 	 Review list of prior and ongoing SSID projects. Assess whether SSID projects have resulted in tangible actions.
 C.8.f. Pollutants of Concern Monitoring Summary: Monitoring of POCs (PCBs, mercury, copper, nutrients, emerging contaminants) to address specific MQs. Minimum number of samples per year required. Management Questions/Priority Information Needs: Source identification Contributions to Bay Impairment Management Action Effectiveness Loads and Status Trends 	 Copper and nutrient monitoring is no longer needed (in terms of loading to the Bay) PCBs and Hg monitoring requirements should not be tied together There should not be annual minimum numbers of samples – it limits monitoring design options 	 Some Permittees still need to do more sleuthing to find PCBs sources. SMCWPPP is most interested in BMP effectiveness Monitoring BMPs is very expensive and extrapolation of information is difficult There are lots of BMP effectiveness questions (e.g., lifecycle of BSM) Trends monitoring should include modeling and empirical monitoring Loading stations could be re-established with monitoring designed for trends detection. There are monitoring challenges at Bayside properties and issues with the referral process for these properties. CECs are of high interest to RWB staff (Mumley) and will be addressed by the RMP 	More discussion needed.

Provision	Agreements/Lessons Learned	Discussion	Next Steps
C.8.g. Pesticides and Toxicity Monitoring Summary: Wet weather and dry weather monitoring of pesticides (pyrethroids, carbaryl [sed only], fipronil, imidacloprid [water only]) and toxicity (5 test organisms) in water and sediments of urban creeks. Also includes PAHs, metals, TOC, and grain size in sediment samples.	•	 TBD. There will be a state program, but details are TBD and implementation mechanism is still unknown. MRP 2.0 is low on level-of-effort, so if statewide monitoring effort is population based, costs could go up. 	•
 C.8.h Reporting Summary: EDDs in SWAMP format submitted to SFEI for CEDEN upload. Annual UCMR on March 31. Annual POC Monitoring Report on October 15 Integrated Monitoring Report on March 31 of fifth year (i.e, 2020) 	•	•	 Align reporting in SWAMP/CEDEN so we can just get the EDD in CEDEN format. Align reporting dates (e,g. move POC Allocations and Accomplishment report (Oct) to align with UCMR or Annual Report dates.