MRP 3.0 C.8 Water Quality Monitoring Workgroup

FINAL Meeting Summary (Internal Meeting)
Monday, March 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)
Carol Boland (SCUVRPPP, City of San Jose)
James Downing (SCVURPPP, Valley Water)
Jim Scanlin (ACCWP)
Craig Pon (ACCWP, City of Oakland)
Amy King (Solano County Permittees, RCD)

I. Introductions and Agenda Review

Attendees introduced themselves and the Workgroup reviewed the agenda. No modifications were made.

II. Review Program Representative Perspectives on MRP C.8 Requirements

The Workgroup reviewed the February 25 meeting summary and then continued to review the current C.8 Provisions. Workgroup members provided perspectives on lessons learned from MRP 1.0 and 2.0 monitoring and ideas for management questions in MRP 3.0. Main discussion topics are listed below:

Provision 3.8.d Creek Status Monitoring

Each of the current creek status monitoring parameters were reviewed within the context of the potential management questions listed below:

- What is the current status?
- Are conditions of creeks in the MRP urban area changing over time?
- What are the causes of poor condition?

	Have we answered these MQs:		
Parameter	**Current Status (Countywide & Regional)**	**Trends**	**Causes**
Biological condition	Yes	No.	Partially. Main causes of poor conditions may not be directly related to stormwater quality. Extent of impervious surface appears to be the primary cause of poor condition; however, there may be site-specific stressors that are equally important. SSID studies can help identify site-specific stressors.
DO	No	No	No. Conditions are likely site-specific.
Temperature	No	No	No. Conditions are likely site-specific
Specific conductance	No	No	No. Conditions are likely site-specific
Chlorine	Yes	No	Yes. Chlorine conducted at bioassessment sites show little to no chlorine issues.
FIB	Maybe	No	Site No. Would require site specific SSID studies.

There was general consensus that, should Creek Status monitoring be required in MRP 3.0, the management question driving the monitoring design should be "Trends." Creek status trends could be addressed using a trends monitoring design. The Programs agreed that although regional approaches are interesting, monitoring at a local level is of more interest to the Permittees. The Committee discussed designing a program that would address specific watersheds (possibly on a rotating basis), priority stream reaches, and/or reaches above and below Green Stormwater Infrastructure features or restoration projects may be the preferred design for MRP 3.0 (although the connection between GSI and creek status indicators is uncertain).

The Programs had varying ideas on the appropriate overall level-of-effort for monitoring in MRP 3.0. Lucile Paquette (CCCWP) reminded the group that at the last meeting the group discussed needing to decide where monitoring could be reduced to mitigate for costs associated with trash receiving water monitoring requirements, assuming that will be included in the reissued permit. Carol Boland (San Jose/SCVURPPP) did not see a need to cut creek status monitoring since the data are useful in showing stakeholders that creeks are being monitored for issues and addressed by the stormwater programs. Chris Sommers suggested that the overall level-of-effort for creek status might be better based on the number of stream miles in urban areas, as opposed to population. Or could there be other ways to determine the level of effort that would be required?

Provision C.8.e SSID

Based on the discussion at the meeting, the group generally agreed that SSID projects can have a high level of local interest and value, even if they do not result in stormwater management actions. Causes of WQO/trigger exceedances are often not related to stormwater. Jim Scanlin asked if there is a better way to find projects and set the level-of-effort – does level-of-effort have to be based on number of projects? Other questions remained like do the number of projects have to be directly related to whether or not RMC members "collaborate", or is there a penalty of more projects if we don't?

Provision C.8.f POC Monitoring

There was overall agreement that MRP 3.0 should allow greater flexibility in obtaining the minimum number of samples (i.e., eliminate annual minimums) with the idea that monitoring should be meaningful and not just to reach a minimum required number. (e.g. 80 PCB/Hg samples could be unnecessary for a County where the majority of source property screening is completed.

Trends are beginning to be addressed through the RMP STLS, and monitoring conducted through the MRP could support or compliment that effort. Chris Sommers suggested that the Workgroup consider focusing some POC monitoring under MRP 3.0 on developing and implementing trends monitoring stations.

III. Discussion of Next Steps and Schedule

The next meeting will include RWQCB staff. The goal will be to hear RWQCB perspectives on MRP 3.0 monitoring. Programs will share their "big picture" ideas:

- Maintain or reduce resources associated with C.8 compliance
- Creek status should shift from baseline to trends
    - desire for lower level of bioassessment effort
    - trends may not be best addressed at a regional level

Actions: Bonnie de Berry will send out a Doodle poll to schedule the next meeting (April 22, 25, 29, May 6). Bonnie will also create a Provision C.8 Table to organize the discussion with RWQCB staff.