MRP 3.0 C.8 Water Quality Monitoring Workgroup
FINAL Meeting Summary
Thursday, April 25, 2019
9:30 am – 12:00 pm
RWQCB, 1515 Clay Street, Oakland

Attendees:
Bonnie de Berry (BASMAA facilitator, EOA)
Jim Scanlin (ACCWP)
Craig Pon (ACCWP, City of Oakland, phone)
Lucile Paquette (BASMAA facilitator, CCCWP)
Michele Mancuso (CCCWP, Contra Costa County)
Amanda Booth (CCCWP, City of San Pablo)
Khalil Abusaba (CCCWP, Wood)
Courtney Riddle (CCCWP, phone)
Reid Bogert (SMCWPPP, phone)
Matt Fabry (SMCWPPP)
Chris Sommers (SCVURPPP, EOA)
Paul Randall (SCVURPPP, EOA)
Carol Boland (SCUVRPPP, City of San Jose)
James Downing (SCVURPPP, Valley Water, phone)
Dale Bowyer (SFRWQCB)
Keith Lichten (SFRWQCB)
Jan O'Hara (SFRWQCB)
Kevin Lunde (SFRWQCB)
Zach Rokeach (SFRWQCB)

Objectives: RWQCB & Programs review each of the current MRP C.8 Provisions, share lessons learned, discuss perspectives, consider potential changes and prioritize issues for future discussion.

Attachments: Matrix of C.8 Provisions

Desired Outcome: Confirm RWQCB perspectives/positions on current and potential C.8 monitoring goals and management questions.

Summary:
The group reviewed a matrix of the C.8 provisions except Pollutants of Concern (C.8.f), discussed lessons learned, expressed perspectives and potential changes for MRP 3.0 C.8 sub-provisions. The group attempted to come to agreement on topics and/or identify those needing more discussion.

C.8.a. Compliance Options: in agreement, continue. RWB staff announced that they will be trying to bring the North Bay Counties under the MRP gradually. BASMAA expressed continued interest in collaboration and incentive for reduced monitoring (e.g. SSID projects); it was acknowledged that collaboration does not always equate to reduced cost.

C.8.b. Monitoring Protocols and Data Quality: in agreement, continue. Follow SWAMP protocols, data will be reported in CEDEN format

C.8.c. San Francisco Estuary Receiving Water Monitoring: in agreement, continue.

C.8.d. Creek Status Monitoring: much discussion ensued about lessons learned in MRP 1 and 2, and what Permittees would like to see in MRP 3.0.

- BASMAA would like to see monitoring efforts reduced or stay cost neutral.
- Through bioassessment surveys, this provision measures ambient conditions and addresses multiple factors in a watershed. We now have a good idea of "baseline creek status" on regional and countywide scales and important stressors driving index scores (i.e., imperviousness). (See BASMAA 5-Year Bioassessment Report).
    - The probabilistic design was helpful in identifying ambient conditions; however, it had the unintended consequence of losing local interest and site-specific relevance. A targeted or watershed-based design should be considered for MRP 3.
- Creek status monitoring is valuable to show the public how creeks are doing; however, the connection between creek status monitoring and what else is being done for permit compliance (e.g., GSI, PCBs controls, C.3 measures) is complicated. Creek status monitoring data do not help site GSI or PCBs controls. Nor would creek status monitoring data be expected to respond quickly to GSI projects or PCBs control measures.
- Is there a place or use for monitoring trends? What trends information is useful?
    - What trends are we looking for/changes can we see? (GSI related)
    - What are the indicators of those trends?
    - What is the timescale for a trends monitoring plan?
    - Trends would focus at a smaller scale
- Management Questions to drive monitoring in MRP 3 should consider:
    - What are the known stressors and problems?
    - How can we prioritize watersheds for protection and/or management actions?
    - Where can we make improvements, conservation, restoration?
    - How do we make creeks more resilient?
    - How can we make monitoring meaningful and tie to management actions?
    - How can we show the public we're protecting Beneficial Uses?
    - How do SSID projects fit into the monitoring program?
- BASMAA and RWB understand that the permit needs to specify type, frequency, and interval of monitoring per 2003 BayKeeper Petition (Consolidated Case No. 500527).
- All agreed that unhelpful/unnecessary parameters could be eliminated.

C.8.e. Stressor/Source Identification (SSID) Projects – Agreement in the usefulness of this type of activity. SSID projects can have a high level of local interest and value even if they do not result in stormwater management actions. SSID projects could be used as a tool in our monitoring toolbox.

More flexibility is needed in defining the SSID project endpoint. RWB staff suggest that there is no longer a need to include a toxicity project.

C.8.f. Pollutants of Concern Monitoring needs further thought and discussion. Align with C.11/12 discussions and needs. BASMAA recommends several modifications:

- Eliminate annual minimum numbers of samples – it limits monitoring design options.
- PCBs and Hg monitoring requirements should not be tied together.
- Copper and nutrient monitoring is no longer needed in terms of loading to the Bay.

C.8.g. Pesticides and Toxicity Monitoring – TBD. There will be a state program, but the details are in development and the implementation mechanism is still unknown.

C.8.h. Reporting – consider eliminating the Oct 15th POC report, fold info into UCMR.

Outcomes/Actions for Sept 3 Steering Committee meeting:

- ✓ BASMAA to develop and propose new Management Questions and/or monitoring scenarios
- ✓ BASMAA presentation on lessons learned and 5-yr report and/or circulation of Fact Sheet
- ✓ POC monitoring will be developed and proposed with relation to C.11/12 discussions
- ✓ Re-think SSID application