**STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
**REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD**
**CENTRAL COAST REGION**

**STAFF REPORT FOR REGULAR MEETING OF OCTOBER 23, 2009**
Prepared on September 24, 2009

**ITEM NUMBER: 21**

**SUBJECT: Executive Officer's Report to the Board**

This item presents a brief discussion of issues that may interest the Board. Upon request, staff can provide more detailed information about any particular item.

## WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATIONS

[Dominic Roques 805/542-4780]

In general, staff recommends "Standard Certification" when the applicant proposes adequate mitigation. Measures included in the application must ensure that beneficial uses will be protected, and water quality standards will be met.

Conditional Certification is appropriate when a project may adversely impact surface water quality. Conditions allow the project to proceed under an Army Corps permit, while upholding water quality standards.

Staff will recommend "No Action" when no discharge or adverse impacts are expected. Generally, a project must provide beneficial use and habitat enhancement for no action to be taken by the Regional Board. A chart on the following pages lists applications received from August 31, 2009 to September 30, 2009.

## WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATION APPLICATIONS RECEIVED FROM AUGUST 31, 2009 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2009

| Applicant | Project | Purpose | Location | County | Receiving Water | Total Acreage[1] | Mitigation[2] | Status of Application |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Chris Skeels -- Aera Energy, LLC | Idle Pipeline Removal in San Ardo Field | To properly remove idle pipeline segments crossing sargent Creek and unnamed drainages in a safe and environmentally-sensitive manner. | San Ardo | Monterey | Sargent Creek | 1.84 | 1.84 | Waiting for CEQA Compliance |
| Jason Rojas -- Housing Authority of the County of Santa Barbara | Creekside Village Apartments | Construction of a 10' by 15' Ungrouted 6" to 12" rip-rap drainage outfall in San Antonio Creek | Los Alamos | Santa Barbara | San Antonio Creek | 0.008 | | To Be Determined |
| Robert Livick -- City of Morro Bay | Dock/Wharf Removal | Remove derelict structure from harbor | Morro Bay | San Luis Obispo | Pacific Ocean | 0.17 | | Waiting for CEQA Compliance |
| Craig Minus -- Towbes Capital Partners | ATK Space Systems | Upgrade existing 18" RCP storm drain to 24" | Goleta | Santa Barbara | Old San Jose Creek | 0.005 | | To Be Determined |
| E. Floyd | Lichen Oaks Ranch Pond Restoration | To restore deepwater bathymetry within the pond, thus restoring water-holding capacity; and to repair the failing culvert infrastructure draining the pond and the headwall supporting the pond dam, thus preventing dam overtopping and potential dam failure. | Felton | Santa Cruz | Quail Hollow Brook, Zayante Creek | 0.43 | | Certification Not Required |
| Shari Hammond-- University of California at Santa Barbara | North Campus Faculty House Project | To restore 1.07 acres of degraded wetland habitat in association with the construction of 161 housing units. Site work includes bioswales and site storm water drainage. | Goleta | Santa Barbara | Pheleps Creek, Devereux Lagoon | 1.07 | 4.26 | To Be Determined |
| City of Grover Beach | Grover Beach Outfall Structure | Amendment | Grover Beach | San Luis Obispo | Meadow Creek | | | To Be Determined |
| City of Santa Cruz-- Resource Conservation District | Lower De Laveaga Service Road Crossing #2 | The proposed project consists of removing one perched culvert at the location titled Crossing #2 and replacing it with a low-maintenance rolling dip constructed with pavers to direct flows over the road. | Capitola | Santa Cruz | West Branch Arana Gulch | 0.09 | | No Permit Required |

| Applicant | Project | Purpose | Location | County | Receiving Water | Total Acreage[1] | Mitigation[2] | Status of Application |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| David Sowle | Sowle Property Biotechnical Bank Stabilization | To restore pre-erosion contours by matching the upstream and downstream banks to the greatest extent feasible. Using the recontoured bank, the landowner has planted mule fat and willow sprigging and applied irrigation over a three year period to establish vegetative cover over the new alluvial bank material placed in 2006. | North Santa Maria | San Luis Obispo | Alamo Creek | ? | | To Be Determined |
| Madonna Enterprises | Prefumo Creek Commons | Commercial development project for a retail center on the western portion of the identified parcel. | San Luis Obispo | San Luis Obispo | Prefumo Creek | 0.23 | | To Be Determined |
| Gary Ruggerone | Nojoqui Creek Bridge | To protect bridge pier footings from continued scour and prevent the potential of a future bridge failure. | Buellton | Santa Barbara | Nojoqui Creek | 0.007 | | To Be Determined |
| Caltrans | Replace Drainage Facility | To replace the existing culvert with one that has a greater headwater capacity and is capable of passing debris more efficiently. | Carmel Highlands | Monterey | Unnamed seasonal drainages, Pacific ocean | 0.0023 | | To Be Determined |
| Bill Kostenlnik | San Julian Span Removal Project | Project will remove three existing spans and replace them with bored sections or rerouted sections of new pipeline. | San Julian Ranch | Santa Barbara | Sisquoc River, Santa Maria River | 0.3 | | To Be Determined |
| Efrem Joelson -- Watt Companies | Laurel Villages/Tumbling Waters | To replace an existing arch span bridge and place soil and rock material for proper bridge function and to match stream gradient above and below the bridge. | San Luis Obispo | San Luis Obispo | Alrita-Carla Creek, San Luis Creek | 0.14 | | To Be Determined |
| D'Arrigo Bros. Co., of California | Rincon Villages (formerly Sun Valley Land Development Co.) | Development of 106.2 acres of residential units, and construction of 2 drainage retention ponds. Improvement of agricultural drainage with a 4 ft bottom width, 3:1 slope, and six 2 ft drops. | Gonzales | Monterey | East branch of Gonzales Slough | 0.13 | | To Be Determined |
| Enrique Saavedra -- City of Monterey | State Route 68/San Benancio Road Intersection Improvements | To widen San Benancio Road and the bridge over El Toro Creek. | Salinas | Monterey | El Toro Creek | 0.65 | | To Be Determined |

[1] Total Acreage includes both temporary and permanent impacts to riparian, streambed, and/or wetland environments within federal jurisdiction.

[2] Mitigation acres are reported only for Certified projects. Water Board compensatory mitigation requirements are determined based on area impacted. They are generally 2:1 for streambed impacts and degraded wetland impacts, 1:1 for riparian impacts, and 3:1 for wetland impacts. Mitigation acreage is final upon issuance of certification and not shown unless the Water Board has issued certification.

## STATUS REPORTS

Program Status Update and Budget Cuts Ramifications [Roger Briggs]

Just before the last Board meeting, I sent the Board a document called "Impact From Three Day Furlough" which discussed our lower priority tasks that we were reducing or eliminating based on the most recent budget cut from added furlough days, coupled with other General Fund cuts for the Water Boards. Before the current round of budget cuts, our region's budget provided for over 74 personnel years, or full time equivalent positions. Currently we are staffed at 58.9 PY equivalents (accounting for some part time employees and furloughs).

A couple of Board Members responded to the Furlough Impact document by saying that it would be more helpful to put those reduced tasks into context with what we are continuing to do. Today's report provides that summary of what we are doing, and some additional discussion of methods for being more efficient/effective and ways of reducing staff time to get the job done.[1] One Board Member has some suggestions for using this time of reevaluation as an opportunity to (slightly edited):

a. Allow each staff member the opportunity to report what seems to them the best use of their time and to list which assigned projects could be completed quickly with only slight delay to the most important items. Reducing the perception of overwhelming volume can limit job stress - increase efficiency.

b. Ascertain which staffers "measure up" in this emergency by keeping their projects on time through better use of their time/work organization. This situation could help in determining which staffers should be considered for reassignment/replacement in their task.

c. Since we serve the public and these are troubled times for more than just the CCRWQCB, give higher priority to projects that will not only remove uncertainty but limit project delays and compliance costs in the short term.

d. Allow for response from the public to proposed priority rankings and consider the need for changes after receiving their comments.

---

[1] For some additional context regarding General Fund cuts (and we may have more shortly), a Sacramento Bee three part series on the California economy provides some perspective by pointing out that California's spending and debt patterns compared to other states' found California spends more per capita than the national average in every government program except highways and public welfare - but consistently runs budget deficits and takes on more and more debt. Those debts include about $246 billion in delays, deferrals and unfunded liabilities to fund schools, public works projects and public employee pensions. On the other side of the coin, an editorial in the Sacramento Bee on 9-23-09, that was a wrap up of the Bee's series said, "The state's general fund spending as a percentage of the economy is as low today as it has been for a generation. In the current budget year, California is spending $5.50 from its general fund for every $100 of personal income in the state." "... California's general fund is taking a smaller bite from the economy now than it has in all but one year since 1975." Also, California has fewer state workers per capita than all states except for one.

## Lisa McCann's Section

Agricultural Regulatory Program [Angela Schroeter 805-542-4644]

As part of an overall program vision alignment effort, the Agricultural Regulatory Program identified the highest priority agricultural water quality issues and goals, regulatory actions that are likely to be most effective at addressing these issues, and associated measures to assess progress and program effectiveness. This vision alignment effort was described to the Board at the June 2009 Board Meeting. In addition, the Agricultural Regulatory Program took these broad program goals and measures and applied them to the watershed scale to develop watershed specific strategies for effectively implementing the Agricultural Regulatory Program in the Santa Maria, Salinas River, and Pajaro River watersheds. In response to recent reductions in resources due to furloughs, staff has identified those tasks it will continue to implement and those tasks for which it will reduce or delay implementation, while still attempting to maximize progress towards healthy watersheds. High priority tasks Agricultural Regulatory Program staff plans to continue at full implementation levels include the following:

- ***Agricultural Regulatory Program Implementation in the Santa Maria and Pajaro River Watersheds –***
  Implementing the Agricultural Regulatory Program in high priority watersheds remains one the program's most important tasks. Full implementation will proceed as planned in the Santa Maria and Pajaro River watersheds in FY 09-10. These watersheds were prioritized based on the severity of water quality impairment (measured by % of waterbodies listed as impaired on the 303(d) List of Impaired Waterbodies), agricultural land use identified as a potential source of impairments, and watershed implementation readiness to proceed. Staff finds implementation of the Agricultural Regulatory Program at the watershed scale to be essential work, because effective implementation of management measures, compliance with discharge requirements, and appropriate follow-up based on specific watershed conditions is necessary to achieve the best water quality outcome. Agricultural Regulatory Program implementation at the watershed scale includes education and outreach, compliance evaluations and inspections, enforcement, and watershed-level reporting on progress and measures to assess program effectiveness. As a subtask for these implementation efforts, staff continues to use Pacifc Gas and Electric Settlement funds and seeks grant funding (e.g., Proposition 84 bond money) to facilitate implementation of management practices (compliance) and reduce compliance costs to irrigated agriculture land owners and operators.

- ***Agricultural Regulatory Program Data Management Improvements –***
  Staff has initiated efforts to evaluate and make improvements to the way the program manages information and data necessary to adequately protect water quality from impairments due to agricultural land uses. Agricultural Regulatory Program staff has identified this activity as among the highest priorities because staff's ability to effectively assess and ensure compliance is dependent on staff's ability to quickly process a diverse set of information and data in an integrated fashion, including landownership, operator information, ranch information, enrollment and fee payment information, management measure reporting, inspection information, enforcement information, and water quality monitoring data. Currently, such information and data are managed and stored in various individual spreadsheets, databases, and paper reports. Staff's ability to efficiently access data, assess data quality and process data for decision-making purposes is limited. The goal is to identify a long-term data management solution that can be phased-in over the short term to maintain current program activities by leveraging our existing data management efforts, as well as other successful data management

models at the Water Board. This is also an example of staff prioritizing work to remove uncertainty and project delays (per the suggestion of a Board member as discussed in the introduction to this report).

- ***Agricultural Order Renewal –***
The Ag Order renewal, currently scheduled to be brought before the Board no later than July 2010, is one of the office's highest priorities, because of the magnitude of water quality impacts from agriculture in our region. As such the associated tasks (compiling information on groundwater basins, analyzing water quality data, researching costs associated with agricultural impacts, developing new requirements for aquatic habitat protection, modifying existing discharge requirements, developing options for monitoring, etc.) are given priority over most other staff responsibilities. Therefore, the furloughs will have minimal impact on completing the Ag Order renewal tasks.

  At this time, staff is reevaluating the public outreach and comment process for the Agricultural Order Renewal. To develop recommendations for the draft Order, Water Board staff planned structured discussions with an Ag Advisory Panel to identify milestones, targets, and schedules for achieving water quality objectives. The intent was for these recommendations and any or all options developed by panel members, to be presented for broader public input and comment, and ultimately to the Water Board for review and approval of the Board's preferred options- in the form of a new Ag Order.

  At the most recent Ag Advisory Panel meeting on September 22, 2009, several members of the Ag Advisory Panel suggested that the forum and process were no longer productive for developing panel recommendations for elements of the draft Order. Some panel members attribute this to some members' perceptions that Water Board staff has predetermined what should be in the Order. Other members indicated that the views of the different interest groups on the panel are too far apart to reach agreements for recommendations on issues like individual monitoring requirements and aquatic habitat protection.

  With awareness that individual panel members, including Water Board staff, have various opinions about whether the panel was or could be productive, staff will determine the best approach going forward to continue to solicit input from stakeholders. Staff may opt to proceed with a more traditional public outreach process rather than the current, more involved process to convene regular Ag Advisory Panel meetings. One proposal was to provide an early first draft of the proposed order to the Ag Advisory Panel and to review this draft for possible modification with the panel prior to further distribution. These options would result in the elimination of some or all of the remaining scheduled Ag Advisory Panel meetings, scheduling, instead, public workshops (at least one or two with the Board), and a formal public comment period early in 2010. Staff will determine how to proceed in the next few weeks. In the meantime, staff will continue to develop the components of and prepare draft recommendations for the Order.

- ***Vision Alignment –***
Alignment of the Agricultural Regulatory Program tasks with the Water Board's vision of healthy watersheds is a high priority planning project that staff began in March 2009 and reported to the Board at the June 2009 Board Meeting. To date, staff has identified the highest priority agricultural water quality issues, associated goals, actions that can be taken to address the impacts, and specific operational measures to demonstrate progress and overall program effectiveness. In addition, staff has applied these priorities, goals, actions, and measures to the watershed scale to develop unique

watershed implementation strategies that focus on the water quality impairments and agricultural land use conditions of a particular watershed. Staff has completed draft watershed implementation strategies for the Santa Maria, Pajaro River, Salinas River, as well as a general strategy for "other" watersheds. Staff will continue vision alignment efforts in FY 09-10 by completing tasks necessary to effectively track and report on operational measures for the purposes of measuring progress and overall program effectiveness.

In addition to implementation of the tasks listed above, staff will reduce or delay implementation of the following tasks:

- ***Agricultural Regulatory Program Implementation in the Salinas River Watershed -*** In response to reduced resources due to furloughs, staff anticipates delaying the full implementation of the Agricultural Regulatory Program the Salinas River Watershed until FY 10-11. Staff recognizes the overall high priority of watershed implementation and finds that a more focused and comprehensive effort to implement the program in specific watersheds is likely more effective than a broader implementation fragmented in multiple watersheds over time. While we will likely have some level of effort in the Salinas River Watershed based on complaints and observations that are determined to be high priority, the overall effort in the watershed will be significantly reduced this FY resulting in little to no watershed scale outreach, and fewer compliance evaluations, inspections, or enforcement actions. For example, staff previously committed to conducting 15-20 inspections in three watersheds (60 inspections total in the Santa Maria, Pajaro River, and Salinas River Watersheds) during FY 09-10. In response to reduced resources due to furloughs, staff anticipates the number of inspections that will be conducted will be reduced to ten to twenty inspections in two watersheds (40 inspections total in the Santa Maria and Pajaro River Watersheds). Full implementation of the Agricultural Regulatory Program in the Salinas River Watershed will commence in FY 10-11. Staff will continue to evaluate progress and overall program effectiveness in the Salinas River Watershed despite a reduced level of program implementation, using the "Vision Alignment" task described above.

- ***Monitoring and Assessment –*** In response to reduced resources due to furloughs, staff anticipates reducing the level of effort related to monitoring and assessment (from 0.1 PY to 0.05 PY), more specifically coordination with the Cooperative Monitoring Program (CMP) and Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP). In the past, staff has prioritized the assessment of watershed-scale trend data related to agricultural water quality and the development of Water Quality Monitoring Fact Sheets. While the CMP and CCAMP programs provide great benefit to the Agricultural Regulatory Program by identifying problem areas and associated water quality trends, they are not directly related to programmatic compliance and enforcement efforts. Thus, staff has determined that the program cannot continue to support monitoring and assessment at the same level, in the same fashion. Efforts will focus on coordinating with CMP and CCAMP to align these programs with the needs of the Agricultural Regulatory Program to the extent practical. Staff will not produce or update Water Quality Monitoring Fact Sheets and will rely on the technical reports directly produced by CMP and CCAMP. In addition, staff will include a brief summary discussion of overall water quality in the watershed implementation efforts and associated "State of the Watershed" reports.

- ***Food Safety Coordination –***
  In response to reduced resources due to furloughs, staff anticipates reducing the level of effort related to food safety coordination (from 0.1 PY to 0.05 PY). While food safety continues to be an important issue in the Central Coast region, staff finds that the reduction in resources requires us to rely more heavily on existing State Water Board representation of Water Board interests. This will result in staff attending fewer Food Safety meetings and commenting on fewer policy documents. Staff will continue to address issues related to aquatic habitat modification at the watershed level.

Basin Planning Program [Angela Schroeter 805-542-4644]

Staff will continue to develop the highest priority Basin Plan Amendments approved as part of the Triennial Review List. These high priority amendment projects include: adding a description of the Vision of Healthy Watersheds, implementation strategies, and the system for tracking progress; replacing the narrative biostimulatory substances water quality objective with numeric objectives; replacing the narrative aquatic life water quality objectives with numeric objectives; establishing protection plans and policies for watersheds, groundwater recharge and aquatic habitat/riparian zones, consistent with the measurable goals for our Vision. Staff is also evaluating opportunities for funding, such as from grants or settlement funds, to insure staff can secure proper expertise where needed to develop Basin Plan Amendments. This will increase efficiency and advance the schedules for completing the longer-term and more complex amendments, such as establishing new plans and policies for watershed protection, and, hopefully remove uncertainty and reduce time to complete the projects.

However, the timelines for completing these amendments will be extended to accommodate the current reduction in budget and staff time. Consequently, staff will likely propose the first amendments to the Board in 2011 rather than in 2010. Staff is also evaluating opportunities for funding, such as from grants or settlement funds, to insure staff can secure proper expertise where needed to develop Basin Plan Amendments. This assistance will increase efficiency and advance the schedules for completing the longer-term and more complex amendments, such as establishing new plans and policies for watershed protection. Additionally, this work and its results should limit uncertainties for stakeholders and reduce time to complete the projects.

Regional Monitoring Program [Karen Worcester 805/549-3333]

Central Coast Ambient Monitoring staff will continue to implement the CCAMP monitoring program, development of vision assessment and tracking capabilities, and other region-wide assessment activities to inform regulatory decisions and track progress and achievement of our vision of healthy watersheds. Staff plans to delay startup of the next five-year watershed rotation from January 2010 to 2011, to allow some recovery time for project funding.

CCAMP field staff will be reduced by one part-time position to save staffing costs over the next year and will be offset by Water Board staff accompanying existing CCAMP field staff on sampling events one day per month. Staff will rotate this responsibility based on various staff members' availability, and ability to maintain progress on and completion of other high priority tasks. Lead staff will attend fewer outreach and education events such as interagency meetings, technical advisory groups and conferences. Those attended will be selected because they provide an opportunity for us to gain information to support current projects or vision progress.

Stormwater Program [Phil Hammer 805-549-3882]

In light of recent reductions in resources due to furloughs, the stormwater unit has prioritized its tasks to focus on those actions most likely to result in progress towards achieving healthy watersheds. Through this process, staff has identified those tasks it will continue to implement and those tasks for which it will reduce or halt implementation. High priority tasks stormwater staff plans to continue at full implementation levels include the following:

- ***Enroll Municipalities Under the General Phase II Municipal Stormwater Permit*** - Enrollment of traditional municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) under the General Phase II Municipal Stormwater Permit remains one of the unit's top priorities and will continue at recent levels of effort. Staff finds enrollment of the traditional MS4s to be essential work, because enrollment triggers full scale implementation of municipalities' Storm Water Management Programs over large geographic areas, which address a wide range of threats to watershed health, such as hydromodification and discharge of urban pollutants. Stormwater staff has enrolled 34 out of 41 traditional MS4s in the region (83 percent), with enrollments of the remaining seven MS4s currently underway. Staff plans to complete enrollment of all traditional MS4s during the first half of 2010. At this early stage, staff finds the enrollment effort has been successful in triggering the municipalities' process for incorporating water quality measures into development projects. For example, Water Board staff has observed many municipalities throughout the region requiring Low Impact Development design aspects for development projects. Likewise, as municipalities submit annual reports, Water Board staff is finding that the enrollment process has resulted in an increased emphasis on assessment of program and best management practice effectiveness by the municipalities.

- ***Renewal of City of Salinas Phase I Municipal Stormwater Permit*** - The process for renewal of the City of Salinas Phase I Municipal Stormwater Permit is just underway. Stormwater staff finds this effort to be a high priority due to the City of Salinas's size, its opportunities for growth, and pollutant sources. In addition, outcomes of this process may help inform staff expectations for Phase II municipalities' stormwater programs. Staff envisions this project to be a team effort, with various staff responsible for developing and drafting various components of the permit. Staff aims to renew the City of Salinas's permit during the first half of 2010.

- ***Joint Effort for Development of Hydromodification Control Criteria*** - Oversight of municipalities' joint effort to develop region-wide hydromodification control criteria also remains a high priority for stormwater staff. Hydromodification is a principal stressor on healthy aquatic habitat throughout the region. Development of consistent hydromodification control criteria increases stakeholder buy-in and the likelihood of criteria effectiveness, among other benefits. Staff expects to issue the regulatory mechanism to enact the joint effort in November 2009. Staff oversight of municipalities' achievement of implementation milestones for the joint effort will continue for approximately two years following enactment of the regulatory mechanism. For more information on the joint effort for development of hydromodification control criteria, including background information, progress made, and next steps, please see the section titled "Status of Joint Effort to Develop Hydromodification Control Criteria" in this Executive Officer Report. This is another example of prioritizing important work that facilitates implementation of a critical best management practice and reduces uncertainty and compliance costs for the dischargers, MS4s in this case.

- ***Vision Alignment*** - Alignment of the stormwater unit's tasks with the Water Board's vision of healthy watersheds is a high priority planning project that staff began in August 2009. The project includes identification of high priority impacts caused or contributed to by stormwater discharges, stressors causing the impacts, actions that can be taken to address the impacts, and measures that can be used to demonstrate staff's progress and effectiveness. Each staff member will use the information generated by this planning effort to develop an implementation strategy for their assigned geographic area. As the enrollment and permitting efforts described above wind down in mid-2010, staff will increasingly mobilize these implementation strategies.

In addition to implementation of the tasks listed above, staff will reduce implementation of the following tasks:

- ***Municipal Audits and Annual Report Reviews*** - Stormwater staff previously committed to conducting 20 municipal audits and annual report reviews during fiscal year 2009-2010. In response to reduced resources due to furloughs, staff anticipates the number of municipal audits and annual report reviews that will be conducted will be reduced to ten. This reduction in audits and annual report reviews, as opposed to the elimination of the tasks, reflects the generally high priority status staff assigns to municipal audits and annual report reviews. Audits provide staff with valuable direct interaction with the municipal staff responsible for program implementation, and give staff first hand insight into the effectiveness of municipal stormwater program implementation both in the office and in the field. Likewise, annual report reviews provide staff with a straightforward means to get a broad overview of municipal stormwater program implementation. The audits will generally focus on two stormwater program components, and will include office and field assessments, reporting of findings, and follow-up actions for noted deficiencies. Annual report reviews, meanwhile, will likely include a broader assessment of municipalities' programs, and will also include reporting of findings and deficiency follow-ups. Municipalities to be audited and reviewed will be distributed throughout the region, and will be chosen based on size, threat to water quality, condition of receiving waters, compliance history, and other factors. In cases where the adequacy of resources to conduct both audits and annual report reviews is in question, staff will place higher priority on conducting audits, because audits provide Water Board staff with detailed information on actual on-the-ground implementation and municipal staff understanding of the program. Such information allows Water Board staff to better determine compliance and the effectiveness of municipalities' stormwater programs.

- ***Industrial and Construction Inspections*** – Stormwater staff previously planned to conduct at least ten industrial and ten construction stormwater inspections. Due to reduced resources resulting from the furloughs, staff plans to reduce these planned inspections to those inspections in response to significant complaints, violations, spills, etc. While inspections can be an effective means for ensuring compliance, staff believes that resources expended on the municipal stormwater program can be leveraged to address pollutant discharges from industrial and construction sites. For example, staff has worked with municipalities to include in their Storm Water Management Programs best management practices for municipal inspections of industrial and construction sites. Improved municipal oversight of industrial and construction sites makes Water Board staff inspections of these sites a lower priority. Water Board staff will continue to assess

municipal oversight of construction and industrial sites through the use of audits, report reviews, and other means.

Staff will implement measures, as mentioned in the "Vision Alignment" task above, to track progress and effectiveness of the high priority tasks and impacts of the reduction in effort for the lower priority tasks. For example, staff will assess the number of municipalities and the success of municipalities at implementing changes to their development and review processes to incorporate stormwater quality controls, low impact development techniques, and hydromodification controls. Similarly, staff will assess the number of municipalities and success level of municipalities at implementing construction site management. Staff will evaluate these measures annually and consider adjusting the priority of the tasks and/or the level of effort for the tasks, and/or adding new tasks to adequately protect healthy watersheds.

Timber Harvest Program Status Report [Lisa Horowitz McCann 805/549-3132]

Water Board staff will optimize the timber harvest program's effectiveness, in light of budget reductions, by inspecting high priority timber harvest sites enrolled in the General Order (General Conditional Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements – Timber Harvest Activities) or issued an Individual Order (Individual Conditional Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements). High priority will be determined as the sites/operations that pose the greatest threat to water quality. Additionally, staff will randomly inspect sites posing lower threats. Based on inspections, staff may determine that management practices or field conditions do not protect water quality. In these instances, Water Board staff may recommend changes to the Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) for timber harvest operations. Recommended changes may include site-specific photo, turbidity, or temperature monitoring. Staff may also recommend more frequent inspections or an extension of MRP duration. Water Board staff may inspect sites again to ensure the Discharger complies with the MRP.

By inspecting sites and reviewing monitoring reports, staff will be able to assess the effectiveness of onsite management measures at protecting water quality. Quick enforcement actions, as needed, will help ensure compliance. Based on compliance history and water quality data, staff likely be able to provide adequate program oversight with the current level of resources.

As we discussed at length at the July Board meeting in conjunction with our written staff report for that meeting, staff will no longer review *all* Timber Harvest Plans, attend *all* pre-harvest inspections, and inspect *all* harvest sites. Also, staff will not track and review as much monitoring data, as the Board recently changed the MRP to reduce the monitoring burden on dischargers. Staff will instead conduct these activities as needed based on understanding the threat to water quality and beneficial uses from the various types and locations of operations. This is another example of prioritizing to limit project delays and compliance costs.

Water Quality Certifications Programs [Phil Hammer 805-549-3882]

Water Board staff issues approximately 90 Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certifications (Certifications) annually. Water Board staff plans to continue to review and consider issuing Certifications for most of the projects that staff has traditionally permitted. Many of these certifications are issued for projects with impacts that can be avoided or mitigated, or for minor projects with minimal impacts to waters or for projects with beneficial impacts to waters. In particular, staff plans to focus on programmatic Certifications that are

typically issued for five year terms and address flood control/channel maintenance projects. Examples of these types of projects include the Monterey County Water Resources Agency's flood control/maintenance work on an approximately 100-mile stretch of the Salinas River, as well as the Santa Barbara County Flood Control District's annual flood control/channel maintenance program implemented throughout Santa Barbara County. Staff will work with these agencies and others to develop flood control/ channel maintenance programs from a perspective of watershed health, with minimized impacts and optimized mitigation.

In response to reduced resources resulting from furloughs, staff will issue fewer Certifications; staff will not issue Certifications for about 20 of the projects with minimal or beneficial impacts to waters. These projects instead will receive their Certifications by default once Water Board staff's timeframe to take action on their application expires. Staff does not anticipate that failure to take action on applications for these types of projects will result in impacts to waters. Staff has typically included few (if any) conditions in Certifications for these minor projects and has not observed problems or impacts from these projects proceeding without conditions. However, staff will assess cumulative impacts of this approach at least annually. Staff will also seek efficiencies in processing Water Quality Certification applications by developing standard criteria for review and categorization of project types. This will allow staff to spend more time implementing conditions on impacting projects to avoid or minimize water quality and habitat impacts. Additionally, staff will develop measures to track the effectiveness of the Certifications at protecting healthy watersheds and consider adjusting the types of projects certified and/or water quality conditions imposed as necessary.

## Harvey Packard's Section

TMDL Program [Chris Rose 805-542-4770]

The TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) program operates under a well-defined workplan and task-tracking system. The workplan for this fiscal year reflects the decreased resources available due to the furloughs. However, we still expect the program to achieve significant accomplishments, as described below.

The TMDL Program is taking a new approach to TMDL development and implementation in one of our high-priority watersheds. We are in the beginning stages of developing a Watershed TMDL for the Santa Maria River watershed. A Watershed TMDL addresses many or all the impairments in a watershed, rather than the traditional approach of addressing one pollution problem (or a few related pollutants problems) on a smaller scale, such as a specific segment of a stream. For the Santa Maria Watershed TMDL project, we are addressing over 90 pollution problems throughout the watershed, including impairments due to nutrients, pathogens, salts, and pesticides. We are also altering our traditional approach by beginning to implement corrective actions much sooner in the overall process. We are testing this new approach to see if it will save considerable time, effort, and resources by going through fewer individual TMDL processes, and to see if we are more effective by implementing corrective actions much sooner. Several staff will work on the Santa Maria Watershed TMDL project, and this fiscal year each staff person will develop a project definition, project plan, data analysis report, and progress report for their part of the project. Each staff person will also contribute to the stakeholder involvement process, e.g., through preparation and involvement at a stakeholder outreach meeting.

The TMDL Program will also bring two additional TMDL projects to the Water Board for approval this fiscal year. The two TMDL projects are the lower Salinas River Watershed Pathogen TMDL, and the lower Salinas River Watershed Pesticide TMDL.

The TMDL Program will also begin implementing the Pajaro River Sedimentation TMDL project this fiscal year. Rural lands are identified as a significant source of sediment in the Pajaro watershed, and a crucial step of the implementation plan is to identify and contact parties responsible for non-point sources of sediment. Staff will use aerial photography, GIS software, parcel data, collaboration with other agencies and trade groups, field-reconnaissance, and more, to identify, contact, and require TMDL implementation by responsible parties.

The TMDL Program will also assess implementation progress of the Clear Creek and Hernandez Reservoir Mercury TMDL. Staff will develop an implementation progress report, including a summary of implementation activities, data analysis of mercury levels in the impaired water bodies, and statement of progress towards achieving the TMDL.

The TMDL Program will also continue development of the lower Salinas River watershed Nutrient TMDL project. TMDL program staff will conduct analyses of nutrient and nutrient-related data and impairments. Staff will use this and other information to develop and propose numeric targets protective of all beneficial uses, including aquatic life related beneficial uses. Staff will engage with stakeholders as part of this numeric target development.

Core Regulatory Programs (NPDES and Waste Discharge Requirements [WDR]) [Burton Chadwick 805-542-4786]

Core Regulatory Program staff will continue issuing and reissuing (and improving) NPDES permits and WDR orders, conducting inspections to show a strong field presence, assist dischargers in assuring compliance, and take enforcement actions when appropriate or mandatory. We will be doing a little less of each of these tasks as a result of the 14 percent resources reduction due to furloughs and will continuously reprioritize based on impacts to water quality, requests or requirements from customers, dischargers, and State Water Board and USEPA staff. These day-to-day readjustments have been ongoing for core regulatory staff; a fiscal year 2000/2001 needs analysis conducted by the State Water Board found that, in general across all regions, the core regulatory programs were operating with approximately 30 percent of the need (to do our work) met by available resources. The resource-to-need ratio has continued to decline since.

One very important "beyond-the-budgeted" task core regulatory staff will be taking on this fiscal year will be initiation of a stakeholder process to prepare salt and nutrient management plans for every basin/subbasin in the region in conformance with the State Board's Recycled Water Policy adopted in May 2009. Pursuant to the policy, the stakeholders will be responsible for preparing the plans; Regional Water Board staff will be initiating the process, holding workshop(s), providing stakeholder assistance, and reporting on the progress to the State Water Board. We will initially start with 15 high-priority groundwater basins (shown below). Preparation and ultimately incorporation of the salt and nutrient management plans into the Basin Plan though the Basin Plan amendment process will greatly assist in reaching our vision goal of cleaner groundwater by focusing on solutions to one of our greatest groundwater impairments—nitrates, as well as problems from other excessive salts.

Priority Groundwater Basins:
Felton Area
Scotts Valley
West Santa Cruz Terrace
Pajaro Valley
Salinas Valley
Santa Cruz Purisima Formation
Soquel Valley
Carmel Valley
Santa Maria River Valley
Santa Ynez River Valley
Llagas Area
Bolsa Area
Hollister Area
Cuyama Valley

**John Robertson's Groundwater Section**

During the last 20 months, each program in the Central Coast Region Groundwater Section (Site Cleanup, Landfills, Underground Tanks, and Department of Defense cleanups) has used a modified prioritization process to identify the sites that pose the greatest risk to water quality. With nearly 1500 cleanup sites within the region, and reduced available hours due to furloughs and programmatic budget reductions, we use the prioritization criteria to understand which sites are priorities (those with water quality risk), and which sites to push harder (those near closure and riskier sites). These criteria focus primarily on reducing human, ecological, and water quality risk (e.g., proximity of wastes to drinking water supply well or creek, relative concentrations of wastes, etc), although we also consider relative ease to achieving site closure – the concept of low hanging fruit – as a criterion, understanding that fewer sites to work on allows staff to better focus on the remaining high priority sites. (Note, this approach is consistent with above mentioned Board member suggestion in the introduction to this report.) Informed by the prioritization efforts, we adjust time allocations, spending more time on the identified high priority sites (examples include Olin, Guadalupe, Lake Nacimiento Resort, Vandenberg Site 8C, or Santa Maria Landfill) to move these sites through characterization and cleanup, to closure. We also view prioritization as dynamic, as we reduce risk at high priority sites, or as we acquire new sites, we have to re-evaluate our priorities.

These efforts in case load prioritization prepare us for reduced available time by providing us with clear understanding of our most important cleanup sites. The following sections provide descriptions of the time and budget reductions experienced by the various Groundwater Section programs, consideration of the specific prioritization efforts in the individual programs, and detail the work that will be done and that which will be de-emphasized in light of these reductions. Program staff participated in the prioritization efforts described below, aiding in the development of the specific criteria, thus providing input in defining the priority projects they will be working on. We developed criteria that are consistent both within each program, and relatively consistent across all of the Groundwater Section programs.

**Underground Tank Program**

The Underground Storage Tank (UGT) program incurred a 0.8 person-year (PY) (~13 percent of the UGT program total funding) General Fund reduction for the current fiscal year (Fiscal Year 2009/2010). In addition, state employee furloughs amount to a reduction of nearly 14 percent. UGT funding supports 5.4 PYs of staff time.

Central Coast Water Board UGT staff collectively prioritized casework over the past year. Our prioritization criteria include risk to receptors, proximity of cases to closure, and age of cases (often the age of a case reflects its complexity, though occasionally, an older case has 'fallen through the cracks'). We are making use of our prioritization effort in several ways to adjust to these reductions.

In order to absorb the reduction in UGT funding, we redirected 0.8 PY of one UGT staff's time to Site Cleanup Program (SCP) work. The staff member (Dr. Wei Liu) was able to retain some of his highest priority UGT cases; the UGT program manager (Chris Adair) redirected the remainder of his caseload to other UGT staff. As a result of this redistribution, the caseload of the remaining UGT staff will increase slightly. UGT staff will focus increased time on the 78 highest priority tank sites to accelerate these sites to remediation and ultimately closure. Additionally, UGT staff estimates 17 site closures for this fiscal year. Approximately 52 of our lowest priority UGT sites will receive little or no attention this year.

Coincidently, State Board Resolution 09-42 (approved by the State Water Board in June) requires UGT staff in all regions to evaluate all of their UGT cases for closure. The regulated community understands that the resolution mandates staff to do this closure evaluation for each cleanup case. We anticipate increasing requests from the regulated community to evaluate and close individual sites, although we have not received any as yet. Increased requests and efforts in this area could potentially reduce efforts on priority sites.

UGT staff has also evaluated monitoring efforts at their sites to maximize use of resources (e.g., staff, Tank Cleanup Fund). Our objective has been to reduce the overall monitoring frequency at most sites and reduce monitoring at lower priority wells for medium and higher priority sites, in order to more effectively use scarce resources. Lowest priority sites have been assigned annual monitoring programs and will consequently get less attention, as these sites will submit less frequent monitoring reports. We are modifying monitoring and reporting plans (MRPs) to sample as little as is necessary and reasonable to verify cleanup (remedial) technology effectiveness and measure progress towards cleanup.

**Site Cleanup Program**

The Site Cleanup Program (SCP) basically responds to spills from anything other than UGTs or Department of Defense sites. For the 2009/2010 fiscal year, SCP General Fund resources were decreased 0.3 PY, to a total of 0.9 PY. The other SCP fund resources remained constant at 7.6 PY. SCP staff work on former or active dry cleaners (24 percent of cleanup cases), industrial/manufacturing facilities (22 percent), bulk fuel storage facilities (20 percent), and oilfield-related facilities (20 percent) cleanup cases. Perchlorate, mine, and drug lab cleanup sites primarily make up the bulk of the remaining 14 percent. Perchlorate unit staff oversees perchlorate waste discharges at non-military facilities.

In 2008/2009, SCP program management (Sheila Soderberg and Thea Tryon and Groundwater Section manager John Robertson) developed case ranking/prioritization criteria to help focus SCP staff time and efforts. Similar to the UGT effort described above, these prioritization criteria included risk to receptors (e.g., drinking water wells, creeks, organisms), proximity of cases to closure, and case complexity. This ranking/prioritization process confirmed that SCP staff is working on the highest risk (e.g. highest priority) sites in our region. In response to the budget reductions and furloughs, SCP staff has decreased their time spent on lower risk sites. For some cases, SCP staff will spend little or no time on the low risk cases; these cases have been assigned to the senior responsible that site. When we receive a case referral from another agency, SCP staff evaluates the available technical data to determine the level of risk posed to human health or the environment such that the case can be ranked appropriately.

To leverage our time and efforts, SCP staff have: 1) reduced work on cases where other environmental regulatory agencies (e.g., Department of Toxic Substances Control [DTSC]) are lead (and if we have to work on these cases, focus on those cases where Water Board permits were issued, such as the Moss Landing Power Plant); 2) continue to reduce quarterly groundwater monitoring frequency for medium and low risk sites to semiannual or annual monitoring; 3) continue to reduce duplicative program roundtable participation between the Perchlorate and SCP program managers; 4) continue to reduce travel to meetings (when possible, participate via teleconference); and 5) continue to push on cases that are close to closure, to move them into closure.

SCP staff will continue to work on those 155 sites that pose the highest risk to human health and the environment (e.g., Olin, Whittaker, Guadalupe oilfield). Additionally, SCP staff estimates nine site closures for this fiscal year. Approximately 50 of our lowest risk SCP sites will receive little or no work from our staff this year. Consequently, program managers will change these cases to "inactive" status. As we achieve cleanup at priority sites, and as we receive new sites, we will reassess priorities, as this is an ongoing prioritization effort.

**Department of Defense Site Cleanup Program**

For the 2009/2010 fiscal year, Water Board Department of Defense (DoD) funded program resources include 4.6 positions. The DoD program also employs two part-time two student interns.

At the various Central Coast DoD facilities, the Central Coast Water Board either shares the lead regulatory role with DTSC or is the sole lead. The Central Coast Water Board's primary oversight responsibilities include:

- Reviewing and commenting on technical reports and studies that
    - Characterize spills/discharges, and
    - Detail design and development of remedial alternatives;
- Achieving public outreach and education through public meetings; and
- Providing oversight for leaking underground storage tank cases, for which DTSC has no regulatory oversight authority.

Most of the DoD budget for the Central Coast Region covers oversight at Vandenberg Air Force Base (3 PY) and Former Fort Ord Army Base (0.6 PY). Water Board staff also oversee Lompoc Branch U.S. Disciplinary Barracks Federal Correction Facility, Fort Hunter Liggett Army Base,

Camp Roberts National Guard Base, and Monterey Peninsula Airport (a former U.S. Navy Air Base). Furloughs have reduced staff availability by approximately 14 percent.

There are numerous other military-related cleanup sites in the Central Coast Region that DoD classifies as Formerly Used Defense Sites. Formerly Used Defense Sites are sites that were previously owned, operated, or leased by the Defense Department. Monterey Peninsula Airport is an example of a Formerly Used Defense Site currently being addressed through the Environmental Restoration Program. Many of the Formerly Used Defense Sites were only used for a short period of time (e.g., during World War II) or had limited activities (e.g., satellite stations) and the Defense Department ranks these as low priority for funding purposes.

In response to furloughs, Water Board staff has decreased time spent on all military facilities' cleanup projects and are currently prioritizing sites using risk criteria similar to those described for SCP sites above, such that staff focuses time on the highest risk sites. However, the Defense Department develops environmental outcome-based goals for each facility/base. If bases do not achieve these goals, funding can be at risk in future years, potentially slowing down the pace of cleanup. Furloughs will slow down the rate at which both DTSC and Water Board staff can review and respond to technical documents, and this will likely impact schedules associated with these environmental outcome goals. We have communicated with Vandenberg and DoD environmental program management about the potential impacts of furloughs on deliverables and time schedules, to aid in focusing funding and resource decision-making toward the highest risk sites.

Defense cleanup funding is sometimes available for a limited period of time in any particular contract year, even for moderate to higher risk sites. In addition, Water Board staff also work on projects where the military base, like Vandenberg Air Force Base, may have multiple contractors with performance-based-contracts for the same site. While the funding and contracting styles add a layer of complexity to our internal prioritization efforts, we work with each base to input our priorities to the budgeting and funding process, such that the most important sites from a risk perspective are receiving funding. With respect to specific work tasks, Water Board staff elevates the priority for field modification report reviews (proposed or completed field work) and responses, compared to more routine groundwater monitoring report reviews and responses.

To leverage our time and effort, Water Board staff have: 1) continued to prioritize sites based on risk to human health and the environment; 2) met with the military base remedial project managers earlier in the workplan planning process to better target content in workplan submittals (such that they address State requirements, resulting in fewer submittal/review iterations) and to discuss assessment/cleanup schedules competing with contract deadlines; 3) reduced or eliminated review of lower priority reports; 4) avoided duplication of efforts by preparing State letters combining comments from both DTSC and Water Board staff; 5) continue to reduce travel to meetings (when possible, participating via teleconference).

**Land Disposal Program**

- The Land Disposal Program receives funding from the Waste Discharge Permit Fund (32 percent of total) and the Integrated Waste Management Account (68 percent of total). This funding equates to 2.8 PYs. The current economic recession has reduced tipping fees at landfills which provide funding for the Integrated Waste Management Account (a big factor is reduction in waste from the construction industry). This trend resulted in a nine percent

reduction in funding for the Central Coast Region landfill program (in Fiscal Year 2009/2010) from that source, in addition to the 14 percent reduction in time imposed by the furloughs.

- The reduction in resources for the Land Disposal Program provided an opportunity for us to reevaluate our priorities to ensure that we are focused on the highest priority work. Our prioritization effort focused on ranking all of our sites based on threat to water quality and human health; and prioritizing our program commitments. Out of 65 landfill sites, we have identified 12 high priority landfills, ten medium priority sites, and nine low priority sites. Land Disposal staff will spend 90 percent of their project management time on the high and medium priority sites and the remaining 10 percent of their project management time on low priority sites. We have also identified 34 low risk landfill sites on which we will not be working. For the current fiscal year, the Land Disposal Program staff will do the following:

- Focus our inspections and project management time on those sites with the highest threats to water quality and/or risks to human health as identified by the ranking effort. Inspections allow for early detection of potential future water quality issues. Identification and correction of inspection-identified landfill issues prevent future long-term water quality impacts.

- Focus our staff time on review and approval of liner designs. A properly designed liner is the best investment for protecting groundwater quality in the future at landfill sites.

- Reduce the frequency of Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) reissuance. In the past, Water Board staff updated landfill WDRs every five years for active landfills and every 10 years for closed landfills. Now we will update WDRs on an as needed basis (i.e., if there is an expansion or change in waste footprint) or every seven years (whichever is smaller) instead of every five years for active landfills. Active landfills are typically updated more frequently because of landfill capacity needs driving proposed expansions.

- Reduce frequency of monitoring requirements for landfills with lower threats to water quality. Less monitoring means less reporting, which results in less staff time spent reviewing reports for sites with lower threats to water quality (and reduces cost to the owner/operator).

- Reduce number of inspections at closed landfills and those sites that the Waste Board inspects (leveraging other agencies' efforts). For closed landfills a well maintained functioning landfill cover and landfill gas collection system provide the best protection for surface and groundwater quality. Waste Board staff inspects and reports to us the results of landfill cover and landfill gas system inspections.

- Reduce attendance, redundancy, and travel associated with roundtables and other administrative-related meetings and tasks.

Summary

We have attempted to be proactive in setting our priorities in all of our programs to be consistent with our goals for clean surface and groundwater and healthy aquatic habitat. We have also been proactive in using these priorities to evaluate potential shifts in staffing that we have anticipated for various budget cut scenarios. That way, we have been ready when those budget cuts have been effectuated, and our needed changes have been more smoothly manageable, less disruptive, and in concert with our priorities.

Joint Effort to Develop Hydromodification Control Criteria [Dominic Roques 805/542-4780

Communities enrolled under the NPDES Phase II General Permit for Municipal Stormwater Discharges are currently required to: 1) develop and begin implementing interim hydromodification criteria within one year of enrolling in the General Permit, and 2) develop long-term hydromodification criteria within the five-year permit cycle. As a strategy to improve the likelihood of success in establishing effective municipal programs for hydromodification control and Low Impact Development (LID), the Water Board is providing municipalities an alternative option of participating in a joint effort, led by a consultant team, to develop hydromodification control criteria for new and redevelopment. The "Joint Effort" will 1) create a methodology for developing hydromodification control criteria; 2) derive criteria by applying the methodology; and 3) support implementation of the resulting criteria throughout the Central Coast for new and redevelopment projects. The effort includes oversight by the Water Board; a team of subject area experts, including staff of the Central Coast LID Center, to execute the scope of work; and participating municipalities. At the request of Central Coast Water Board staff, the State Water Resources Control Board approved an allocation of $600K from the Cleanup and Abatement Account (CAA) to support the Joint Effort. The Joint Effort is scheduled to commence November 2, 2009 and last for two years. The Executive Officer sent a letter to the Phase II Municipalities in the region on August 4, 2009 explaining the Joint Effort and the option for municipalities to participate. **[See Attachment 1]**

While municipalities may choose to follow the current options for developing and implementing hydromodification criteria indicated in their current Storm Water Management Plans (SWMP), they may be at a disadvantage in obtaining the necessary resources and expertise required to complete the work, and may be challenged to meet the schedule of the existing requirements for both interim and long-term hydromodification control criteria. By participating in a joint effort led by subject area experts with Water Board staff oversight, municipalities will be assisted in moving forward in a timely fashion toward optimal water quality protection; avoiding the challenges of "going it on their own." The benefits provided by the Joint Effort include:

- Focuses on reasonable scientifically based techniques with clear outcomes
- Provides state funding for the initial part of the technical work ($600K from CAA)
- Dispenses with Interim Criteria due in one-year and focuses on the more robust, final criteria
- Ensures better consistency in the outcomes for Phase II communities, both technical and regulatory
- Provides greater certainty for the development community of what is required and the basis for those requirements
- Addresses the unique conditions of each community; one methodology – differing criteria
- Provides multiple benefits of working with others on the same schedule (saves costs and time)
- Allows municipalities to focus on their strengths (process and implementation), and delegates the highly technical, scientific work to subject area experts.

Water Board staff conducted three workshops (8/27, 9/3, 9/8) or "charettes" on the Joint Effort in the southern, central and northern parts of the Region. A total of 115 stakeholders attended the workshops, including 71 representatives from permitted Phase II communities. Staff achieved the workshop objectives to provide further information on the Joint Effort, and to develop recommendations for Project Milestones for the Joint Effort that will help ensure the effort's success. Participants made more than 300 individual recommendations defining the spectrum of actions that MS4s could undertake over the two-year Joint Effort to ensure successful implementation of hydromodification control programs. Water Board staff collected 68 evaluations from participants and found the majority to include very favorable ratings of the

workshops: organization and format, materials, activities, presenter's communication skills, and logistics. Information on the workshops and the charette materials can be viewed at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralcoast/water_issues/programs/stormwater/docs/lid/lid_hydromod_charette_index.shtml.

Prior to its commencement on November 2, 2009, Water Board staff will determine which municipalities are participating in the Joint Effort by having the municipalities: 1) formally request participation, 2) agree to provide the consultant team with information and data as appropriate (i.e., existing data and information), and 3) commit to meeting project milestones and reporting requirements through amendments to BMPs in their SWMPs. Water Board staff will provide a letter to Phase II municipalities on October 20, 2009 instructing them how to secure their participation in the Joint Effort (see Supplemental Sheet for this item). The letter will identify the Project Milestones that participating municipalities must complete during the two-year Joint Effort. Water Board staff is developing the Project Milestones based on input from the workshop participants, direct communications with Phase II permittees, and lessons learned through the enrollment process about the municipalities' capacity to structure successful programs for hydromodification control and LID.

Today's Board Meeting provides opportunity for public comment on the Joint Effort, including Water Board staff's proposed changes to SWMP BMPs for participating municipalities (Supplemental Sheet).

## ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Presentations and Training [Roger Briggs 805/549-3140]

Executive Officer Roger Briggs is a guest lecturer for two classes:
Introduction to Engineering class at Cuesta College on October 13, 2009, and Leadership Development course at Chapman University on October 15, 2009, focusing on the Water Boards. This leadership course is a third year level, pursuant to a four-year degree in Organizational Leadership.

Executive Assistant Carol Hewitt attended a Notary training and took an exam on September 22, 2009 for her Notary Commission renewal.

## ATTACHMENTS

1. Phase II Municipalities Letter dated August 4, 2009.