

Meeting Summary from Focused Outreach Meetings

Meetings were held with representatives of POTWs, Environmental Groups, Northern and Southern Stormwater Agencies, Public Health Departments, and Dairy & Agriculture Interests and the Subject Matter Experts.

Element 1: Bacterial Indicators (Fresh Waters)	
Options presented	Preferences
Leave existing bacterial indicators in place (each region would set their own indicators; there would be no statewide consistency).	
Use only Enterococci as an indicator organism.	
Use only E. coli as an indicator organism.	This option was supported by: Northern & Southern CA Stormwater Agencies, POTWs, & two of the three Environmental Groups, the Subject Matter Experts* & one of the Public Health Department representatives**.
Use both E. coli and Enterococci as indicator organisms.	
Other	One Environmental Group supported using all indicators available (Total and Fecal Coliform, E. coli and Enterococci).
Notes:* Several of the Subject Matter Experts wanted to retain the Region's narrative bacteria objectives. **The other Public Health Department representatives had no preference. Dairy & Agriculture Representatives had no group preference.	

Element 1: Bacterial Indicators (Marine Waters)	
Options presented	Preferences
Leave existing bacterial indicators in place (each region would set their own indicators; there would be no statewide consistency).	
Use only Enterococci as an indicator organism.	This option was supported by: Southern CA Stormwater Agencies, POTWs, two of the three Environmental Groups, the Subject Matter Experts & most Public Health Agencies
Other	One Environmental Group and one Public Health Agency supported using all indicators available (Total and Fecal Coliform, E. coli and Enterococci).
Notes: Northern CA Stormwater Agencies had no group preference for this item. Dairy & Agriculture Representatives had no group preference. One Dairy & Agriculture Representative wants the new objective to supersede the narrative objective at Region 6.	

Element 2: Level of Public Health Protection for Illness Rate	
Options presented	Preferences
No action (Water Quality Objectives would be specified in the individual Regional Basin Plans).	One Environmental Group supported this option.
Use the U.S. EPA's Estimated Illness rate of 36/1,000.	This option was supported by: Southern CA Stormwater Agencies, Dairy & Agriculture Representatives, most of the Subject Matter Experts and one of the Northern CA Stormwater Agencies
Use the U.S. EPA's Estimated Illness rate of 32/1,000.	This option was supported by: one of the Environmental Groups
Use an alternative Estimated Illness rate.	
Other	One of the Environmental Groups supported an alternative estimated illness rate than is more protective than what U.S. EPA is proposing.
Notes: POTWs and Northern CA Stormwater Agencies had no group preference on this item. There was no group consensus among the Public Health Agencies. One Subject matter Expert had no preference.	

Element 3: Address Natural Source of Bacteria Levels	
Options presented	Preferences
No action (Existing basin plans with natural sources/antidegradation exclusions and reference beach approaches would remain).	
Allow a reference system/antidegradation approach or natural sources exclusion approach.	This option was supported by : Northern & Southern CA Stormwater Agencies, POTWs, Dairy & Agriculture Representatives, the Subject Matter Experts & Public Health Agencies.
Do not allow a reference system/antidegradation approach or natural sources exclusion approach.	
Other	Environmental Groups are not completely opposed to the idea but are worried about how this would work and feel the need for caution. They would like the science to improve before offering this option.
Notes: The Southern CA Stormwater Agencies and the Subject Matter Experts suggested that the State Water Board provide guidance	

Element 4: High Flow Exemptions of Objective for Fresh Water

Options presented	Preferences
No action (LA Water Board’s existing high flow suspension would remain; other water boards could adopt high flow suspension in their basin plans).	
Allow high flow exemptions for non-engineered channels along with engineered flood control channels.	This option was supported by : Southern CA Stormwater Agencies, most of the Northern CA Stormwater Agencies, POTWs, Dairy & Agriculture Representatives, most of the Public Health Agencies, & only one of the Environmental Groups. Most of the Subject Matter Experts support this option with the caveat that the designation be left to the Regional Boards. Some of the Subject Matter Experts support this option for engineered channels only.
Do not allow high flow exemptions, exempting the Los Angeles Water Board, who already has a high flow exemption policy.	
Other	
Notes: The Public Health Agencies suggested that the State Water Board provide guidance on which waterbodies this could be applied to and what conditions would apply.	

Element 5: Compliance Schedules and Interim Requirements

No action (the compliance schedules and interim requirements would be established by regional water board permit writers in accordance with the compliance schedule policy).	This option was supported by: the Environmental Groups, the Subject Matter Experts & several of the Northern CA Stormwater Agencies.
Allow up to a ten-year compliance schedule to meet the new objectives for REC 1 waters.	
Other	
Notes: Southern CA Stormwater Agencies, Public Health Agencies, Dairy & Agriculture Representatives, and POTWs had no preference	

Element 6: Calculation of Effluent Limits for POTWs

No action (Allow regional water boards to specify the permit limits based on CDPH guidelines for total coliform).	This option was supported by: the Environmental Groups and the Subject Matter Experts.
Calculate effluent limitation based on effluent variability.	
Apply objective at the end of the pipe.	
Other	One Northern CA Stormwater Agency suggested using U.S. EPA's 1986 Recreational Water Criteria guidance.
Notes: Southern CA Stormwater Agencies, and Dairy & Agriculture Representatives, Public Health Agencies had no preference. There was no group consensus from the POTWs.	

Element 7: Mixing Zones for Point Sources

No action (regional water board policies and procedures would apply; currently four of the nine regional water boards have mixing zone provisions in their basin plans).	This option was supported by: Most of the POTWs
Allow mixing zones in a small area near an outfall.	This option was supported by: Southern CA Stormwater Agencies
Do not allow mixing zones.	This option was supported by: the Environmental Groups.
Other	
Notes: Northern CA Stormwater Agencies, Dairy & Agriculture Representatives, the Subject Matter Experts and Public Health Agencies had no preference.	

Element 8: Averaging Periods to Determine Compliance

No action (regional water boards could specify the averaging time, if any, which could lead to inconsistent application across the state).	
Specify the geometric mean as a rolling average.	This option was supported by: One of the Environmental Groups and the Subject Matter Experts who had differing opinions of the length of the averaging period.
Specify the appropriate averaging period (considering 6 week rolling average)	This option was supported by: Northern & Southern CA Stormwater Agencies*.
Other	
Notes: The Public Health Agencies and Dairy & Agriculture Representatives had no preference. The POTWs had no group consensus. *Southern CA Stormwater Agencies want a 6 wk. averaging period while Northern CA Stormwater Agencies prefer a longer averaging period that reflects a seasonal period.	

Element 9: Effluent Monitoring and Reporting Frequency

No action (currently none of the regional water boards have specific monitoring requirements for bacteria in their basin plans; monitoring frequencies could continue to be specified by permit requirements).	This option was supported by : Southern CA Stormwater Agencies, the Subject Matter Experts and most Public Health Agencies
Establish monitoring frequencies for all dischargers.	
Provide narrative guidance which can be used as guidelines to help establish monitoring frequencies in NPDES permits.	This option was supported by : Northern CA Stormwater Agencies
Other	
Notes: The Environmental Groups and Dairy & Agriculture Representatives, and POTWs had no preference.	

Element 10: Analytical Methods to Measure Bacteria Indicators

No action (no specified analytical methods would allow any analytical method, approved by the regional boards for their waters to be used; the option would eliminate the need to update the statewide plans to accommodate new methods).	This option was supported by : Southern CA Stormwater Agencies, most of the Public Health Agencies, the Subject Matter Experts & one of the Environmental Groups
Specify analytical methods for receiving waters and various effluents.	
Specify analytical methods - Use only U.S. EPA approved methods.	
Specify analytical methods - Allow the use of Rapid Indicators, quantitative polymerase chain reaction (qPCR) on a site specific basis using EPA method 1611.	
Other	Dairy & Agriculture Representatives want whichever policy is adopted to allow for improvement in analytical methods.
Notes: Environmental Groups suggested methods be consistent statewide and side-by-side comparisons should be done when methods are changed. The POTWs and the Northern CA Stormwater Agencies had no group preference.	

Element 11: Allow for a Variance, Seasonal Suspension or Limited REC 1

No Action (no changes would occur in the designation of the Limited REC 1 beneficial use).	Supports by the Subject Matter Experts.
Encourage the designation of Limited REC 1 waters where appropriate.	
Allow the use of a variance, seasonal suspension or Limited REC 1.	This option was supported by: Northern CA Stormwater Agencies, and most Public Health Agencies.
Other	One Environmental Group was opposed to allowing Variances, Seasonal Suspension or Limited REC 1. The other two Environmental Groups have concerns about the way these may be applied.

Notes: The Southern CA Stormwater Agencies had mixed preferences; most believe it is too much work to apply for a Limited REC 1 designation. The POTWs and Dairy & Agriculture Representatives had no group preferences.