

San Diego  
Regional Water Quality  
Control Board



Executive Officer's  
Report

January 11, 2006

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### PART A

1	Public Outreach: Brownfields Support Letter	1
2	Meeting with USEPA Region IX: Office of Underground Storage Tanks	1

### PART B

1	Sanitary Sewer Overflows	1
2	Grants Update	3
3	Public Hearing on Statewide General WDRs—Regulation of Sanitary Sewer Overflows	4
4	Change in Regional Board Agenda Noticing Procedures	5
5	Tanker Truck Fire at Qualcomm Stadium	5
6	Mission Bay Landfill	6
7	Status of Cleanup of the Discharge of Concrete Slurry to De Luz Creek near Temecula	6
8	Atlas Hotel Management, Town & Country Hotel, American Asphalt & Concrete CAO	7

### PART C

1	Update: Final Report - Forging Partnerships on Emerging Contaminants	8
2	Brownfields Statewide Status Update - CA Land Reuse and Revitalization Act of 2004	8

**Attachments** for B-1, B-2 and C-1 are included at the end of the report. Also included as an attachment are the Significant NPDES Permits, WDRs and RB Actions.

# SAN DIEGO REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD

## EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

January 11, 2006

### **PART A**

#### **SAN DIEGO REGION STAFF ACTIVITIES** *(Staff Contact)*

1. Public Outreach: Brownfields Support Letter *(Sue Pease)*

On November 30, 2005, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (Regional Board) sent a letter of support on behalf of the National City Community Development Commission (CDC) for a Hazardous Substance Community-Wide Assessment Grant from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). The National City CDC is submitting an application to USEPA for a "Community-wide Assessment Grant" and a "Revolving Loan Fund Grant" for the Westside Neighborhood Project in National City. The USEPA requires a letter of support from a State agency be submitted with the application for the Federal Brownfield Grant Programs. The Community-wide assessment will benefit the residents of the neighborhood by identifying businesses and/or sites with hazardous substances, using that information to develop strategies to reduce or eliminate public exposures, and begin the process of bringing under utilized properties back into productive use.

2. Meeting with USEPA Region IX: Office of Underground Storage Tanks *(John Odermatt and Beatrice Griffey)*

On December 20, 2005, the Regional Board staff from the Department of Defense – DoD (Beatrice Griffey) and UST (John Odermatt) programs met with representatives of the USEPA Region IX Office of Underground Storage Tanks. The USEPA has provided a contractor to assist the Regional Board with processing of low-risk UST cases in the San Diego Region. The USEPA contractor is expected to be available to the Regional Board between December 2005 and March 2006. The focus of this meeting was to identify activities the EPA contractor must accomplish to develop their recommendations for management of low-risk UST cases located at Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton.

### **PART B**

#### **SIGNIFICANT REGIONAL WATER QUALITY ISSUES**

1. Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSO) *(Charles Cheng, Cade Johnson, Joann Lim, Melissa Valdovinos, Victor Vasquez)* *(Attachment B-1)*

From December 1 to December 31, 2005, there were 17 sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs) from publicly-owned collection systems within San Diego Region reported to the Regional Board office; 11 of these spills reached surface waters or storm drains and one resulted in closure of recreational waters. Of the total number of overflows from public systems, four were 1,000 gallons or more. The combined total volume of reported

sewage spilled from all publicly owned collection systems for the month of December 2005 was 101,606 gallons.

There were also 16 sewage overflows from private property reported in December 2005. Four of these spills reached surface waters or storm drains, but none resulted in closure of recreational waters. None of the overflows from private property were 1,000 gallons or more.

The total rainfall amount for December 2005 recorded at San Diego's Lindbergh Field was 0.25 inches. For comparison, in November 2005, 0.12 inches of rainfall was recorded at Lindbergh Field, and 14 public SSOs were reported. Also for comparison, in December 2004, 4.01 inches of rainfall were recorded at Lindbergh Field, and 23 public SSOs were reported.

Attached is a table entitled "Sanitary Sewer Overflow Statistics," updated through December 31, 2005, which contains a summary of all sanitary sewer overflows (by FY) from each agency since FY 2001-2002.

It should be noted that the data for spill volume per volume conveyed (GAL/MG) could be easily misinterpreted. For a sewer agency that has a small system size, but experienced a spill of a few hundred gallons or more, the value may show high. Also, for a sewer agency that has a large system size, a high volume spill event may not result in a high value for this statistic. Hence, these numbers by themselves are not sufficiently representative of the measures being taken by a sewer agency to prevent SSOs, nor can the numbers be compared directly between agencies. The data does represent a different way to review and analyze SSO volume data as it relates to system size.

Additional information about the Regional Board's SSO regulatory program is available at the Regional Board's website at <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/programs/sso.html>.

No Notices of Violation were issued in December. The following significant overflows, however, occurred in the Tijuana River as a result of operation and maintenance issues in Mexico's Tijuana sewage collection system:

***December 3, 4, and 5, 2005***

The International Boundary and Water Commission (IBWC) reported a series of three SSOs to the Tijuana River from the IBWC collector system in Mexico; (1) 2,985,672 gallons from 4:00 a.m. to 12:45 p.m. on December 3, (2) 1,733,233 gallons from 6:30 p.m. on December 3 to 4:30 a.m. on December 4, and (3) 1,954,345 gallons from 6:45 p.m. on December 4 to 4:00 a.m. on December 5. According to the IBWC, the Mexican agency Comision Internacional de Limites y Aguas (CILA) explained that these SSOs were the result of pump station failure due to a series of power outages. The sewage in the Tijuana River did not reach the Tijuana Estuary or recreational ocean waters.

**December 26, 2005**

The IBWC reported a 646,693-gallon SSO to the Tijuana River. According to the IBWC, CILA explained that this SSO was the result of trash and debris blocking the inlet to pump station wet wells. The spill did not reach the Tijuana Estuary or recreational ocean waters.

**2. Grants Update (Dave Gibson) (Attachment B-2)****Status of State Bond Act and federal 319(h) Grant Program Projects**

The Regional Board staff is currently managing 37 grant-funded contracts worth approximately \$53 million. The extension requests for Proposition 13 Phase II grants have been completed and submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) for review and approval. The SWRCB Division of Financial Assistance and Office of Chief Counsel staff rejected the contract deviation and amendment requests submitted by the Los Penasquitos Lagoon Foundation for its two Proposition 13 projects. An extension for these two grants for up to two years for both contracts has been offered and the Regional Board staff is continuing to work with the Foundation to ensure the projects remain viable.

**Proposition 40 and Proposition 50 Consolidated Grants Program**

Approximately \$144 million is available in the six funds included in the Consolidated Grants program. All remaining funds (approximately \$10 million) in the Proposition 13 accounts will also be made available in the Consolidated Grants program.

The SWRCB adopted the Consolidated Grants Program Guidelines on January 4, 2006, but agreed to further consider Section VI.F of the Guidelines regarding the waiver of litigation rights to address concerns raised by stakeholders. The SWRCB may deliberate on this subject at its February 1, 2006 meeting.

The Concept Proposal Solicitation Notice (Attachment B-2a) was released on January 5, 2006. Applicants must submit a complete electronic Concept Proposal application by **11:59 PM on Thursday, February 9, 2006** using the SWRCB on-line Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST) system. Late applications will NOT be accepted. Three applicant workshops will be held in January in Sacramento, San Luis Obispo, and Los Angeles.

Applicants that submit competitive Concept Proposals will be invited to submit Full Proposals in March 2006. All grants funded under Proposition 40 must be encumbered no later than December 2006 and all grant funded work completed by September 2008. Grants funded under Proposition 50 must be encumbered no later than June 2008 and all work completed by June 2010.

**Proposition 50 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the SWRCB have completed the selection and awarded funding to competitive IRWM and Integrated Coastal Watershed Management (ICWM) grant proposals (Attachment B-2b). Included in the funding

awards was a proposal by the Regents of the University of California for \$499,874 for a Coastal Watershed Management Plan. The proposed ICWM Plan will develop a collaborative watershed approach to implement effective and efficient strategies to address non-point source pollution within the urban watershed tributary to two ASBS areas. The plan will address a watershed area encompassing areas of the San Diego community of La Jolla and the Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO).

Selection Panel Reviews of the Step 1 Implementation Grant Proposals are continuing. The Call Back letters for Step 2 Implementation are now scheduled for release in February 2006. DWR and the SWRCB will hold a public meeting in Sacramento on February 22, 2006, at 10:00am to discuss the results of the Step 1 review effort.

#### **Clean Beaches Initiative Grant Program**

On January 4, 2006, the SWRCB amended the Competitive Location List (CLL) to add Paradise Cove. The SWRCB also authorized the Chief of the Division of Financial Assistance to add beaches that meet certain criteria to the CLL. The SWRCB is continuing to accept applications for Proposition 40 funding for projects on the CLL. There are approximately \$6.4 million Prop 40 funds remaining for CBI projects. The next Clean Beaches Task Force meeting is February 22, 2006 in Oakland.

#### **Water Recycling Funding Program (WRFP)**

SWRCB staff is currently reviewing Proposition 50 construction grant applications, totaling approximately \$59.5 million, from a ranked list adopted by the SWRCB in April 2005. Total available funding is \$42 million. As of January 6, 2006, eight construction projects were approved for funding totaling approximately \$25.2 million. Two additional construction projects, totaling approximately \$2.4 million, have SWRCB funding commitments pending approval on the next scheduled signing date of February 3, 2006.

SWRCB staff is also reviewing applications for Proposition 13 Facilities Planning Grants. Applications are accepted on a continuous basis pending available funding. Funding is limited to a 50% match up to a maximum grant of \$75,000 per facilities planning study. No new funding commitments are pending.

#### **3. Public Hearing on Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements—Regulation of Sanitary Sewer Overflows (Michael McCann)**

On February 8, 2006 the State Water Resources Control Board will conduct a public hearing in Sacramento to receive public input on the draft general waste discharge requirements. The draft requirements address reporting of sewage spill incidents and proper sewage collection system management and operations necessary to protect public health, water quality, and the public's investment in sewage system infrastructure.

Submission of public comments prior to the scheduled hearing are due by January 25, 2006. Information on the public hearing, the hearing notice, and the draft requirements can be accessed at the State Board's website <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sso>

#### 4. Change in Regional Board Agenda Noticing Procedures (*Arthur Coe*)

At November 9, 2005 Regional Board meeting, Laura Hunter of the Environmental Health Coalition informed the Board of problems with the timing of the distribution of the Board's Agenda Notice and the deadlines for submittal of written materials pertaining to agenda items. In the past the Agenda Notice had been distributed nineteen days prior to a Regional Board meeting. Laura pointed out that the submittal deadlines are close to the date that the Agenda Notice becomes available, particularly when weekend days are considered, and that as a result, stakeholder's ability to submit comments on agenda items is sometimes inhibited.

The submittal deadlines are established to enable the Regional Board staff to make necessary copies and distribute the materials to the Board. Agenda materials are mailed to Regional Board members eleven days prior to the meeting date (main mailing) and four days prior to the meeting date (supplemental mailing).

In response to these concerns, starting in 2006 the agenda notices will be mailed out to the public and posted on our Web Page a week earlier than in the past. Specifically, agenda notices will be mailed and posted twenty-six days prior to the meeting dates. This change will give the stakeholders an extra seven days to identify and review Agenda Notice items and submit comments on scheduled agenda items. This change will not affect the current schedule of agenda material mail-outs to the Board members.

#### 5. Tanker Truck Fire at Qualcomm Stadium (*Kelly Dorsey*)

On December 7, 2005, a tanker truck carrying gasoline overturned and caught fire at the San Diego Mission Road entrance to Qualcomm Stadium (Stadium). Approximately 4,000 gallons of gasoline flowed onto the Stadium property; affecting the soil adjacent to the crash site and entering the storm drain system. The gasoline entering the storm drain was discharged through the outfall into the San Diego River. According to Mr. Brad Long, County of San Diego Hazardous Materials Division (DEH), several mitigation measures were progressively implemented throughout the event: hydrophobic booms were placed in the parking lot prior to the storm drain and containment dikes were partially in place (within ~45 minutes); containment beams were in place containing the runoff from the parking lot with additional hydrophobic booms placed at the storm water outfall (within 60 minutes); and additional hydrophobic booms were placed at multiple points along the runoff flow (within 90 minutes). The initial cleanup guidance from the San Diego Department of Environmental Health, California Department of Fish and Game, US Coast Guard, and the City of San Diego Storm Water Department included: remove contaminated soil from the area of the crash site, wash paved surfaces affected by the discharge of fuel, wash the interior of affected storm drains, remove fuel contaminated debris and soils from the area surrounding the storm drain outfall.

The Regional Board staff inspected the spill site on December 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup>, 2005. A meeting was held on December 20<sup>th</sup>, 2005, including all interested regulatory agencies (Regional Board, City of San Diego, County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health (DEH), US Coast Guard, and Department of Fish and Game - DFG). The agency

representatives agree that the DFG will oversee the cleanup of the San Diego River; the County DEH will oversee the cleanup of wastes near the crash site and on the stadium property. The Regional Board will be copied on the correspondence regarding the spill enabling the staff to monitor the progress of the cleanup. The Regional Board plans to continue in an advisory role for the cleanup, unless enforcement actions are required because the Responsible Party fails to respond to the cleanup requirements established by the other agencies.

6. Mission Bay Landfill (*Brian McDaniel*)

On November 18, 2005, the Regional Board staff attended the monthly Mission Bay Landfill Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting. The Regional Board currently regulates the Mission Bay Landfill pursuant to Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) Order 97-11 (and addenda thereto). Regional Board staff continue to review the facility's semi-annual groundwater monitoring reports. Current groundwater monitoring reports indicate the detection of low levels of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in several wells at the site

The current focus of the TAC is to provide the City's environmental consultant, SCS Engineers, with comments on the draft Site Investigation Report by December 30, 2005. The staff anticipates that the TAC members will request additional information regarding the report's conclusion and addressing current and future land uses for the site. The City of San Diego has created a web site (at <http://www.sandiego.gov/citycouncil/cd6/crtk/mblandfill.shtml>) allowing the public, and other interested parties, to follow the work of the Mission Bay TAC.

7. Status of Cleanup of the Discharge of Concrete Slurry to De Luz Creek near Temecula, Riverside County (*Eric Becker*)

As reported in the December Executive Officer's Report, approximately 170,000 gallons of concrete slurry waste was discharged to De Luz Creek, a tributary of the Santa Margarita River, after an illicit, unregulated surface impoundment failed some time between November 22<sup>nd</sup> and November 29<sup>th</sup>. The impoundment is located in Riverside County, but the discharge to De Luz Creek has also impacted areas within San Diego County. On December 7, 2005, the Regional Board issued a Cleanup and Abatement Order (CAO) requiring the responsible parties to take immediate and effective action to remove the slurry from the creek and to mitigate for the impacts of the discharge.

The responsible parties named in the CAO are Multiple Concrete Enterprises Inc., Micheal & Milan Lubanko, LUBCO Inc., and Tabatha and Keri Lubanko. Multiple Concrete Enterprises Inc. is the contractor that generated the concrete slurry waste as part of its concrete grinding operation for a Caltrans Interstate-5 construction project and transported the waste to the surface impoundment. LUBCO Inc. was contracted by Multiple Concrete Enterprises Inc. to dispose of the slurry waste. LUBCO Inc. is owned by Mike and Milan Lubanko, and their wives, Tabatha and Keri Lubanko own the property where the surface impoundment was constructed.



Within 3 weeks of the issuance of the CAO, approximately 25% of the spill was adequately cleaned up. This initial cleanup was overseen by the Department of Fish & Game, with support from the Regional Board Watershed Protection Unit (WPU). Recent inspections found that as a result of storm events, a portion of the slurry waste is now submerged in De Luz Creek, which may hamper further cleanup efforts. The discharged slurry did not appear to have moved significantly downstream. Because of the delayed cleanup, the responsible parties are not in compliance with the CAO. These parties are subject to potential Administrative Civil Liability for the initial discharge of waste and noncompliance with the CAO.

8. Atlas Hotel Management, Town & Country Hotel, and American Asphalt & Concrete Cleanup and Abatement Order (*Mike Porter*)

On November 23, 2005, the Regional Board received a complaint from the public that the Town & Country Hotel's parking lot construction project caused a discharge of waste to the San Diego River in Mission Valley and that wetland plants had been disturbed and removed. The complaint was investigated on the same day by Mike Porter, Engineering Geologist within the Southern Watershed Protection Unit.

The November 23, 2005 investigation revealed that wastes (concrete, sediment, piping, debris) were pushed into the San Diego River, bulrush vegetation had been covered with sediment, and willow trees had been cut, gashed, pushed over and removed. The length of the impact along the southern bank of the San Diego River was estimated to be approximately 600-feet long. The discharge area is approximately 400-feet upgradient of the Fashion Valley Road Bridge. This discharge of waste was not permitted by the Regional Board.

On December 15, 2005, Executive Officer of the Regional Board issued Cleanup and Abatement Order (Order) No. R9-2005-0279 for the discharge of waste to the San Diego River associated with parking lot construction activities. The Order requires that the affected area be restored to its previous condition. The dischargers have until January 12, 2006 to submit a report documenting the restoration of affected areas and cleanup of the discharged wastes.

The City of San Diego and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have also issued enforcement actions.

The Regional Board has received, via E-mail, interim, update reports regarding the progress of the cleanup. These update reports indicate that waste that was discharged to the River has been removed.

The dischargers have not requested a hearing to contest the directives of the Order.

**PART C**  
**STATEWIDE ISSUES OF IMPORTANCE TO THE SAN DIEGO REGION**

1. Update: Final Report - Forging Partnerships on Emerging Contaminants (*John Anderson*)  
(Attachment C-1)

In the December EO Report, I reported on the Environmental Council of the States (ECOS) - Department of Defense (DoD) Sustainability Work Group conference in San Diego November 2-3, 2005 on Forging Partnerships on Emerging Contaminants, A Forum for State and Federal Stakeholders. Attached is the final report from that conference.

The purpose of the Forum was "to foster dialogue between environmental regulators and the regulated community on the issues and challenges associated with emerging contaminants and how they can be better addressed in the future." The ECOS-DoD Sustainability Work Group was created in Spring 2004 and is co-chaired by Jon Sandoval of Idaho Department of Environmental Quality and Alex Beehler of the Department of Defense. The Work Group serves as a focal point within ECOS where ECOS and DoD can discuss and address issues related to sustainability of remedial work and the military mission at DoD installations.

The specific objective of the Forum was to identify issues that the Forum participants believe are the greatest roadblocks in addressing emerging contaminant issues. Emerging contaminants are either newly identified contaminants (i.e. perchlorate, 1,4-Dioxane) or contaminants that have new or conflicting toxicology or exposure information not used before (i.e. trichloroethylene). In attendance were 150 state, federal, and non-governmental representatives that included representatives from 30 states. Through four breakout sessions, the Forum participants identified twenty-two issues. As an example, the top two issues include: 1) *The ECOS and DoD Sustainability Workgroup should develop a resolution and champion a broad policy of pollution prevention regarding emerging contaminants;* 2) *Develop a framework with consideration of the risk assessment process and risk management perspectives for what to do with Emerging Contaminants after identification but prior to agreement on protective levels.* Again, attached is the final report from that conference.

2. Brownfields Statewide Status Update - California Land Reuse and Revitalization Act of 2004 (CLRRA) (former Montanez - AB 389) (*John Anderson*)

Brownfields cases are included in the Spill, Leaks, Investigation, and Cleanup (SLIC) Program, which is the Regional Water Board's cleanup program where project proponents receive technical oversight and regulatory review of investigation and cleanup plans. The party pursuing the cleanup reimburses staff oversight costs incurred by the Regional Water Board. The outcome of the SLIC program process may range from a No Further Action (NFA) letter indicating cleanup is complete with no land-use restrictions, to the design and implementation of a remedial system.

Currently the San Diego Regional Water Board provides oversight to 11 brownfields/redevelopment cases through our SLIC Program. To date, the San Diego Regional Water Board has not received any CLRRRA applications.

### **Regional Water Board and DTSC Brownfields Memorandum of Agreement**

The Regional Water Boards & DTSC have the authority to regulate cleanup of polluted/contaminated sites in California. In order to improve coordination between the agencies on oversight of brownfields cleanups, a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) was signed in March 1, 2005

[http://www.calepa.ca.gov/Brownfields/MOA/MOA3\\_05.pdf](http://www.calepa.ca.gov/Brownfields/MOA/MOA3_05.pdf). The MOA describes the process and considerations used to determine the appropriate lead agency for a particular brownfields site. Anyone requesting oversight from the Regional Water Board or DTSC for a brownfields site must submit an application to the Regional Water Board or DTSC with enough site information to allow the agencies to determine the appropriate lead agency.

The most significant change that the MOA represents is that for brownfields sites, anyone requesting oversight from a Regional Water Board or DTSC must submit an application to initiate the process to assign the appropriate oversight agency. Pertinent documents (all attachments to the MOA) are also available at the following websites:

- Request for Oversight of a Brownfields Site  
<http://www.calepa.ca.gov/Brownfields/MOA/Application.pdf>
- Site Information Needed  
<http://www.calepa.ca.gov/Brownfields/MOA/SiteInfo.htm>

### **CalEPA Status of Statewide Brownfields Applications Since July 1, 2005**

#### *Memorandum of Agreement Application Statistics*

Total Applications Received	100
Applications Received by Regional Boards	56
Applications Received by DTSC	44
Determinations Made	94
Determinations Made to Regional Boards	45
Determinations Made to DTSC	49
Determinations Not Yet Made	2
Applications Not Eligible	4

*Current as of 1/9/2006*

### **Brownfields Contact Information**

On August 29, 2005, Rick Brausch was appointed as CalEPA's Brownfields Ombudsperson to fulfill a variety of functions on behalf of CalEPA, including coordinating CalEPA's various brownfields efforts, representing CalEPA on task forces and committees, investigating and resolving complaints related to our brownfields

programs, and ensuring that environmental justice is considered in our brownfields decisions. CalEPA's Brownfields Website can be found at:  
<http://www.calepa.ca.gov/Brownfields/AB389/default.htm>

The San Diego Regional Water Board Brownfields contacts are John Anderson, Senior Engineering Geologist, Site Mitigation & Cleanup Unit at (858) 467-2975, email: [Janderson@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Janderson@waterboards.ca.gov) and Art Coe, Assistant Executive Officer at (858) 467-2986, email: [Acoe@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Acoe@waterboards.ca.gov). The Statewide Contact List can be found at: <http://www.calepa.ca.gov/Brownfields/Contacts/MOAContacts.pdf>

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD  
SAN DIEGO REGION**

**SIGNIFICANT NPDES PERMITS, WDRs,  
AND REGIONAL BOARD ACTIONS**

**January 11, 2006**

APPENDED TO EXECUTIVE OFFICER REPORT

**SIGNIFICANT NPDES PERMITS, WDRS, AND RB ACTIONS**

DATE OF REPORT	NAME OF PERMIT/WDR/RB ACTION	Action Type	Initial Document Application Complete	Dish./RWQ Limits and Monitoring Plan Known	Draft Complete	Public Rev. & Comment	BOARD HEARING & ADOPTION	Consent Item	COMMENTS	Staff
<b>January 11, 2005</b>	<b>MARCH 8, 2006 RB MEETING</b> San Diego Regional Board Office									
	CITY OF ESCONDIDO WASTEWATER FACILITY AND DISCHARGE TO OCEAN OUTFALL	Hearing: Admin. Civil Liability	100%	NA	100%	20%	March 8, 2006	No	ACL COMPLAINT \$1,797,150	Stewart
	DAKOTA RANCH DEVELOPMENT CO. 401 WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATION VIOLATION SANTEE	Hearing: Admin. Civil Liability	100%	NA	100%	20%	March 8, 2006	No	ACL COMPLAINT \$140,500	Melbourn
	SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY WASTEWATER AUTHORITY--ALISO CREEK OCEAN OUTFALL	NPDES Permit Reissuance	0%	90%	0%	0%	March 8, 2006	No	NPDES Workplan FY 2005-06	Kelley
	SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY WASTEWATER AUTHORITY--SAN JUAN CREEK OCEAN OUTFALL	NPDES Permit Reissuance	0%	90%	0%	0%	March 8, 2006	No	NPDES Workplan FY 2005-06	Kelley
	FALLBROOK PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT OCEAN OUTFALL DISCHARGE	NPDES Permit Reissuance	100%	90%	90%	50%	March 8, 2006	No	NPDES Workplan FY 2004-05	Vasquez
	OCEANSIDE MARINE CTR. OCEANSIDE HARBOR	NPDES Permit Reissuance	100%	90%	0%	0%	March 8, 2006	No	NPDES Workplan FY 2005-06	Felix
	DRISCOLL MISSION BAY BOATYARD	NPDES Permit Reissuance	100%	90%	0%	0%	March 8, 2006	No	NPDES Workplan FY 2005-06	Felix
	DANA POINT BOATYARD DANA POINT HARBOR	NPDES Permit Reissuance	100%	90%	0%	0%	March 8, 2006	No	NPDES Workplan FY 2005-06	Felix
	SOUTHERN CALIF. EDISON SAN ONOFRE POWER PLANT DEWATERING DISCHARGE	NPDES Permit Revision	100%	100%	0%	0%	March 8, 2006	Yes		Kelley
	<b>APRIL 12, 2006 RB MEETING</b> San Diego Regional Board Office									
	REGIONWIDE BACTERIA TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD	Adoption TMDL	NA	NA	50%	0%	April 12, 2006	No	TMDL Workplan FY 2005-06	Arias
	CITY OF SAN DIEGO SOUTH BAY WATER RECLAMATION FACILITY	NPDES Permit Reissuance	100%	90%	50%	0%	April 12, 2006	No	NPDES Workplan FY 2005-06	Valdivinos
	JACK AND MARK STIEFFEL DAIRY RIVERSIDE COUNTY	NPDES Permit Reissuance	80%	90%	90%	0%	April 12, 2006	No	NPDES Workplan FY 2004-05	Kelley
	FRANK J. KONYN DAIRY SAN PASQUAL VALLEY	NPDES Permit Reissuance	0%	90%	0%	0%	April 12, 2006	No	NPDES Workplan FY 2005-06	Ghoram
	KAMPEN BROS. (fmr. DeJAGER/BOERSMA) DAIRY RIVERSIDE COUNTY	NPDES Permit Reissuance	0%	90%	0%	0%	April 12, 2006	No	NPDES Workplan FY 2005-06	Ghoram
	T.D. DAIRY (VAN TOL DAIRY) RAMONA	NPDES Permit Reissuance	0%	90%	0%	0%	April 12, 2006	No	NPDES Workplan FY 2005-06	Ghoram

**SIGNIFICANT NPDES  
PERMITS, WDRS, AND RB ACTIONS**

1/11/2006 3:23 PM

DATE OF REPORT January 11, 2005	NAME OF PERMIT/WDR/RB ACTION	Action Type	Initial Document Application Complete	Dish./RWQ Limits and Monitoring Plan Known	Draft Complete	Public Rev. & Comment	BOARD HEARING & ADOPTION	Consent Item	COMMENTS	Staff
	FALLBROOK PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT FALLBROOK RECLAMATION PROJECT	WDRs Update Mast. Reclamation	NA	100%	80%	0%	April 12, 2006	Yes	Master Reclamation Req'ts	Vasquez
	OAK TREE RANCH MOBILE HOME PARK FACILITY EXPANSION SAN DIEGO COUNTY	WDR Revision	100%	100%	0%	0%	April 12, 2006	Yes		Quach
	<b>MAY 10, 2006 RB MEETING</b> City of Laguna Beach									
	SAN DIEGO COUNTY MUNICIPAL STORMWATER PERMIT	NPDES Permit Reissuance	100%	90%	0%	0%	May 10, 2006	No	NPDES Workplan FY 2005-06	Hammer
	CABRILLO LLC ENCINA POWER PLANT CARLSBAD	NPDES Permit Reissuance	100%	100%	75%	0%	May 10, 2006	No	NPDES Workplan FY 2004-05	Kelley
	POSEIDON RESOURCES DESALINATION PROJECT CARLSBAD	New NPDES Permit	0%	80%	0%	0%	May 10, 2006	No	NPDES Workplan FY 2005-06	Kelley
	GROUNDWATER EXTRACTION GENERAL PERMIT FOR SAN DIEGO BAY	NPDES Permit Reissuance	NA	50%	0%	0%	May 10, 2006	No	NPDES Workplan FY 2004-05	Kelley
	BASIN PLAN UPDATE AND DIGITAL REFORMAT	Hearing: Basin Plan Amendment	NA	NA	50%	0%	May 10, 2006	No	Triennial Review Issue No. 1	Pardy
	<b>JUNE 14, 2006 RB MEETING</b> San Diego Regional Board Office									
	OCEAN DISCHARGER RECEIVING WATER MONITORING PROGRAM UPDATES	NPDES Permits	NA	50%	0%	0%	June 14, 2006	No	NPDES Workplan FY 2004-05	Kelley
	<b>PENDING / UNSCHEDULED ACTIONS</b>									
	PROPOSED GREGORY CANYON LANDFILL NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY	New WDRs	100%	20%	30%	10%			Public Workshop scheduled for May 19, 2005	Tamaki

SANITARY SEWER OVERFLOW STATISTICS (Updated through December 31, 2005)

SEWAGE COLLECTION AGENCY	SYSTEM SIZE <sup>B</sup>		NO. OF SEWAGE SPILLS [LISTED BY FISCAL YEAR (FY) - JULY 1 THROUGH JUNE 30]					SPILLS PER 100 MILES (LISTED BY FY)					SPILL VOLUME 2005-06 <sup>A</sup>	
	Miles	MGD	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05 <sup>A</sup>	05-06 <sup>A</sup>	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05 <sup>A</sup>	05-06 <sup>A</sup>	GAL	GAL/MG <sup>C</sup>
<b>ORANGE COUNTY:</b>														
EL TORO WD	55	2.2	3	1	3	3	2	5.5	1.8	5.5	5.5	3.7	13,506	33.0
EMERALD BAY SERVICE DISTRICT	6	0.09	0	0	0	1	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0	0.0
IRVINE RANCH WD	36	2.0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
LAGUNA BEACH, CITY OF	95	2.4	10	27	8	11	3	10.5	28.4	8.4	12.6	3.2	650	1.5
MOULTON NIGUEL WD	530	13.0	2	1	2	5	0	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.9	0.0	0	0.0
SAN CLEMENTE, CITY OF	179	4.5	6	7	2	5	1	3.3	3.9	1.1	2.8	0.6	125	0.2
SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO, CITY OF	100	3.4	0	0	1	2	0	0.0	0.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	0	0.0
SANTA MARGARITA WD	546	10.7	12	4	5	6	1	2.2	0.7	0.9	1.1	0.2	375	0.2
SOUTH COAST CWD	132	4.0	5	8	7	4	2	3.8	6.1	5.3	3.0	1.5	80,120	109.9
TRABUCO CANYON WD	43	0.72	0	0	1	3	0	0.0	0.0	2.3	7.0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>RIVERSIDE COUNTY:</b>														
EASTERN MWD	421	9.5	1	3	7	0	0	0.2	0.7	1.7	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
ELSINORE VALLEY MWD	80	2.0	0	0	1	3	1	0.0	0.0	1.3	3.8	1.3	348	0.9
MURRIETA MWD	25	0.5	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
RANCHO CA WD	71	2.9	2	0	1	2	1	2.8	0.0	1.4	2.8	1.4	1,125	2.1
<b>SAN DIEGO COUNTY:</b>														
BUENA SANITARY DISTRICT	84	1.9	0	2	1	2	0	0.0	2.4	1.2	2.4	0.0	0	0.0
CARLSBAD MWD	214	7.2	15	6	6	12	5	7.0	2.8	2.8	4.7	2.3	204	0.2
CHULA VISTA, CITY OF	400	16.0	6	3	1	7	3	1.5	0.8	0.3	1.3	0.8	305	0.1
CORONADO, CITY OF	53	3.8	5	2	5	0	0	9.4	3.8	9.4	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
DEL MAR, CITY OF	30	1.1	2	7	1	0	1	6.7	23.4	3.3	0.0	3.3	3,500	16.8
EL CAJON, CITY OF	198	9.1	2	3	0	3	0	1.0	1.5	0.0	1.5	0.0	0	0.0
ENCINITAS, CITY OF	118	4.1	2	6	1	5	0	1.7	5.1	0.8	4.2	0.0	0	0.0
ESCONDIDO, CITY OF	350	10.8	14	3	2	4	2	4.0	0.9	0.6	1.1	0.6	268	0.1
FAIRBANKS RANCH COMM SERV DIST	15	0.21	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
FALLBROOK PUBLIC UTILITY DIST	72	2.0	17	22	9	10	5	23.6	30.6	12.5	13.9	6.9	6,600	17.9
IMPERIAL BEACH, CITY OF	84	2.2	1	14	2	8	2	1.2	16.7	2.4	9.5	2.4	425	1.1
LA MESA, CITY OF	155	5.8	12	3	4	3	0	7.7	1.9	2.6	1.9	0.0	0	0.0
LEMON GROVE, CITY OF	69	2.4	9	4	4	3	0	13.0	5.8	5.8	4.3	0.0	0	0.0



**SANITARY SEWER OVERFLOW STATISTICS (Updated through December 31, 2005)**

SEWAGE COLLECTION AGENCY	SYSTEM SIZE <sup>B</sup>		NO. OF SEWAGE SPILLS [LISTED BY FISCAL YEAR (FY) - JULY 1 THROUGH JUNE 30]				SPILLS PER 100 MILES (LISTED BY FY)					SPILL VOLUME 2005-06 <sup>A</sup>		
	Miles	MGD	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05 <sup>A</sup>	05-06 <sup>A</sup>	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05 <sup>A</sup>	05-06 <sup>A</sup>	GAL	GAL/MG <sup>C</sup>
<b>SAN DIEGO COUNTY (continued):</b>														
LEUCADIA CWD	185	4.2	5	6	1	6	1	2.7	3.2	0.5	2.7	0.5	1,350	1.7
NATIONAL CITY, CITY OF	97	5.1	0	1	2	1	3	0.0	1.0	2.1	1.0	3.1	3,100	3.3
OCEANSIDE, CITY OF, WTR UTIL DEP	446	13.0	17	23	22	13	5	3.8	5.2	4.9	3.1	1.1	2,755	1.2
OLIVENHAIN MWD	16	0.39	1	2	0	3	0	6.3	12.5	0.0	18.8	0.0	0	0.0
OTAY MWD	86	1.4	0	3	1	0	0	0.0	3.5	1.2	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
PADRE DAM MWD	150	5.1	4	3	3	1	1	2.7	2.0	2.0	0.7	0.7	1,200	1.3
PAUMA VALLEY COMM SERVICE DIS	8	0.07	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
POWAY, CITY OF	170	4.0	1	5	3	0	2	0.6	2.9	1.8	0.0	1.2	2,300	3.1
RAINBOW MWD	54	0.74	2	2	6	2	0	3.7	3.7	11.1	3.7	0.0	0	0.0
RAMONA MWD	83	1.3	5	2	2	4	0	6.0	2.4	2.4	3.6	0.0	0	0.0
RANCHO SANTA FE COMM SERV DIST	52	0.44	1	1	0	2	0	1.9	1.9	0.0	3.9	0.0	0	0.0
SAN DIEGO CO, PUBLIC WORKS	380	11.0	4	11	2	2	2	1.1	2.9	0.5	0.5	0.5	33,000	16.3
SAN DIEGO, CITY OF, MWWD	2,894	170	226	193	115	122	43	7.8	6.7	4.0	3.3	1.5	50,881	1.6
SOLANA BEACH, CITY OF	52	1.2	2	1	6	1	0	3.8	1.9	11.5	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
USMC BASE, CAMP PENDLETON	194	3.1	18	23	14	12	9	9.3	11.9	7.2	5.2	4.6	47,170	84.1
US NAVY	123	4.0	24	12	11	13	7	19.5	9.8	9.0	10.6	5.7	19,220	26.1
VALLECITOS WD	202	6.1	4	5	4	6	2	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.5	1.0	576	0.5
VALLEY CENTER MWD	48	0.32	0	3	1	1	0	0.0	6.3	2.1	2.1	0.0	0	0.0
VISTA, CITY OF	198	6.5	4	4	7	9	1	2.0	2.0	3.5	4.6	0.5	650	0.5
WHISPERING PALMS COMM SERV DIS	17	0.26	1	1	0	0	0	5.8	5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
REGION 9 TOTAL	9615	363	445	427	275	266	105						269,753	
AVERAGE <sup>1</sup>								4.6	4.4	2.9	2.8	1.1		7
STANDARD DEVIATION <sup>2</sup>								5.0	7.0	3.4	4.4	1.6		21
MEDIAN <sup>3</sup>								2.4	2.4	2.0	2.5	0.2		0

<sup>A</sup> Includes available preliminary data for July 1, 2004 through December 31, 2005, and may not include all spills less than 1,000 gallons that did not enter surface waters or storm drains during this period.

<sup>B</sup> As of June 2003.

<sup>C</sup> Volume of spills for the period in gallons divided by the amount conveyed for the period in million gallons.

<sup>D</sup> Included with Eastern Municipal Water District

<sup>1</sup> The average is the sum of all values divided by the number of values.

<sup>2</sup> In a normally distributed set of values, 68% of the values are within one standard deviation either above or below the average value.

<sup>3</sup> The median is the middle value in a set; half the values are above the median, and half are below the median.



**2005-06 CONSOLIDATED GRANTS PROGRAM  
NOTICE OF CONCEPT PROPOSAL  
APPLICANT ASSISTANCE WORKSHOPS**

**ANNOUNCEMENT:**

The State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) is pleased to announce the schedule for the 2005-06 Consolidated Grants Program Concept Proposal Applicant Assistance Workshops.

A total of approximately \$143 million will be made available from six interrelated grant programs administered by the State Water Board's Division of Financial Assistance. The six consolidated programs are:

1. Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program (Proposition 40, Chapter 4)
2. Coastal Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program (Proposition 50, Chapter 5)
3. Nonpoint Source Implementation Program (Federal Clean Water Act, Section 319 (h))
4. Agricultural Water Quality Grant Program (Propositions 40 and 50, Chapters 4 and 5)
5. Urban Stormwater Program (Proposition 40, Chapter 4)
6. Integrated Watershed Management Program (Proposition 40, Chapter 4)

**WORKSHOP DETAILS:**

Three workshops<sup>1</sup> to assist applicants in applying for the 2005-06 Consolidated Grants Program will be held as follows:

NO.	CITY	DATE	TIME	LOCATION
1	Sacramento <sup>2</sup>	Tuesday January 17, 2006	10:00 AM – 3:00 PM	Cal/EPA Building, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor Sierra Hearing Room 1001 I Street Sacramento, California 95814
2	Los Angeles	Monday January 23, 2006	10:00 AM – 3:00 PM	Los Angeles Water Board Office Auditorium, 1 <sup>st</sup> Floor 320 West 4 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 200 Los Angeles, California 90013
3	San Luis Obispo	Tuesday January 24, 2006	10:00 AM – 3:00 PM	Central Coast Water Board Office Regional Board Room 895 Aerovista Drive - Suite 101 San Luis Obispo, California 93401

For more information on the 2005-06 Consolidated Grants Program, visit the State Water Board's website at: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/funding/consolidgrants0506.html>.

**NOTE: IT IS NOT NECESSARY TO REGISTER TO ATTEND THESE WORKSHOPS.**

<sup>1</sup> Additional workshops may be scheduled by Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) staff. Please check with your Regional Water Board for additional workshops or visit the 2005-06 Consolidated Grants Program website referenced above.

<sup>2</sup> The Sacramento workshop will be audio broadcast over the Internet. The web audio broadcast can be accessed at <http://www.calepa.ca.gov/broadcast>. During the audio broadcast, listeners may e-mail comments or questions to: [DFA\\_GRANTS@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:DFA_GRANTS@waterboards.ca.gov).



## 2005-06 CONSOLIDATED GRANTS PROGRAM

CONCEPT PROPOSAL SOLICITATION NOTICE  
JANUARY 5, 2006

**APPLICATIONS ARE DUE BY 11:59 P.M. ON THURSDAY,  
FEBRUARY 9, 2006.**

The State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), Division of Financial Assistance is accepting applications for the 2005-06 Consolidated Grants Program.

All applicants requesting funds from the 2005-06 Consolidated Grants Program must submit a complete electronic application by **11:59 pm on Thursday, February 9, 2006** using the State Water Board's online Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST) system at: <https://faast.waterboards.ca.gov/>. Late applications will not be accepted.

We strongly suggest that applicants submit their applications early to avoid disqualification. We recommend submittal of applications prior to 5:00 P.M. because technical assistance for FAAST will not be provided after 5:00 P.M. on Thursday, February 9, 2006.

To be considered complete, the submitted application must include all of the items in the checklist below. It is suggested that applicants use this checklist to verify all required information is submitted using the FAAST.

Eligibility and program requirements are detailed in the *2005-06 Consolidated Grants Program Guidelines*, which are available on-line at the State Water Board's website at: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/funding/consolidgrants0506.html>.

## 2005-06 CONSOLIDATED GRANTS PROGRAM

### CONCEPT PROPOSAL SOLICITATION NOTICE CONTINUED

JANUARY 5, 2006

<b>Checklist for Completing 2005-06 Consolidated Grants Program Online Concept Proposal Application</b>				
Within the FFAST, the following SECTIONS must be completed and submitted:				
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>General Information</b> (For the project location information requested in this section, specify the latitude and longitude values that are representative of the project. For large areas of land, specify the mid-point of the area. For a waterbody, specify the mid-point of the waterbody stretch.)			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Funding Programs</b> Select one or more funding programs to apply. Consult with the contacts listed in pages 3-5 of this notice for questions regarding applicant eligibility, project eligibility, and agency priorities.			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Project Management</b> Please indicate the Project Director and the Project Manager from the applicant's organization.			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Legislative Information</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Agency Contacts</b> This section must include all agency contacts (Regional Water Board, United States Environmental Protection Agency, etc.) that assisted in the development of the project proposal.			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Cooperating Entities</b> List the organizations that will assist the applicant in implementing the project, including partner organizations, consultants, and volunteers.			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Application Questionnaire</b> These are questions outlined in Appendix H (pages 57-62) of the <i>2005-06 Consolidated Grants Program Guidelines</i> .			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Optional Attachment:</b> A. Only if needed, up to two (2) pages to complete your answers to any application questions. Please reference the question number(s) you are responding to. Attachments longer than two (2) pages will <b>not</b> be reviewed.	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30%; padding: 5px;"><b>Maximum Length:</b> 2 pages</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">                     If the optional attachment is submitted, it <u>must</u> conform to the following formatting requirements:                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A <b>maximum</b> of 2 pages in length;</li> <li>Letter (8.5" x 11") size paper;</li> <li>Single-spaced or wider;</li> <li>Times New Roman font - Size 11 or larger; and</li> <li>One inch (1-inch) margins.</li> </ul> </td> </tr> </table>	<b>Maximum Length:</b> 2 pages	If the optional attachment is submitted, it <u>must</u> conform to the following formatting requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A <b>maximum</b> of 2 pages in length;</li> <li>Letter (8.5" x 11") size paper;</li> <li>Single-spaced or wider;</li> <li>Times New Roman font - Size 11 or larger; and</li> <li>One inch (1-inch) margins.</li> </ul>
<b>Maximum Length:</b> 2 pages	If the optional attachment is submitted, it <u>must</u> conform to the following formatting requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A <b>maximum</b> of 2 pages in length;</li> <li>Letter (8.5" x 11") size paper;</li> <li>Single-spaced or wider;</li> <li>Times New Roman font - Size 11 or larger; and</li> <li>One inch (1-inch) margins.</li> </ul>			

For further assistance on the 2005-06 Consolidated Grants Program, please call Ms. Erin Ragazzi, of the Division of Financial Assistance, at (916) 341-5733 or e-mail her at: [enragazzi@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:enragazzi@waterboards.ca.gov). You may also call Ms. Ibyang Rivera, of the Division of Financial Assistance, at (916) 341-5440 or e-mail her at: [irivera@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:irivera@waterboards.ca.gov).

For further assistance on the FFAST, please call Ms. Aubree French, of the Division of Financial Assistance, at (916) 341-5729 or e-mail her at: [afrench@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:afrench@waterboards.ca.gov).

# 2005-06 CONSOLIDATED GRANTS PROGRAM CONTACTS

## REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARDS & STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD CONTACTS

<b>NORTH COAST REGION (1)</b>	<b>SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION (2)</b>
<p><b>Bernadette Reed</b> 5550 Skylane Boulevard, Suite A Santa Rosa, California 9540 <a href="mailto:breed@waterboards.ca.gov">breed@waterboards.ca.gov</a> OFFICE: (707) 576-2678 FAX: (707) 523-0135</p>	<p><b>Susan Gladstone &amp; Dale Hopkins</b> 1515 Clay Street, Suite 1400 Oakland, California 94612 <a href="mailto:sgladstone@waterboards.ca.gov">sgladstone@waterboards.ca.gov</a> (Gladstone); <a href="mailto:dhopkins@waterboards.ca.gov">dhopkins@waterboards.ca.gov</a> (Hopkins) OFFICE: (510) 622-2352 (Gladstone) (510) 622-2362 (Hopkins) FAX: (510) 622-2460</p>
<b>CENTRAL COAST REGION (3)</b>	<b>LOS ANGELES REGION (4)</b>
<p><b>Bill Hoffmann</b> 895 Aerovista Drive, Suite 101 San Luis Obispo, California 93401-5427 <a href="mailto:bhoffmann@waterboards.ca.gov">bhoffmann@waterboards.ca.gov</a> OFFICE: (805) 549-3691 FAX: (805) 772-4162</p>	<p><b>Raymond Jay &amp; Maryann Jones</b> 320 West 4<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 200 Los Angeles, California 90013 <a href="mailto:rjay@waterboards.ca.gov">rjay@waterboards.ca.gov</a> (Jay) <a href="mailto:majones@waterboards.ca.gov">majones@waterboards.ca.gov</a> (Jones) OFFICE: (213) 576-6689 (Jay); (213) 576-6692 (Jones) FAX: (213) 576-6686</p>
<b>CENTRAL VALLEY REGION (5F)</b>	<b>CENTRAL VALLEY REGION (5R)</b>
<p><b>Pam Buford</b> 1685 "E" Street Fresno, California 93706 <a href="mailto:pbuford@waterboards.ca.gov">pbuford@waterboards.ca.gov</a> OFFICE: (559) 445-5576 FAX: (559) 445-5910</p>	<p><b>Dennis Heiman</b> 415 Knollcrest Drive Redding, California 96002 <a href="mailto:dheiman@waterboards.ca.gov">dheiman@waterboards.ca.gov</a> OFFICE: (530) 224-4851 FAX: (530) 224-4857</p>
<b>CENTRAL VALLEY REGION (5S)</b>	<b>LAHONTAN REGION (6SLT)</b>
<p><b>Kathleen Harder &amp; Joshua Grover</b> 11020 Sun Center Drive, #200 Rancho Cordova, CA 95670 <a href="mailto:kharder@waterboards.ca.gov">kharder@waterboards.ca.gov</a> (Harder) <a href="mailto:jgrover@waterboards.ca.gov">jgrover@waterboards.ca.gov</a> (Grover) OFFICE: (916) 464-4778 (Harder); (916) 464-4691 (Grover) FAX: (916) 464-4645</p>	<p><b>Cindy Wise</b> 2501 South Lake Tahoe Blvd. South Lake Tahoe, California 96150 <a href="mailto:cwise@waterboards.ca.gov">cwise@waterboards.ca.gov</a> OFFICE: (530) 542-5408 FAX: (530) 544-2271</p>
<b>COLORADO RIVER BASIN REGION (7)</b>	<b>SANTA ANA REGION (8)</b>
<p><b>Doug Wylie, P.E.</b> 73720 Fred Waring Drive, Suite 100 Palm Desert, CA 92260 <a href="mailto:mailto:dwylye@waterboards.ca.gov">mailto:dwylye@waterboards.ca.gov</a> OFFICE: (760) 346-6585 FAX: (760) 341-6820</p>	<p><b>Mark Adelson &amp; Talitha Sweaney</b> 3737 Main Street, Suite 500 Riverside, California 92501-3339 <a href="mailto:madelson@waterboards.ca.gov">madelson@waterboards.ca.gov</a> (Adelson) <a href="mailto:tsweaney@waterboards.ca.gov">tsweaney@waterboards.ca.gov</a> (Sweaney) OFFICE: (909) 782-3234 (Adelson); (909) 782-3219 (Sweaney) FAX: (909) 781-6288</p>

**REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARDS &  
STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD CONTACTS CONTINUED**

<b>SAN DIEGO REGION (9)</b>	<b>STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD</b>
<p><b>David Gibson &amp; Deborah Woodward</b> 9174 Sky Park Court, Suite 100 San Diego, California 92123-4340 <a href="mailto:dgibson@waterboards.ca.gov">dgibson@waterboards.ca.gov</a> (Gibson) <a href="mailto:dwoodward@waterboards.ca.gov">dwoodward@waterboards.ca.gov</a> (Woodward) OFFICE: (858) 467-4387 (Gibson); (858) 637-5586 (Woodward) FAX: (858) 571-6972</p>	<p><b>Erin Ragazzi</b> Division of Financial Assistance 1001 I Street, 16<sup>th</sup> Floor Sacramento, CA 94244-2130 <a href="mailto:enragazzi@waterboards.ca.gov">enragazzi@waterboards.ca.gov</a> OFFICE: (916) 341-5733 FAX: (916) 341-5700</p>

**U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, REGION 9 CONTACTS**

<p><b>NONPOINT SOURCE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM</b> <i>(Clean Water Act, Section 319[h])</i></p>	
<p><b>Sam Ziegler</b> California Nonpoint Source Coordinator 75 Hawthorne Street (WTR-3) San Francisco, CA 94105 <a href="mailto:ziegler.sam@epa.gov">ziegler.sam@epa.gov</a> OFFICE: (415) 972-3399 FAX: (415) 974-3537</p>	<p><b>Tina Yin</b> California NPS Project Officer 75 Hawthorne Street (WTR-3) San Francisco, CA 94105 <a href="mailto:yin.christina@epa.gov">yin.christina@epa.gov</a> OFFICE: (415) 972-3579 FAX: (415) 974-3537</p>

**PARTNER AGENCIES CONTACTS**

<b>COASTAL CONSERVANCY</b>	<b>CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION</b>
<p><b>David Hayes</b> 1330 Broadway Suite 1100 Oakland, CA 94612 <a href="mailto:dhayes@scc.ca.gov">dhayes@scc.ca.gov</a> OFFICE: (510) 286-0736</p>	<p><b>Jack Gregg</b> 45 Fremont Street, Suite 2000 San Francisco, CA 94105 <a href="mailto:jgregg@coastal.ca.gov">jgregg@coastal.ca.gov</a> OFFICE: (415) 904-5246</p>
<b>CALIFORNIA RESOURCES AGENCY</b>	<b>DEPARTMENT OF BOATING AND WATERWAYS</b>
<p><b>Cathy Bleier</b> 416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311 Sacramento, California 95814 <a href="mailto:cathy.bleier@resources.ca.gov">cathy.bleier@resources.ca.gov</a> OFFICE: (916) 653-6598</p>	<p><b>Kim Sterrett</b> 2000 Evergreen St, Suite 100 Sacramento, Ca 95815 E-mail <a href="mailto:sterrett@dbw.ca.gov">sterrett@dbw.ca.gov</a> OFFICE: (916) 263-8157</p>
<b>CALFED (WATERSHED PROGRAM)</b>	<b>CALFED (DRINKING WATER PROGRAM)</b>
<p><b>John Lowrie</b> 650 Capitol Mall, 5th Floor Sacramento, CA 95814 <a href="mailto:lowrie@calwater.ca.gov">lowrie@calwater.ca.gov</a> OFFICE: (916) 445-5011</p>	<p><b>Lisa Holm</b> 650 Capitol Mall, 5th Floor Sacramento, CA 95814 <a href="mailto:lisah@calwater.ca.gov">lisah@calwater.ca.gov</a> OFFICE: (916) 445-0782</p>

**PARTNER AGENCIES CONTACTS CONTINUED**

<p><b>DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION</b></p> <p><b>Andrew Rush &amp; Cy Oggins</b>          Watershed Coordinator (Rush);          Abandoned Mine Lands (Oggins)          Address 801 K Street, MS 18-01 (Rush);          MS 09-06 (Oggins)          Sacramento, CA 95814-3529  <a href="mailto:arush@conservation.ca.gov">arush@conservation.ca.gov</a> (Rush);  <a href="mailto:coggins@conservation.ca.gov">coggins@conservation.ca.gov</a> (Oggins)          OFFICE: (916) 323-4163 (Rush);          (916) 323-9226 (Oggins)</p>	<p><b>DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME</b></p> <p><b>Gail Newton</b>          Watershed Assistance Teams          830 S Street          Sacramento, CA 95814  <a href="mailto:gnewton@dfg.ca.gov">gnewton@dfg.ca.gov</a>          OFFICE: (916) 327-8841</p>
<p><b>DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY</b></p> <p><b>Chris Keithley</b>          Fire and Resource Assessment Program          Department of Forestry and Fire Protection          1300 U Street          Sacramento, CA 95814  <a href="mailto:chris.keithley@fire.ca.gov">chris.keithley@fire.ca.gov</a>          OFFICE: (916) 445-5344</p>	<p><b>DEPARTMENT OF PARKS &amp; RECREATION</b></p> <p><b>Syd Brown &amp; Rick Rayburn</b>          P. O. Box 942896-0001          Sacramento, CA 94296-0001  <a href="mailto:sbrow@parks.ca.gov">sbrow@parks.ca.gov</a> (Brown)  <a href="mailto:rrayb@parks.ca.gov">rrayb@parks.ca.gov</a> (Rayburn)          OFFICE: (916) 653-9930 (Brown);          (916) 653-6725 (Rayburn)</p>
<p><b>DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES</b></p> <p><b>Stefan Lorenzato &amp; Kristyne Van Skike</b>          Department of Water Resources, DPLA          P.O. Box 948236          Sacramento, CA 94236-0001  <a href="mailto:stefanl@water.ca.gov">stefanl@water.ca.gov</a> (Lorenzato)  <a href="mailto:kskike@water.ca.gov">kskike@water.ca.gov</a> (Van Skike)          OFFICE: (916) 651-9617 (Lorenzato);          (916) 651-9621 (Van Skike)</p>	

**Attachment A  
List of Applicants Recommended for Funding and those Not Recommended for Funding**

**DWR - Recommended for Funding**

<b>IR/IC</b>	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Proposal Title</b>	<b>Grant Request</b>	<b>Total Project Costs</b>
IR	Amador Water Agency	Amador/Mokelumne Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	\$145,500	\$194,000
IR	California State Coastal Conservancy	San Francisco Bay Area Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	\$451,230	\$806,230
IR	County of Humboldt	North Coast Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	\$500,000	\$954,000
IR	El Dorado Irrigation District	CABY (Cosumnes, American, Bear, & Yuba Rivers) Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	\$500,000	\$797,042
IR	Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District	Regional Integration of the Lower Tuscan Formation Through Conjunctive Water Management	\$499,940	\$666,970
IR	Kings River Conservation District	Kings Basin Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	\$500,000	\$770,360
IR	Los Angeles, City of	Upper Los Angeles River Watershed IRWMP	\$500,000	\$675,000
IR	Madera County	Eastern Madera County Water Management Plan	\$500,000	\$725,000
IC	Mendocino County Resource Conservation District	Draft Russian River Watershed Management Plan	\$264,748	\$530,000
IC	Mendocino County Water Agency	Noyo/Big River Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plan	\$196,000	\$196,000
IR/IC	Monterey Peninsula Water Management District	Monterey Peninsula, Carmel Bay, and South Monterey Bay IRWMP and ICWMP	\$496,957	\$1,228,650
IR	Natural Heritage Institute	Sierra Meadows: Developing an IRWMP	\$500,000	\$760,000
IR	Newport Beach, City of	Newport Bay - San Diego Creek IRWMP	\$487,000	\$650,000
IR	Northeastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Banking Authority	Eastern San Joaquin Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	\$498,468	\$889,131
IR	Northern California Joint Exercise of Powers	Sacramento Region Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	\$499,980	\$769,010
IR	Regional Water Authority	Regional Water Authority Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Program	\$500,000	\$1,419,224
IR	San Benito County Water District	Pajaro River Watershed Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	\$500,000	\$872,220
IR	San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District	IRWMP For the Upper Santa Ana Water Resources Association	\$498,560	\$761,960



IR	San Jacinto River Watershed Council, The	The San Jacinto Watershed Component of the Santa Ana Integrated Watershed Plan	\$500,000	\$787,000
IR	San Luis Obispo County FC and WCD	San Luis IRWM Planning Grant Proposal	\$500,000	\$675,000
IC	Santa Monica Bay Restoration Authority	North Santa Monica Bay IRWMP	\$500,000	\$2,163,301
IR	Semitropic Water Storage District	The Poso Creek IRWMP Management Group	\$499,435	\$714,035
IR	Ventura Countywide Integrated Regional Water Mgmt.	Ventura Countywide Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	\$220,000	\$300,000
IR	Water Resources Association of Yolo County	Water Resources Association of Yolo County, IRWMP Completion	\$500,000	\$792,565
IR	Watershed Conservation Authority	San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers Watershed IRWMP	\$500,000	\$800,000
IR	Western Municipal Water District	WMWD IRWM Plan	\$495,000	\$684,000
IR	Yuba County Water Agency	Yuba County Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	\$499,640	\$718,340
IR	Zone 7 Water Agency	Bay Area Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	\$387,000	\$552,000

**DWR Funding Total \$12,639,458 \$21,851,038**

**DWR - Not Recommended for Funding**

IC/IR	Applicant	Proposal Title	Grant Request	Total Project Costs
IR	Alpine County	Alpine Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	\$156,250	\$198,578
IR	Borrego Water District	Plan of Development of a Conjunctive Use (Water Banking) Project in Borrego Valley, CA	\$498,900	\$498,900
IR	Cottonwood Creek Watershed Group	Cottonwood Creek Watershed Erosion Inventory	\$357,000	\$359,400
IR	Downey, City of	Conjunctive Use and Treatment Plant Project	\$375,000	\$500,000
IR	Friends of Deer Creek	Deer Creek Integrated Regional Mercury Remediation Plan	\$500,000	\$770,000
IR	Lower Tule River Irrigation District	Tule River Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	\$225,560	\$242,540
IR	Merced County Economic Development Corp.	Merced County Regional Utilities Infrastructure Plan (MCRUIP)	\$500,000	\$3,000,000
IR	Mojave Desert-Mountain Resource Conservation and Development Council	IRWMP Plan for South Fork of the Kern River Watershed	\$500,000	\$667,000
IR	North Cal-Neva Resource Conservation District	Pit River Alliance Watershed Management Strategy	\$471,135	\$471,135

IR	Rancho California Water District	Southern Riverside County Water Supply Augmentation Project	\$375,000	\$950,000
IR	Riverside, City of	Middle Santa Ana Watershed Management Plan	\$253,000	\$339,985
IR	Running Springs Water District	Hilltop Water Management Project	\$237,968	\$317,291
IR	San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District	Southern California Foothill Communities Intergrated Regional Water Management Planning Study	\$500,000	\$625,000
IR	San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Water Authority	Upper San Joaquin River Conceptual Restoration Plan/Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	\$499,952	\$634,972
IR	Santa Barbara County	Santa Barbara County IRWMP Project	\$132,050	\$174,950
IR	Self Help Enterprises, Inc.	Tulare County Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	\$150,000	\$187,500
IR	Shafter, City of	Shafter Regional Water Management Plan	\$50,426	\$67,235
IR	West Basin Municipal Water District	Los Angeles County South Bay Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	\$479,555	\$1,330,304

### SWRCB - Recommended for Funding

IR/IC	Applicant	Proposal Title	Grant Request	Total Project Costs
IC	Mattole Restoration Council	Mattole Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plan	\$246,772	\$566,508
IC	Newport Beach, City of	Central Coastal Orange County ICWMP	\$397,500	\$797,042
IC	Regents of the University of California, The	La Jolla Shores Coastal Watershed Management Plan	\$499,874	\$694,036
IC	Tomales Bay Watershed Council Foundation	Marin County ICWM Plan and Assessment including 4 ASBS and 3 CCAs	\$459,900	\$644,900
IC	Trinidad, City of	Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plan for the Trinidad ASBS	\$500,000	\$545,546
<b>SWRCB Funding Total</b>			<b>\$2,104,046</b>	<b>\$3,248,032</b>

#### NOTES:

**DWR** = Department of Water Resources

**SWRCB** = State Water Resources Control Board

**IR** = Integrated **Regional** Water Management Planning Grant

**IC** = Integrated **Coastal** Water Management Planning Grant



**Final Report**  
**12/19/05**

**The ECOS and DoD Sustainability Work Group**  
**444 North Capitol St., NW, Suite 445**  
**Washington, DC 20001**



**Table of Contents**

**Overview.....3**

**Policy Goals.....4**

**Communication.....4**

**Process.....5**

**Assessment (Risk/Site/Toxicity).....6**

**Resources.....6**

**Priority Items.....7**

**Prioritization Results.....13**

### Overview

The ECOS-DoD Sustainability Work Group hosted the Forging Partnerships on Emerging Contaminants Forum November 2-3 in San Diego, California. The Forum was an opportunity for State and Federal stakeholders to discuss and define the issues and challenges posed by emerging contaminants. The objective of the Forum was to jointly develop and prioritize proposed actions. The Forum's output will now form the foundation for further development of a cooperative process by which emerging contaminants can be addressed by all stakeholders.

The 22 priority items identified at the Forging Partnerships on Emerging Contaminants Forum reflect a variety of actions and issues ranging in specificity from site/risk assessments to broad policy goals. These can be grouped into five general themes:

- Policy Goals
- Communication
- Process
- Assessment (Risk/Site/Toxicity)
- Resources

On the following pages the 22 priority items have been categorized into one or more of the above themes. The goal of these thematic categories is to capture priority items common among the breakout groups. Please note that these groupings are not intended to be an exhaustive compilation of the substantive output of the breakout groups. Rather, they are a summary of common priority items. For a comprehensive listing of what a particular priority item addressed, please refer to the list at the back of this document.

### Policy Goals

While many of the items identified suggest that specific goals, i.e. development of an independent advisory group, should be sought, three items identify broad policy concepts for the Work Group to address. **Item M** suggests that the Work Group should develop and champion a *broad pollution prevention policy* for emerging contaminants, while **Items O and S** support the development of a *proactive and preventative emerging contaminants (EC) strategy to address ECs before they become regulatory concerns*.

The above items share a common theme of early action/pollution prevention that could be incorporated into the process goals identified below. These items are captured in the following summary statement:

***The Work Group could develop and champion a proactive emerging contaminants policy that supports pollution prevention through life cycle analysis and the development of best management practices for ECs.***

### Communication

Several groups identified improved communication of all phases of the emerging contaminant process as a priority item. **Item G** suggests the Work Group develop a *comprehensive risk management/assessment communication strategy for ECs*, while **Item N** adds that such a strategy should be based on expert advice and emphasize *proactive risk communication*. **Item V** emphasizes that such a communication strategy should seek to achieve greater *consistency* in the EC process. Lastly, **Items G and V** support the idea of a *clearinghouse to disseminate information on ECs*. These items are captured in the following summary statement:

***The Work Group could develop a consistent, comprehensive communication strategy regarding the entire process by which ECs are addressed- from risk/hazard identification to implemented regulations. This process would be proactive, emphasize stakeholder education, clearly define terms and provide for such information to be made available in a central clearinghouse.***

## Process

Process was widely identified as an item to be addressed by the Work Group. Loosely defined, it represents the steps necessary to successfully manage ECs from initial identification through to implemented regulations. Specific Breakout Group suggestions include:

**Item D** recommends the development of an *independent advisory group* to coordinate data collection and provide interim guidance for initial action and risk communication during the development of final toxicity values. **Item H** supports the development of a *uniform protocol to identify and prioritize ECs*. **Item P** suggests that in light of the *uncertainty* surrounding ECs, the workgroup identify *what conditions should trigger an action to interrupt exposure*. **Items I and U** add to Item H by recommending that a *framework for action be developed to guide management of ECs after identification but prior to agreement on levels*. **Item J** supports a *collaborative process to address research needs and fill data gaps*. **Item K** recommends a *state survey* to identify where resources should be allocated including future toxicological studies. **Item Q** supports the *development of definitions for ECs that recognize different processes may be necessary for ECs based on whether they are newly discovered, reemerging or reassessed*. **Item R** recommends the Work Group develop a *broad strategy of early involvement, cooperation and transparency in an effort to achieve a more consistent approach to ECs*. Lastly, **Item T** recommends the development of a consensus document to foster a *collaborative process for addressing ECs*. These items are captured in the following summary statement:

***The Work Group could support a broad, collaborative framework to guide the identification and management of ECs. This framework would provide agreed upon definitions and address all aspects of the EC process including what conditions should trigger a response when an EC is identified in an exposure pathway. The framework would recognize that different processes may be necessary on an EC-by-EC basis and would aspire to achieve consistency in identifying and addressing ECs while reflecting the interests of all affected stakeholders.***

### Assessment

4 items identified "assessment" as a priority to be addressed by the Work Group. While this term was not given a universal definition at the Forum, it appears to have been loosely understood as the specific steps by which contaminants are identified and their risks to human health and the environment evaluated and quantified.

**Item B** recommends that the Work Group increase the role of *stakeholders in health risk assessment*. **Item C** supports *increased transparency in health and site risk assessments*. **Item I** suggests that *risk assessment serve as one consideration in determining what action to take after an EC is identified, but prior to agreement on levels*. **Item J** supports a collaborative process that *fills data gaps between the States and DoD and other agencies*. These items are captured in the following summary statement:

***The Work Group could support a transparent, collaborative health and site risk assessment process that involves all stakeholders and fills existing data gaps. The results of this risk assessment process would be one factor in guiding the management of ECs prior to agreement on levels.***

### Resources

Financial resources were identified as a priority item in five instances. Specifically, **Item A** recommends that the Work Group *leverage state and federal resources, coordinate activities to avoid duplication and focus available resources on areas of greatest potential risk*. **Item E** suggests that the Work Group convene a group of budget experts to *evaluate site-specific management priorities at the national level*. **Item F** promotes the *development of flexible budgetary tools to help achieve timely proactive investments addressing ECs*. **Item I** supports the development of mechanisms to *efficiently communicate the EC issue to the budget writing process in an effort to acquire necessary resources*. **Item L** encourages the Work Group to *pursue funding to allow for proactive responses to ECs that allow for the DoD to budget for such proactive actions*. These items are captured in the following summary statement:

***The Work Group could support flexible budgetary tools that allow stakeholders such as DoD to budget for proactive actions regarding ECs. To aid in obtaining these resources, the Work Group would endeavor to provide clear communication of the EC issue to the budget writing process. These tools would utilize available resources in an efficient manner that avoids duplication of effort and focuses resources on areas of greatest potential risk.***



## Priority Items

### Item A: (Group A)

ECOS/DoD Sustainability Workgroup should leverage resources across states and federal agencies, coordinate activities to eliminate duplication of efforts, such as risk assessments, and focus public resources on areas of potential highest risk.

### Item B: (Group A)

ECOS/DoD Sustainability Workgroup should work on ways to enhance stakeholder involvement in health risk assessment, and define the roles of stakeholders in the health risk assessment process.

### Item C: (Group A)

ECOS/DoD Sustainability Workgroup should develop recommendations on how to improve the transparency of health and site risk assessments (e.g. explain uncertainties, defaults and assumptions.)

### Item D: (Group A)

ECOS/DoD Sustainability Workgroup should explore establishment of an independent, inclusive, advisory group (e.g. ITRC, CRESP) that can coordinate data gathering, and provide interim guidance for initial action and risk communication, while encouraging continued development of final toxicity values.

### Item E: (Group A)

ECOS/DoD Sustainability Workgroup should establish a group with budgetary expertise that evaluates site specific risk management priorities at a national level, not just state by state. ECOS/DoD can facilitate state understanding/ acceptance. (Could be modeled after FFERDC—Keystone Report, '96).

### Item F: (Group A)

ECOS/DoD Sustainability Workgroup should promote a more flexible budgetary process by developing tools to document and illustrate fiscal and mission benefits, allowing for timely proactive investments, e.g. pollution prevention and response actions for emerging contaminants.

### Item G: Communication (Group B)

Develop and implement a comprehensive communication strategy for ECs including risk management and assessment:

- Communication of ECs to all involved
- Communication in light of uncertainty
- Risk communication at the site level
- Development of an EC clearinghouse including those that don't make the list
- Risk communication on ECs and their uncertainties

- How can we benefit most from shared experiences and lessons learned
- How can risk communication messages be as consistent and least confusing to the public?
- Open dialogue with all stakeholders with regard to ECs
- Regulatory early communication on emerging EC issues
- Establish a clearinghouse on ongoing research for ECs to support regulatory standards or actions

Item H: Process (Group B)

Establish a uniform protocol to proactively identify and prioritize ECs relevant to DoD operations including:

- Identify responsibilities of regulators, producers and users of chemical substances
- A process to ensure transparency in addressing ECs in a collaborative manner
- Develop a process focusing on a few high probability ECs and designation of an EC lead
- Establish agreed upon criteria for identifying ECs not just process
  - o peer review/ ARARs / TBCs
- An EC process that links response, data quality, and the federal budget process
- Ensuring that standards are based on technically defensible science with a method to resolve scientific disputes publicly in an unbiased way.

Item I: Policy/ Budget (Group B)

Develop a framework with consideration of the risk assessment process and risk management perspectives for what to do with ECs after identification but prior to agreement on levels.

- Discuss consistencies and address inconsistencies between state and federal government on policies, positions and standards
- Explore budgetary and other impediments to acting on ECs
- Once ECs are identified, what are the responsibilities of regulators and the regulated
- How can the EC issue be communicated efficiently to the Budget writing process- identify key players in the process that can be communicated in order to acquire necessary resources
- Depoliticizing the standard setting process
- How to consider TBCs in developing site-specific responses for ECs
- Explore alternative funding sources for testing and remediating wells
- Protocols/procedures for taking interim steps for addressing ECs when found in absence of final standards
- Balancing public health and budget issues
- How competing risks can be ranked when margins of safety are applied in the face of scientific uncertainty

- Develop a framework for a tiered evidence based risk management approach for ECs
- Consider net environmental benefit analysis when considering risk management
- Encourage mechanisms to expeditiously manage risks and human exposure
- Maintain the distinction between risk management and risk assessment
- Ensure development of site specific risk management measures for each EC
- In addition to development of MCLs need to develop acute levels for expedited response
- When does scientific judgment enter into the policy formation arena?
- Identify P2 and BMPs for chemicals which are being put into use with health impacts to prevent release into the environment
- Consideration of eco-risk in addition to human health risk
- Regulatory and remedial activities should be consistent for all PRPs
- Can we manage ECs in groups as opposed to individual compounds

Item J: Data/Research (Group B)

Develop a collaborative process between states and DoD to address research needs and data gaps with respect to ECs.

- Identify other outside agencies/entities for further collaboration
- Responsibility for anticipating what ECs will be- what is likely to get into the environment, taking early action- a more proactive attitude among producers and users of chemical substances
- Identify DoD's role, if any, in conducting toxicological and epidemiological research regarding ECs
- How can DoD fund and conduct research to best ensure the results will be viewed as valid?
- Consider the value of human information in characterizing emerging contaminants (bio-monitoring, observational studies, epidemiology, human subject research)

Item K: Survey (Group C)

The ECOS and DoD Sustainability Workgroup should survey states. The results would assist agencies in being proactive to identify and project where resources will need to be expended in the future and for developing toxicology studies. The survey would include but not be limited to:

- What emerging contaminants are the states dealing with and in what media?
- In what division or program are emerging contaminants being addressed?
- What is the relative priority of emerging contaminants?
- What is going on in bordering states that impacts state regulatory agencies?
- What contaminants are we potentially overlooking?

- What is the prevalence/occurrence?
- How do emerging contaminants impact programs?
- Have they sampled for emerging contaminants? What emerging contaminants are they sampling for?
- What are state regulations and guidance for each emerging contaminants?
- How do states deal with emerging contaminants response?
- What is the sense of urgency for each contaminant?

Item L: Funding and Implementation Strategies (Group C)

The ECOS and DoD Sustainability Workgroup should encourage funding and implementation of strategies for proactively responding to emerging contaminants such that DoD (and possibly other federal and state agencies) can budget for proactive actions including pollution prevention and impact analyses prior to regulations

- Identifying (scanning the horizon)
- Assessment of impact on mission
- Taking risk management actions such as pollution prevention
- Initiating further study including occurrence/prevalence
- Initiating further toxicological studies
- Estimating life cycle costs

Item M: Pollution Prevention Policy (Group C)

The ECOS and DoD Sustainability Workgroup should develop a resolution and champion a broad policy of pollution prevention regarding emerging contaminants by:

- supporting the investigation of life cycle analysis for compounds
- identifying methodologies for life cycle analysis
- identifying, evaluating, and recommending best management practices

Item N: Risk Communication Strategy (Group A/C)

The ECOS and DoD Sustainability Workgroup should consult with EPA, DoD, CDC and other experts to develop and embrace a comprehensive proactive risk communication strategy for emerging contaminants, including:

- Identification and engagement of stakeholders
- Dissemination of educational materials
- Explaining uncertainties, including the reliability of underlying toxicity studies
- Explaining the underlying basis among various state and federal risk levels
- Clearly defining terms used

Item O: Response Framework (Group C)

The ECOS and DOD Sustainability Workgroup should work with EPA and DoD to develop recommendations on a framework to enable DoD and others to anticipate and proactively respond to emerging contaminants before they

become regulatory concerns. The recommendations should consider such factors as:

- Exposure (current or future)
- Toxicity/health effects and uncertainty
- Occurrence
- Timing/Urgency
- Permanency of options
- Long-term stewardship
- Budget
- Co-contaminants
- Taste/odor and other qualitative factors
- Political considerations
- Recognition of government need to protect first
- Stakeholder identification for those who need to be involved and how

Item P: Discussion of response in face of uncertainty (Group C)

The ECOS and DoD Sustainability Workgroup should discuss under what conditions we should act/not act in the face of uncertainty to interrupt exposure.

Item Q: (Group D)

The ECOS/DoD Sustainability Workgroup should define emerging contaminants recognizing that the process/strategy differs for:

- Newly discovered
- Reemerging (New exposure pathway)
- Reassessed (Change in toxicity)

Item R: (Group D)

In order to achieve a more consistent approach, the ECOS/DoD Sustainability Workgroup should develop strategies to:

- Identify and Prioritize Emerging Contaminants
- Encourage Early Stakeholder Involvement
- Work Together (stakeholders, etc.)
- Identify Data Gaps (additional research, etc.)
- Identify Applicable Studies
- Investigate Occurrence
- Evaluate Technological Methods and Application
- Strive for transparency and consistency in the setting and updating of regulatory standards

Item S: (Group D)

The ECOS/DoD Sustainability Workgroup should develop a proactive and preventative strategy that includes:

- Inventories past and present
- Environmental Fate and Toxicological Testing
- Monitoring
- Management

- Communication/Notification
- Cross-media clearing house

Item T: (Group D)

The ECOS/DoD Sustainability Workgroup should adopt a consensus document to foster a collaborative process for addressing emerging contaminants

Item U: (Group D)

The ECOS/DoD Sustainability Workgroup should develop interim procedures for addressing emerging contaminants in the absence of "appropriate" standards which may include:

- Risk Management
- Containment and exposure prevention
- Technological limitations
- Indicator development
- Budget Issues (triggers, constraints, etc.)

Item V: (Group D)

The ECOS/DoD Sustainability Workgroup should adopt risk communication strategies in order to achieve a more consistent approach, to possibly include:

- Information clearinghouse/repository
- Site specific crisis communication strategy
- Strategic communication plan
- Glossary of terms
- Education and training – internal and external

### Prioritization Results

<u>ITEM</u>	STATE	EPA	DOD	OTHER FED AGENCIES	OTHER
A	8	2	13	2	1
B	0	0	1	2	0
C	3	2	4	0	0
D	12	3	17	2	1
E	1	3	2	0	0
F	11	6	5	0	1
G	12	13	13	3	1
H	7	4	19	3	0
I	16	10	23	3	1
J	8	4	17	2	0
K	29	9	12	1	2
L	12	7	19	0	0
M	16	44	7	1	0
N	10	2	12	1	2
O	26	8	14	2	2
P	10	0	7	1	0
Q	3	1	8	1	1
R	4	3	15	2	1
S	7	11	0	0	0
T	4	1	10	1	0
U	10	3	15	1	1
V	13	0	11	2	4
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Ballots received</b>	39	23	41	5	3
<b>Total Possible "X's"</b>	234	138	246	30	18

### Top Items by Organization

(Numbers in parentheses reflect number of x's cast per issue)

<u>ITEM PRIORITY</u>	<u>STATE</u>	<u>EPA</u>	<u>DOD</u>	<u>OTHER FED AGENCIES</u>	<u>OTHER</u>
1	Item K (29)	Item M (44)	Item I (23)	Items G, H, and I (3) (tie)	Item V (4)
2	Item O (26)	Item G (13)	Items H and L (19) (tie)	Items A, B, D, J, O and R (2) (tie)	Items K, N and O (2) (tie)
3	Items M and I (16) (tie)	Item S (11)	Items D and J (17) (tie)	Items K, M, N, P, Q, T and U (1) (tie)	Items A, D, F, G, I, Q, R, and U (1) (tie)
4	Item V (13)	Item I (10)	Items R and U (15) (tie)	N/A	N/A
5	Items D, G, and L (12) (tie)	Item K (9)	Item O (14)	N/A	N/A
6	Items N, P and U (10) (tie)	Item O (8)	Item G (13)	N/A	N/A

### Overall Top Priorities

Item Priority	Item Letter	Number of Votes
1	M	68
2 (tie)	I&K	53
3	O	52
4	G	42
5	L	38