California Regional Water Quality Control Board
San Francisco Bay Region

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

A Monthly Report to the Board and Public

April 2005

The next regularly scheduled Board meeting is April 20, 2005.
See http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/ for latest details and agenda

Items in this Report (Author[s])

San Francisco Bay Mercury TMDL (Tom Mumley)

Contrary to earlier expectations from the early March State Board Workshop on our San Francisco Bay Mercury TMDL, the State Board tabled adoption of the Mercury TMDL at its hearing on March 16, 2005. The State Board did however adopt a Resolution that found our TMDL to be exceedingly complex. The Resolution states that the TMDL requires: (a) the control of mercury in San Francisco Bay, including the control of mercury in various upstream waters; (b) this control of mercury requires the development and implementation of numerous additional TMDLs in both our Region and the Central Valley Region; and (c) controlling mercury, a bioaccumulative constituent, is exceedingly complex given California's Gold Rush legacy, the natural presence of mercury in the environment, and society's ubiquitous use.

The Resolution calls for a concerted effort to integrate our TMDL with mercury TMDLs under development by the Central Valley Water Board for the Delta and upstream waters and this Water Board's for the Guadalupe River Watershed. It also calls for documentation, and additional effort if necessary, to resolve issues raised regarding attainment of applicable standards within a reasonable

timeframe. We are currently working with State Board staff on a plan to meet these State Board requests, including our planned effort to replace or revise our Basin Plan's mercury water quality objective.

Although disappointed in the State Board's last-minute actions, the State Board validated that the approachtaken in our Mercury TMDL is appropriate and provides a suitable model for mercury TMDLs statewide, and other Bay-wide TMDLs. We are continuing to implement "early actions" identified in the Mercury TMDL. I will keep you posted on further developments.

Recent Court Decisions Affect Board Regulatory Actions (Yuri Won)
City of Los Angeles, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al. (California Supreme Court). On April 4, the California Supreme Court upheld the Los Angeles Regional Water Board's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits issued to three publicly owned treatment works plants (POTWs), holding that the POTWs must comply with federal water quality standards, regardless of cost. The decision was in response to a lawsuit filed by the Cities of Los Angeles and Burbank against the Los Angeles Regional Water Board, which had issued permits to the cities setting forth numeric limits for 30 toxic pollutants to implement its narrative toxicity water quality objective. The cities had contended that the numeric requirements would be too costly when considered in light of the potential water quality benefits and that the Los Angeles Regional Water Board had failed to consider costs when issuing the permits. Many, if not all, of the POTWs in this Region have made the same argument before our Board and in the numerous petitions for review still pending before the State Board.

Building Industry Assoc., et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al. (California Supreme Court). On March 30, the California Supreme Court refused to grant review or de-publish a lower state appellate court decision upholding the San Diego Regional Water Board's municipal stormwater permit, thus letting the lower appellate court decision stand. As was reported to you in the December 2004 Executive Officer's Report, the lower appellate court had rejected the Building Industry Association's contention that under the federal Clean Water Act, the "maximum extent practicable" (MEP) standard is the exclusive measure that may be applied to municipal stormwater discharges and that a state may not require a municipality to comply with a state water quality standard if the required control exceeds the MEP standard. This decision firmly validated this Board's approach to regulating municipal stormwater discharges.

Northwest Environmental Advocates, et al. v. U.S. EPA (U.S. District Court, Northern District of California). On March 30, a federal district court struck down U.S. EPA's regulations exempting ship ballast water discharges from NPDES permitting requirements. Ballast water is taken on or discharged by a ship to accommodate changes in its weight when cargo is loaded and unloaded. Ballast water discharges have been a concern in San Francisco Bay because ballast water transports invasive species that take over wetland and other habitats and deprive native species of food sources. The Board's strategy has been to list the Bay as impaired by invasive species, develop a technical TMDL report, and participate in the state program administered by the Marine Facilities Division of the State Lands Commission (SLC). When the state ballast water law was enacted in 1999, it prohibited any state agency besides the SLC from regulating ballast water except as required by federal law, so further Board action has not occurred. If the decision stands, it will affect how the Board regulates these types of discharges. It is unknown if U.S. EPA will appeal this decision.

Waterkeeper Alliance, Inc., et al. v. U.S. EPA (U.S. Court of Appeals, 2nd Circuit). On February 28, a federal appellate court struck down portions of U.S. EPA's regulations on concentrated animal

feeding operations (CAFOs), or large-scale industrial operations that raise extraordinary numbers of livestock. The court vacated provisions of the regulations that: (1) allow permitting authorities to issue permits without reviewing the terms of the nutrient management plans; (2) allow permitting authorities to issue permits that do not include the terms of such plans and that do not provide for adequate public participation; and (3) require CAFOs to apply for NPDES permits based on potential rather than actual discharges. While CAFOs are not pervasive in our Region, and this decision is not legally binding in California, the court's reasoning may have implications in other NPDES contexts, such as in stormwater permits for industrial facilities and construction sites. Staff will report back to the Board once the implications, if any, are better understood.

Oversight Lead Under Review for Campus Bay (former Zeneca) and UC Field Station, Richmond (Curtis Scott)
This report continues several months of reports to the Board on activities at these sites. Last month we reported that the City of Richmond, in a City Council resolution adopted March 1st, had requested that Cal/EPA reassign the lead on cleanup regulatory oversight on all of these adjoining sites to the Department of Toxics Substances Control (DTSC). Currently, DTSC only has the lead for the uplands portion of the Campus Bay/Zeneca site with the Water Board overseeing the restoration of the site's wetland portion and all of the adjacent UC Field Station. Cal/EPA requested the Water Board and DTSC review and respond to Cal/EPA on the City's request and that we use the recent Brownfield Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) as a template to resolve oversight concerns for Campus Bay and the UC Field Station site.

In response, supervisory staff of the Water Board and DTSC met initially on March 17th and several other times since then to implement the review process following the MOA guidelines. While the MOA is not explicitly applicable to these sites (the MOA process is meant for "new" sites), it does provide a useful template. As of this writing, the oversight lead has not been resolved.We will keep the Board informed on the status of this review.

U.S. EPA Cites Deficiencies in San Jose's Pretreatment Program (Michael Chee)
On March 17, U.S. EPA issued an Administrative Order requiring the City of San Jose to strengthen its pretreatment program. This action was a result of deficiencies U.S. EPA, and our contractor, Tetra Tech Inc., found during joint inspections during 2004 of industrial facilities that discharge waste to the San Jose/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant.

The deficiencies include errors in the permits issued by the treatment plant to its industrial contributors, inspection inadequacies by San Jose, and failure to prevent illegal discharges of untreated wastewater to the treatment plant. Of the 13 facilities U.S. EPA inspected, significant errors were found in 12, including incorrect pollutant limits.

The Order requires San Jose to make major improvements to its pretreatment program over the next two years. The improvements include reissuing permits to 170 industrial facilities, and establishing a more effective program to assess compliance of each. San Jose must comply in stages over the next two years, or face fines of up to $32,500 per day. San Jose has been cooperative. We provided data and other assistance to U.S. EPA in its investigation, and are fully supportive of its findings and Administrative Order.

Illegal Discharge Stopped at the Presidio (Jim Ponton/Lila Tang)
As a result of quick coordination among Board staff, and fast response by the City of San Francisco, an illegal discharge into Lobos Creek was recently stopped. Lobos Creek, located along the

southwest boundary of the Presidio, is the last free-flowing stream in San Francisco. Lobos Creek has long been a source of drinking water for the Presidio and provides important native plant and wildlife habitat in an otherwise urban area.

At a public meeting on the evening of March 8th, members of the Presidio Restoration Advisory Board, an advisory panel and citizens' forum for discussion and review of environmental cleanup plans for the Presidio, informed Board staff of sewage discharges into Lobos Creek. They said a stormwater overflow pipe, located along the south bank of Lobos Creek, discharged both stormwater and raw sewage into the creek during high flow storm events.

Board staff immediately contacted the City's Public Utilities Commission, resulting in the launching of an investigation of the alleged discharge outfall at Lobos Creek. Within three weeks of notification, the City inspected the outfall pipe by video and discovered that it was indeed connected to their wet weather overflow system. The overflow to Lobos Creek is not permitted. Within the following week, the City sealed the overflow to Lobos Creek. The City's quick response will factor into our consideration for whether to pursue further enforcement in this matter.

State of the Estuary Conference Scheduled (Larry Kolb)
The biennial State of the Estuary Conference, organized by the San Francisco Estuary Project, is scheduled for October 4-6 in the Kaiser Convention Center in Oakland. A tentative agenda has been completed, to include a session on the San Joaquin basin, which is the source of major problems and uncertainties concerning the Bay-Delta system.

The San Francisco Estuary Protect is part of the national Estuary Program and is federally funded. It is housed within the Board's office. Its staff, led by Marcia Brockbank, are employees of the Association of Bay Area Governments and work cooperatively with Board staff on implementing a number of programs of mutual benefit, including our annual erosion control and construction stormwater worksops and implementation of supplemental environmental projects.

Lights Out for Potrero Power Plant? (Larry Kolb)
The old Potrero Power Plant in San Francisco has an NPDES permit from this Board that expired and was administratively extended in 1999. Staff has prepared a draft order that would reissue the that permit and distributed it for public review, with Board action anticipated this summer. Because of this pending permit action, the Board finds itself involved in the larger issue of whether the Plant should be closed.

The City of San Francisco and the community around the Plant would like to see it closed once the City completes construction of newer and cleaner electrical generating capacity in 2007. The City adopted a resolution to this effect in February, urging the Board to have any permit expire in 2007.

More recently, Mirant, the Plant's current operator, has indicated that it would like to see the permit reissuance deferred. This stems from possible reconsideration of settlement of the State of California's lawsuit against Mirant and other power producers for price gouging.

A key issue for the Board will be the extent to which it wishes to be supportive of the City's efforts. One consideration for this is that the plant has once-through cooling using Bay water, allowed because of a grandfather clause in the state's Thermal Plan. This type of cooling is not as benign as newer technologies such as cooling towers. Another consideration is to what extent the Board should

require Mirant to implement some new technology now to minimize any ongoing water quality impact if the plant is going to close in two years.

Staff is gathering and evaluating the technical information behind these and other issues raised by commentors to the draft permit, and will develop a recommendation for Board consideration this summer.

Public Participation during Site Cleanup (Stephen Hill)
Staff at the State Board and the other water boards have prepared draft guidance for public participation at cleanup sites. The guidance is intended to address the specific needs for public participation in our site cleanup program. As the cleanup program has matured, an increasing portion of the cleanup decisions are made administratively, particularly at lower-threat sites. Water boards tend to hear site cleanup items only when there is some fundamental dispute or when a more formal regulatory action is needed. Currently, our public participation efforts at cleanup sites are tailored to the perceived need, based on the severity of contamination and the degree of public interest. At this Board, we have provided extensive public participation opportunities at a number of sites, including 20 federal Superfund sites and several non-Superfund sites.

The draft guidance retains this "tailored" approach to public participation but provides more explicit criteria for determining the appropriate level of effort. It suggests a minimum level of effort for all cleanup sites, and incorporates specific public participation requirements for leaking underground fuel tanks, Brownfield sites, and other special categories. It integrates these efforts into our existing process, which already provides significant public participation opportunities for matters that come before the Board. It recommends that we request responsible parties to carry out many public participation tasks, while retaining key tasks for Board staff.

State Board staff is organizing a series of public participation training sessions at each of the water boards this spring, with the new guidance as an integral part. The training session in Oakland is scheduled for June. Our office has played a leadership role in this effort, preparing the draft guidance, overseeing review by the other water boards, and helping to organizing the training sessions. Mark Johnson, Chuck Headlee, and Stephen Hill did most of this work.

Recent Public Participation Activities at Board Cleanup Sites (Mark Johnson)
In recent weeks, Water Board staff conducted public participation activities at several cleanup sites. These efforts are focused on sites with identified public interest in cleanup activities and/or site redevelopment.

Union Pacific Rail Spur, East Palo Alto: On March 23, Board and City staff met with affected residents to discuss final grading plans for the rail spur, once soil cleanup has been completed and the land incorporated into their backyards. This follows a prior meeting and site walk with the residents, where grading and drainage of their properties was presented and discussed. The latest grading plan incorporates community comments.

Terminal One, Richmond: On March 30, Board staff presented a summary of site cleanup activities to the Point Richmond Neighborhood Council regarding remedial actions that will be taking place over the next several months at the former Port Terminal. These actions are being regulated pursuant to Site Cleanup Requirements adopted by the Board. Community residents have been quite interested in both the cleanup technologies being applied to the site as well as the planned redevelopment into residential use.

Sherwin-Williams, Emeryville: On April 7, Board staff met with the Park Avenue Neighborhood Association steering committee to discuss the pending cleanup plan. This site has been significantly impacted with arsenic, as well as lead and other organic pollutants and a major cleanup will be needed. Residential and live/work uses are located adjacent to the site, and we anticipate local concerns about potential exposure to contaminants and potential disruption during cleanup activities. Association members had a substantive discussion with staff on the cleanup plan and how their needs would be addressed. A larger community meeting is scheduled for May 5, to discuss the matter further.

Williams Street Yard, San Jose: Board staff has scheduled an April 21 community meeting to present a draft cleanup plan for this former railroad property, which will be converted into a housing development. The proposed cleanup involves the removal and offsite disposal of approximately 40,000 cubic yards of soil, primarily affected with arsenic. We sent a fact sheet in both English and Spanish to the surrounding community to announce the public meeting and comment period for the propose cleanup. Translation services will also be provided for the community meeting.

Brownfield MOA Implementation (Stephen Hill)
Board staff are taking several steps to proactively implement the March 1 Brownfield Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) among Cal/EPA, DTSC, and all water boards. Stephen Hill has met twice with his counterpart at the DTSC/Berkeley office to discuss new cases, in order to determine the appropriate oversight agency in light of the MOA's lead-agency criteria. We are testing a new Cal/EPA database that tracks lead-agency determinations made using these MOA criteria. We are also planning some internal training on MOA implementation. This training will be coordinated with the other water boards. For context, Cal/EPA mandated development of the MOA in order to encourage Brownfield restoration; the MOA standardizes certain aspects of the oversight process and requires that all water boards and DTSC coordinate their efforts at sites where both agencies have interests.

Resolution of Dispute Over Moffett's Hangar 1 (Judy Huang)
Hangar 1, located at the former Moffett Naval Air Station in Mountain View, was constructed to house the airship USS Macon in 1932. The floor of the hangar encompasses approximately 8 acres (~10 football fields) and has an indoor height of 200 feet. The interior of the building is so large that fog sometimes forms near the ceiling.

In 1997, PCBs were detected in sediments in adjacent wetlands that are also used as a stormwater retention pond (called Site 25) for the facility and the runway area. As a result of various source investigations, Hangar 1 was identified as the primary source of the PCBs.

In September 2004, the Navy submitted a draft work plan for the remedial investigation and feasibility study for the final cleanup of Hangar 1. The draft work plan, however, does not include any sampling for lead, asbestos or any analyses of discharges of pollutants from within the interior of the Hangar. The Navy claims that it is against Department of Defense policy and the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) for the Navy to sample from within a building when, in its view, all of the pollutant discharges from the Hangar emanate solely from the exterior of the Hangar. Staff and

counsel for both the Board and U.S. EPA and the community all object to the narrowly defined work plan and interpretation.

On February 17, Board and U.S. EPA staff sent a joint letter to the Navy invoking formal dispute resolution pursuant to the Moffett "Federal Facilities Agreement." In response, Navy requested additional meetings to resolve these issues. On March 17, the Navy, U.S. EPA staff and Water Board staff met and tentatively resolved the issues. Specifically, the Navy has agreed to:

1) Conduct a non-time-critical removal action instead of going through the full requirements of the federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability (or "Superfund") Act. This would accelerate the cleanup process by combining the risk investigation, risk assessment, and remedial action steps;
2) Conduct any necessary investigation both in the interior and exterior of the Hangar, with low detection limits, for the purposes of identifying disposal options as part of the non-time-critical removal actions;
3) Comply with all public involvement requirements as specified in the U.S. EPA's "Guidance on Conducting Non-Time Critical Removal Action"; and
4) Obtain regulatory agency concurrence on the Hangar 1 Non-Time Critical Removal Action Memorandum.

Staff is currently working with the Navy to ensure that all parts of the tentative agreement are met and all reports submitted meet Board requirements.

Staff Updates Boxer and Eshoo Aides on Site 25 Activities at Moffett (Adriana Constantinescu)
On April 7, Board staff John Kaiser and Adriana Constantinescu attended a Site 25 update meeting at the Palo Alto office of Representative Anna Eshoo. In addition to Representative Eshoo's aide, attendees included an aide from Senator Barbara Boxer's office, a representative from Santa Clara County Supervisor Liz Kniss, and representatives from the Navy, U.S. EPA and NASA.

The purpose of the meeting – one of several as a result of a joint Congressional letter issued in August 2003 – was to provide an update of the Site 25 Remedial Investigation / Feasibility Study Draft Addendum under preparation. The addendum includes proposed alternatives regarding remediation and restoration of wetlands at Site 25. Alternatives range from full restoration of Site 25 to a saltwater tidal marsh to partial restoration as seasonal wetland. Once finalized, the report will summarize the various cleanup alternatives considered and conclude with selection of the final preferred alternative. Currently, NASA has indicated its preference for the alternative that involves partial restoration of Site 25 as a tidal marsh concurrent with expansion of Stevens Creek.

Stormwater Runoff and Land Use (Larry Kolb)
Data published recently from Seattle show that the average annual runoff from forested land amounts to 21 percent of the rainwater falling on it, with the rest soaking into the ground. Once that land is converted to suburban residential use, the percentage running off rises to 53 percent, and multifamily use increases the runoff to 64 percent.

This doubling or tripling of runoff explains how new development and other "hardscape" routinely causes downstream flooding and creek channel destruction. Mitigating such impacts through measures to keep more rainwater onsite is one of the major goals of the Board's stormwater program.

Benjamin Franklin Middle School Project Gets Go Ahead (Lila Tang)
I recently approved the work plan for the North San Mateo County Sanitation District's Supplemental Environmental Project. This project was in lieu of a $3,000 mandatory minimum penalty on March's Board agenda. The Benjamin Franklin Middle School Environmental Club in Colma will receive the funds and use them to complete construction of a greenhouse, purchase a composting bin, repair microscopes, and provide transportation, and supplies, for beach cleanup and environmental field trips.

Marin Stormwater Workshop (Marla Lafer)
The 12 municipalities in Marin County have participated in a voluntary storm water program - The Marin County Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (MCSTOPPP) - since the early 1990's. In May 2004, MCSTOPPP received required coverage under the State Board's Phase II General Storm Water Permit. Compliance with the Phase II permit requires all municipalities to implement programs for the control of post-construction storm water runoff. The Phase II permit also specifies additional post-construction requirements for large and fast growing communities. Three Marin municipalities, the cities of San Rafael and Novato, and the County of Marin , are subject to these additional requirements.

In an effort to assist these municipalities, on March 30 Board staff conducted a workshop for municipal staff and consultants at the Marin County Civic Center. Janet O'Hara presented a session on New Development Treatment Controls that included information on swales, bioretention options, permeable pavement, and low impact development. Wendy Edde (a consultant to the Marin program) provided sessions on operation and maintenance requirements for stormwater controls.

Review of Wastewater Treatment Facilities in Tomales Bay Watershed (Farhad Ghodrati)
Domestic wastewater facilities are identified as one of the potential sources of pathogens within the Tomales Bay watershed. In September 2004, Board staff started a team project to evaluate and improve the operation and management of the permitted domestic wastewater facilities within the Tomales Bay watershed. The main goals of this project are to: 1) ensure adequate water quality protection of Tomales Bay watershed; 2) evaluate compliance status of the facilities within the Tomales Bay watershed; 3) improve the management and oversight of the facilities by both the Board and the dischargers; and 4) assist with implementation of the Tomales Bay pathogen TMDL.

The initial scope of this team project includes the eleven domestic wastewater facilities in the Tomales Bay watershed that are permitted by the Board. Future inventory of other treatment facilities within the watershed (those with either no permit or on a County permit) may result in inclusion of additional facilities in this project. We will update you on regular basis as the project progresses.

Artificial Groundwater Recharge Workshop (Sarah Raker)
Sarah Raker attended and was a moderator for the Groundwater Resources Association of California's two-day workshop on groundwater artificial recharge, held in Sacramento on March 16-17. The focus of the workshop was on the use of spreading basins and aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) wells. Water quality issues, policy development, aquifer sustainability, underground storage permits and groundwater recharge as a beneficial use were also addressed. Participants at the workshop represented water districts, water agencies, and state and local regulatory agencies.

Due to increased water demand from our growing population and due to public pressure to limit surface water storage and the creation of dams, there is an increased need for artificial recharge in

California. Artificial recharge has also proven to be considerably more cost-effective than building new surface water reservoirs.

Artificial recharge is the process of storing water in aquifers indirectly through spreading basins, directly through ASR wells, or sometimes directly in permeable stream beds. The source of water is often excess surface water that can be stored during the winter and is extracted during the summer. Water can be stored underground during times of flood or when the water quality is good, and recovered later during emergencies or times of water shortages, or when water quality from the other sources may be poor.

Artificial recharge can also be used to create a saltwater intrusion barrier. Treated wastewater is injected directly into a groundwater aquifer to provide a freshwater barrier to saltwater intruding further into the aquifer. This method is used in coastal areas such as Orange County and locally here in Alameda County near the South Bay salt ponds.

In our Region, spreading basins (known as recharge ponds) are used by Alameda County Water District (ACWD) using water diverted from Alameda Creek, and by Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) throughout Santa Clara Valley. Artificial recharge using ASR wells is being used by SCVWD and by the Zone 7 Water Agency in Livermore Valley (Zone 7), is in the pilot stages by East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) and is also being considered by Yountville. Zone 7 also releases surface water from the State Water Project facilities into tributaries of Alameda Creek for groundwater recharge; ACWD and SCVWD do something similar by constructing temporary dams in the waterways during low flows. These temporary dams are equivalent to in-line spreading basins; concern has been expressed in recent years about their impact on fish and many of them are under consideration for changes and/or removal.

Policy and regulatory issues currently facing artificial recharge projects discussed included impacts of emerging chemicals of concern (e.g., pharmaceuticals, disinfection by-products, etc.), how to permit surface water rights for underground storage projects through the State Board, and whether waste discharge requirements should be issued or waived by the water boards. While artificial recharge is not as significant an issue in our Region as in the other regions of the state, it is an issue that the Board will be involved in from time-to-time, especially as new sources of water become scarcer and more expensive.

In-house Training
Our March training was on meetings – making them efficient and effective. Our April training will be on managing time and clutter. We had three noontime seminars in March: a session on groundwater sampling by Sandy Britt, a session on enhanced anaerobic bio-remediation at a federal site in Sunnyvale by Pawan Sharma, and a session on reaching remedial endpoints by Raj Mahadevaiah.

Staff Presentations
SFSU Science and Engineering Career Fair
On March 9, Mary Rose Cassa, Mark Johnson, and Student Assistant Reynaldo Barrera represented the Water Board at the annual Science and Engineering Career Fair at San Francisco State University. More than 400 students attended the fair, many of which stopped by the Board's table to obtain information about the work we do and how to go about obtaining a state job.

Tomales Bay Stakeholders Meeting
On March 15, Dyan Whyte, Rebecca Tuden, and Farhad Ghodrati conducted a stakeholder meeting in west Marin County to: 1) update stakeholders on the results of our Tomales Bay hydrodynamic modeling study; and 2) discuss and answer questions on the proposed Basin Plan amendment to establish a Tomales Bay Watershed pathogens TMDL. In addition, Matt Brennan, UC Berkeley, presented an overview of the Tomales Bay modeling effort and its results.

Santa Clara Law School's Land Use Class
Dorothy Dickey gave a guest lecture on the state's regulation of wetlands to the Santa Clara Law School's Land Use class on March 22. She also led the class in a role play that encouraged the students to consider some issues regarding fill in wetlands from various perspectives.

Annual Wine Industry Conference
On March 29, Wil Bruhns addressed the Annual Wine Industry Conference in Santa Rosa. He was part of a panel regarding environmental challenges the industry faces. He spoke about upcoming regulatory changes that may have an impact on vineyards, such as the sediment TMDL for the Napa River, and on wineries, such as the State Board's proposed new general industrial stormwater permit

San Jose Meeting on Water-Related Environmental Program
On April 5, Richard McMurtry spoke to 90 local public works/planning department staff from county and city governments in Santa Clara County on the topic of Board programs for stream protection and enhancement. The meeting was sponsored by the City of San Jose's Environmental Services Department to increase local government understanding of state and federal water-related environmental programs and to promote dialogue between the regulators and local government. Local government representatives discussed a series of case studies illustrative of difficult issues. Also making presentations were the Department of Fish and Game, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, NOAA-Fisheries, and the San Francisco Estuary Project.

Cal/EPA Workshops on Brownfields and Screening Levels
On April 13 and 14, Stephen Hill participated in two Cal/EPA workshops on new Brownfield legislation (California Land Reuse and Revitalization Act of 2004) and new statewide screening levels (California Human Health Screening Levels). Cal/EPA hosted a total of three workshops: April 5 in Los Angeles, April 13 in Sacramento, and April 14 in Oakland (in our building). Mr. Hill co-presented information on the new screening levels, explaining why screening levels are useful in the site cleanup process and describing current efforts to expand the scope of the new statewide screening levels. This Board's environmental screening levels provided the impetus for development of the new statewide screening levels.