Urban Runoff Management Overview

- Clarification: This strategy reflects the direction towards viewing discharges of wet water flows as a resource that we need to protect. It distinguishes between bright water flows (car washing, irrigation flows) and storm runoff. The approach to dealing with flows from the urban environment is moving from a flood control to water quality process. Cognizant of urbanization process (increased flows and velocities during wet season), infiltration requirements for new development. This chapter deals with the fact that, since early 1990s, urban areas are subject to NPDES permits for storm sewer systems, and reducing pollutants to the amount practicable.
- If you could infiltrate a significant amount, this could perhaps augment supplies.
- Costs are all over the board – people don't account for practices in the same way. Santa Monica has dry treatment facility that is effective, and also costly.
- Not all programs are very well integrated. They are currently housed in public works, needs to be addressed through planning – especially for new development. Protecting recharge, this is where planning comes into play. Don't want to build over recharge zones. Perhaps explain this in the text.

Urban Runoff Management in California

- Box 1, bullet #2: Environmental quality and social well-being relates to all strategies; bullet #3 should include enhancement and restoration, like the first bullet
- Clarification: Rinsate is rinsewater.
- Box 2, natural catastrophes: Should we be listing things that are controllable? Need to recognize that we might want to put in control measures for pollution sources.
- If stormwater is to be used locally, how is it managed? Are there energetic costs? How does this water become available for use?
- Provide additional description about types of projects and programs. Say more about onsite capture and reuse. Stormwater reuse can involve treatment in grassy swales.
- On the topic of treatment – how much treatment is needed? From transportation perspective, this is a big deal for CalTrans. Highways have responsibilities for managing runoff. Perhaps that can be captured for reuse.

Benefits of Urban Runoff Management

- Cite numbers about harvesting levels. Can that be extended on a statewide basis to show the range of water that might be available?
- Perhaps that can be done for major metropolitan areas: Fresno has extensive collection efforts, as does Orange County and other small efforts.

Issues Facing Urban Runoff Management

- One issue is inconsistency of implementation between Regional Boards, these are still fairly new regulations that are changing and evolving.
- Add issue of groundwater quantity. NPDES permit requires recharge onsite as much as possible. This can have impacts on slope stability issues, especially in areas where there is over-irrigation (of lawns).There are positive and negative issues associated with infiltration, for soil composition and stability. Inappropriate infiltration/irrigation has caused landslides.

- In San Diego, build out has occurred on steep slopes near irrigation. Over-irrigation results in loads 400 – 500 times greater than normal precipitation. Zoning regulations should specify soils or percentage slope for lawns, to be conducive to use.
- Show how this strategy integrates with other RMS. Take last sentence from first major issue (lack of integration) and expand into it's own section, similar to what was done in flood management strategies.
- Look at the impediments to funding, as well as options for generate funding or generate existing funding. Water quality is more of a regional matter, tourism – funding may be more difficult than where local benefits are more apparent; who are beneficiaries and contributors?
- Prop 218 affects available funding. In offering up a solution, not sure how political the recommendations should be.

Recommendations to Move Urban Runoff Management Forward

- Recommendations should flow directly from issues or benefits. There needs to be a direct nexus with the rest of the chapter.
- In recommendations, be clear about who is responsible for what.
- Need mention of water agency role (either wholesalers or retailers) – for water conservation, reduction of water waste, motivations for water users. Create a tighter nexus of water waste – that's an opportunity in many ways.
- Need mention of individual homeowners. What would it take to give homeowners a choice? (e.g. using porous concrete). How do we give people choices? For individual homeowners, the biggest issue is retrofit. They are willing to make changes. Santa Monica provides vendor lists.
- Include integration with IRWMPs (local agencies recommendation). State can also emphasize guidance in IRWMPs for urban runoff management
- Should there be an effort to support efforts to fix Prop 218? For example, exempting stormwater management, as for sewer (sanitary sewer, not storm sewer) – including an interpretation for sewer and storm water. Offer as needed new legislation for exemption. Brownley's bill for expanding uses through flood control districts.
- Look at Water Board Strategic Plan regional workshops comments – anything to pull into here? Look at what was incorporated into Strategic Plan.

Facilitation action item: Look at companion plan language for recommendations.

- Recommendation #8: acknowledge that there are areas that don't have that option.
- Recommendation #9, include looking at what is happening upstream or upslope, as well as impacts to downstream areas.

BMPs

- Recommendation #9 (third and fourth bullets): How do we become aware of technology, projects, and ordinances? For BMP efficacy, Cal Trans does third-party independent testing and rates BMP effectiveness. (IBF consulting is managing CalTrans' BMP programs and may be able to help provide information.)

Facilitation action item: Check with CalTrans on this companion plan document.

- Provide links to CalTrans and CalSWA for third party review – efficiencies are close to what the vendor represents them to be; not appropriate at every site; just because listed, approver still responsible for determining what's acceptable. (Will provide links to State/Federal agency lists and weblinks.)
- Land use planners want to know what's proven. The Air Quality management program has a list of approved best available control technology. Projects are put in place, then monitored. The State is not precluded from doing that in other areas. (Differentiate between certification and verifying vendor claims.)
- Instead of getting into details, create a recommendation that there needs to be a clearinghouse for BMPs. This doesn't contradict what we've been talking about. There is value in raising awareness and sources of information for getting data on BMPs.
- Recommend that State should maintain list of effective BMPs and support research that backs up BMPs – this is a big deal for development in the South.
- Some BMPs have been proven to not be as effective as emerging technologies – don't want to inhibit innovation that enhances the practice. That can be the down side. For difficult sites, latitude is needed for new approaches.
- Look at Low Impact Development BMPs: porous surfaces, point to water use efficiency.
- It might be helpful or important for identifying which BMPs might have impacts for future climate change.

Facilitator action item: Coordinate with the Land Use subgroup of the Climate Action Team.

- Where appropriate, relate strategies to AB 32 implementation. Using information in different venues.

Other Comments

Comment: It is difficult to access data from Regional Board NPDES programs. Watershed groups trying to get data to establish watershed management programs.

Comment: Standards are provided in a water quality database that is available to all.

Summary

Review: In moving this document forward, the group is asking for a little more expansion on:

- types of projects, issues, costs
- structural impacts of current bond language
- a clearinghouse for quality information for homeowners and agencies

There is also a desire to reframe the chapter, with additional discussion on supply, IRWMs, incentives for retrofit, and cost data.

Participants

Sara Agahi, County of San Diego
Beverly Anderson, Dept. of Insurance
Barbara Cameron, Malibu Grants Coordinator
Bruce Fujimoto, SWRCB
Jennifer Hadra, CA Urban Water Agencies
Mike Hardesty, Central Valley Flood Control Association
Pal Hegedus, RBF Consulting
Bob Languell, SWRCB
Melanie Powers, CABY
David Sypnieski, OpenFairway.com
Iovanka Todt, FMA
Lorraine White, CA Energy Commission
Steven Winkler, Winkler Family Farms (vineyards)
Betty Yee, Region 5 Water Board

DWR and Facilitation Staff
Abi Aderonmu, DWR
Paul Dabbs, DWR
Tom Filler, DWR
Ted Frink, DWR
Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR
Ray Hoagland, DWR
Lew Moeller, DWR
Jim Wilde, DWR
Lisa Beutler, CCP
Judie Talbot, CCP