

**Model Ocean Discharge Monitoring Workshop
Meeting Minutes - Questions and Answers
Sacramento, California: May 5, 2005**

QUESTION: Will bioaccumulation be included in the model monitoring program?

ANSWER: Depends on the data you are looking for. Data for wildlife protection and data for human health require different approaches and are the responsibility of different agencies. Bioaccumulation is used in trend monitoring. OEHHA is an agency responsible for human health. State and Regional Boards still regulate the human health standards.

QUESTION: Should storm water take "effluent" in ocean plan to be equivalent to storm water runoff?

ANSWER: RPA is not applicable to storm water BMPs. Effluent monitoring for storm water has been required.

QUESTION: Is there a link between storm water and CIWQS?

ANSWER: No, hasn't been suggested. Focus of SWAMP has been on bays and inland water. Plan is to integrate ocean plan and SWAMP.

QUESTION: What would the process of implementation look like?

ANSWER: Possibilities:

- By discharge type
- By region

State water board is currently reviewing comments.

Suggestion: add language to ocean plan appendix III for dischargers doing monitoring.

Response: broaden plan and include language emphasizing risk-based approach.

Suggestion: permit monitoring should determine if standards are being met and if beneficial uses are being protected.

QUESTION: Will this model reduce monitoring/protect beneficial uses?

ANSWER: Some elements turned out to be "cost-neutral," some money, some monitoring was being done.

Model modeling program focuses on cumulative monitoring, not just on individual discharges.

Suggestion: Include protection beneficial uses as part of model monitoring program.

QUESTION: Include flexibility of model monitoring program in ocean plan?

ANSWER: Ambient monitoring done on regional basis.

Suggestion: Look regionally and strategically.

Partnership has been formed to monitor storm water. Scripps is lead agency. Coastal conservancy, SCCWRP and NASA are also partners.

QUESTION: Where should monitoring be done to comply with RPA?

ANSWER: RPA focuses on sampling effluent and should be representative of discharge bacteria measurements that are receiving water.

QUESTION: Was there a cost savings from implementing program?

ANSWER: Money saved has been reinvested into special studies.

Goal: to make monitoring programs cost-effective. RPA should help reduce some of the cost, especially for some larger POTWs. May be more expensive for some of the smaller dischargers.

Note: monitoring requirements permit limit cost-effective does not necessarily mean less expensive.

For RPA: if you don't have averaging period, use the data you have.

QUESTION: Revise ocean plan to include more realistic averaging periods?

ANSWER: Numbers are historic and state water board has not moved to convert to something more compatible with EPA.

PROCESS OF IMPLEMENTATION

QUESTION: Separate small and large POTWs and storm water?

Response: Keep POTWs and storm water together.

- Separate into smaller stakeholder groups and then come back together before changing ocean plan.
- This model implementation has been different for small and large POTWs and storm water. The questions and how they are regulated varies.
- The approach of the model is the same.
- Have more large stakeholders meetings before breaking into subgroups.
- Keep small and large POTWs together.
- Regional monitoring for POTWs and storm water is same; core monitoring is different.
- Separate into subgroups for core monitoring questions.
- Have large stakeholders group to address regional questions.

Action: Have meetings in other parts of the state.