# Geosyntec<sup>(</sup> consultants

## Use of SBPAT for Compliance with San Diego County Bacteria TMDLs:

A Discussion on Comprehensive Load Reduction Plans

Presentation to Los Angeles MS4 Permit Group Watershed Management Program Technical Advisory Committee Reasonable Assurance Subcommittee

Ken Susilo, Geosyntec Consultants October 17, 2013 Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Alhambra, CA

# SAN DIEGO RIVER WATERSHED



## 20 BEACHES AND CREEKS TMDL FOR INDICATOR BACTERIA

- Bacteria TMDL
  - Wet Weather and Dry Weather
  - TMDL Developed 2002, like SMB
  - Compliance year 1993 (90th pctl)
- Compliance Metrics
  - No guidance on compliance metrics (assumed to be AED, like Los Angeles/SMB TMDLs)

Table 6.3

- Subsequent (post-submittal) staff-level direction was AEF
- Subesquent direction included (with 2013 MS4 Permit) Load Reduction alternative

#### • Project Schedule (very aggressive)

- Kickoff June 2011
- Priorities established; Structural BMPs identified; Baseline Loads; EMCs modified Nov 2011
- Preliminary CLRP iteration Dec 2011
- Draft Monsitoring Plan Feb 2012
- 2nd complete CLRP iteration Mar 2012
- Final iteration/Agency Draft May 2012
- Final Agency Draft June 2012 (1 year)
- Submittals to RWQCB October 2012

		Load-Based Effluent Limitations					
Watershed	Watershed	Dry Weather			Wet Weather		
Management Areas	and Water Bodies	Total Coliform	Fecal Coliform	Entero- coccus	Total Coliform	Fecal Coliform	Entero- coccus
San Diego River	Mission San Diego HSA (907.11) and Santee HSA (907.12) - Pacific Ocean Shoreline - Forrester Creek (lower 1 mile) - San Diego River (lower 6 miler)	74.03%	69.44%	93.96%	38.14%	53.22%	42.74% (42.47%)*

## COMPREHENSIVE LOAD REDUCTION PLANNING (CLRP) OVERVIEW

**OBJECTIVES:** 

- Provide a decision support tool and roadmap for BMP/CIP planning
- Model watersheds to estimate/predict pollutant loads, targets, and benefits
- Incorporate agency-specific preferences; even if divergent within watershed
- Model implementation activities to assess compliance & costs;
- Understand areas of variability and uncertainty



## **CLRP APPROACH OVERVIEW**

- CLRP is "comprehensive" in that it addresses nitrogen and phosphorous in addition to FIB;
- Process includes opportunities for input in prioritization, opportunity development, and levels of implementation;
- Quantitative analysis allows for updating with new and/or site specific data;
- CLRP presents a suite of BMPs, both non-structural and structural (SBPAT);
- Plan allows for phased implementation over 18.5 year timeframe; and

## CONSIDERING POTENTIAL BMPS (NONSTRUCTURAL)





## PRIORITY POTENTIAL BMP STRATEGIES (NONSTRUCTURAL)

#### Non-Structural BMP Types

Identification and control of sewage discharge to MS4

Homelessness Waste Management Program

**Onsite Wastewater Treatment System Source Reduction** 

Irrigation Runoff Reduction & Good Landscaping Practices

Commercial/Industrial Good Housekeeping

Residential/Small-Scale LID Incentive Program

Pet Waste Program

**Animal Facilities Management** 

Street and Median Sweeping

MS4 Cleaning

**Redevelopment and LID Implementation** 







## NONSTRUCTURAL BMP QUANTIFICATION (PET WASTE EXAMPLE)



## NONSTRUCTURAL BMP QUANTIFICATION (PET WASTE EXAMPLE)



## POTENTIAL BMP STRATEGIES (STRUCTURAL)

#### Structural BMP Types

Infiltration Basins, Trenches and Galleries

Bioretention

Dry Wells or Hybrid Bioretention/Dry Wells

Permeable Pavements

Capture and Use Rainwater Harvesting

Constructed Wetland/Wetpond

Subsurface Flow Wetlands

Creek Enhancement

Biofiltration with or without Underdrain

Trash Separators

Planter Boxes

Green Streets



Infiltration

Natural Treatment or Filtration

## **BASIS FOR SELECTING MODELING TOOLS**

#### Modeling tool needs to:

- Allow for accelerated development of draft solutions;
- Be appropriate for levels of data available
- Be easy to update with new data (LU EMCs, Effluent Data, Land Uses)
- Be transparent in both process and analysis;
- Provide output to support risk-based decisions, acknowledging differing compliance risks of individual MS4s;
- Capture uncertainty and variability;
- Have a discharger/permittee/implementation-focus;
- Consider site-specific approaches & estimates
- One tool among many (i.e. Local MS4 input, BPJ).
- Models considered: SBPAT, SUSTAIN, SWMM.



#### **SBPAT MONTE CARLO PROCESS**



## AGENCY INPUT/PREFERENCES AT KEY MILESTONES IN THE PROCESS

- Water Quality Emphasis/Priorities
  - Bacteria, Nutrients, other
  - TMDL, 303(d)-list, level of emphasis
- BMP Siting Preferences (Land ownership, interjurisdictional issues)
- Risk Tolerance
- Financial Constraints
- Coordination with Existing/Current Land Plans





Figure 7. Average fecal coliform results during dry weather in SDR Watershed.





Figure 15. Design criteria for SDCo-R-D-1

20

Figure 17. Design criteria for MJ-R-D-1

# REGIONAL BMP EXAMPLE SUMMARY OUTPUT

Table 12. Structural BMP (regional) pollutant reduction				
	Water Quality (FIB-FC Load) Benefits (10^12 MPN reduction/year)		Water Quality (Nitrate Load) Benefits (Ib reduction/year)	Water Quality (TP Load) Benefits (lb reduction/year)
	WY 1993	Annual Average	Annual Average	Annual Average
	[Low - High]	[Low - High Years]	[Low - High Years]	[Low - High Years]
SDCo-R-04	8	6	62	22
	[7 - 9]	[3 - 7]	[38 - 78]	[16 - 28]
SDCo-R-05	14	9	143	39
	[11 - 16]	[6 - 12]	[87 - 180]	[28 - 50]
SDCo-R-06	27	18	403	111
	[21 - 30]	[11 - 23]	[246 - 508]	[80 - 141]
O-R-06	55	41	492	134
	[43 - 62]	[25 - 52]	[300 - 620]	[97 - 171]
O-R-08	10	6	65	21
	[8 - 11]	[4 - 8]	[39 - 82]	[15 - 26]
O-R-10	16	11	112	36
	[12 - 18]	[7 - 14]	[68 - 141]	[26 - 46]
O-R-11	25	18	807	116
	[19 - 28]	[11 - 22]	[492 - 1,017]	[84 - 147]
MJ-R-01	490	329	35,000	4,440
	[382 - 549]	[204 - 415]	[21,350 - 44,100]	[3,197 - 5,639]
MJ-R-02	14	10	114	35
	[11 - 15]	[6 - 13]	[70 - 144]	[25 - 45]
MJ-R-04	43	30	466	136
	[34 - 48]	[19 - 38]	[284 - 587]	[98 - 172]
Total	701	478	37,663	5,091
	[547 - 786]	[296 - 602]	[22,974 - 47,456]	[3,665 - 6,465]

<sup>1</sup>Range of WY1993 and annual water quality benefits represent 25<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> percentile SBPAT results. Range

21

## DISTRIBUTED BMP EXAMPLES (INCLUDES GREEN STREETS)





Table 11. Modeled Distributed BMPs<sup>1,2,3</sup>

Jurisdiction	Location/Name	BMPs Planned	Assumed Drainage Area (acres)	Catchment ID
County of San Diego	Bradley Avenue/SR67 Interchange	Curb Inlet Filters	$NA^4$	1463
County of San Diego	Woodside Avenue	Curb Inlet Filters	NA	1185
County of San Diego	Flinn Springs Road at Oak Creek Road	Curb Inlet Filters/ Bioretention Swale	NA	1051
City of San Diego	Allied Gardens, 5155 Greenbrier Ave	Green Lot- Filtration	NA	2397
City of San Diego	Park Ridge Blvd, south of Murray Park Dr	Hydrodynamic Separator	NA	2278
City of San Diego	Cabrillo Heights Watershed Protection, 8308 Hurlbut St	Rain Garden	NA	2437
City of Santee	Fanita Parkway, Between Mast and Ganley	Wet Ponds	309	3200, 3201
City of Santee	San Diego River Trail - East project	Bioretention Swale	180	3210, 3211,3801
City of Santee	Mast Park West	3 - Bioretention Projects	100	3202
City of Santee	Woodglen Vista Park Improvement	Bioretention Project	100	3197
City of Santee	Mission Creek Drive & Mission Creek Trail	2 - Bioretention Projects	120	3237
City of Santee	Magnolia Avenue, County Parcel	Bioretention Project	230	3260
City of Santee	Blackhorse Estates - proposed retrofit	Detention Basin with infiltration	40	3263
City of Santee	Ladera (Morning View) Basin	Detention Basin with infiltration	20	3264
City of Santee	Sycamore Creek – Right of Way	Bioretention Swale	37	3212
City of Santee	Shoredale Basin	Detention Basin	15	3206

#### Geosyntec<sup>></sup>



Figure 24. Dry weather flow area treated by proposed structural BMPs

## SCHEMATIC DEMONSTRATION OF INTERIM COMPLIANCE



## COSTS (PRELIMINARY PLANNING OPINIONS-SDR)



Table ES-3. 20-Year Cost Estimate to Achieve Bacteria TMDL Compliance in 2011 Dollars

Cost Category	Lower Limit (\$M)	Upper Limit (\$M)
Nonstructural BMPs	\$38M	\$104M
Infrastructure Improvement	\$144M	\$423M
Regional Structural BMPs	\$59M	\$141M
Distributed Structural BMP	s \$66M	\$219M
Stream Restoration Projects	\$42M	\$42M
Dry-Weather Diversion/Treatment	\$19M	\$43M
Private Property BMPs <sup>1</sup>	\$216M	\$360M
Special Studies	\$3M	\$6.5M
Monitoring	\$3M	\$3M
Total Cost Estimates	\$590M	\$1,340M

<sup>1</sup> Private property BMPs are an optional strategy and may be considered at the discretion of individual jurisdictions if needed to meet load reduction targets.

## **COSTS (REGIONAL COST BREAKDOWN)**

Table 25. Regional Structural BMP Costs				
	Preliminary Range of Potential	Preliminary Range of		
Location/Name	Capital Costs	Potential O&M Costs		
	(2011 \$)	(2011 \$)		
SDCo-R-D-1	\$9,800,000 - \$32,600,000	\$200,000 - \$700,000		
SDCo-R-D-2	\$1,700,000 - \$4,800,000	\$100,000 - \$300,000		
MJ-R-D-1	\$9,800,000 - \$32,800,000	\$430,000 - \$900,000		
CoSD-R-D-1	\$26,700,000 - \$45,400,000	\$830,000 - \$2,800,000		
CoSD-R-D-2	\$4,900,000 - \$7,600,000	\$120,000 - \$400,000		
CoSD-R-D-4	\$1,600,000 - \$2,400,000	\$40,000 - \$100,000		
MJ-R-D-4	\$1,300,000 - \$4,300,000	\$280,000 - \$900,000		
CoS-R-D-2	\$900,000 - \$2,900,000	\$100,000 - \$300,000		
CoS-R-D-3	\$300,000 - \$1,000,000	\$10,000 - \$50,000		
Totals	\$57,000,000 - \$134,000,000	\$2,000,000 - \$7,000,000		

#### Retrofit factor 2.0 to 4.0

## WATER QUALITY BENEFITS AND UNCERTAINTIES SAN DIEGO RIVER WATERSHED (ULTIMATE)

BMP CATEGORY		FC Load Reduction (10 <sup>12</sup> MPN/YEAR) 1993 WY Load <sup>1</sup> [Low-High Range]		
Non-Structural BMPs	High	nest	2,000 [710 -3,300]	
Regional Structural BMPs	Varia	bility	870 [500 -1,000]	
Distributed Structural BMPs			1,400 [780 – 1,600]	
Stream Restoration Projects		110 [25 – 190]		
Subtotal		4,400 [2,000 -6,100]		
Load Reduction Adjustment		-500 [-220 to -730]		
Load Reduction Effective Fraction		0.28 [0.23 - 0.34]		
Load Reduction Sum		1,100 [410 -1,800]		
TARGET LOAD REDUCTION		1,750		

## **UNCERTAINTIES WITH CLRP**

- Hydrology (historical unadjusted <u>rainfall</u> statistics available)
- LU EMCs (statistical distributions, continuously augmented)
- BMP Performance (<u>statistical distributions</u>, continuously augmented)
- Non-structural BMPs effectiveness
- Interactions between non-structural and structural BMPs
- Impacts of non-permitted (non responsible parties) in watershed
- Compliance monitoring variability (STV vs. SSM/GM)

## LESSONS LEARNED

- Pick modeling methods that can accept new data, and that improves as a result.
- Include responsible parties in each step.
- Have schedule that allows for changes and new data.
- Agree upon decision framework (meet regularly and build on previous meeting).
- Do not depend too heavily on any model, pick an appropriate model for analyses, and understand areas of uncertainty.

# **NEXT STEPS**

- Water Quality Improvement Plans (WQIP) – 2013 MS4 Permit
- Preliminary Structural BMP Designs
- Non-structural BMP
  Implementation
- Microbial Source Tracking and Human Marker Monitoring
- Reevaluate TMDLs/Models
- ACHIEVE COMPLIANCE!

- Updated BMP
  Preferences
- Expanded Study Areas
- All Impairments
  Addressed
- More Active Stakeholder Process
- Consultation Panels
- Reevaluation of Targets (e.g., WY)
- Nonstructural BMP requantification
- Integration with other Models (LSPC)

# NEXT STEPS (WQIP MODELING)

For San Diego River WQIP Modeling, a paired modeling analysis just initiated:

- LSPC to establish updated target load reductions for MS4 areas in entire watershed (SD Permit includes LSPC modeled load reductions).
- Check/Compare load estimates (SDR)
- SBPAT to
  - Establish/confirm water quality priorities (with monitoring data)
  - Refine/adjust implementation activities for expanded areas and for all 303(d) listed impairments;
  - Quantify load reductions and benefits
- LSPC or SBPAT or other method to reevaluate in-stream and/or largescale regional BMP performance

Baseline Loads (FC)	LSPC (WY 2003)	SBPAT (WY 2003)
25 <sup>th</sup> Pctl		1x10 <sup>15</sup> MPN
Average	~2x10 <sup>15</sup> MPN (avg)	2x10 <sup>15</sup> MPN (50 <sup>th</sup> pctl) 3x10 <sup>15</sup> MPN (avg.)
75 <sup>th</sup> Pctl.		4x10 <sup>15</sup> MPN





Ken Susilo, PE, D.WRE, CPSWQ <u>ksusilo@geosyntec.com</u> 310-946-9009