

**Los Angeles County MS4 Permit
Watershed Management Programs Technical Advisory Committee
(TAC)**

Meeting Notes: July 24, 2013

(Compiled by Alicia Jensen, City of Walnut and James Carlson, City of Sierra Madre;
consolidated and edited by Renee Purdy, LA Regional Board)

Regional Board (RB) Staff convened meeting at 1:00 pm

Introductions Made (see attached sign-in sheet)

Overview of Purpose / Role of TAC

- RB Executive Officer Sam Unger introduced the discussion. TAC is advisory in nature; the TAC as envisioned should provide input on the suite of models/technical approaches (including the range of data input values) used to develop WMPs/EWMPs, including requirements and expectations of the Reasonable Assurance Analysis (“RAA”)
- RB Staff (“Board Staff”) Renee Purdy followed up by adding that one of the purposes of the TAC was to help promote consistency with the large number of WMP/EWMP plans that are to be submitted
- Discussion -- A WMP/EWMP Representative (“Rep”) asked for clarification on the roles and provided an example that if an EWMP wants to choose an “alternative path” and the TAC disagrees, then how would it be mediated? RB Staff reminded everyone that RB staff is a member of the TAC. RB Staff indicated that there would always be an effort to strive for a consensus, but there may end up being a decision that would have to be made by the Regional Board. The Rep followed up by asking if it would be possible that the Regional Board would say “no” at a later date even if the TAC agreed on a particular technical issue, and RB Staff responded that it is possible but not very likely since RB staff as members of the TAC would likely indicate their disagreement through the TAC meetings. Ultimately, the Regional Board does have the final decision as the agency approving the WMPs/EWMPs.
- RB Staff indicated that the TAC is not the end-all/be-all of stakeholder of public input and that each WMP/EWMP group should have its own stakeholder process.
- A Rep asked for further clarification that the TAC is intended to focus on science and not legal or compliance opinions, which was confirmed by RB Staff. RB staff ended the topic by stating that the “TAC is as its name indicates, it is technical not legal”.
- A Rep asked whether a member of the EPA is going to be attending. RB Staff indicated that they were unable to attend this meeting but understand that they are committed to this process going forward.

TAC Meeting Structure

RB Staff introduced this topic by pointing to the draft guidelines that were distributed, specifically page 2 that recommended a Chair and Vice Chair for the TAC.

Chair:

- Discussion (RB Staff indicated that the RB Staff would be willing to act as Chair. When a Rep asked why this would be a good idea, there was discussion that RB Staff have broad interests that would not be associated to just one watershed. A Rep confirmed that RB Staff would be the best to chair the TAC, and pointed out that their position as Chair should not be overwhelmed by “side-arguments”; that they would lead and keep the discussions focused. There was discussion that RB Staff however could not be expected to be an “on-the-spot” decision maker.
- ACTION: Group agreed to have RB Staff serve as Chair of TAC

Vice Chair:

- Discussion on filling the role of Vice Chair. Initial thoughts were to have Vice Chair share Chair responsibilities.
- Rotation discussed, but TAC will exist only until all WMPs/EWMPs are reviewed and submitted to the Regional Board so there is not really enough time to rotate the position in a meaningful way
- Interested persons may e-mail their names to RB Staff (Renee). Nominations will be accepted (if nominee is in agreement)
- Suggestion made to have RB Staff serve as Vice Chair
- Suggestion made to forgo the Vice Chair position
- ACTION: TAC to consider at next meeting (to be placed on agenda)

Notes:

- No volunteers
- Alternative suggestions were to rotate the task among the representatives
- Suggestion made that all who take notes should submit them to RB Staff (Renee) to be condensed into a meeting summary
- ACTION: TAC to consider at next meeting (to be placed on agenda)

Facilitator:

- Suggestion made from group member to have a facilitator to keep group on track and avoid confrontation
- Discussion among group. Suggestions made included 1) it should be a neutral person with no bias, and 2) preferably someone with a background in storm water
- ACTION: Conclusion reached that RB Staff will look for a potential Facilitator to have available should there be a need based on 1) technical topics, and/or 2) tone of discussions. State Water Board would be a possible source.

Representatives & Alternates

- Discussion concerning how the role of representatives and alternates would be determined. Discussion regarding need to keep the “working group” a manageable size to have productive dialogue and decision making ability.
- Agreed that each entity with a representative have a single person “at the table” -- Representatives are to attend, Alternates to attend in their absence

- If neither Representative nor Alternate can attend, the entity they represent will forgo input at that meeting (no proxy will be permitted)
- Generally agreed that there should be space for “observers”, which could be the alternate, consultants, or other interested parties. However, observers may not participate in discussions or vote
- One representative pointed out that there could be many occasions in which a representative “at the table” would want or need information from their consultant regarding the discussion. A number of possibilities were discussed regarding this point including “ceding” time to a consultant or basically informally asking the other members at the table if a consultant could be asked to provide information or clarification. ACTION: to be addressed at the next meeting.

Subcommittees:

- Discussion
- Subcommittees could be formed by topic
- Results of Subcommittee to be presented to entire TAC group
- Representatives and Alternates interested in a particular Subcommittee could both serve
- Experts (i.e. consultants) could be brought in to the Subcommittee to provide input/advice
- Subcommittees could be formed on an as-needed basis

Consultants:

- Discussion on whether or not to include consultants in TAC meetings during technical reviews
- If to include, how might the TAC include them on behalf of a group during technical discussions.
 - TAC may consider putting consultants on the agenda or having them address the group on an as-needed basis
- TAC to consider at next meeting (to be placed on agenda; See also above on “Representatives & Alternates”)

Key Technical Issues:

- RB Staff suggested three primary issues for the TAC
 1. Reasonable Assurance Analysis guidance and modeling
 2. Criteria for the comprehensive identification/evaluation of opportunities for multi-benefit regional projects in EWMPs
 3. Monitoring Programs (there was some discussion if this would be an appropriate TAC area for comment/review, since the permit language directs the TAC to review only the WMPs/EWMPs and not IMPs or CIMPs)
- Discussion -- The attendees discussed a number of topics that could be considered “key” for the TAC’s work. There was general agreement that the RAA (which will have many questions regarding modeling and BMP performance input values), EWMPs and their “comprehensive evaluation of opportunities for multi-benefit regional retention projects”, monitoring and MCMs (the balance between allowing customization and

preserving group consistency) were all mentioned. Also, a couple of representatives asked that there possibly be the use of templates across the board of major submittals, which would also assist in WMP development and ultimately the review process. A representative from the County also asked that the mapping and "HUD12" questions be addressed by the TAC in future review.

- ACTION: TAC will begin to discuss RAA at next meeting

Meeting Frequency:

- Discussion -- Representatives agreed that early in the development of WMPs/EWMPs was important for the TAC to meet frequently so that technical input, models and acceptable criteria are available to agencies as soon as possible
- ACTION: Agreement to meet approximately monthly at this point in time, more frequently if and when needed
- Room availability is a question. Those with conflicts or day/time exclusions should e-mail RB Staff (Renee). RB Staff will work with LACDPW staff to coordinate meeting space.
- ACTION: County will confirm meeting space, and email the information regarding future meeting dates / times to the representatives and alternates.
- **August meeting tentatively set for Wednesday, August 28 at 12:30-3:00 PM at LA County Department of Public Works. However, RB will confirm August meeting day/time/location with TAC**

Adjournment: 3:00 pm