

Impervious Surface Data Collection Workshop
California Regional Water Quality Control Board
San Francisco Bay
9:00 to 12:00
Tuesday, October 11, 2005
Room 11, 2nd Floor of Elihu M. Harris Building
1515 Clay Street, Oakland

1. Introductions
2. Opening Remarks (Dr. Lawrence Kolb, Assistant Executive Officer, Water Board)
3. Background of this workshop and other future workshops by Water Board (Shin-Roei Lee, South Bay Watershed Division, Water Board)
4. Review management questions (see attached) and framework for addressing these questions (Sandia Potter, Workshop Facilitator, Water Board)
5. Impervious Surface Data Collection
 - a. Review of existing data from Santa Clara County (Sue Ma, Water Resource Control Engineer, Water Board)
 - b. Other on-going efforts (Dr. Jack Gregg – impervious surface tracking for Non-Point Source program at California Coastal Commission, Dr. Lester McKee – storm drain systems mapping by SFEI, others?)
 - c. Identify any other existing sources of data (workshop participants) – If possible, please share with the group a copy of the form used, the type of info. collected, the length of time of the data set, the estimated costs associated with the data collection, how data are used, etc.
 - d. Completeness of the existing data and options of collecting additional data
 - e. Summarize lessons learned and agree on next steps
6. Conclusions (Shin-Roei Lee)

Management Questions Relative to Impervious Surface Data Collection

- ***Why collect the data?***
 - ***How will the data be used?***
 - ***Why collect the data now?***
 - ***What is the link to water quality?***
 - ***What existing data are available?***
 - ***What would the costs/benefits be for collecting additional data?***
1. How could the data be translated into credit toward waste load allocation?
 2. How could the data be used to measure stormwater program (or other programs) effectiveness?
 3. How to use the data to prioritize stormwater management activities?
 4. Where would reduction in imperviousness (and decreases in drainage density) have large cumulative benefits in terms of groundwater recharge and storage?
 5. How could the data be used to create incentives to reduce imperviousness in watersheds?
 6. What information is there to suggest if there is any link between imperviousness and water quality?
 7. What is the relative magnitude of projected impervious surface increase due to small parcels (less than 10,000 square feet of impervious surface) compared to parcels having greater than 10,000 square feet of new/replaced impervious surface in the county as a whole and in each community?
 8. If the percentage increase due to small parcels is significant (say 30-50%) of the total, is it feasible (economically, public acceptance) to require pollutant and flow controls on smaller parcels? What incentives are there to control pollutant and flow impacts?
 9. If it is not feasible to address stormwater discharges from impervious surface increases from small parcels, what can be done to mitigate for the projected increase in pollutant loads and erosive forces? How would that be paid for?
 10. Is it necessary to collect the data for all projects and from everywhere in the region?
 11. At what stage in the local approval process should the data be collected?
 12. How could existing data be used to make a credible estimate of the relative magnitude of projected impervious surface increase due to small parcels (less than 10,000 square feet of impervious surface) compared to parcels having greater than 10,000 square feet of new/replaced impervious surface in the region as a whole?

13. How would the data be used in the future Municipal Regional Permit?
14. Under what conditions do impervious surface increases contribute to pollutant loads or erosive forces in creeks? Under what conditions do impervious surface increases not contribute to pollutant loads or erosive forces in creeks?
15. To what degree are the discharges from existing imperviousness contributing to pollutant loads and/or erosive forces in creeks?