

---

## State Water Resources Control Board

### AGENDA FOR PUBLIC WORKSHOP

#### MUNICIPAL STORM WATER PERMITS RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS LANGUAGE

**November 20, 2012 – 9:00 a.m.**

By public notice dated [October 10, 2012](#), the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) announced a public workshop on the receiving water limitations language in municipal storm water permits. The State Water Board also circulated an Issue Paper. The public workshop is scheduled as follows:

**November 20, 2012 - 9:00 a.m.**  
**Joe Serna Jr. Cal/EPA Headquarters Building**  
**Coastal Hearing Room**  
**1001 I Street, Second Floor**  
**Sacramento, CA 95814**

The public workshop may additionally be viewed via webcast at:  
<http://epanet.ca.gov/Broadcast/>

The notice and Issue Paper are available at:  
[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/stormwater/rwl.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/rwl.shtml)

To promote a productive and efficient public workshop in which all participants have an opportunity to participate, the State Water Board will conduct the workshop in accordance with the attached agenda.

In addition to a staff presentation, the State Water Board has designated two panels for presentations to the Board and is requesting that the panelists at a minimum address certain specified questions. The Board has also provided for ten-minute presentations by certain stakeholders and their representatives listed under agenda item 3 below.

All other participants will be allowed five minutes to make a policy statement before the Board. At its discretion, the Board may allow additional stakeholders an opportunity to make presentations exceeding five minutes. Stakeholders may request a longer presentation by contacting Mr. Bruce Fujimoto at the e-mail address listed below by 12 noon on Tuesday, November 13, 2012.

Panels and stakeholders making presentations are asked to submit any PowerPoint presentations to Jeanine Townsend, Clerk to the Board, by 12 noon on Monday, November 19, 2012, by e-mail to [jtownsend@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:jtownsend@waterboards.ca.gov).

Questions may be directed to Mr. Bruce Fujimoto, Chief of the Surface Water/Permitting Section at (916) 341-5523 or [bfujimoto@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:bfujimoto@waterboards.ca.gov), or Ms. Emel Wadhvani, Staff Counsel, at (916) 322-3622 or [ewadhvani@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:ewadhvani@waterboards.ca.gov).

**Agenda:**

1. State Water Board and Regional Water Board staff presentation

2. Presentations by panels

The following panels will be allotted 45 minutes each for a presentation to the Board. The panels are asked to address the questions outlined below under "Questions for Panels."

- a. California Stormwater Quality Association
- b. Environmental Non-Governmental Organizations

3. Presentations by stakeholders

The following stakeholders will be allotted ten minutes each for a presentation. Stakeholders may choose to address some or all of the questions outlined below under "Questions for Panels."

- a. U.S. EPA
- b. Caltrans
- c. Statewide Stormwater Coalition
- d. TECS Environmental Compliance Services

4. Policy Statements by participants

All other participants at the Workshop will be allotted five minutes to make policy statements. Participants may choose to address some or all of the questions outlined below under "Questions for Panels."

### Questions for Panels:

1. What changes need to be made to the iterative process to promote measurable water quality improvements? Consider this question in light of the parameters for the iterative process specified in Alternative 2 of the Issue Paper.
2. Should the receiving water limitations requirements be different for:
  - a. Storm water v. non-storm water discharges?
  - b. Discharges with pollutants subject to a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Waste Load Allocation and discharges not subject to a TMDL?
  - c. Phase 1 as opposed to Phase 2 permittees?
3. In the iterative process, should there be specified, enforceable time frames between iterations? Should there be an explicit compliance schedule or time limit for ultimate compliance with receiving water limitations?
4. What is the most appropriate alternative? Please discuss in light of the criteria listed below. The proposed alternative may be an alternative in the Issue Paper, a combination of those alternatives, or an alternative not identified in the Issue Paper. Please identify and discuss a second alternative that your organization(s) would regard as a second choice.
  - a. **Water Quality Protection** – Is the requirement protective of water quality?
  - b. **Practicability/Cost-effectiveness** – Is it practical and cost-effective to implement the requirement?
  - c. **Clarity** – Are the requirements clear and unambiguous?
  - d. **Enforceability** – Can the requirement be readily enforced for non-compliance?
  - e. **Municipal Resources** – What are the impacts of the requirement on municipal staff and financial resources?
  - f. **Regulatory Resources** – What are the impacts of the requirement on the staff and financial resources of the regulatory agencies?
  - g. **Acceptability** – To what degree does the requirement provide a path to compliance that is acceptable to all parties?
  - h. **Other Criteria** – What other criteria are appropriate for consideration?