

**James Fitzgerald Reserve Pilot CCA Project Pilot Subcommittee
August 10, 2006 Summary**

Participants:

In person: Rich Allen, Kellyx Nelson-San Mateo County Resource Conservation District; Lisa Sniderman-Coastal Commission; Kathleen Van Velsor-Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG); Nicole David-San Francisco Estuary Institute (SFEI); Neil Cullen-County of San Mateo, Public Works; Sam Herzberg-San Mateo County Parks, Carmen Fewless-Regional Water Quality Control Board; Carolann Towe-Surfrider
Guests: Tim Frahm-Farm Bureau; Gail Raabe-Ag Commissioner
Phone-In: Heidi Hall-State Water Resources Control Board

Agenda items, key discussion points, agreements:

1. SFEI presents draft watershed map for mark up

Kathleen presented a draft preliminary 3-D base map with some possible CCA boundaries identified. Kathleen also presented additional maps showing alternate boundaries and watershed configurations for reference and discussion. People provided input on the first drafts. Some members expressed concern about the possible policy and regulatory ramifications associated with boundary mapping (e.g., some people perceived that a larger boundary could relate to regulatory or enforcement potential). Some suggested shifting the Northern Boundary of the CCA from Devils Slide to the Martini Creek watershed. The Subcommittee agreed that we should have a scientifically defensible scope and boundaries, informed by ocean current data. Kathleen suggested that we ask NOAA to present at a future meeting to discuss ocean currents. Next steps include: refinements to draft map and contacting NOAA.

Action Item: Lisa will contact Chris Coburn at NOAA to inquire about NOAA presenting on ocean currents related to the Reserve at a future CCA meeting.

2. Follow-up on Draft Watershed Assessment/Initial (first cut) Management Measure evaluation and evaluation of direction of Watershed Assessment

Lisa pulled together some background information for a draft watershed assessment document, much of it informed by previous Subcommittee meetings and discussions. She described her progress to the group. Lisa also gave a quick update on progress towards an initial evaluation of Management Measure categories. Due to the priority of other agenda items, the Subcommittee did not have much discussion on either the draft document or the initial evaluation. Instead, the Subcommittee focused discussion on the best ways to use the draft assessment, and what the group wanted to get out of the draft. Many brought up the need to prioritize existing and potential pollutant problems in the watersheds. It became apparent that the group doesn't have a good sense of which existing/potential pollutant issues are priorities. It was agreed that to do that, we need more information about which of these pollutants: (1) we have data on, and (2) are significant problems (or could be causing significant impacts to water quality.) (Lisa wants to reiterate that the Reserve's impairment status for pathogens is one of the key drivers for the CCA pilot

project and a high priority to address.) Further, Tim raised an important issue about wildfire management and fire hazards to the Reserve and whether Management Measures covered that topic. Lisa thought it might be covered in Forestry (Note, after the meeting, Lisa checked and it is MM 2G in Forestry, Fire Management, however, that MM deals with prescribed fires and control or suppression of fires; it does mention, under programs, that there is a California Fire Plan)

(<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/nps/docs/encyclopedia/forestry.pdf>, MM 2G)

Next steps include confirming information included in the draft Assessment, revisions and additions to draft assessment and continuing to evaluate MM categories and obtaining additional information on existing programs and efforts implementing management practices.

3. Short survey to assist consultant team

As a follow-up to identifying land use in the watersheds, and to help better understand which of the existing and potential pollutant issues for the watersheds may be priorities for the Subcommittee, Kathleen asked folks to identify possible land-based pollutant sources and pathways within each watershed, based on their knowledge and experience. It became clear through the group exercise that many of the issues raised may be present in multiple watersheds, such as invasive species and trash. After the meeting, some people raised issues about ensuring that information gathered be scientifically defensible. The information gathered helps to identify where we have good data and where we have gaps in our collective knowledge. Next steps include soliciting group information about areas of the watershed that weren't evaluated due to time constraints. A draft summary of issues defined during the initial survey will be prepared.

4. Tim Frahm/Gail Raabe discuss Agricultural Practices in the MidCoast

Gail Raabe talked about various programs under the Department of Agriculture and Weights and Measures, focusing on Environmental Protection regulation of pesticide use as well as specific pesticide-related training and outreach conducted for farmworkers, applicators, etc. The Subcommittee heard about a successful outreach effort conducted a few years ago to San Mateo County pest control companies. Gail indicated that one area that seems to be a gap in terms of outreach is homeowners/DIYs. Gail proposed to the group that something similar could be done for the MidCoast area addressing proper use and disposal of pesticides, use near creeks, etc., and that she would be willing to work with the group to personalize issues/messages for such an effort. The Subcommittee was supportive of the idea and mentioned that we could partner with SMC STOPP and possibly Environmental Health to expand the messages to include debris, trash, pathogens, etc. and relate it to the Reserve. Additionally, other outreach efforts were discussed such as the Household Hazardous Waste program, and a potential need for more HHW days to service the MC communities, and outreach to local retail stores. The group did not discuss next steps, but they may include determining who should be involved in such an effort, whether a smaller subcommittee should be formed to address what we can do now, etc.

Gail and Tim Frahm discussed the Ag Water Quality Short Course for farm water quality planning, described some of the management included in the course, and the history of the program. Tim indicated that all of the major producers have either been through the course or are currently going through it, and that 2 operations comprised more than 95% of the farming. Tim also briefly discussed nutrient management indicating that SM Coastal was added onto a grant from Region 3 providing a 2-year opportunity to work with growers on nutrient/irrigation issues. Tim noted cover crops are expensive and would see value in the CCA Program helping identify funding.

Action Item: Revisit this topic at future meeting to assess interest and form subcommittee to address if appropriate.

5. Discuss holding Fall workshop for stakeholders

Kathleen briefly mentioned the idea of holding a workshop for stakeholders to: provide updates on the CCA project to the full stakeholder group; invite NOAA or other agencies to give presentations; obtain input on draft work products; discuss and evaluate progress and stumbling blocks, etc. Kathleen indicated she would provide the Subcommittee with proposed agenda topics for a Fall/Winter workshop.

Action Item: Kathleen to send Lisa proposed Fall/Winter workshop agenda topics for distribution.

6. Next steps/Emerging Issues/Action Items

Nicole from SFEI handed out Rainer's draft SFEI comments on the State Board's Special Protections for ASBS. The group had some discussion about the ASBS status, and Carmen and Nicole urged folks to submit comments to the State Board by August 15. Note, deadline for comments to the State Water Board has been extended until September 1, 2006. We did not set another meeting date as we would like to look into a Fall/Winter workshop in lieu of a next meeting, likely in November.

Action Item: Lisa will propose workshop date, develop a proposed agenda and send to Subcommittee for review.