

CENTRAL COAST LONG-TERM ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NETWORK (CCLEAN)

Steering Committee

Meeting Minutes

July 24, 2024

2:00 pm- 3:30 pm

Via Teleconference Zoom Webinar

The meeting was called to order on July 24, 2024, at 2:0 pm by Barbara Buikema. Roll Call Was taken by Barbara Buikema of the voting committee members signed on to Zoom.

Participants:

Present:

Akin Babatola, Laboratory/Environmental Compliance Manager (Chair)| City of Santa Cruz
Jennie Munster, Quality Assurance/Quality Control Chemist| City of Santa Cruz
Barbara Buikema, General Manager: Carmel Area Wastewater District (CAWD)
Carla James, Laboratory Supervisor (CAWD)
Ray De Ocampo, Laboratory Analyst II, Environmental Compliance (CAWD)
Sarah Stevens, Environmental and Regulatory Compliance Supervisor: Monterey One Water
Olivia Woolery, Interim Laboratory Supervisor: Monterey One Water
Bryan Condry, Laboratory Manager: City of Watsonville

Absent:

Kati King, Wastewater Lab/Compliance Manager: City of Scotts Valley
Jose Guzman, Operations Manager| Monterey One Water
Vistra Zero Landing Energy Storage Facility (Moss Landing Power Plant) Power Plant
Representative: Unknown At This Time

A quorum was present

Participants – Non-Voting Members: Present

Cameron Kostigen Mumper, Associate Manager | Pure Water Soquel
Aroon Melwani, Senior Scientist, Central Coast Managing Principal Partner: Applied Marine Sciences,
Dane Hardin, Senior Marine Scientist, Principal: Applied Marine Sciences
Sarah Bragg-Flavan, Water Resource Control Engineer: Central Coast Water Board

Participants – Non-Voting Members: Absent

Mary Hamilton, Environmental Program Manager| Central Coast Water Board

Virtual Public Attendees: None

1. **Appearances/Public Comments:** *No public appearances/ Public Comm*
2. **Agenda Changes:** *No request to change agenda.*
3. **Agenda Items: No agenda changes requested**

A. Introductions: Roll Call taken by Barbara Buikema

Olivia Woolery, newly appointed interim Laboratory Supervisor from Monterey One Water, was introduced as the new representative. Sarah Stevens and Jose Guzman will be the alternate representatives for M1W.

B. Chair's Report, by Akin Babatola

Akin Babatola and Jennie Munster were not present at the last meeting on June 26, 2024. Akin Babatola went through the CCLEAN Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) before and since the June meeting. The updated QAPP still requires work that needs to be done. Akin Babatola wrote to Barbara Buikema and Dane Hardin notifying them that additional work needs to be completed. In general, there is low acceptance that Central Coast Long Term Environmental Assessment Network (CCLEAN) is the organization of the discharging community. Applied Marine Science (AMS) is the agent that City of Santa Cruz employs to do the technical work for CCLEAN participants. In terms of the deliverables and responsibilities, it is still the CCLEAN agencies responsibility to approve documents that are written in CCLEAN's name to the degree that if there are errors to be corrected, these will need to be sorted out before the document is sent out.

When we joined together as CCLEAN we knew that we had to create a QAPP. That QAPP was reviewed back then, and Dane Hardin was active in the crafting of the initial ones to the State. So, we did have a good QAPP. The QAPP did need to be modified as managed projects, so we didn't always have to start from scratch. Akin's Babatola stated that CCLEAN's QAPP does not need to be sent with our program plan. He contends that the QAPP needs to sustain our vision for years, while the program plans each year is specific for plans that year. The QAPP does not need to be changing with it. Mr. Babatola wished that Mary Hamilton could be at the meeting so further discussion could occur on this item. Yes, QAPP needs to be modified but it does not need to be tied directly to this current program plan or any such plan. Mr. Babatola ended the Chair's report with his comments and said that this item will be discussed later in the agenda.

Dane Hardin stated that in the use of CCLEAN data is to inform achievement or non-achievement of water quality objectives (i.e. exceedances in the ocean plan) it is required that data be submitted to California Environmental Data Exchange Network (CEDEN) and he believes that QAPP's are required to be on file for data that are taken into CEDEN for this purpose.

Mr. Babatola responded that Mr. Hardin's statement above is a given and the document does not change with every analysis that you do. I am sure everyone knows that the QAPP is not modified with every report that is sent.

C. Review of the Meeting Minutes for May & June- Continuity and Acceptance by members, Report by (CAWD), Ray DeOcampo Laboratory Analyst II /Environmental Compliance Inspector.

Akin Babatola asked for **May 22, 2024**, CCLEAN Meeting minutes to be put up on the screen, Sarah Stevens had a correction for her name spelling from Sara Stevens to Sarah Stevens in the minutes.

Bryan Condry made a motion to accept the minutes, Carla James seconded the motion.

AYES: COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Akin Babatola, Sarah Stevens, Barbara Buikema, Bryan Condry, Kati King
NOES: COMMITTEE MEMBERS: None
ABSENT: COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Vistra Zero Landing
ABSTAIN: COMMITTEE MEMBERS: None

After a roll call vote the committee approved the May 22,2024 meeting minutes.

June 26, 2024, CCLEAN Meeting minutes:

- Corrections were made to Sarah Stevens' name and title.
- Discussion on the length and detail of minutes; the committee agreed to keep more detailed minutes and clarified they will be posted on the CAWD website.
- Motion to approve was made by Bryan Condry and seconded by Sarah Stevens.

Barbara Buikema wanted to ask the group if the minutes for the June meeting are much longer than the May minutes because more detail was added to the June minutes to follow the Brown Act. The question is do we want minutes that show everything or show very little and show action taken. It is the group's decision on what details it will want to memorialize in future minutes.

Sarah Stevens was okay with shorter minutes because they take notes during the meeting and if there are any details they communicate this to the upper management.

Bryan Condry prefers the longer minutes, because there has been confusion on what was decided and what was written. Jennie Munster votes for the longer detailed minutes. Barbara Buikema votes for longer minutes.

The Committee agreed to the transcribed minutes being more detailed.

Cameron Kostigen Mumper, Associate Manager | Pure Water Soquel, requested if he could receive the meeting minutes. Barbara Buikema stated that the meeting minutes at the last meeting it was decided that Akin Babatola, Aroon Melwani, and Dane Hardin would receive the minutes in advance. Bryan Condry explained to Cameron Kostigen how to obtain the minutes off of the Carmel Area Wastewater District website.

Jennie Munster asked if the meeting minutes can be sent out sooner than the 72 hours required by the Brown Act.

Barbara Buikema let the group know that one of the items on last meeting needed to be brought back for a vote, and it is on the \$2,000.00 additional for "The Hook" . We had 3 votes aye, and 1 "maybe" vote and there was no quorum to pass the vote. A "maybe" is not a "yes" or "no" vote. The vote must be a "yes" vote, "no" vote or "abstain" vote no "maybe."

Bryan Condry made a motion to approve the June 2024 minutes and seconded by Sarah Stevens.

AYES: COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Akin Babatola, Sarah Stevens, Barbara Buikema, Bryan Condry, Kati King
NOES: COMMITTEE MEMBERS: None
ABSENT: COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Vistra Zero Landing
ABSTAIN: COMMITTEE MEMBERS: None

After a roll call vote the committee approved the June 26,2024 meeting minutes.

Vote of additonal \$2K for the mussel CEC sampling:

Barbara Buikema requested a redo of the vote of the \$2K for the “The Hook” sampling that was conducted at the May CCLEAN Steering Committee meeting as we did not have a consensus.

- Akin Babatola asked for clarification on this item since he missed the May meeting.
- Aroon Melwani explained the importance of adding Contaminants of Emerging Concerns (CEC) sampling in mussels to compare to other data collected in the Program
- After discussion, the committee voted to approve the additional \$2,000 for this sampling.

Akin Babatola asked if someone could go over this item since he was not present at May meeting.

Aroon Melwani presented a slide to explain the proposed change to the CCLEAN scope of work for the 2024-25 period is the addition of a single CEC sample collected at “The Hook”, which is the site that has predominantly had the highest legacy contaminant concentration. The reason behind adding this site was based off of the analysis on the CCLEAN annual report, authored by Dane Hardin, which highlighted the importance of CEC’s coming in the effluent and river concentrations. So, the concern was that the same site may be associated with accumulation of new contaminants of concern nearshore Monterey Bay. Given that this site has predominately had highest concentrations of legacy contaminants we could now add information on chemicals that are being monitored in other parts of the program and if they are entering the bay. It is one site plus QA sample for an additional cost of \$2K.

Dane Hardin added that river and effluent data have exceeded levels at which Fipronils are known to bioaccumulate, based on UC Davis scientific journal publications.

Mr. Babatola asked about the investment by CCLEAN would be what in terms of our own benefit. Is it something traceable or something of value to our program? Dane Hardin, stated yes on the value to the program. One of the primary objectives of CCLEAN is protection of beneficial uses around the bay and removing any sort of impairments to those beneficial uses. There are no human health or wildlife health alert levels associated with CECs, Fipronils in particular, but certainly it would inform the direction of CCLEAN if we were seeing an accumulation of those compounds along the shores of Monterey Bay. Mr. Babatola asked, is there any possibility of linking to our discharges or run off.

Mr. Hardin responded that there were high concentration of Fipronils most consistently detected in both wastewater in river discharges and at the edge of the Zone Of Initial Dilution (ZID) using each dischargers model. Mr. Hardin stated that everyone is ZID and every discharger ZID, at exceedances of UC Davis at ecological integrity criteria.

Note: proposal doc was brought up in the meeting from the June meeting in the July meeting

Mr. Babatola asked a question about Santa Cruz wanted to change what from the previous meeting?

Dr. Melwani stated there were comments in the monitoring plan in QAPP to support for POP sampling on the San Lorenzo River and influent sampling done for Watsonville. Both of these data are collected as part of CCLEAN regular monitoring, but the contract setup states that Watsonville influent is conducted as a tasks within the CCLEAN Program as in prior years. However, after funding was lost from CCAMP, the San Lorenzo POPs were pulled out of CCLEAN and worked under a separate contract. So, the question that came up for consistency is do we want to treat them both the same, do we want to align or keep them the same? The approval of the budget assumed status quo meaning that the San Lorenzo POP sampling will be done outside of CCLEAN on a separate contract and Watsonville influent will remain part of the Program.

Mr. Babatola stated that Watsonville influent monitoring is an error, and it is not a CCLEAN project. Bryan Condy could withdraw at any time and we would have no say about it. For historical reference the San Lorenzo River had been withdrawn for several years from CCLEAN monitoring and then came back into it. These are not CCLEAN projects, these are contracts between the individual dischargers and AMS. Yes, it is good that AMS is applying the QAPP from CCLEAN to those projects. After all it was critical in Mr. Babatola decision to contract with AMS but it not a CCLEAN project. Nobody else on this panel has anything to say about it just like he has nothing to say about Watsonville's influent monitoring. The liabilities accruing there from are strictly between the contracting agencies, the cities, and AMS.

Dane Hardin stated that AMS does not have a contract with Watsonville. All that is run through CCLEAN and billed to Watsonville by CCLEAN as part of the extra assessment that was added to the CCLEAN budget to cover those costs from Watsonville. We handled Santa Cruz's San Lorenzo River the same way until the other rivers were taken out of the Program. Mr. Hardin stated Mr. Babatola wanted to maintain the flow proportional sampling on the San Lorenzo River.

Mr. Babatola stated Watsonville is paying for AMS services not CCLEAN. It is not a CCLEAN project. Santa Cruz has a contract with AMS because of the vetting process and not because the other cities moved out. CCLEAN was funded at some earlier stage and that is why some of the other rivers where participating and when that funding went away the other rivers dropped off the program.

The liability lies between AMS and Watsonville and has nothing to do with the other participants in CCLEAN.

Bryan Condry stated that our permit states, as corrective action for finding PCBs in the effluent, that high volume water sampling will occur and CCLEAN will exam the relationship between degradation of PCBs compounds and congeners. Mr. Condry agrees with Mr. Babatola comments regarding liability is not related to CCLEAN comments and appreciates the mechanism of using it in the same manner that has been used in the past.

Mr. Hardin asked Mr. Condry if Watsonville is comparing PCB degradation? Mr. Condry stated **he** is not doing this comparison. Mr. Babatola stated that they had to track year to year the effectiveness of their program. If CCLEAN reported on it you would have to get Mr. Babatola permission.

Mr. Condry stated would be an interesting project because many of our wastewater treatment plants have very similar process units to see how that degradation might help.

Mr. Hardin stated it runs the gamut of all the CECs and everything. That would be an interesting exercise.

Mr. Babatola stated that incorrect record keeping should not be the order.

Mr. Condry moved to vote on the additional \$2,000.00 for “The Hook” CEC sampling. Barbara Buikema requested a roll call vote as follows:

AYES: **COMMITTEE MEMBERS:** *Akin Babatola, Barbara Buikema, Bryan Condry, Sarah Stevens*
NOES: **COMMITTEE MEMBERS:**
ABSENT: **COMMITTEE MEMBERS:** *Vistra Zero Landing*
ABSTAIN: **COMMITTEE MEMBERS:** *Kati King*

After a roll call vote the committee passed the additional \$2,000.00 for “The Hook” CEC sampling.

D. Lead Agency Remarks, Report by, CAWD, General Manager, Barbara Buikema

Barbara Buikema thanked everyone for their patience in attending the meetings and adherence to abiding by the Brown Act rules.

E. Financial Report by, CAWD, General Manager, Barbara Buikema-Inform stakeholders; for financial planning and answer questions

- Jennie Munster Jeannie Munstermeeting. Mr. Babatola agreed with Ms. Munster's recommendation.
- Barbara Buikema went over the financial statements for all attendees.
- Jennie Munster Jeannie Munster requested that the agenda state if there is an attachment.

Ms. Munster moved to accept the financial statement. Barbara Buikema requested if there were any No's and there were none.

**AYES: COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Akin Babatola, Barbara Buikema, Bryan
Condy, Sarah Stevens, Kati King**

NOES: COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

ABSENT: COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Vistra Zero Landing

ABSTAIN: COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

The committee accepted the financial statements.

F. CCLEAN lay out any topics or questions that the participants would like the Water Board to provide updates

Mr. Babatola asked if there is an update from the State Water Board or Central Coast on what the program is for analyzing and controlling Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS).

Sarah Bragg-Flavan will get back to the committee as a lot of it is coming from the State board.

G. Program Director's Report, Applied Marine Sciences, Aroon Melwani-Senior Scientist-Central Coast Managing Principal & Dane Hardin-Senior Marine Scientist-Principal

o CCLEAN Quality Assurance Project Plan Update (QAPP)

- A revised draft of the QAPP was shared with the Steering Committee, incorporating feedback from the earlier draft in May, in preparation for distribution to Mary Hamilton to initiate Water Board review.
- Mary Hamilton shared via email that the CCLEAN QAPP will need to be reviewed annually and will include any changes to future NPDES permits.
- Significant change to draft has clarified data collected by individual dischargers, such as effluent nutrients that is not part of the CCLEAN CEDEN submittals.
- Discussion of receiving water bacteria sampling and removal from QAPP; resolution was to clarify that "part of the dischargers CCLEAN requirements are to do receiving water bacteria measurements, but this data is not evaluated through this CCLEAN QAPP but evaluated through the individuals discharges QAPP".
- Discussion of San Lorenzo POP sampling and whether this monitoring should be part of CCLEAN; resolution was to remove reference to San Lorenzo monitoring as it is not funded by CCLEAN and is not included in the CCLEAN monitoring plan.
- City of Santa Cruz request further revisions to draft QAPP are needed; requested changes to be distributed via email.

Dr. Melwani stated that a revised draft of the QAPP was provided to the Steering Committee, which addresses the comments that were provided on the version that was distributed back in May. Dr. Melwani provided an overview of the significant changes.

Dr. Melwani shared a WORD version with track changes on OneDrive.

Dr. Melwani shared that he has had communication with Mary Hamilton last week to discuss her review of the upcoming revision to the QAPP. Mary Hamilton indicated that there will be an annual review of the QAPP for CCLEAN every year. There will also be statements in any future National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits, where the State and Regional Board will have the opportunity to review the QAPP prior to CCLEAN sampling each Program Year. This goes behind the rationale behind including the monitoring plan as an appendix in the QAPP review package. The idea is where we don't have any changes to the QAPP we can send the notification to the Regional and State Board that there are no changes, but there might be some minor changes to an appendix, which will make it much easier for them to review and approve.

Some of the bigger picture changes that were requested by the Steering Committee were to remove elements of the Program that are conducted by the Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW's) and don't follow through the QAPP process that AMS implements through CCLEAN. There are aspects of the Program that AMS does not receive data for and is not provided to CEDEN. The POTW labs do this work themselves and AMS is not provided that data and does not interpret or synthesize that data for the annual report. So, AMS had added text to clarify those specific elements because they are CCLEAN elements that are requirements posed on the individual dischargers. The significant change was the receiving water bacteria monitoring that is performed by dischargers and AMS is not receiving that data or collecting that data. At the last meeting (7-26-24) the group approved the removal of this monitoring element.

There was also the discussion of the Watsonville influent and the San Lorenzo POP sampling. Dr. Melwani proposed to keep both in. The Watsonville data are assessed through the CCLEAN QAPP process and are being collected by the same AMS contractors that are collecting CCLEAN data. Similarly, the San Lorenzo POP sampling, although they are specifically a requirement of the City of Santa Cruz, those data are also collected, assessed, and reporting on via CCLEAN and is important to our understanding of the patterns in the Monterey Bay.

Jennie Munster Jeanie Munster didn't recall any of the Watsonville influent being discussed in any of the reports. Dr. Melwani stated that is hasn't been included as it has not informed any of our interpretations. Whereas river POPs are vastly important. Ms. Munster asked if the influent data is evaluated but we just don't report on it? Dr. Melwani stated that it is evaluated in terms of the QAPP process for data quality.

Dane Hardin stated that Watsonville influent data is also reported to CEDEN along with all CCLEAN data.

Mr. Babatola asked about the bacterial monitoring in the ocean area is expressly part of our responsibility to CCLEAN. Part of the confusion is that all CCLEAN data is not reviewed by AMS. POTWs generate CCLEAN data under a QAPP on file with the State and that is what our bacteria in the outfall areas falls under. In the permit, of the excerpt that Mary Hamilton shared with you states expressly that we do this under a CCLEAN program. So, yes, it is CCLEAN for us, and no it is not being reported to AMS, but AMS is not CCLEAN and that needs to be clear to avoid confusion. When we do work that is in the permit, we are obligated to do because of CCLEAN- it is CCLEAN.

Bryan Condy asked 25 years ago before CCLEAN existed are you saying that we never had to collect ocean receiving water samples. Mr. Babatola stated yes, they did and the standard was so poor that they created the impetus for CCLEAN. Bryan Condy stated that we are operating under different quality controls when gathering samples and we are not operating under the same QAPP at all in terms of sampling and analysis. That is why I suggested that we remove it from CCLEAN, because it existed before CCLEAN, and we are not following the QAPP to evaluate the quality of those data. Mr. Babatola stated what you are missing is that in fact prompted CCLEAN and CCLEAN needs that data to be standardized. If we have not written a comprehensive enough QAPP your question would trigger that. Our labs QAPP is consistent and maybe even supersedes the standards of CCLEAN on those bacteria.

Jennie Munster Jeannie Munster asked Mr. Babatola if the receiving water analysis are a CCLEAN requirement that we should standardized and we should put it in this QAPP? Mr. Babatola stated that our QAPP qualifies for all that CCLEAN requires. He is asking that it is submitted the way we have been submitting it in fulfillment of our CCLEAN application.

Mr. Babatola stated that Santa Cruz QAPP is the highest standard. The QAPP that CCLEAN requires is responsible and informed and should have been there all along. When Peter Von Langen took over and one of the questions, they asked was the geometric mean data of Watsonville's bacteria did not meet the metric. So, of course you didn't meet CCLEAN standards that doesn't mean if it wasn't done right it can't be CCLEAN. Ours was always done to meet those standards.

Jennie Munster asked are we thinking that the receiving waters should not be in QAPP because our contractor is not evaluating the data and it is evaluated individually by each lab.

Mr. Babatola is agreeing that it should not be part of AMS report. I am saying it is a CCLEAN obligation to the degree if Bryan Condy doesn't not have a QAPP he can reference it because it is in his permit because it is part of CCLEAN. It wouldn't be if he wasn't part of CCLEAN. It is in our permit because we are part of CCLEAN and our QAPP is solid.

Byran Condy stated their data is uploaded to California Integrated Water Quality System (CIWQS) portal and that is where our data on receiving waters goes and we are ELAP certified laboratory and that is why it is considered valid legal data. Is data uploaded to CEDEN in any way by CCLEAN? Dr. Melwani stated no, bacteria data are not submitted to CEDEN. Mr. Condy stated there is no need for this to be in the QAPP. Mr. Babatola stated you have a QAPP because you doing analysis you want to attest to the integrity of it. Even if you want to go to CEDEN you will still need a QAPP.

Mr. Babatola says that I have to do these things because of CCLEAN, it expressly states that. Mr. Condy responded that when it lists program elements inside a permit it should not be taken it as literal things that CCLEAN is but just a representation of that CCLEAN is doing at the time. It is not used in the report, and not uploaded by CCLEAN to CEDEN, and the only use of the data is permit compliance upload to CIWQS, which doesn't require the CCLEAN QAPP it should be removed. Mr. Condy thinks it would be a good idea to remove elements from the QAPP that are not needed for review purposes.

Mr. Babatola stated that the QAPP is supposed to be an omnibus guiding document to guide your work. You make changes only when something new comes up.

Let's go further, you are saying that you are discussing here is to remove your (Watsonville's) water bacteria and I don't see why mine (Santa Cruz) should be removed. I have followed the requirements and is reviewed by me under the QAPP that he submits to the State. Jeannie Munster stated in the QAPP that the receiving water are done by the individual labs that are ELAP certified and follow their own quality assurance quality control procedures.

Dr. Melwani clarified that statement was specific to the effluent nutrients, but the text could be amended to be applied more broadly to include bacteria sampling. The prior meeting discussion those monitoring data are not being evaluated through a quality assurance (QA) process that is reflected in a QAPP and is not being interpreted by CCLEAN, then it does not need to be in there at all. Dischargers might still be doing this monitoring for an individual permit but CCLEAN is not using it or assessing that or using that to guide the program. Where as effluent nutrient data is very much part of that conversation and is why it was foot noted in the report tables to talk about methods.

But it is still part of our report and we will be assessing those data as we interpret the information that is received and the bacteria is NOT being done in the same way.

Mr. Babatola stated that Watsonville's bacteria is done by Bryan Condy and reported straight to the State. Santa Cruz's bacteria is done by Mr. Babatola reported to the State through many avenues including the monthly report CIWQS and is guided by the highest QAPP. When I write my annual report I am referencing that this is in fulfillment of the CIWQS obligation. I am not saying it is being reviewed by AMS. Jennie Munster Jeannie Munster is saying it should not be in this particular document.

Mr. Babatola clarified his understanding to not discuss the analysis of Watsonville's bacteria because we have to discuss receiving waters bacteria because it is our CCLEAN obligation. We just aren't just discussing the one that we do not curate.

Dr. Melwani stated that it is the City Santa Cruz responsibility because CCLEAN is not interpreting the data and never have. Mr. Babatola stated that maybe we should because it is a CCLEAN obligation. Mr. Babatola explained the relationship that AMS contracts with the City of Santa Cruz and when you read the permit it states the city has CCLEAN obligations. Many of them, perhaps most of them are done through your agency but not all of them.

Dr. Melwani stated that the things that you do separately are not in this QAPP. So, the idea that this receiving water bacteria that you are doing is not being assessed by the CCLEAN program. It can be in your own QAPP and your annual report but it is not in the CCLEAN annual report. Mr. Babatola stated that because it is my CCLEAN obligation it should be in the CCLEAN report. I am not asking AMS to do it for me, I will do it, but it needs to be reflected in my CCLEAN obligations.

Mr. Hardin stated that he looked at City of Santa Cruz latest NPDES permit, where in attachment E for the monitoring and reporting program it has a table straight out of the CCLEAN monitoring plan. The purpose of the redo of the QAPP was to put everyone on the same page through time as we had identified that some NPDES permits say one thing and other NPDES permits say another thing, depending on when the year the permit was issued. The sampling elements have changed in the program through adaptive management.

So, if we are taking certain elements out like the 30-foot contour sites that are technically not done by CCLEAN, the only responsibility to CCLEAN is what is in your permit, which is reflected in the table in the CCLEAN monitoring plan.

If that element then comes out your obligation for receiving watering monitoring it is no longer through CCLEAN.

Bryan Condy gets to the reason it should be removed. When I look at my permit and when I see it say CCLEAN monitoring requirements, there could be a time that our NPDES permit did not require us to do receiving monitoring. Would we then be required to do it because it is in now in this CCLEAN monitoring table. I want to try and pair down this table such that we will not be required to monitor things because of CCLEAN but because of our permit. I want to separate the permit and the CCLEAN monitoring requirements in the actual permit.

Mr. Babatola stated that you have CCLEAN in part because you have an NPDES permit. I am looking at Santa Cruz' permit that states the CCLEAN monitoring requirements and goes into what is discussed under Monterey Bay, which is explicitly that you are going to do total coliform, fecal coliform, inter oxide, fecal indicator bacteria pathogen etc. In the permit it is expressly under what it says CCLEAN application. The point you are making is you are saying that at some future date you are not required to look at bacteria and it says so in CCLEAN easily. When your permits are renewed/reviewed you can reference to take it out. It not going to stand on its own and suddenly obligate you to do something irrelevant. Right now, we are all required to look at these indicators. You asked if we were sampling? Yes, we were sampling but we did not have the guiding QAPP. People did what they wanted to do. Just six or seven years ago Watsonville data presented was not geometric mean it was just simple monthly data. Twelve data points over twelve months and the geometric mean is supposed to be 5 data points in 30 days. If you don't have guidance the problem will continue. Right now, in my permit (page E20) is says we are going to monitor in the Bay receiving water for Santa Cruz, Watsonville, Monterey One Water for total coliform, fecal coliform, enterococcus and it is specifically under CCLEAN.

Bryan Condy asked how we can move forward. Mr. Babatola stated that we move forward by complying with the permit. There is nothing personal I just don't like doing shotty work. The permit expressly states that receiving water Monterey Bay, Santa Cruz, Watsonville, and Monterey One Water will look monthly or weekly as required by each entity as permitted.

Jennie Munster Jennie Munster proposed a language suggestion. For the CCLEAN QAPP could there be a statement that states part of the dischargers CCLEAN requirements are to do weekly bacteria measurement, but this data is not evaluated through this CCLEAN QAPP but evaluated through the individuals discharges QAPP. Mr. Babatola agrees with this statement. It is clear what is in the CCLEAN QAPP and we distinguish other measurement/quality are referenced in other individual QAPPS. Ms. Munster stated that the TNI requirements we are all going to have to have pretty robust QAPPS.

Bryan Condy stated that the table in his permit is **TE8** and what we have discussed in the past and what Peter Von Lagen agreed to is that **OC** monitoring requirements are not actual requirements but statements of what the current set is. We all had different time frame but different analysis. We should remove the things from this and not take those in table E10 (as shown during the meeting by Dr. Melwani) as actual requirements but as a statement of this is the CCLEAN program when that permit was renewed. Specifically, what phase four of CCLEAN could look like essentially if we interpret this monitoring requirement if there is no phase four. We will do the same thing over and over.

Jennie Munster is saying the data that is generated through this program is evaluated through this program. Bryan Condy stated that Dr. Melwani has stated is not evaluated.

Ms. Munster has stated that it is evaluated by the individual dischargers in their own quality manuals. Bryan Condy asked then why would it not follow our own quality manuals rather than the CCLEAN QAPP? Ms. Munster stated it will follow our own quality manuals. What Mr. Babatola desires are that this CCLEAN QAPP informs the Water Board of everything and data quality be collected through CCLEAN. To meet both your needs data collected by the dischargers and not collected by the contractors are evaluated in their own quality manuals indicating that all the data for CCLEAN has a quality assurance program.

Bryan Condy stated that is basically what the QAPP says and they are not CCLEAN sampling points they are our sampling points and only related to our permits, except for this one table that stated is not a table that is an actual requirement. He requested that a document should be written up for a pro and con and vote on it next month.

Mr. Babatola says my permit says that I have CCLEAN obligation. To fulfill those obligations, I have signed off on a QAPP that is consistent with all those things. If we have a CCLEAN report that measures and reports our fulfillment of our obligations and has to be comprehensive enough to include those things that are done through AMS and her subcontractors, and their individual cities, and their contractor laboratories for CCLEAN. The suggestion that Ms. Munster made was that the QAPP that we are signing off now does not include every QAPP, but the solution is not to be silent on the other deliverables that are done under robust QAPP. So, a reference can be made in this CCLEAN QAPP rather than adding other QAPPs.

There are QAPPs consistent with the objectives of CCLEAN under which these bacteria measurements are being done, it isn't simple to remove bacteria, because it is an expressed CCLEAN obligation.

Mr. Hardin asked if this Mr. Babatola if this is the only element to be handled this way? Or are we talking about effluent measurement and the whole shmeat. Mr. Babatola stated that the regulator has given us a list and that list is exclusive, who is responsible, the parameter samples, and what the applicable stressors are.

Mr. Hardin asked for the list from Mr. Babatola, and he shared his screen and provided the following list: Table E-10.

Document shown titled:

CCLEAN Monitoring Requirements on page E-19 of the document (sample matrix column labeled Monterey Bay-receiving water-Santa Cruz, Watsonville, Monterey One Water).

Bryan Condy moved that he write out a con or some sort of statement or questions that can be sent out and that Mr. Babatola can generate questions and vote on it next month. Mr. Babatola stated that we can move on in the agenda, but I will not be satisfied with something that shorts the responsibility that I sign for, and that is to say my CCLEAN obligations include this; and yes they need to be recorded as fulfillment of those obligations.

Mr. Condy asked does that include influent Watsonville as a CCLEAN obligation? Mr. Babatola stated no, that is incumbent upon you.

Mr. Condy stated Watsonville should not be paying for that individually if it is a CCLEAN obligation. We probably should have to do all the rivers if that is what we go by. Mr. Babatola stated that if it says influent Watsonville, a responsible person will recognize it as their responsibility and there is no way to pass it along to Santa Cruz. Mr. Hardin then asked what about rivers San Lorenzo, Pajaro, Salinas, Carmel? Mr. Babatola stated yes to Mr. Hardin's question, and that the objective is that we agree with other members of CCLEAN, who's jurisdiction, it is that we will fulfill this commitment. That is why we pay for what we do for CCLEAN. We don't do it for everybody – it is a CCLEAN monitoring obligation.

Mr. Hardin stated that is why the QAPP and the monitoring were being separated so the QAPP would not have to be updated every year as the sites that might be monitored in a given year fluctuate. Mr. Babatola agreed with Mr. Hardin. Mr. Babatola stated that if something more sophisticated than the boundaries of our QAPP gets in then we modify the QAPP, otherwise we don't need to modify the QAPP. Mr. Babatola asked Sarah Bragg-Flavan earlier in the meeting when polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) is promulgated there will be standards that are not hear here yet and the QAPP will have to modified accordingly.

Sarah Bragg-Flavan stated that Santa Cruz is the newest permit and that is the standard language that we would use to update others. The areas of concern of bacteria monitoring the nutrient effluent, if you can show where that data is used it would help with the review. Does it go into the CCLEAN reports? Does it just go to CIWQS or does it go into CEDEN? There are some concerns around different levels of data quality and where is goes into CEDEN with different specifications.

Dr. Melwani brought forward the retained nearshore (open water) bacteria sampling (but removed reference to total coliform). In the draft QAPP, a comment was made to remove bacteria monitoring as it related CCLEAN in the ocean. We have not removed it as the data for two analytes have Ocean Plan standards, but one analyte (total coliform) does not and can be removed.

Mr. Babatola stated the quick answer is that it is true there are no known documented health impacts from total coliform. However, because the waters that are being monitored include commercial shellfish harvesting. The only standard for that is total coliforms, which is a utility of total coliforms that the beneficiaries uses and the reason to monitor. I have argued successfully from the San Lorenzo River because there are not shellfish harvesting there, but it is listed as one of the beneficiaries along the near shore as commercial harvesting. That is why it is difficult to argue against its inclusion and there is no measurable impact in it. Unless you are informed of that beneficial use and if you removed it there would be no denominator for its compatibility.

Mr. Hardin stated that is where your 30-foot contour sampling comes in. The point that Dr. Melwani is highlighting is specific grab sample analyses at the beginning and end of each ocean buoy deployments in Monterey Bay.

Dr. Melwani shared his screen showing monitoring plan appendix A (Table 1. CCLEAN technical project parties and responsibilities). The resolution is to add a statement referring to the receiving waters bacteria sampling for individual permits and retain the ocean sampling for bacteria as referenced in the QAPP. Dr. Melwani asked for clarification on the total coliform does not have a standard in the ocean plan. Are we on board with not including that in the buoy sampling? Mr. Babatola agreed that makes sense.

Mr. Babatola stated that he sent information to Mr. Hardin and Ms. Buikema that there are still errors in the QAPP. The spelling of Mr. Babatola's name, the term "CCLEAN primarily employees, page 8)" needs to be taken out. There were also some technical errors. Dr. Melwani asked to write to him with the specific errors that need to be rectified. Mr. Babatola stated that he wrote that in the WORD document and made editorial comments. Dr. Melwani stated that he is responsible for making the edits and please direct further edits to him. Mr. Babatola is requesting that the errors be corrected. Dr. Melwani would prefer direct communications. Dr. Melwani has not received any additional comments from Mr. Babatola in the QAPP. Mr. Babatola stated that if they are not there when I look at the revised version he will send them to Mr. Hardin and Ms. Buikema.

Jennie Munster Jeannie Munster asked, if we review the QAPP and ideally it does not have to change every year, why are we including the program plan as an appendix, which could possibly be revised every year. Dr. Melwani stated that the QAPP has to be submitted annually to the Water Board. Ms. Munster then asked shouldn't they be two separate documents? Mr. Babatola agreed that there should be two documents, but he understands Mary Hamilton's concern and it is the first time handling this and she has not seen our QAPP.

Snip from Dr. Melwani notes: associated with the discussion above that was shown in the meeting.

Monitoring Elements

- ~~Removed~~ reference to receiving water bacteria that is conducted by POTWs. CCLEAN does not use these data for analysis – APPROVED BY CCLEAN SC 7/26/24
- Retained reference to Watsonville influent and San Lorenzo POPs as being the responsibility of City of Watsonville and City of Santa Cruz, respectively - APPROVED BY CCLEAN SC 7/26/24, awaiting feedback from Santa Cruz
- Following approval of the CCLEAN 24-25 scope of work, the Monitoring Plan has been added as Appendix to the QAPP



Supporting Information

- Retained nearshore (open water) bacteria sampling (but removed reference to total coliform).-ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT DISCUSSED BY CCLEAN SC 7/26/24

CCLEAN SC suggested removal of this program element as not being used by AMS for interpretation. Upon review of the Ocean Plan, AMS noted that fecal coliform and *Enterococcus* have objectives, but total coliform does not.

- Added footnote to water QA tables that identify that effluent nutrients are analyzed by individual POTW labs that use different ELAP approved methods to the nutrient lab that analyzes the river and ocean samples. APPROVED BY CCLEAN SC 7/26/24
- Modified language to calculate MDL to be consistent with EPA definition and confirmed with laboratories. PAGE 19
- Added analytes, method names, and target RLs for CEC analytes in mussels (Table 19) –APPROVED BY CCLEAN SC 7/26/24



H. City of Santa Cruz response to the question if the San Lorenzo River POP sampling should remain in CCLEAN's QAPP as discussed in the prior meeting on June 26, 2024

Mr. Babatola stated, no it should not and it is not a CCLEAN program and we are not doing as part of our obligation to CCLEAN. If it expressed as one of my obligations to CCLEAN and the driver is its utility for the City of Santa Cruz, and if it is included I will submit it for that purpose. But as long as it is not- the answer is no. The express purpose of which AMS is being paid is strictly to monitor the program, its efficiency and the decline in the anthropogenic compounds in the San Lorenzo River due to the intervention of the Santa Cruz source control program.



Jennie Munster stated that it is included in the table that was viewed earlier. Mr. Babatola stated it is saying something different than what are doing now. Mr. Babatola asked about the list of services to be included. Mr. Hardin responded that we are not doing that for the City of Santa Cruz. We have a CCLEAN task that includes sampling nutrients and current use pesticides in all three rivers. We are not doing POPs flow proportional sampling in Salinas or Pajaro rivers.

I. Water Board's Report – Update on Water Board Attorney(s) position regarding CCLEAN Committee attendance

Sarah Bragg – Flavan stated they are currently working on Scotts Valley renewal. Mr. Hardin asked anything from their attorneys about the Brown Act? Ms. Flavan stated that they will not be voting members or assigning members. We are acting as a public sense in these meetings. We are still hiring one more backfill position for Peter's position and we are working at getting better at permits not on extension.

Mr. Babatola asked if the permit obligation loaded into CIWQS has not extended beyond August. If we generate in August or September there is no receptable in CIWQS for them. The last communication I had with the State said there is no contract for doing it yet and that is why it is not there yet. Ms. Flavan will get back to you on this CIWQS question.

J. Ad Hoc Committee Formation for the Budget Year 2025-26 Member Vote, designation of volunteers, and naming convention of the committee

Bryan Condy wants to talk about the future of CCLEAN program (Phase IV) to propose monitoring program changes for 2025-2026. As we have been talking about the last eight months or so on these POPs very strongly, and found they are not from the wastewater treatment plants. It would be nice to move something different and more beneficial instead of monitoring the same thing over and over and seeing the same thing over and over again.

Ms. Buikema stated that a committee has to be publicly formed, assign members, and give the committee a name. Bryan Condy moved to form this committee. Mr. Babatola nominated Jennie Munster to be nominated. Ms. Munster accepted.

The committee members agreed to set a date and bring it back to the Steering Committee.

Mr. Condy requested that Ms. Buikema send out an email to those who have volunteered to set a date and time. *(Note: Ad Hoc committees do not have to adhere to the Brown Act)*

K. Meeting attendance that members would like to state

No comments.

August the 28th was agreed to as the next meeting day for the steering committee.

Ms. Buikema requested a motion to adjourn. Mr. Babatola agreed to adjourn and seconded by Mr. Condy. All Ayes and no opposition.

- 4. ADJOURNMENT:** *Barbara Buikema adjourned the meeting at 3:59 p.m. The next CCLEAN Committee meeting will occur on Wednesday, August 28, 2024, at 2 p.m. The next month CCLEAN Committee meeting is tentatively scheduled to occur on September 25, 2024, at 2 p.m. The teleconference webinar is hosted through Zoom and you may receive access by visiting our website homepage, www.cawd.org, calling the District office at 831-624-1248 or via email at downstream@cawd.org.*

AS REPORTED TO:

Ray DeOcampo, Committee Secretary

APPROVED: **Akin Babatola, Chair of the Committee**