

MRP 3.0 C3/GI Work Group Meeting
Thursday, February 7, 2019
Meeting Summary

1. Introductions

- Introductions were made. List of attendees is attached.

2. Purpose and Agenda

- BASMAA Board and Water Board (WB) staff agreed to form work groups to allow detailed discussion of certain MRP 3.0 provisions, and those work groups would present results and any outstanding issues to the MRP Steering Committee.
- Purpose of this Work Group is to discuss C.3 provisions, with a focus on green infrastructure (GI) requirements.
- Terminology – Agreed to call all stormwater treatment on public and private property and public ROWs GI (or GSI). LID is a subset of GI that is parcel based.

3. Work Group Topics and Schedule

- Key topics for this Work Group over the next 5-6 months (monthly meetings);
 - GI
 - Alternative Compliance/Offsets
 - Other topics from Water Board list from 10-31-18 Steering Committee meeting
 - Other topics from BASMAA reps
- As topics come up for discussion, we should review the materials that were developed for MRP 2.0.
- ★ Action Item: Work Group members will develop a list of C.3/GI topics and approximate schedule for discussion and share with WB staff.

4. GI Plan Expectations for MRP 2.0

- The Work Group reviewed the draft GI Plan guidance memo provided by Water Board staff on February 5. It is intended to provide guidance on GI Plans, coordination with RAA analysis, and next steps in MRP 3.0, and to be used as a discussion tool for the C3/GI Work Group meetings.
 - Jill Bicknell – the guidance memo came out late in the process; many permittees are well into their GI Plan development, and are using the current MRP language as guidance.
 - Keith Lichten – the guidance memo was intended to present guidance on the current plans as well as ideas for future.
- The focus of the discussion was the three broad goals on the first page of the guidance memo, especially Goal #1: Ensure each Permittee has established the necessary procedures and practices to require and implement GI in public and private projects as part of its regular course of business (including design, design review, inspections, and operations and maintenance).
 - Keith – they are looking for permittees to have practices to design, construct and inspect. It's OK to incorporate regional guidance documents by reference.
 - Dan Cloak – agrees it's important to get practices and procedures in place. It's not a big deal to resolve conflicts in codes/policies and adopt standard details

and specs. It is more difficult to have the right people in the room (during design) to advocate for incorporation of GI.

- Jill – practices and policies should be in place for each department to identify opportunities for GI (e.g., BASMAA guidance).
- Dale Bowyer – does anything in MRP 2.0 require Goal #1? Jill - No, not explicitly.
- Jeff Sinclair – San Jose’s GI Plan is a high level plan. Projects originate and evolve with different sources of funding and different responsibilities.
- Dan – there was resistance from planning departments early on with respect to reviewing C.3 projects; now it will take some time to overcome resistance to new procedures related to GI.
- Shannan Young – getting support in General Plans and Specific Plans is a first step.
- Adele Ho – direction needs to come from the top down.
- Pam Boyle Rodriguez – staff culture needs to change, and it takes a while to create internal procedures and get buy-in.
- Jill – having processes in place is a good sign of commitment to the GI Plan.
- Process for review of GI Plans
 - The Work Group expressed concern as to how Water Board staff would review 70+ GI Plans before adoption of MRP 3.0, and how staff would judge plans to be acceptable.
 - Keith – they will look at a subset of plans initially to help craft MRP 3.0 and then review others for compliance later.
 - Dale – can the Work Group provide input to a standard review process?
 - Jill – it’s easy to develop a checklist based on the MRP requirements, but Water Board staff needs to consider the context and characteristics of each community in determining what makes sense for that community’s GI Plan.
- GI implementation and targets in MRP 3.0
 - Terri Fashing (and others) – the Water Board should allow time for permittees to implement their GI Plans instead of adding new requirements that would divert resources from implementation.
 - Dale – understands that it will take a long time to get the plans moving. They will be most concerned about plans that have a “weak start”.
 - Matt Fabry – San Mateo permittees have been focused on PCBs and mercury. Information from the RAA has enabled conversations on how to comply jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction or at countywide scale. But others’ RAAs will not be completed until 2020.
 - Terri – previous discussions with Water Board staff have indicated that we are already on a different path – that of MEP.
 - Dale – the challenge of permit writing is to provide motivators and drivers without creating useless requirements
 - Keith – we have TMDLs and other goals to address impacts of urbanization.
 - Matt – it is challenging to use PCBs as targets because it’s hard to communicate.
 - Jill – need to look at multiple benefits to sell projects.
 - Keith – want to know that they can rely on the GI Plans to get things done vs. expanding MRP requirements.
 - Matt – what the drivers are affects what can be done. It is also hard to align with the requirements/goals of funding sources.

- Dan – Meeting PCB loads is not the best goal. The best approach is “no missed opportunities”, implement as much as possible, and use a tracking mechanism. (Others agreed with this approach.)
- Pollutant trading and metrics
 - The Work Group discussed using different “currency” for tracking progress, such as volumes captured or acres greened.
 - Keith – open to other metrics but don’t want to indicate that we don’t have to meet TMDL waste load allocations.

5. Next Steps

- Develop a list of C.3/GI topics and approximate schedule.
- Potential topics for next meeting:
 - O&M/asset management
 - Targets/metrics/goals, including RAA tracking metrics/recipes/goals
 - Indicators of strong GI program over time
 - How MRP 3.0 can be set up to support GI implementation

List of Attendees – February 7, 2019 Meeting

Name	Affiliation	2/7/19	3/7/19	4/4/19	5/2/19	6/6/19	
Keith Lichten	Water Board	X					
Dale Bowyer	Water Board	X					
Zach Rokeach	Water Board	X					
Matt Fabry	SMCWPPP	X					
Jill Bicknell	EOA/SCVURPPP	X					
Peter Schultze-Allen	EOA/SMCWPPP	X					
Courtney Riddle	CCCWP	X					
Adele Ho	CCCWP	X					
Jennifer Harrington	Vallejo F&WD	X					
Pam Boyle Rodriguez	Palo Alto	X					
Jeff Sinclair	San Jose	X					
Terri Fashing	Oakland	X					
Shannan Young	Dublin	X					
James Paluck	Fairfield	X					
Dan Cloak	DCE/CCCWP	X					
Derek Crutchfield	Vallejo	X					
Melissa Tigbao	Vallejo	X					
Geoff Brosseau	BASMAA	X					