

MRP 3.0 Trash Work Group
Meeting Summary
Wednesday, May 29, 2019
1:00 – 3:30pm
EOA Conference Room
1410 Jackson Street, Oakland, CA 94612

I. Introductions and Agenda Review

Attendees introduced themselves and the work group reviewed the agenda. Chris Sommers presented the goals of the meeting. No modifications were made to the agenda.

II. Meeting Summary and Tracking Matrix

Chris asked if any participants had comments on the meeting summary or matrix. The group was generally okay with the level of detail in the meeting summary and the structure of the matrix. Chris indicated that the color-coding in the matrix is intended to identify which topics still need to be discussed and other where there is general agreement. Water Board staff suggested that the column header “general agreement” should be revised to state “general tentative agreement.” Chris indicated that this change would be made and that the matrix includes only what was discussed at the work group meetings, as does not include dialogue from conversations outside . He stressed that it is important to have tentative agreements document as this process progresses. Chris requested comments on the meeting summary and matrix by June 5th.

III. Priority Topics for Discussion

- **Source Control Credits**

Chris provided an overview of how actions that fall under the “source control” category are currently credited, consistent with the MRP. Chris indicated that reductions associated with source controls are credited based on characterization studies conducted by Permittees. The methods are fully documented in Annual Reports. Reductions are typically greater than the 10% maximum, based on the findings of the studies. A majority of Permittees are accessing the source control credit for single use plastic bag and expanded polystyrene food ware ordinances/laws. Additional actions that target items beyond these two, such as plastic straws, are also in place or planned.

Water Board staff indicated that their general feeling is that the credits in the MRP are double-counting reductions that are also being accounted for via On-land Visual Trash Assessments (OVTAs). Permittees disagreed with this perspective, stating that OVTAs are blunt tools. Chris raised the question “How does one account for these existing and new actions, when the reductions are likely less than those needed to see a change in OVTA scores?” Chris agreed that the OVTA protocols are blunt tool that detect roughly a 60% or greater change in litter levels on streets and sidewalks. Source control actions adopted to-date are focused on reducing litter in the 5-15% range. OVTAs were not developed to detect this level of change.

Water Board staff also indicated that they may be willing to suggest keeping the existing or lower source control credit if actions are new or go beyond the baseline of the State’s law. Permittees indicated that even with a floor of State law, enforcement is needed to ensure the action is occurring. Permittees, in many instances, conduct the enforcement. This is an investment.

Permittees asked what type of information could be provided to indicate that source controls are important to trash reduction and their effects are not double-counted through OVTAs. Water Board staff indicated that the goal is for each Permittees' map to turn green (low trash generating). If Permittees are getting significant credit for source control, then the map won't turn green. Staff stated that there is a need to define a clear path to compliance, while also giving continued motivation to implement significant actions. Staff suggested that there are different levels of ordinance scope and enforcement. Hard to apply one credit universally. Additionally, staff indicated that Water Board members and some stakeholders view credits as cheating the load reductions, at the detriment of having cleaner landscapes.

Matrix Color Following Discussion – The group agreed to keep this topic as Orange (under discussion).

Next Steps – Chris will include source control credits on August/September work group meeting agenda. A small group consisting of Permittee representatives will be created to discuss perspectives on this topic and will present additional information on the benefits and costs of source control programs at the August/September meeting, in comparison to alternative controls that reduce or intercept trash prior to reaching receiving waters.

- **Mandatory Trash Hot Spot Cleanups**

Chris indicated that the current MRP requires that nearly all Permittees annually remove trash from a specific number of trash hot spot locations within receiving waters. Permittees questioned whether these actions should continue to be mandated in the MRP, or just be accounted for towards load reductions (via offsets) if they occur. Water Board staff indicated that they would like to understand trends at these spots, although they realize that there are many variables that can affect trends evaluations. Chris indicated that this question is more appropriately answered via the receiving water monitoring data being collected per the MRP. Water Board staff indicated that they are tentatively okay with removing the mandated cleanups and including the benefits of the cleanups into whatever creek/shoreline cleanup offsets remain in the reissued MRP. That said, Water Board staff stated that requirements for non-population based permittees still need to be discussed and cleanups could be part of these requirements.

Matrix Color Following Discussion – The group agreed to turn this topic to Green (Tentative Agreement) on the matrix.

Next Steps – Chris to include discussion of requirements for non-population based Permittee on the August/September Work Group meeting agenda.

- **Full Capture System O&M Requirements**

Water Board staff indicated that current requirements in the MRP don't work well for large full capture systems. The requirements are written with smaller systems in mind. Staff indicated that the reissued MRP needs to distinguish between large and small systems, and possibly different types of large systems. Possibly inclusion of reference to manufacture guidelines for operation and maintenance in the MRP will also be considered. Reporting on O&M will be discussed in a subsequent meeting.

Matrix Color Following Discussion – The group agreed to turn this topic to Green (Tentative Agreement) on the matrix.

Next Steps – Revisions to MRP text will be prepared.

IV. Prioritization of Additional Topics

The Work Group agreed to prioritize the following topics for the next Work Group meeting:

- Trash receiving water monitoring
- OVTA Frequencies
- Definition of a “Consistent A” OVTA score (i.e., low trash generation/green on maps)
- Full Capture Equivalency via Other Actions (e.g., individual and combinations of control measures)

V. Next Steps and Schedule

- Chris will update the perspectives matrix based on the discussion and agreements at the May 29th meeting.
- The next meeting of the MRP 3.0 Trash Work Group will occur on July 23rd in the PM. Chris will send out a meeting request. The meeting will be held at the Water Board’s offices.

Meeting Attendees

Attendee	Agency	In-person or via Phone
Chris Sommers	EOA/BASMAA facilitator	In-person
Dale Bowyer	SF Bay Water Board	In-person
Zach Rokeach	SF Bay Water Board	In-person
Ali Kalyan	SF Bay Water Board	In-person
Kirsten Struve	Valley Water	In-person
Rinta Perkins	City of Walnut Creek	In-person
Carrie Sandahl	City of Mountain View	In-person
Sara Scheidt	City of San Mateo	In-person
Jim Scanlin	Alameda County Clean Water Program	In-person
Sharon Gosselin	Alameda County	In-person
Reid Bogart	San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program	Phone
Liz Neves	City of San Jose	Phone
Amanda Booth	City of San Pablo	In-person
Beth Baldwin	Contra Costa Clean Water Program	In-person
Ben Livsey	City of Oakland	In-person
Shelia Tucker	West Valley Clean Water Program	In-person
Kathy Cote	City of Fremont	In-person
Jennifer Harrington	Vallejo Flood and Wastewater	In-person
Joanne Le	City of Richmond	In-person