

**MRP 3.0 C3/GI Work Group Meeting**  
**Thursday, April 4, 2019**  
**Meeting Summary**

**1. Introductions/Changes to the Agenda**

- Introductions were made. List of attendees is attached.

**2. Accept Previous Meeting Summary**

- The March 7, 2019 meeting summary was accepted, as written.

**3. Work Group Topics and Schedule**

- The Work Group agreed on the topics for today's meeting, and that the list of topics for next meeting will be revisited at the end of the meeting.

**4. Discussion of Key Topics for MRP 3.0**

- The key topics for this Work Group meeting were:
  - Continued discussion of indicators
  - Asset management
  - C3/LID implementation experience

**4.a. Continued Discussion of Indicators**

- Ideas for indicators of GI implementation progress included impervious acres treated and volumes treated. This will vary by community, so an indicator that relates to a community characteristic, e.g., percentage of impervious area (IA) treated, may be more appropriate. This could be expressed as % of total IA or % of IA in GI focus areas.
- Dan – if purpose is to motivate progress, do we need the same measure for each permittee?
- Keith – Would like one broad overarching indicator but may be more options (e.g., programmatic indicators) as well. PCBs are compelling but looking for something broader. For example, combined sewer communities use volumes. Is there anything we can use that also relates to other benefits such as climate resiliency?
- Dan – Reduced local flooding?
- Shannan – Dublin has been doing life cycle analysis of GI projects, using software that takes benefits into account (e.g., flood reduction, urban heat island mitigation, pedestrian safety, etc.). Some project do not pencil out in terms of cost-benefit ratio.
- Pam – Would be useful to have more than one indicator, e.g., increased tree canopy, especially in low income areas. There should be some metrics for outcomes as well as a suite of programmatic indicators so permittees can get credit for things they are doing to advance their GI Plans.
- Dale – It is easier to measure/report outcomes than programmatic indicators. It's good to have a story and a vision for the GI Plans and a way of expressing progress toward that; however, this is hard to express in a permit.
- Keith – Open to looking at measurement of benefits.
- Reid – Obvious indicators for the next permit are those things we are already tracking. With good GI Plans, does Water Board (WB) staff feel like we are moving in the right direction?

- Dale – Want to see that GI is being integrated into projects and there are less missed opportunities – can we measure this?
- Jill – This would be very hard and subjective to measure. There are a lot of different issues around taking advantage of opportunities, especially funding.
- Keith – Maybe we can frame this differently.
- Dan – A programmatic indicator suite is a way to get at this. For example, acres treated as a function of transportation spending. This could be a way of normalizing the effort.
- Jeff – If doing regional projects, don't want to get dinged for not doing green street projects in that drainage area.
- Jill – Communities will have different strategies for types of projects and where to focus GI; it would be hard to have just one indicator related to transportation.
- Shannan – Transportation funding is very project specific; we'd need to separate out costs of paving/sealing projects.
- Jill – We also need to recognize municipalities that create opportunities in priority GI implementation areas (Dale agreed).
- Dan – Suggested including a process for developing indicators during the next permit.
- Keith – Open to this but will also require reporting.
- Dale – Challenge is to put heat on the underperformers.
- Jill – This will be hard because WB staff haven't seen the GI Plans. There will be a large range in the types and content of plans.
- Shannan – That's why programmatic indicators are important.
- Keith - Agreed but wants outcome indicators too. Under the rubric of continuous improvement, wants permittees to be able to show progress.
- Pam – Maintenance costs are a key issue.
- Jill – Agreed it's important to look at life cycle costs in decision making, not just capital costs.
- Dale – What driver can we use in the permit to help convince project managers of the need to include GI?
- Jim – And what message to City Councils and Boards of Supervisors is motivating?
- Dale – We still have PCBs linkage, but understands the challenge of communicating this. Need other drivers to provide incentive for implementation. What if the C.3 exemptions for road projects were removed?
- Jill – Most permittees are opposed to this. This was the whole reason for the GI Plans – to be able to implement GI where it makes sense, and in priority areas.
- Dale – Permittees could use alternative compliance approach and mitigate equivalent amounts of IA somewhere else.
- Terry – We need some kind of prescriptive requirement to help get funding for projects, but not sure at what level.
- Jill – Suggested incorporating “planning level targets” similar to POTW permits.
- Frank – Some cities have very low maintenance budgets and no CIPs, as well as many other challenges to implementation.
- Keith – Knows that there are real budget challenges but interested in how we can move forward with implementation. If we can identify other metrics, he is willing to be flexible on the PCB requirements. He suggested that permittees draft an approach for WB staff consideration, and that WB staff would send an email with

minimum things that have to be in the approach, e.g., PCBs/Hg have to be in the mix, and everyone has to do something.

#### **4.b. Asset Management**

- Work Group discussed current asset management (AM) systems being used and benefits of tracking not just locations of constructed GI/LID systems but also costs, O&M frequency and issues, what we are learning, and feedback to improve future designs.
- Jill – Thinks there will be a transition period from current tracking systems toward AM, but it will not be appropriate for all permittees. The permit can specify what needs to be tracked and reported, but should not mandate a particular system or approach. Suggested using the next few years as an opportunity to provide training on AM and learn from other efforts around the state and nationally.
- Keith – Thinks AM is a good approach for public systems but also interested in proper oversight mechanism for private systems - need to make sure features are operated and maintained adequately and at an appropriate frequency. Summary of information needs to be transmitted to public and regulators. There are different approaches to AM and we need to figure out the appropriate level of detail; e.g., doesn't think we need to be as detailed as Philadelphia and SF have been - don't need to track all widgets. One option is to use the permit to require assessment of different types of AM and define what mechanisms and goals are important. Thinks we should focus on constructed projects and costs, not programmatic elements. Suggested permittees could develop a proposed approach.

#### **4.c. C3/LID implementation Experience**

- Dan – Commented that some of the everyday challenges to design and construction of LID facilities were not on the WB staff “list” of issues to address in MRP 3.0. The current Provision C.3.c language is a good preamble but it doesn’t translate well to good site design for LID. For example:
  - Designers still do not understand that you should do landscape dispersion and distributed bioretention in visible locations (e.g., not in backyards).
  - You should design for use of surface drainage to move runoff around the site, not build facilities too deep (and not use pumps).
  - The bottoms of facilities should be unlined wherever possible.
  - Bioretention systems should be designed with flat surfaces.
- Jill – Agreed with all of these points, but thinks this information should be provided in guidance documents and training, and does not need to be in the permit.
- Dan – Suggested C.3.c language could be tweaked to emphasize good design practice.
- Frank – Issue with designers cutting and pasting details onto plans without much thought about what is appropriate for the site.
- Dale – May want to think about specifying maximum ponding depth in permit.
- Pam – Concerned about third party certification process, thinks reviewers are engineers that may not be well versed in all aspects of design.
- Work Group agreed that third party certification should be added to the list of issues for discussion at a future meeting.

## **5. Action Items**

- A subgroup of the Work Group will discuss and draft an approach to drivers, metrics, and indicators for GI implementation prior to the next Work Group meeting (Shannan, Dan, Jill, Pam, Jeff, Jim, and Matt/Reid).
- WB staff (Keith, Dale) will provide input on minimum contents of the drivers/metrics/indicators approach.
- Permittees will develop a proposal for language addressing asset management.
- Third party certification will be added to the list of topics.

## **6. Next Meeting**

- Next meeting scheduled for May 2, 10:30 am - 12:30 pm.

### List of Attendees – April 4, 2019 Meeting

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