

MRP 3.0 C3/GI Work Group Meeting
Thursday, October 3, 2019
Meeting Summary

1. Introductions/Changes to the Agenda

- Introductions were made. List of attendees is attached.
- There were no changes to the agenda.

2. Accept Previous Meeting Summary

- Requested edits by Pam Boyle Rodriguez to the draft September 3, 2019 meeting summary were sent to the work group prior to the meeting. Dan Cloak requested an additional edit at the meeting, which was to change the second sentence of the last bullet on page 1 to read: "Some members of the group stated that these are already addressed in guidance, training, and inspection procedures, and don't need changes in permit language." The draft September 3, 2019 meeting summary was accepted with these suggested edits.

3. Permittee Perspectives on C.3 Provisions

- The group continued the discussion of topics carried forward from the September meeting: O&M provisions and practices; C.3.b thresholds and exemptions (focused on roads exemption); and Special Projects. The following is a summary of key comments.
- O&M Provisions and Practices
 - WB staff expressed interest in learning what permittees were finding during inspections, how failure and poor function is recognized, and what lessons have been learned. Attendees shared their experiences with O&M and O&M inspections of treatment measures. Discussion included plant selection and maintenance, training of maintenance personnel, the importance of proper design and building to specifications, how design can facilitate maintenance, and involving the general public.
 - Permittees generally agreed that properly designed and built systems achieve very good pollutant removal (including trash and microplastics) and are very resilient.
 - Problems observed are ponding, pump failure, and weed growth. Permittees discussed sharing data on restorative practices.
 - Different maintenance training options discussed included the WEF National GI Certification Program, Rescape, and other local programs.
 - Proper signage (in multiple languages) about system function, plant characteristics, and prohibitions on fertilizer and pesticide use is helpful to ensure proper maintenance.
- C.3.b Thresholds and Exemptions
 - Water Board (WB) staff want significant road reconstruction projects to incorporate GI, either at the project site or somewhere else. Permittees expressed concern that a GI requirement for road reconstruction projects >5,000 sq ft would put inequitable burden on permittees who have not had the funding to maintain roads and whose roads are therefore more likely to require reconstruction vs repair. Adequate funding is already an issue, with cities losing ground annually to deferred maintenance, and SB1 revenue less than expected.

There are thousands of miles of roads in the Bay Area needing reconstruction based on low PCI scores. Permittees are concerned that the GI requirement would discourage road repair due to the additional GI cost that would be involved with each project.

- Keith Lichten stated that they are open to looking at the road requirement and threshold, but he feels there is a need to start considering the environmental impacts of roadways. They are looking for suggestions on how to craft language that acknowledges the nexus between private projects and public impacts, and a mechanism for infill projects that works for everyone. They are concerned that if there is no requirement, projects will not happen.
- Comments/suggestions by permittees included:
 - Consider the type of road project, such as those involving curb/gutter/drainage alterations;
 - Set targets related to acres of redevelopment rather than infrastructure expenditures;
 - Work with private development to install GI along frontage;
 - Use alternative compliance such as in lieu programs;
 - Set broad scale targets: multi-year, multi-agency, countywide if not region-wide, as opposed to a project-specific threshold;
 - Need flexibility. Spending may be restricted by Gann Limit in some cities.
- Permittees stated that GI Plans identify and prioritize where/how to install GI, and that diverting from these plans to meet new requirements will hinder implementation. Some permittees are already requiring roadway improvements through conditions of approval on development projects. They need more time to enact that type of implementation and would prefer that kind of flexibility.
- San Jose perspective – the City recently passed a \$25M bond measure and is starting to implement its GI Plan. Concern about staff capacity to switch focus to new requirements. Alternative compliance may not be the best way to achieve City goals (but plan to look into it).
- Keith would like to add asset management to the agenda for the next meeting. The stormwater permits for Guam and Salinas currently contain requirements for asset management. He wants to focus on the assets linked to water quality and whether the assets attached to a system are delivering the desired benefits. He's interested in what permittees are doing already, i.e., which tools are permittees using and which do they want to amplify. He also asked the attendees whether they see asset management as a useful tool for achieving other goals. Dan suggested to compile what is required already, and document what programs permittees have in place to address these requirements. He also stressed the need for prioritized and phased implementation, and Keith agreed this was important as well as what can be done at different levels (countywide programs vs. permittees). Jill commented that any asset management permit requirement should be scalable. Discussion will be continued at the next meeting.

4. Green Infrastructure (GI) Provisions – Preliminary Draft Language

- Keith Lichten stated that WB staff had hoped to have written comments on the proposed GI language for this meeting, but will provide comments for the November meeting.

- Zach and Dale provided their initial comments on the draft outline for GI drivers and indicators. Key comments and responses are summarized below:
 - Dale questioned the approach to “do one of the following” when the options are not all equivalent. Dan added that not all actions listed may be effective for a particular permittee. Keith asked how we can determine a level of effort that is meaningful and also avoids unnecessary work. Amanda suggested figuring out a system of equivalent choices to show GI implementation.
 - Zach asked what was meant by “enhanced standards for LID” Dan replied that it means requiring private development to do more than what is required by the permit. Keith requested a list of examples of how to go “above and beyond” C.3.
 - Goals and targets were discussed. Keith said they would consider a structure similar to the PCB loads reduction targets – regional, countywide, and individual permittee goals.
 - Tracking and reporting were discussed as well as frequency of reporting. It was agreed that LID and GI projects may be reported separately but can track together for purpose of meeting goals.

5. Next Steps/Action Items

- Continue to discuss the following topics on future meeting agendas: regulated project thresholds, exemptions for single family homes and roads; Special Projects; reporting requirements; asset management.
- WB staff to provide written comments on the preliminary draft GI drivers/indicators language.
- EOA to send out copy of Guam stormwater permit.
- Alternative Compliance Subgroup to finalize preliminary draft language for Provision C.3.e and share with Work Group.
- Set meeting date for November MRP 3.0 C3/GI Work Group meeting. (There is a conflict with the November 7 date for many work group members, so Jill will work with WB staff to find another date.)

6. Next Meeting

- To be determined.

List of Attendees – October 3, 2019 Meeting

Name	Affiliation	2/7/19	3/7/19	4/4/19	5/2/19	6/6/19 (int)	7/15/19 (int)	9/5/19	10/3/19
Keith Lichten	Water Board	X	X	X	X			X	X
Dale Bowyer	Water Board	X	X	X				X	X
Zach Rokeach	Water Board	X	X	X	X			X	X
Matt Fabry	SMCWPPP	X	X		X		X	X	
Jill Bicknell	EOA/SCVURPPP	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Peter Schultze-Allen	EOA/SMCWPPP	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Liesbeth Magna	EOA/SCVURPPP				X		X		X
Courtney Riddle	CCCWP	X			X				
Adele Ho	CCCWP	X	X						
Jennifer Harrington	Vallejo F&WD	X							
Pam Boyle Rodriguez	Palo Alto	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Jeff Sinclair	San Jose	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Terri Fashing	Oakland	X	X	X		X		X	X
Shannan Young	Dublin	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
James Paluck	Fairfield	X	X	X					
Dan Cloak	DCE/CCCWP	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Derek Crutchfield	Vallejo	X	X	X		X			
Melissa Tigbao	Vallejo	X							
Sam Kumar	Vallejo				X				
Geoff Brosseau	BASMAA	X	X						
Kristen Hathaway	Oakland		X						X
Kevin Cullen	Fairfield		X	X			X?	X	X
Frank Kennedy	Concord/Moraga/ Pleasant Hill		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Jim Scanlin	ACCWP		X	X			X	X	X
Chris McCann	Danville				X		X		
Reid Bogert	SMCWPPP				X	X	X	X	X
John Steere	CCCWP				X		X		
Chris Sommers	EOA/SCVURPPP					X			
Lisa Sabin	EOA/SCVURPPP					X			
Lisa Austin	Geosyntec					X			
Robert Newman	Vallejo					X			
Karin Graves	CCCWP					X		X	X
Rinta Perkins	City of Santa Clara					X	X	X	X
Steve Carter	Paradigm						X		
Amanda Booth	San Pablo						X	X	X
Craig Pon	Oakland						X		
Alvin Lei	Fairfield								X