



**Santa Clara Valley
Urban Runoff
Pollution Prevention Program**

**MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
INFORMATION PACKET**

Campbell • Cupertino • Los Altos • Los Altos Hills • Los Gatos • Milpitas • Monte Sereno • Mountain View • Palo Alto
San Jose • Santa Clara • Saratoga • Sunnyvale • Santa Clara County • Valley Water

July 18, 2019 Meeting

MATERIALS FOR INFORMATION

II. July 18, 2019 Agenda

III. May 16, 2019 Meeting Minutes

IV. May 16, 2019 Action Items

VIII. MRP Implementation

1. Memorandum to Management Committee, from Program Staff, re: Management Committee Briefing on Priority Items, July 2019
2. Highlights of BASMAA Committee Meetings, June 2019 to July 2019

VIII. A. New Development and Redevelopment

1. Letter to Geoff Brosseau, BASMAA, from Keith H. Lichten, SFBWQCB, re: Conditional Acceptance of Guidance for Sizing Green Infrastructure Facilities in Street Projects

IX. Other Business

1. Letter to Mr. James Nachbaur, Director, Office of Water Research, Planning and Performance, State Water Resources Control Board), from Daniel Apt, CASQA, re: the State Water Resources Control Board's Guidance for Future Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Municipal Storm Water Cost Estimation and for Guidance for Obtaining Past Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit Compliance Costs, June 20, 2019
2. Agenda for FY 2019-20 Water Quality Fees Stakeholder Meeting
3. MC Calendar, July 2019 to August 2019



**Santa Clara Valley
Urban Runoff
Pollution Prevention Program**

Campbell • Cupertino • Los Altos • Los Altos Hills • Los Gatos • Milpitas • Monte Sereno • Mountain View • Palo Alto
San Jose • Santa Clara • Saratoga • Sunnyvale • Santa Clara County • Valley Water

AGENDA

MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

July 18, 2019, 9:30 - 11:00 am

Sunnyvale Civic Center, West Conference Room
456 Olive Avenue, Sunnyvale

- 9:30** **I. Management Committee Meeting Call to Order/Introductions**
- II. Additions or Revisions to Agenda; Announcements**
- III. Approval of Minutes (May 16, 2019 meeting)**
- IV. Review of Action Items from Last Meeting**
- 9:40** **V. Time Open for Public Comment on Any Subject Not on Agenda (2 minutes)**
- VI. Regional Water Board Staff Comments**
- 9:45** **VII. Program Business**
- A. Program Manager's Report**
1. Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association (BASMAA) Update – *information.*
2. California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) Update – *information.*
3. Grants Update – *information.*
- B. Program Management**
- No items.
- 10:00** **C. Program Budget**
1. Request for Use of Unencumbered SCVURPPP Budget from Previous Fiscal Years – *consideration of approval.*
- 10:20** **VIII. MRP Implementation**
- A. New Development and Redevelopment**
1. Priority Items Identified by Program Staff-- *see MC briefing memorandum.*
- a. Green Stormwater Infrastructure Work Plan Tasks – *see MC briefing memorandum.*
- b. Stormwater Resource Plan Development – *status report.*
2. Management Committee Requested Items

10:30

B. Trash Controls

1. Priority Items Identified by Program Staff -- *see MC briefing memorandum.*
 - a. Receiving Water Monitoring Plan – *status report.*
 - b. Trash Load Reduction – *status report.*
2. Management Committee Requested Items

10:35

C. Monitoring / Pollutants of Concern

1. Priority Items Identified by Program Staff-- *see MC briefing memorandum.*
 - a. PCBs/Mercury Load Reduction – *status report.*
 - b. Reasonable Assurance Analysis (RAA) – *status report.*
2. Management Committee Requested Items

10:45

D. Outreach Activities

1. Priority Items Identified by Program Staff -- *see MC briefing memorandum.*
2. Management Committee Requested Items

10:50

E. Other Permit-Related Activities

1. Priority Items Identified by Program Staff -- *see MC briefing memorandum.*
2. Management Committee Requested Items

10:55 **IX. Other Business**

1. External Meeting Summaries – *questions on materials provided prior to the meeting.*
2. Miscellaneous – *information from MC members.*
3. AHTG Status Table – *updates available at <http://www.scvurppp-w2k.com/mc.shtml>*

11:00 **X. Adjourn**



**MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES**

May 16, 2019

Campbell • Cupertino • Los Altos • Los Altos Hills • Los Gatos • Milpitas • Monte Sereno • Mountain View • Palo Alto
San Jose • Santa Clara • Saratoga • Sunnyvale • Santa Clara County • Valley Water

I. MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE CALL TO ORDER / INTRODUCTIONS

Kirsten Struve (Chair, Valley Water) called the meeting to order at 9:35 am. Management Committee (MC) members introduced themselves.

II. ADDITIONS OR REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA; ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no additions to the agenda. The following announcements were made:

- The Palo Alto City Council accepted the City's Green Stormwater Infrastructure Plan.
- The Los Altos City Council approved the City's PCBs in Demolition Ordinance.
- The City of Santa Clara has hired a new compliance manager. Her name is Rinta Perkins. She will be the MC voting representative for Santa Clara.
- Laura Bates (Valley Water) will present information on infiltration tests conducted at local GSI features at the May 20 C3PO AHTG meeting.
- State Board and EPA are hosting a stormwater asset management training on June 14 in Sacramento.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion: Dave Staub (Santa Clara) moved to approve the minutes from the April 18, 2019 MC meeting. **Second:** Melody Tovar (Sunnyvale). **Vote:** Motion passed unanimously.

IV. REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS FROM LAST MEETING

Action Items from the April 18, 2019 meeting:

- None.

Action Items from previous meetings:

- Action item 4-18-2 (Develop an updated description of WMI-related groups for posting on the WMI website) is in progress. Jill Bicknell (Program staff) will send it to Kirsten, Trish Mulvey (CLEAN South Bay), and Phil Bobel (Palo Alto) for review.

V. TIME OPEN FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON ANY SUBJECT NOT ON AGENDA

No members of the public were present.

VI. WATER BOARD STAFF COMMENTS

Water Board (WB) staff was not present at the meeting, and no comments were submitted.

VII. PROGRAM BUSINESS

A. PROGRAM MANAGER'S REPORT

1. BASMAA Update

Kirsten reported that she was approved to be on the BASMAA Board. The BASMAA Board will discuss the organizational structure at its meeting on May 23. Kirsten worked with the SCVURPPP BASMAA AHTG to develop questions for the BASMAA Board's consideration.

2. CASQA Update

Jill Bicknell (Program staff) reported on the CASQA Board meeting held on May 8, 2019. The Board approved consultants for the following projects: Water Quality Priorities, Statewide Bacteria Efforts, Trash Control Measure Implementation Guidance, Phase II Municipal Permit Renewal Support, and Development of an Online Pollutant of Concern Reduction Guidance Manual.

The CASQA Quarterly Meeting held on May 9, 2019 was on the topic of "Homelessness and the Role of Stormwater Management". It was well attended. Kirsten presented a case study of efforts to address homelessness in Santa Clara County creeks.

3. Grants Update

Vishakha reported that the California Natural Resources Agency is accepting applications for its Green Infrastructure Grant Program from May 13, 2019 through June 28, 2019. However, these grants are only for projects in or benefitting disadvantaged or severely disadvantaged communities.

B. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

1. Final FY 18-19 Annual Report Guidance

Jill informed the MC that WB staff submitted comments on the FY 18-19 Annual Report forms for Provisions C.4, C.5, C.6, C.9, and C.12. She provided an overview of the comments. She noted that comments on C.4 and C.5 are minor and will be incorporated into the Annual Report template. Comments on Provisions C.6, C.9, and C.12 are more significant and Permittees may not have the information that WB staff is requesting to be reported. BASMAA will submit a response to comments to WB staff. Adam Olivieri (Program staff) recommended that Jill contact Keith Lichten (WB staff) to discuss the concerns.

C. PROGRAM BUDGET

1. FY 19-20 Program Manager Agreement

Chris Sommers (Program staff) reported that the Notice-to-Proceed from the MC was provided to the City of Sunnyvale (SCVURPPP fiscal agent). The City of Sunnyvale will proceed with modifying the Program Manager's Agreement for FY 19-20.

VIII. MRP IMPLEMENTATION

A. NEW DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT

1. Priority Items Identified by Program Staff

Jill provided the following updates:

- Program staff are working with Valley Water staff to respond to State Board staff's comments on the Final SWRP. State Board staff asked that the SWRP include the cost of implementation for all GSI opportunities listed in the prioritized project opportunities list. Jill distributed a handout to the MC describing edits to Chapter 7 of the SWRP to address this request. The edits include cost estimates for implementing a small percentage of the identified GSI opportunities. The MC discussed the cost estimates and agreed with the approach.
- Josh Bradt (SFEP) recently contacted Program staff regarding cost estimates for implementing GSI projects. SFEP would like to include this information in the Plan Bay Area update. The MC discussed the request and agreed to share cost information.
- The State of the Estuary Conference will be held in Oakland on October 21 – 22, 2019. The MC discussed including a panel on GSI. Chris noted that he is proposing a session on transformation of watersheds. It will include information on trash reduction efforts. The session could be enhanced to include information on GSI.
- The request for submitting information on FY 17-18 constructed GSI projects to the SCVURPPP GSI Database will be sent out soon.

B. TRASH CONTROLS

1. Priority Items Identified by Program Staff

Chris informed the MC that Program staff is working with Co-permittee staff in response to Water Board staff's request for information on municipal Permittee trash generating areas associated with Caltrans ROW (freeways and state highways, on/off ramps), and status of identifying existing, planned and potential trash capture systems and other control measure locations that would address trash from both Caltrans ROW and Co-permittee areas. WB staff has agreed to a 10-day extension. The information is now due on May 31.

Chris added that comments on the Receiving Water Monitoring Report are due on May 22, 2019.

C. MONITORING AND POLLUTANTS OF CONCERN

1. Priority Items Identified by Program Staff

Chris informed the MC that the WB sent a letter responding to Stanford's comments on managing PCBs during demolition. The letter reiterates the requirements to control PCBs during building demolition. Program staff is working through BASMAA to schedule a meeting with Stanford and WB staff to discuss their comments.

D. OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

1. Priority Items Identified by Program Staff

Vishakha informed the MC that the WEO AHTG approved the new anti-litter advertisement at its meeting on May 6, 2019. The WEO AHTG also discussed the potential for conducting joint outreach with the RWRC TAC's Public Education Subcommittee, and recommended conducting outreach on single-use food ware.

E. OTHER PERMIT-RELATED ACTIVITIES

No items.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

No items.

X. ADJOURN

The MC meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.



**Santa Clara Valley
Urban Runoff
Pollution Prevention Program**

Meeting Attendance Record

DATE May 16, 2019

Campbell • Cupertino • Los Altos • Los Altos Hills • Los Gatos • Milpitas • Monte Sereno • Mountain View • Palo Alto
San Jose • Santa Clara • Saratoga • Sunnyvale • Santa Clara County • Valley Water

CO-PERMITTEE REPRESENTATIVES

(voting members)

SIGNATURE

Cheri Donnelly – Cupertino
Alternate: Roger Lee

C Donnelly

Aida Fairman – Los Altos
Alternate: Andrea Trese

Aida Fairman

Nichol Bowersox – Los Altos Hills
Alternate: John Chau

Steve Erickson – Milpitas
Alternate: Kan Xu

Eric Anderson – Mountain View
Alternate: Carrie Sandahl

Karin North – Palo Alto
Alternate: Pamela Boyle Rodriguez
Alternate: Michel Jeremias

Sharon Newton – San Jose
Alternate: Jeff Sinclair

Dave Staub – Santa Clara
Alternate: Karin Hickey

Melody Tovar – Sunnyvale
Alternate: Nupur Hiremath

Vanessa Marcadejas – Santa Clara County
Alternate: Garik Iosilevsky

Kirsten Struve – SCVWD
Alternate: James Downing

Sheila Tucker – West Valley Communities
(Campbell, Los Gatos, Monte Sereno, and Saratoga)

URBAN RUNOFF PROGRAM STAFF

Adam Olivieri

Jill Bicknell

Chris Sommers

Vishakha Atre

[Handwritten signatures for each representative and staff member, including: C Donnelly, Aida Fairman, Steve Erickson, Eric Anderson, Karin North, Sharon Newton, Dave Staub, Melody Tovar, Vanessa Marcadejas, Kirsten Struve, Sheila Tucker, Adam Olivieri, Jill Bicknell, Chris Sommers, and Vishakha Atre.]

**Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program
Management Committee Meeting Action Items**

Action Items from the May 16, 2019 Meeting

Action	Description	Responsibility	Due Date	Status	Comments
	None				

Action Items Remaining from Previous Meetings

Action	Description	Responsibility	Due Date	Status	Comments
4-18-2	Develop an updated description of WMI-related groups for posting on the WMI website.	Program staff	June	In Progress	

REGIONAL BOARD REPRESENTATIVE

TBD

INTERESTED PARTIES/AGENCY REPRESENTATIVE

Trish Mulvey – Clean South Bay

ADDITIONAL ATTENDEES



**Santa Clara Valley
Urban Runoff
Pollution Prevention Program**

MEMORANDUM

Campbell • Cupertino • Los Altos • Los Altos Hills • Los Gatos • Milpitas • Monte Sereno • Mountain View • Palo Alto
San José • Santa Clara • Saratoga • Sunnyvale • Santa Clara County • Santa Clara Valley Water District

TO: Management Committee

FROM: Program Staff

DATE: July 12, 2019

SUBJECT: Management Committee Briefing on Priority Items

Program Management

- NPDES Permit Reissuance – The fourth meeting of the MRP 3.0 Steering Committee occurred on June 25th. The agenda included a review of the summary and action items from the previous meeting, summaries from the four MRP 3.0 work groups regarding discussions that have occurred to-date and topics for upcoming meetings, and a presentation and discussion on the relationship between Green Stormwater Infrastructure (C.3.j) requirements, and C.11/C.12 load reduction requirements (if any) in MRP 3.0, and other potential indicators/drivers for GSI. The next meeting is scheduled for September 3rd.

Updates on the Work Groups are as follows:

- C3/GI Work Group – The Work Group is being coordinated by Jill Bicknell (SCVURPPP) and Matt Fabry (SMCWPPP). The Work Group held its fifth meeting on June 6, 2019. During this internal meeting (with no Water Board staff present), the Work Group discussed a list of “perspectives” provided by Water Board staff on current and proposed C.3 provisions that was received just before the meeting, and an approach for response. The Work Group also discussed topics and approach to the upcoming Steering Committee meeting on June 25th. The next C3/GI Work Group meeting will be held on July 15 and will again be internal – for permittee staff and consultants only.
- Monitoring Work Group – The Work Group is being coordinated by Bonnie de Berry (SCVURPPP/SMCWPPP) and Lucile Paquette (CCCWP). Carol Boland (San Jose), James Downing (Valley Water), and Chris Sommers and Paul Randall (SCVURPPP) are representing SCVURPPP on the Work Group. The first meeting with Water Board staff was held on April 25th. The Work Group members briefly reviewed current C.8 requirements and shared their perspectives on the utility of different types of monitoring data. The Work Group will meet again on August 19th.

Note: * indicates that Program staff has identified this item for discussion and/or consideration for approval at the Management Committee meeting.

1021 S. Wolfe Rd., Suite 185 • Sunnyvale, CA 94086 • tel: (408) 720-8811 • fax: (408) 720-8812
1410 Jackson Street • Oakland, CA 94612 • tel: (510) 832-2852 • fax: (510) 832-2856

1-800-794-2482

- PCBs/Mercury Work Group – This Work Group is being coordinated by Jim Scanlin (ACCWP) and Lisa Austin (Geosyntec for ACCWP/CCCWP). Raffles Warners (City of Santa Clara), Carol Boland (San Jose) and Chris Sommers (SCVURPPP) are representing SCVURPPP. The Work Group met with Water Board staff on April 25th and June 10th. The Work Group members reviewed current C.11 and C.12 requirements and shared their perspectives on the current structure of the permit and the lessons learned in MRP 1.0 and 2.0 regarding control measure effectiveness, costs and load reduction opportunities moving forward. Discussions have been productive to-date. The Work Group will meet again in October.
- Trash Work Group – The Work Group is being coordinated by Chris Sommers (SCVURPPP) Carrie Sandahl (Mountain View), Liz Neves (San Jose), Shelia Tucker (West Valley) and Kirsten Struve (Valley Water) are representing SCVURPPP on the Work Group. Work Group meetings with Water Board staff occurred on April 23rd and May 29th. The Work Group members reviewed current C.10 requirements and shared their perspectives. Discussions have been productive to-date. The Work Group will meet again on July 23rd in the afternoon, following the BASMAA Trash Committee meeting
- FY 18-19 Annual Report Form and Guidance – Each year, SCVURPPP staff assist BASMAA with preparation of the draft MRP Annual Report Form updates. The Form was submitted to the Water Board on March 29th. Water Board staff provided a letter of acceptance with some requested changes to the Form on May 1st. There were concerns with three of the requested changes, and Program staff worked with BASMAA to prepare a response to the letter and changes to the Form, which were submitted to the Water Board on June 5th. Water Board staff accepted the changes on June 11th, and Program staff then completed development of the SCVURPPP-specific guidance on the Annual Report Form.

Program staff completed the draft FY 18-19 Annual Report Guidance, emailed it to the MC on April 11, and reviewed it at the April 18 MC meeting. The final guidance and Annual Report Forms were emailed to the MC on June 13.
- SCVURPPP Website – Program staff launched the Program’s new website on April 22nd (Earth Day). The same url www.scvurppp.org is being used.

New Development and Redevelopment

- Stormwater Resource Plan (SWRP) – The Final SWRP was completed and submitted to the Grant Manager on December 21, and is posted on the SWRP website. Program staff responded to a few additional comments from the grant manager (as discussed at the May MC meeting) and the response and revisions to the SWRP were accepted. The revisions were incorporated into the Final SWRP, the date updated to July 2019, and submitted to the grant manager.
- GSI Handbook Part 1 – This final draft document is undergoing minor edits and addition of the BASMAA GI Alternative Sizing Guidance. The final version for this FY will be completed by the end of July and posted on the SCVURPPP website.
- GSI Handbook Part 2 – Program staff are continuing to incorporate Co-permittee comments into the set of documents and developing the SCVURPPP typical details. The bioretention and pervious pavement typical details will be completed and posted on the SCVURPPP website in both PDF and CAD formats by the end of July.
- GSI Alternative Sizing Guidance - BASMAA conducted a regional project that evaluated approaches to treatment measure selection and sizing where GI project constraints preclude fully meeting the C.3.d sizing requirements, using hydrologic modeling analyses. The report on the modeling analysis containing bioretention sizing curves and the guidance for use of the sizing curves have been completed and approved by the BASMAA Board. WB staff initially provided verbal comments saying they accepted the modeling results and were fine with the

approach for sizing for capture/treatment of 80% of annual runoff; written comments were later provided on June 21, 2019 that granted conditional acceptance of the technical report and guidance (see MC Information Packet). It is anticipated that continuing discussions will occur during FY 19-20 to address their remaining concerns.

- C3PO AHTG – The C3PO AHTG met on May 20. The meeting included a presentation from Valley Water staff on infiltration tests conducted at local bioretention areas. Meeting minutes are included in the MC Informational Packet. The next C3PO AHTG meeting will be held on July 29, 2019 at Milpitas City Hall.

Industrial/Commercial Business Inspection

- IND/IDDE AHTG – The last AHTG meeting was held on March 21, 2019. Regional Water Board staff had requested to attend the AHTG meeting but could not attend on this date. Regional Water Board staff emailed individual municipalities with the RWB’s prioritized list of Industrial General Permit (IGP) non-filers for input.
- IND/IDDE Inspector Training Workshop – The IND/IDDE inspector training workshop was held on Thursday, May 30, 2019 from 11:30am – 3:00pm at the Quinlan Community Center in Cupertino. Approximately 46 municipal staff attended the training. The workshop included a presentation on Code Enforcement Officer (CEO) Safety from a City of Santa Clara CEO, a presentation on Residential RVs and Stormwater from a City of Mountain View Environmental Specialist and three inspection scenarios provided by City of San Jose inspectors. The evaluation forms indicated the majority of attendees thought the workshop was very useful. Workshop materials, including the presentations, are posted on the SCVURPPP website. The Code Enforcement Officer Safety presentation was recorded and will be available on the SCVURPPP members-only website.

Municipal Maintenance

- Rural Roads BMP Workshop –The Municipal Maintenance AHTG Rural Roads BMP Workshop was held on Monday, June 24th and Tuesday, June 25th. The same workshop was held on these two dates from 8am – 12noon. The workshop included a classroom session at the Valley Water Administrative Building and a field session at a nearby site. Twelve people attended the first day and 29 people attended the second training date. The evaluation forms indicated the majority of attendees thought the workshop was very useful. Workshop materials including the classroom presentation, agenda, attendance and evaluation summary will be posted on the SCVURPPP website.

Watershed Education and Outreach

- Watershed Watch Media Interviews – As the Watershed Watch Campaign spokesperson, Aida Fairman (Los Altos) taped three 2-minute interviews in Spanish on KDTV Univision on June 20. The interview topics were litter, Santa Clara Valley Green Gardener program, and mercury in fish. The interviews will air in July.
- Watershed Watch Outreach Events – Three half-off car wash events were held on June 12, June 19, and June 26. Program, Ad Manor, San Jose, Valley Water, and Cupertino staff staffed these events.

Pesticide Controls

- Green Gardener Training – The Fall 2019 Green Gardener training will be held on the following dates:
 - Training in English – Wednesdays, August 28, 2019 to October 30, 2019, 4:30 PM - 6:30 PM
 - Training in Spanish – Thursdays, August 29, 2019 to October 31, 2019, 4:00 PM - 6:00 PM

- Local OWOW Store Partnership Program – Program staff have completed the final round of store visits for FY 18-19.

Watershed Management Initiative

- Land Use Subgroup (LUS) – Program staff chaired the March 20th meeting. The Subgroup has decided to change the meeting frequency to approximately quarterly. Program staff prepare agendas and meeting summaries and complete actions items related to this subgroup. One topic discussed was partnering with the Peninsula-South Bay Watershed Forum on presentations and information sharing. The June 19th meeting of the LUS was cancelled and will be rescheduled soon.
- Zero Litter Initiative (ZLI) –The ZLI Steering Committee meets on a monthly basis. Major topic areas currently being discussed include coordination with Caltrans and other agencies on trash management, design guidance for reducing litter and waste in new and existing buildings, regulations and programs for reducing plastic foodware and litter, and other topics for future webinars. A presentation on reducing litter and waste in building design and operation was given by Peter Schultze-Allen (representing the ZLI) at the RWRC TAC on May 9th. Other tasks that will be implemented in FY 19-20 and future years are currently being discussed by the Committee. The next ZLI Steering Committee meeting/call is scheduled for July 12, 2019.
- SCBWMI Website - SCVURPPP currently hosts the Watershed Management Initiative website. Program staff continue to update the website quarterly. Program staff is updating descriptions of the WMI committees and subgroups to reflect current WMI activities.

Trash Controls

- On-land Visual Trash Assessments – Trash assessments in FY 18-19 at previously assessed street/sidewalk sites are complete. Over 1,000 assessment events were conducted by Program staff in FY 18-19. Additionally, Program staff conducted an analysis of how best to modify the assessment program to incorporate assessments at land areas that drain to private inlets directly connected to Co-permittee storm drain systems. Program staff provided guidance to Co-permittees on reassessing baseline conditions and requested that if Co-permittees choose to update their baselines, assessments should ideally be completed by the end of the fiscal year. A number of Co-permittees have submitted their data to Program staff. Potential modifications to baseline maps and the assessment sites will be discussed with the Trash AHTG in August 2019. Additionally, Program staff are currently developing a technical basis for modifying assessment frequencies at previously assessed sites. The preliminary results of the frequency analysis being conducted by Program staff will be presented at the next MRP 3.0 Trash Work Group and at the August Trash AHTG meeting.
- Trash Performance Standard Development – The Program has developed study designs for two performance standards for trash control measures – curb inlet screens and enhanced business inspections. The curb-inlet screen performance standard project includes participation by the City of Oakland. Fieldwork began in late July 2018 and will run through August 2019. Three of the four characterization events have been completed to-date. The final characterization event will occur in August 2019. For the enhanced business inspection performance standard project, Program staff are moving forward with the City of Sunnyvale staff on this project. The design of the study is currently under development. Program staff are evaluating assessment data collected to-date at locations where the enhanced inspection program has been implemented. Based on this evaluation, Program staff will recommend how best to move forward. Additional details will be provided at the August AHTG meeting.
- Receiving Water Monitoring Program Reporting (BASMAA Regional Project) – MRP 2.0 requires that Co-permittees develop and implement a Monitoring Program Plan and assess the level of trash in local receiving waters to answer specific monitoring/management questions. The regional Monitoring Plan is being implemented by each MRP Program, and coordinated at the regional level. Program staff have completed the first three (of five) rounds of qualitative

assessments at 30 sites in water bodies in the Santa Clara Valley. One (of two) round of qualitative/quantitative assessments led by Co-permittees have been completed, with assistance from Program staff. Data generated by Co-permittees were forwarded to Program staff. The first interpretation of the data collected by Program staff, SCVURPPP Co-permittees and by Permittees/Programs associated with other MRP counties is now complete. The preliminary regional report was approved by the Management Committee in June and submitted to the Water Board via BASMAA on July 1, 2019. The final report is due to the Water Board by July 1, 2020.

- Trash AHTG Meetings – The Trash AHTG typically meets on the 3rd Tuesday of the month. Due to scheduling conflicts the last meeting occurred on May 2nd. The next meeting is July 23rd.

Monitoring / Pollutants of Concern

- Regional Monitoring Coalition (RMC)
 - Creek Status Monitoring – The Program submitted the WY 2018 Urban Creeks Monitoring Report (UCMR) and Electronic Data submittal to the Water Board on April 1, 2019. WY 2019 creek status monitoring is underway. Bioassessment monitoring was completed in mid-June. Other monitoring will occur in the summer and fall 2019.
 - Stressor/Source Identification (SSID) Projects – The Program is required to conduct two SSID projects during MRP 2.0 and plans to participate in a regional project to fulfill MRP requirements. The following is a status of the three SSID projects:
 - Coyote Creek Toxicity - Program staff is currently conducting a project to evaluate the stressors and sources of sediment toxicity in Coyote Creek. Monitoring for the project began in the summer of 2018 with sediment toxicity and chemistry monitoring. Initial results were received from laboratories and minimal toxicity was observed. With AHTG concurrence, Program staff have moved forward with proposed additional monitoring in summer 2019. An update on the project will be provided at the next Monitoring AHTG meeting, scheduled for late July 2nd.
 - Lower Silver/Thompson Nutrients - Program staff are currently developing a work plan for a second SSID project for SCVURPPP. This project will begin in the summer of 2019 and occur through FY 19-20. Based on the discussion at the February and July Monitoring AHTG meetings, the Program is moving forward with a nutrient study in Lower Silver and Thompson Creeks. A draft work plan will be forwarded to the Monitoring AHTG for review in late July. Monitoring will begin in August.
 - Electrical Facilities as PCB Sources – BASMAA has begun a regional SSID project on behalf of all MRP Permittees. Through the project, BASMAA member agencies will work with Water Board staff to compile and analyze data and information received from electrical transmission/distribution agencies in an effort to better understand potential sources of PCBs to stormwater. The project began in FY 18-19 and will continue through FY 19-20. A work plan describing the project is included in the Program's Water Year 2018 UCMR.
 - POCs Monitoring – The Program conducted POC monitoring in WY 2019 at 6 sites in collaboration with RMP monitoring. Results will be available in mid-2019 and will inform potential future source property identification projects. Additional POC monitoring currently being planned for late 2019.
 - PCB/Hg Source Identification Studies – The Program recently completed PCB/Hg source property identification studies in seven WMAs. Four of the seven areas are within San Jose, two are in Santa Clara, and one is in Palo Alto. Program staff have met with the affected Co-permittees and next steps, including property referrals, are

currently under discussion. Additionally, based on WY 2017 POC monitoring data, Program staff have identified another four WMAs that may contain source properties, and source property investigations are now underway in these WMAs.

- PCB/Hg Control Measure Implementation Plan – To better inform the potential locations where focused PCB control measure implementation may occur, the Program continues to conduct projects in compliance with MRP 2.0 requirements that entail updating preliminary source maps, sampling sediment and water within potentially high interest drainages, and identifying current and proposed control measures. Program staff will soon begin developing an updated Control Measure Implementation Plan, which will be submitted to the Water Board with the Program’s FY 18-19 Annual Report. Requests for information on newly installed GSI projects was forwarded to Co-permittees in May. Information was due to Program staff by June 26, 2019. Nearly all Co-permittees submitted GSI information to Program staff.
- Tracking POC Control Measure Implementation – Information on the extent and magnitude of GSI facilities was summarized in Versions 1.0 and 2.0 of the Program’s POC Control Measures Plan. Program staff has developed a more efficient method to obtain, store and access LID/GSI data and other geospatial data at a county-wide level. The method includes applications for each Co-permittee to effectively and efficiently track GSI projects, which is needed for conducting the RAA for PCBs and mercury and addressing GSI planning requirements. The Program’s GSI database is now available to Co-permittees and will be made available to the public in late 2019 or early 2020. The current structure of the database is phase I. The remaining phases (including the publicly available version) are planned to be completed in FY 19-20. Additional functionality will be added to the database as well during the next phase.
- Reasonable Assurance Analysis (RAA) – Co-permittees are required to conduct an RAA to address PCB and Mercury load reductions required by the TMDLs. Initial RAA tasks for SCVURPPP began in April 2018 and a separate RAA work group has been formed to help guide the project. Current tasks include baseline pollutant modeling and modeling the benefits of existing GSI systems. A draft report on POC baseline modeling results was distributed to the Work Group the third week of April and comments were request by early May. Next steps include modeling the benefits of existing and predicted GSI projects. A presentation of these results will be given to the Management Committee, likely following the September MC meeting. In addition, the BASMAA RAA Work Group is currently outlining the “Peer Review” process required by the MRP and contacting potential peer reviewers. Peer review of the Program’s RAA methods and assumptions will be initiated in late summer or early fall.
- Management of PCBs during Building Demolition – Co-permittees are required to develop and implement a protocol to manage PCBs in applicable buildings during demolition. Over the course of FY 2017-18 and 2018-19, BASMAA conducted a regional project to develop a model protocol and tools to assist Co-permittees in their implementation of this protocol. The regional project was completed in October 2018. With assistance from Program staff, Co-permittees are using the information, tools and guidance provided via the regional project to begin implementing a PCBs in Building Demolition Management Program by July 1, 2019. Program staff is assisting Co-permittees in the development and implementation of this program. Tasks that Program staff is undertaking are included in a separate PCBs in Demo Control Program Work Plan. The tasks were discussed at the POC AHTG meeting in June.
- Additional BASMAA Regional Projects
 - RAA for Source Controls – BASMAA is currently conducting a project designed to update the current Interim Load Reduction Accounting Methodology for use when developing reasonable assurance that control measure plans developed by MRP Permittees by the end of the permit term will achieve TMDL wasteload allocations. The project began in January 2019 and will occur through calendar year 2019. Additional information on this project will be provided at the next POC and RAA AHTG meetings.

- SF Bay Regional Monitoring Program (RMP)

Program staff serves as stormwater representatives on the RMP's Steering Committee (SC) and Technical Review Committee (TRC). Program staff participates to ensure, to the extent possible, that information needs and priority projects for the RMP align with monitoring needs and requirements identified in the regional stormwater permit. The TRC last met on June 13th and the SC met in April. The next TRC meeting is scheduled for September 2019 and the SC meeting is scheduled for August 13th. RMP Workgroups also continued to meet in June and July 2019, including the Small Tributaries Loading Strategy (STLS) team.

- Monitoring & Pollutants of Concern AHTG Meetings

- The POC AHTG last met on June 24th to discuss ongoing Program staff assistance needed by Co-permittees to adopt/implement the MRP-required Management of PCBs during Building Demolition Program by July 1, 2019. The next meeting will occur in September or October 2019 (exact date TBD).
- The Monitoring AHTG met on July 2nd. The next meeting will occur in the fall of 2019 (exact date TBD).



Campbell • Cupertino • Los Altos • Los Altos Hills • Los Gatos • Milpitas • Monte Sereno • Mountain View • Palo Alto
San José • Santa Clara • Saratoga • Sunnyvale • Santa Clara County • Valley Water

Highlights of BASMAA Committee Meetings June – July 2019

June and July Committee meetings not previously reported were either cancelled or rescheduled. Dates for the next meetings are listed below.

BASMAA PIP Committee

Chair – Jennifer Kaiser (Vallejo Flood & Wastewater District)
SCVURPPP representatives– Vishakha Atre (SCVURPPP)

- Next Meeting (meets quarterly) – July 24, 2019, 1:30 – 3:00 pm

BASMAA Development Committee

Chair – Shannan Young (Dublin); *Vice Chair* – Peter Schultze-Allen (SCVURPPP)
SCVURPPP representatives – Jeff Sinclair (San Jose), Pam Boyle Rodriguez (Palo Alto), Jill Bicknell (Program Staff),

- Next Meeting – August 1, 2019, 1:30-4:00 pm

Trash Committee

Chair – Kirsten Struve (Valley Water)
SCVURPPP representatives – Chris Sommers (SCVURPPP), Liz Lewis (San Jose) and Cheri Donnelly (Cupertino).

- Next Meeting – July 23, 2019, 10:00 am – 12:00 pm

Monitoring/POC Committee

Chair – Reid Bogert (SMCWPPP)
SCVURPPP representatives – Chris Sommers and Lisa Sabin (SCVURPPP), Carol Boland (San Jose), and James Downing (Valley Water)

- Next Meeting – August 7, 2019, 9:00 am – 3:00 pm

San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

June 21, 2019
CIWQS Place ID 756972

Geoff Brosseau, BASMAA, geoff@brosseau.us
Jim Scanlin, ACCWP, jims@acpwa.org
Courtney Riddle, CCCWP, courtney.riddle@pw.cccounty.us
Adam Olivieri, SCVURPPP, awo@eoainc.com ; Jill Bicknell, SCVURPPP,
jcbicknell@eoainc.com
Matt Fabry, SMCWPPP, mfabry@smcgov.org
Kevin Cullen, FSURMP, kcullen@fssd.com
Melissa Morton, VFWD MMorton@vallejowastewater.org ;
Jennifer Harrington, VFWD, jharrington@vallejowastewater.org

Subject: Conditional Acceptance of Guidance for Sizing Green Infrastructure Facilities in Street Projects

Dear MRP Stormwater Program Managers:

This letter provides the Water Board's conditional acceptance of BASMAA's "Guidance for Sizing Green Infrastructure Facilities in Street Projects" (Guidance) and the "Green Infrastructure Facility Sizing for Non-Regulated Street Projects Technical Report" (Report). The Water Board supports Permittee efforts to retrofit existing streets with low impact development/green stormwater infrastructure (LID) bioretention treatment controls and recognizes both the challenges inherent in retrofitting existing urban infrastructure and the substantial water quality and related benefits that can result from successful retrofits.

Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit (MRP) Permittee studies, including stormwater resource plans and work on reasonable assurance analyses for pollutants of concern, have identified the public right-of-way, and particularly streets, as a key location for retrofits to control urban runoff pollution from the Bay Area's already-built urban environment. The Water Board recognizes the importance of green street retrofits and supports Permittee efforts to implement them. At the same time, there is a potentially significant trade-off between reduced treatment control sizing relative to the tributary area and the likelihood a control will function effectively over its life. All else

DR. TERRY F. YOUNG, CHAIR | MICHAEL MONTGOMERY, EXECUTIVE OFFICER

1515 Clay St., Suite 1400, Oakland, CA 94612 | www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay

being equal, controls that are relatively larger are more likely to provide water quality and related co-benefits with less attention over time.

MRP Provision C.3.j.i.(g) allows the Permittees to propose an approach for alternate sizing of LID treatment controls to achieve treatment control and hydromodification requirements in certain green streets projects where conventional design storm hydraulic sizing may be difficult:

For street projects not subject to Provision C.3.b.ii (i.e., non-Regulated Projects), Permittees may collectively propose a single approach with their Green Infrastructure Plans for how to proceed should project constraints preclude fully meeting the C.3.d sizing requirements.

The Report, in support of the Guidance, sets forth a sizing approach for bioretention controls for treatment using the combined flow and volume modelling approach. The Report notes, appropriately, that Permittees will design treatment controls to be “as large as feasible.” Where larger sizing is impracticable, this approach enables bioretention controls to be as small a percentage of the tributary area as possible, and as little as 1.5 – 3 percent, while treating at least 80 percent of the average annual runoff based on local precipitation gauge records. This conditional acceptance provides direction on how Permittees should design controls to be as large as practicable, within existing MRP requirements.

The Guidance includes general suggestions regarding an approach for treating less than 80 percent of the total runoff, which may be appropriate for voluntary green street retrofit projects, and could be considered for green infrastructure plan street retrofit projects, in combination with Permittee reasonable assurance analyses and a future, more-detailed proposal of how to implement such reduced sizing. We look forward to working with the Permittees on that.

One aspect of the approach is that it has minimized safety factors, which, as noted in the Guidance, is likely to result in the construction of controls that have a greater need for operation and maintenance work over their lifetime, a higher rate of failure, and may be more likely to have reduced effectiveness and a reduced effective life in the absence of that attention. This calls into question whether the approach meets the C.3.d sizing requirements for Regulated Projects, and whether it should be applied beyond non-Regulated Green Streets retrofit projects. In the absence of additional evaluation of this issue, the reduced sizing approach should not be applied to Regulated Projects.

In addition, BASMAA considered developing, but did not include in this effort, specific guidance regarding how Permittees could determine practicability for using the reduced sizing approach, and regional guidance for green street best management practice installation, such as recommended locations and designs based on typical tributary areas. Such work could be a useful future project. The Guidance does include examples of constraints that could lead to reduced sizing.

The Report and Guidance do not propose an alternative sizing approach for hydromodification. While noting the MRP's triggers for hydromodification controls, the Guidance states categorically that hydromodification controls "...do not apply to street projects that retrofit drainage systems that receive runoff from existing roofs and paving." It is likely that many projects would not trigger the MRP's hydromodification control requirements. However, where the retrofits are part of a project that meets or exceeds the triggers for the MRP's hydromodification requirements, then the requirements would apply. Permittees should continue to review that as part of project implementation.

To better address the question of practicability and to help develop information that can contribute to future guidance regarding green street retrofits, this conditional acceptance directs Permittees to use existing MRP Provision C.3.d regulated project sizing for green street bioretention treatment control initial sizing. The design approaches for that sizing are set forth in the Permittees' existing technical guidance documents. With cause (e.g., significantly constrained area for a BMP, substantially increased costs for that sizing relative to the C.3.j.i.(g) approach, significant amounts of run-on from adjacent areas, or other substantial constraints identified by Permittees), and with reporting in their Annual Reports, Permittees may use the proposed C.3.j.i.(g) sizing for "non-Regulated Project" green streets projects, including non-Regulated Project green streets projects in Permittees' Green Infrastructure Plans and purely voluntary green streets projects.

The intent of the reporting is for the Permittees and the Water Board to, over time, identify more categorically green street retrofit approaches and needs, allowing Permittees to more-easily implement an effective and robust green street retrofit program. We look forward to working with the Permittees to identify appropriate and useful sizing analysis practicability information that can be developed, reported, and/or retained by the Permittees, as appropriate.

This conditional approval categorizes green streets projects into three categories. Regulated Projects under MRP Provision C.3.b, including green street retrofit projects funded all or in part from alternate compliance; green street retrofit projects that are not otherwise Regulated Projects under C.3.b, which may include green street retrofit projects in Green Infrastructure Plans; and purely voluntary green street retrofit projects.

- **Regulated projects:** Should be designed to the sizing standard in C.3.d, using the approaches set forth in existing Permittee technical guidance manuals.¹
- **Green street retrofit projects in Permittee green infrastructure plans, which are not Regulated Projects under C.3.b:** Should be designed to the sizing standard in C.3.d, using the approaches set forth in existing Permittee technical guidance manuals. If Permittee analysis determines there is substantial cause to

¹ The Water Board may consider changes to this approach for Regulated Projects in a future MRP reissuance, following additional discussion regarding safety factors, control performance, and more-specific guidance regarding implementation.

reduce the sizing to the proposed C.3.j.i.(g) approach, then reduce the sizing, with reporting in the Permittee's annual report as to why larger sizing was impracticable.

- **Voluntary green street retrofit projects outside of green infrastructure plans:** Permittees should determine whether controls can be designed to the C.3.d sizing standard, using the approaches set forth in existing Permittee technical guidance manuals. To the extent that is not possible, they should use the C.3.j.i.(g) approach.

The Guidance notes that even with site-specific constraints, it may still be desirable to design bioretention treatment controls to treat amounts of runoff below the 80 percent of average annual runoff standard. We agree. It notes, further, that “[p]ollutant reduction achieved by GI facilities in street projects will be estimated in accordance with the Interim accounting Methodology or the applicable Reasonable Assurance Analysis.” We look forward to working with the Permittees to establish an agreed-upon approach for estimating pollutant load reductions associated with smaller-sized facilities. In addition, we are interested to work with the Permittees regarding guidance on bounds for control sizing, such as particular control designs to use or bounds below which the operation and maintenance burden may be unreasonably high relative to the benefits achieved.

We look forward to working with you to identify appropriate reporting regarding use of the Guidance and Report that can be completed prior to the MRP's reissuance, and which could inform the reissuance. Reporting is likely to include a narrative discussion of how Permittees implemented the alternative design guidance for projects using it, and consideration of how to track partial treatment with respect to crediting for Provisions C.11 and C.12.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss this matter further, please contact Dale Bowyer at (510) 622-2323 or dale.bowyer@waterboards.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Keith H. Lichten, Chief
Watershed Management Division



California Stormwater Quality Association®

Dedicated to the Advancement of Stormwater Quality Management, Science and Regulation

June 20, 2019

Mr. James Nachbaur, Director, Office of Water Research, Planning and Performance
State Water Resources Control Board

Subject: Comments on the State Water Resources Control Board's Guidance for Future Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Municipal Storm Water Cost Estimation and for Guidance for Obtaining Past Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit Compliance Costs

Mr. Nachbaur:

Thank you for presenting at the May 9th California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) Quarterly Meeting in Sacramento and for providing an opportunity to comment on the following guidance documents being developed by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) for estimating and tracking the costs of stormwater management (Attachment A):

- *Guidance for Future Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Municipal Storm Water Cost Estimation (Cost Estimation Guidance)*
- *Guidance for Obtaining Past Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit Compliance Costs (Compliance Cost Reporting Guidance)*

Based on the presentation and subsequent discussion as well as our review of the guidance documents, CASQA is submitting this comment letter to highlight our concerns with the purpose, approach, and content of these documents.

CASQA is a nonprofit corporation with approximately 1,800 members throughout California and is dedicated to the advancement of stormwater quality management through collaboration, education, implementation guidance, regulatory review, and scientific assessment. Our membership is comprised of a diverse range of stormwater quality management organizations and individuals, including cities, counties, special districts, industries, and consulting firms. As municipal stormwater program managers and practitioners since the inception of the stormwater program (almost 30 years), CASQA members offer our "in the trenches" perspectives and knowledge regarding the ability and challenges of tracking and reporting stormwater program expenditures.

CASQA understands that the development of the guidance documents was the result of a June 2017 request by California State Assemblymember Al Muratsuchi of Los Angeles County¹ and a subsequent March 2018 State Auditor's Report titled *State and Regional Water Boards: They Must Do More to Ensure That Local Jurisdictions' Costs to Reduce Storm Water Pollution Are Necessary and Appropriate (Report 2017-118)*.

The primary objective of the audit requested by California State Assemblymember Muratsuchi² was to "determine and compare how the requirements, and the attending costs, for CWA and MS4 permit compliance are established by the different Regional Water Boards" and that "this audit should specifically address the issue of "whether the requirements and attending costs of CWA and MS4 permit compliance being imposed upon cities within Los Angeles County are reasonable and proportional to the amount of storm water pollution being generated by the cities." However, the scope

¹ JLAC Hearing, June 28, 2017 Analysis Fact Sheet, 2017-118 State and Regional Water Boards – Permitting. Requestor: Assemblymember Muratsuchi (focus on Los Angeles region, Central Valley region, and San Francisco Bay region)

² Letter dated June 8, 2017 from California State Assemblymember Al Muratsuchi to the Joint Legislative Audit Committee

and objectives for the two guidance documents developed by the State Water Board differ significantly from the original requests as outlined below (key excerpts related to costs are summarized; emphasis added).

Audit requested by California State Assemblymember Muratsuchi - Analysis Fact Sheet, June 28, 2017

- “III.3. Identify data and information used by the State Water Board, Regional Water Boards, and any other entities to allocate storm water cleanup costs”
- “III.4(c) ...determine whether those responsible for storm water pollution...are also responsible for the associated costs of their pollution and the storm water permits...determine whether options exist for equitably redistributing cleanup costs to those responsible...”
- “III.4(d) ...identify the fiscal and other impacts jurisdictions have had or will have in complying with storm water permits.”
- “III.4(e) ...identify current and potential funding sources for programs that target storm water cleanup and management, such as watershed management programs.”

Once the audit was completed, the State Auditor’s Report (March 2018) was developed, which included the following key Findings (cover letter):³

- “When imposing storm water requirements, the regional boards did not adequately consider the costs that local jurisdictions would incur to comply with these requirements. Specifically, the regional boards did not always consider the overall cost of storm water management that local jurisdictions paid.”
- “Also, the State Water Board and regional boards lack consistent information on the actual costs that local jurisdictions incur to comply with storm water requirements because the State Water Board has not issued guidance on how local jurisdictions should track and report their costs.”

Additionally, the following recommendations were identified (excerpt from pg. 36 of the State Auditor’s Report; emphasis added):

- “The State Water Board should develop guidance by August 2018 for regional boards to document estimates of the costs local jurisdictions will incur in order to comply with pollutant control plans (emphasis added). These procedures should also address the need to use appropriate methods to develop those estimates, to document the sources they use to develop the estimates, and to document consideration of the overall cost of storm water management to local jurisdictions when completing an economic analysis as part of developing pollutant control plans. Additionally, the documentation of cost estimates should include, where applicable, the impact other pollutant control plans will have on the costs local jurisdictions are expected to incur.”
- “To ensure that the regional boards obtain adequate and consistent information on the storm water management costs local jurisdictions incur, the State Water Board should develop statewide guidance by August 2018 for local jurisdictions on methods for tracking the cost of storm water management. If the State Water Board believes it does not have the expertise to develop such guidance, it should hire or contract with an expert in municipal finance (emphasis added) who can assist in developing that guidance.”

The two key takeaways from the State Auditor’s Report recommendations are 1) guidance would be developed for the regional boards to use to develop estimates; and 2) guidance would be developed with input from experts in municipal finance for municipalities on methods for tracking costs.

³ The method used to address each of the audit objectives was provided in Table 4 of the State Audit Report

However, the guidance documents presented deviate from the recommendations and raise numerous concerns for CASQA. This list includes examples of the concerns that the CASQA membership has with the guidance documents and is not exhaustive.

- *Guidance for Future Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Municipal Storm Water Cost Estimation*
 - The State Water Board does not link the purpose of this document directly to the State Auditor's Report and note which of the recommendations this document fulfills.
 - It appears that experts in stormwater program and TMDL implementation were not consulted during the development of the document and, in fact the document states "ORPP staff are not experts in TMDL issues..." (pg. 1)
 - The document is highly prescriptive and includes requirements and assessments that would take an extraordinary amount of time for municipal staff to respond, further increasing the costs of compliance.
 - The document inappropriately shifts the burden of the economic analysis from Regional Water Board staff to municipal stormwater staff and suggests issuing Water Code section 13383 Orders requiring permittees to submit cost information (pg. 4).
 - The document identifies costs that should not be included "Permittees should not include costs that would have been incurred regardless of a TMDL, permit, or renewal." (pg. 5) and Appendix 1. This is impractical and unreasonable. As soon as an activity is mandated pursuant to a stormwater permit, the flexibility that the agency had to modify the implementation becomes severely constrained.
 - The document indicates the Regional Water Board staff should reject cost estimates with insufficient detail, "Appropriate methods must be used to develop cost estimates and such methods should be clearly described and documented, including any assumptions used." (pg. 7) This shifts the burden to develop the methods requested by Assemblymember Muratsuchi and the State Auditor to the municipalities subject to the TMDL.
 - The document contains numerous statements that erode the good faith efforts and relationships that have been developed between the municipalities and Regional Water Board staff since the inception of the stormwater program. These statements are inappropriate, unhelpful, and should be removed from the document, such as:
 - "Note, however, that some permittees may overestimate their costs and use those numbers as justification for objecting to perform adequate implementation of pollution control measures." (pg. 2)
 - "Note some permittees may try to get credit for pollutant reductions a project is not likely to provide, for which there is no justification, or where the purpose of the project is flood control or something else other than addressing a TMDL (e.g., purpose was to increase flood control capacity)." (pg. 6)
 - "Staff should be aware that the permittee point of contact may not know to consult with his or her colleagues. For example, sometimes the municipal staff contact may not be in contact with the municipality's budget staff." (pg. 7)
 - "There is a risk of cost overestimation" (pg. 7)

- *Guidance for Obtaining Past Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit Compliance Costs*
 - The State Water Board does not link the purpose of this document directly to the State Auditor's Report and note which of the recommendations this document fulfills.
 - The purpose of the document is stated as (emphasis added) "The objectives of this guidance are for the Water Boards and the public to obtain adequate, consistent, and comparable information on the storm water management costs local jurisdictions incur and for the Water Boards to base decisions on that information." instead of methods for tracking costs as requested by Assemblymember Muratsuchi and the State Auditor. (pg. 1) The State Auditor's Report did not require that the cost information be comparable amongst jurisdictions statewide.
 - It appears that experts in municipal finance were not consulted during the development of the document and, in fact the document states "ORPP staff are not experts in MS4 issues...". (pg. 1)
 - In general, the document goes beyond the federal mandate (40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(vi)), is highly prescriptive, and includes requirements, assessments, and management questions that are onerous, and would take extraordinary amounts of time for a municipality to provide.
 - The document implies that municipal agencies would have to change internal accounting tools and practices in order to comply with reporting requirements "The Water Boards are aware that the development and implementation of new standardized cost-reporting or information requests will likely result in short-term costs as local jurisdictions transition cost-accounting practices and data systems." (pg. 2)
 - The document contains numerous statements that erode the good faith efforts and relationships that have been developed between the municipalities and Regional Water Board staff since the inception of the stormwater program. These statements are inappropriate, unhelpful, and should be removed from the document (e.g., "Permittees may have incentives to over-report costs or report costs they would have incurred regardless of their permit.") (pg. 2)

Additionally, it is unclear what public process, if any, has been employed to receive and address comments on these guidance documents prior to their apparent distribution for use by the Regional Water Boards.

Lastly, in response to two of the State Auditor's five recommendations regarding developing guidance on cost estimation and reporting (Attachment B), the State Water Board responded in part "To provide appropriate guidance, the State Water Board believes it will be necessary to engage a wide range of experts, convene public meetings, and potentially develop new methodologies."⁴

CASQA Recommendation:

As a result of these concerns, CASQA strongly recommends the following:

- *The guidance documents should address the specific recommendations of the audit requested by California State Assemblymember Muratsuchi.*

⁴ Letter dated February 13, 2018 from State Water Board to State Auditor regarding recommendation in Auditor's report: State and Regional Water Boards: They Must Do More to Ensure That Local Jurisdictions' Costs to Reduce Storm Water Pollution Are Necessary and Appropriate; Report No. 2017-118; California State Auditor, March 2018.

- *A full review and finalization of these guidance documents be included as a part of the work that will be completed in the State Water Board's Strategy to Optimize Resource Management of Stormwater (STORMS) program - Phase II Project 4c (2019): Identify Municipal Storm Water Permit Compliance Cost⁵. Further, this full review and finalization should occur prior to the use of the documents by either State Water Board or Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) staff. Developing these documents within the STORMS project would allow for a much more informed and thorough development, vetting, and review process by experts in municipal program management, implementation, and finance, which is critical to developing methods that are practical, viable, and useful.*

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on these guidance documents and we look forward to working with you to address our concerns. If you have any questions, please contact the CASQA Executive Director Geoff Brosseau at (650) 365-8620.

Sincerely,



Daniel Apt, Chair
California Stormwater Quality Association

Attachments: A – Guidance on Estimating and Tracking Costs of Storm Water Management, presentation by James Nachbaur, Office of Research, Planning and Performance
B – California State Auditor's 5 Recommendations regarding Cost Estimation and Reporting Guidance and State Water Board Responses

cc: Eric Oppenheimer, Chief Deputy Director, State Water Board
Jonathan Bishop, Chief Deputy Director, State Water Board
Jeffrey Albrecht, Stormwater Planning Unit Chief, State Water Board
CASQA Board of Directors
CASQA Executive Program Committee
CASQA Policy and Permitting Subcommittee
Geoff Brosseau, Executive Director, CASQA
Karen Cowan, Assistant Executive Director, CASQA

⁵ https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/storms/obj4_proj4c.shtml Description of the project: "Develop a standard accounting and allocation method to estimate the Storm Water Program costs including costs for personnel, operation and maintenance, and capital improvements. The method will differentiate cost of compliance from unrelated costs of infrastructure construction and maintenance."

Guidance for Future Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Municipal Storm Water Cost Estimation

Purpose. This guidance strives to increase the consistency and transparency of the estimation of costs to implement TMDLs.

Intended audiences:

1. Regional Water Board staff engaged in total maximum daily load (TMDL) development,¹ primarily for TMDLs with allocations or implementation actions that are assigned to urban storm water, municipal storm water and/or National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s) permittees.
2. NPDES permit writers who are including information regarding costs of compliance with TMDL waste load allocations in the fact sheet of an NPDES MS4 permit.
3. Water Board staff working on statewide and region-wide regulations, policies, water quality control plans, and basin plan amendments.

Legal requirements. Refer to Appendix 3 for relevant legal requirements. This general guidance is not binding and does not change or otherwise affect the legal obligations of the Water Boards related to the adoption of waste discharge requirements. Rather, this guidance provides best practices for staff to conduct a thorough estimation of MS4 permit compliance costs to the extent that sufficient staffing resources exist.

This guidance does not relate to the estimation of the *benefits* TMDLs will achieve.

This guidance was developed in part to respond to recommendations of the California State Auditor (2018).

Maintenance of this guidance. The State Water Board's Office of Research, Planning, and Performance (ORPP) is currently responsible for updates to this guidance. Please tell ORPP staff (ORPP@waterboards.ca.gov) about your experience using this guidance, including the amount of time and resources required. ORPP staff are not experts in TMDL issues and are happy to work with you to revisit and revise this guidance as more information becomes available and as the guidance is applied. If needed, ORPP staff will lead efforts to make this guidance more formal.

Introduction. Water Board staff developing TMDLs generally approximate the anticipated costs for local jurisdictions to implement reasonably foreseeable means of compliance and document that approximation in the corresponding staff report. Staff are responsible for providing good quality

¹ TMDLs can be developed for a wide range of pollutants. Most municipality TMDL costs are associated with municipal storm water discharges, but there are also costs associated with municipalities' Publicly Owned Treatment Works and industrial storm water facilities. TMDLs are typically adopted through the quasi-legislative process of amending Regional Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans).

information for their Board to make good policy decisions. This cost analysis becomes an initial reference regarding costs the dischargers affected by the TMDLs may bear and can help to inform subsequent cost considerations when the Water Boards adopt waste discharge requirements and other permits and orders to implement TMDLs.

How approximating costs at the TMDL development stage can inform cost considerations at the TMDL implementation stage

If the development of a TMDL includes a robust and detailed cost analysis of the methods of compliance to implement the TMDL, then the Water Boards will be able to substantially rely on that analysis when issuing MS4 permits to implement the TMDL. The NPDES permit writer should summarize the analysis performed for the TMDL in the MS4 Permit fact sheet and supplement it as appropriate.

Municipal storm water permittees have some discretion in deciding how to comply with permit requirements, which may include TMDL-related requirements that implement TMDL waste load allocations. Permittees, therefore, may be in a better position to estimate costs of reasonably foreseeable methods of compliance than Water Board staff. As such, and in addition to conducting independent analyses, Regional Water Board staff should generally solicit information on compliance approaches and associated costs from the local jurisdictions that will be assigned TMDL waste load allocations. Staff's role includes rigorously assessing estimates so that the Water Boards are able to assess whether they are reasonable. Note, however, that some permittees may overestimate their costs and use those numbers as justification for objecting to perform adequate implementation of pollution control measures.

This guidance describes methods for obtaining information on compliance approaches and associated costs and for completing an independent analysis. Staff may seek information from stakeholders, including permittees, via existing public processes. This guidance strives to promote greater consistency and transparency related to estimation of costs to implement TMDLs. We recognize that precise cost estimation is challenging and that the level of precision possible may be low in many cases. For example, industry-wide, there is no uniform database of projects' components and costs.² Despite the limitations, good cost information collection efforts are invaluable for fully informed decision-making

² CASQA usually has a list of best management practices and associated costs that can act as a resource. TMDL report cards often also include information on projects and costs incurred by stakeholders in implementing pollutant reduction projects.

National efforts to collect cost information have typically focused on surveys of implementers because information is not collected across implementers in a regularized and consistent way. A recent example is Clary and Piza's *Cost of Maintaining Green Infrastructure* (2017). Currently, a number of cities, including cities under combined sewer overflows consent decrees (e.g., Washington, DC and Philadelphia), and San Francisco, are undertaking asset management projects intended to lead to a better understanding of both O&M and full life cycle costs of green and gray infrastructure. Cost information may be added to the International BMP database in the future. Those efforts, and smaller efforts such as in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, are likely to lead to a more regularized framework for considering costs associated with this part of the permit program. Cost estimates have also been developed as part of crediting programs, for example in Washington, DC (and suburban Washington) and San Francisco, and to support stormwater utility fees in various jurisdictions.

and for the evaluation and improvement of policies and practices. Water Board staff will revisit and revise this guidance periodically as it is applied and as more information becomes available.

Guidance on data the Water Boards already have

Before seeking new data, Water Board staff should first consider information in existing public records, such as:

1. Annual reports or permit reapplication packages (such as for existing elements of the jurisdiction's storm water management program) by MS4 permittees on costs to implement their local storm water program, in compliance with fiscal analysis requirements in permits. To the extent measures anticipated to support attainment of waste load allocations are similar to those already in place (e.g., street sweeping, MS4 maintenance, etc.), these reported costs can help isolate the costs of the TMDL.
2. Grant funding applications, proposals, and reports submitted to the Division of Financial Assistance (e.g., Prop. 1, Prop 50, Prop. 84). These may include contractors' itemized bids for recently-built projects, which can, with scaling, be used to help estimate TMDL implementation costs.
3. Local funding measures.
4. Caltrans cooperative interagency agreements.
5. Cost estimates in Storm Water Resource Plans, Integrated Regional Water Management Plans, Watershed Management Program plans, or other types of plans.
6. Agency budgets.
7. Past permittee or stakeholder responses to Regional Water Board staff requests.

The TMDL Roundtable, in conjunction with MS4 permitting staff, should compile all gathered cost information for access and use by State and Regional Water Board planning and permitting staff statewide.

Obtaining cost estimates from permittees and other stakeholders during TMDL development

After staff has a good sense of the proposed waste load allocation(s) and implementation requirements, staff should incorporate an explicit process to request estimates of costs from permittees and other stakeholders into the TMDL development process.³ Developing estimates in such a process, or vetting estimates through a public process, may be the best way to address possible biases or shortcomings and ensure realistic cost information is provided to the Water Boards. Also, having a variety of perspectives on cost estimates can help put an estimate in context. Below, possible approaches are illustrated. These approaches vary in how they fit into the TMDL development process. Any one approach can be used, or several could be implemented together:

³ The Water Boards consider input from local jurisdictions during TMDL development and assume that jurisdictions take into consideration their existing expenditures on stormwater management and their ability to obtain funding when the jurisdictions provide their input on proposed TMDLs, including implementation schedules.

1. **Add on to the CEQA scoping meeting.** During project CEQA scoping, ask permittees and other stakeholders to submit information on a range of economic factors, including costs of reasonably foreseeable means of compliance to achieve TMDL waste load allocations or other alternative requirements.⁴ Notices of CEQA scoping meetings should begin this solicitation process and permittees and other stakeholders should be given an opportunity to submit information following the scoping meeting. Note that this option is likely to be most successful if sufficient details regarding the proposed TMDL are provided prior to the scoping meeting.
2. **Host a stand-alone scoping meeting solely on economics and costs.**
3. **Issue Water Code section 13383 orders.** Require existing permittees or named jurisdictions to submit information on a range of economic factors, including costs of reasonably foreseeable means of compliance to achieve TMDL waste load allocations or other alternative TMDL requirements. This could be done through Water Code section 13383 orders.
4. **Voluntary approaches.** For example, Water Board staff could send out an email request to relevant parties, and through the project's Lyris list, for the voluntary submittal of cost information.

These steps can add time to the process of TMDL development. As staff apply this guidance, the Water Boards will be able to determine what amount of time is typical. Additional time should be incorporated into project planning to allow for data collection and independent analysis.

⁴ Project scoping is required by the Water Boards' CEQA Certified Regulatory Program regulations. California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 3777.5.

TMDL Example from Region 2

For TMDLs, where needed, staff develop cost analyses for TMDL implementation actions. A good example is the economic analysis in the San Pedro Creek and Pacifica State Beach Bacteria TMDL's Substitute Environmental Documentation. See the Staff Report starting at page 105 [here](#). References supporting that analysis are listed a few pages later. Note that (page 50), "...on May 11, 2011, the Water Board issued Cease and Desist Order No. R2-2011-0031(CDO) to the City of Pacifica, ordering the City to comply with the following requirements..." and then goes on to itemize specific structural Best Management Practice (BMP) measures to control sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs). This is a completely different situation than a Phase I MS4 permit, which is typically the implementation mechanism for a TMDL waste load allocation.

Note that while staff makes their best effort to collect and use available cost information, full information is not always available. In these cases, staff makes their best estimate and then rely on the public review process to identify additional available information and analysis.

Guidance on Cost Estimation Approaches

Please feel free to contact the Water Board's Training and Technical Services Unit, in ORPP, with questions. ORPP may be able to help you engage consultants, if needed to develop economic analyses.

The Division of Water Quality (DWQ) also has access to professional economists with experience working on standards actions and TMDLs through USEPA's in-kind support using Clean Water Act Section 205(j) grant funds. DWQ may have some ability to support Regional Water Board projects. Regional Water Board staff should discuss their needs with DWQ's TMDL Program Coordinator, Rebecca.Fitzgerald@WaterBoards.CA.Gov. The best time to contact her about this is in February and March of each year when fiscal year workplans are developed.

When requesting cost estimates from permittees, staff should provide general guidance on steps permittees should take in cost estimation, described below.⁵ Note, staff need to critically evaluate how all these steps were done and may want to give stronger direction to permittees.

1. Characterize costs of the TMDL.
 - a. Permittees should not include costs that would have been incurred regardless of a TMDL, permit, or renewal. In other words, costs should be based on a comparison of "with permit policy change" versus "without permit policy change."
 - b. Many kinds of costs must be considered. For example, permittees should include, as applicable:
 - i. Costs in the planning, design, construction (including land acquisition, if necessary), and operations/maintenance phases.
 - ii. Financial costs.
 - iii. Data collection costs.
 - iv. Monitoring costs (see box below).

⁵ Adapted from Boarding, Greenberg, Vining, and Weimer, 1996.

- v. Costs of hiring Qualified Industrial Storm Water Practitioners (QISPs) or Qualified Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan Developers (QSPs).
 - c. Costs of TMDL implementation are not always additive. The same practices can be implemented to address multiple pollutants, so care must be taken to avoid double-counting. Note some permittees may try to get credit for pollutant reductions a project is not likely to provide, for which there is no justification, or where the purpose of the project is flood control or something else other than addressing a TMDL (e.g., purpose was to increase flood control capacity).
 - d. Costs should be apportioned among permittees and other parties, as appropriate, so that the permittee does not claim costs that others should or will bear.
 - e. See Appendix 1 for a list costs that generally *do not* count.
2. Monetize all costs.
 - a. Costs should be broken down into discrete units (permitting, operation and maintenance over the expected time to meet the TMDLs, etc.) rather than treated in aggregate.
3. Discount costs to find their present values. See Appendix 2 for directions.
4. Sum the discounted costs. This is your estimate.
5. Perform sensitivity analysis or develop a range of possible costs. In other words, produce and present estimates using different assumptions and values of key parameters. This will help account for the uncertainty of cost estimation.

Comments on Monitoring Costs

- A TMDL can require the sampling and analysis of multiple media (e.g., fish tissue, bird eggs, water, sediment, algae) in multiple water bodies to evaluate progress in attaining a TMDL. This sampling and analysis can be substantial.
- Costs for analysis of constituents can be obtained from labs. For special analyses, where few labs have the specific capacity, costs are dictated by those select labs. Also, field time needs to be accounted for.
- Some types of monitoring can take two or more people an entire day.
- Often with TMDLs, we see new types of monitoring, new analyses not routinely done, and low detection limits.
- Options to create or participate in regional monitoring efforts could be considered. This can reduce costs for each entity. There have to be checks and balances to make sure that each entity is fully participating and costs are balanced.
- If different constituents need method quality objectives (for example, to meet Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) requirements), then those objectives might have to be developed. However, the SWAMP unit has limited resources for this purpose.
- Some types of monitoring don't yet have approved standard operating procedures (SOPs). If those SOPs are to be adopted statewide, there is a cost for review of those SOPs.
- The development of Quality Assurance Project Plans and the costs of data management too often have gone undocumented.

For each potential compliance option, staff should consider asking these questions of the permittee before the Board adopts the TMDL:

1. What will your costs be?
2. What are the ranges for your costs?
3. When will costs be incurred (timing and frequency)?
4. Why should each cost be included?
5. How were costs developed? (Is the information provided scientifically, technically, and legally defensible?) Can real-world cases, on which costs were based, be shared?
6. Were common industry practices for cost estimation followed?⁶
7. How do your costs compare to the costs of other similar projects? (The emphasis should be on more recent and more similar projects.)
8. What costs are *not* included in your estimates? (All costs need to be identified whether or not they are quantified.)
9. What have you done to keep costs low?
10. How will you mitigate costs?
11. How is the work going to be financed? (This affects costs and matters for public awareness and oversight.)

Staff should be aware that the permittee point of contact may not know to consult with his or her colleagues. For example, sometimes the municipal staff contact may not be in contact with the municipality's budget staff.

If information on the costs of implementing best management practices (including structural treatment controls) is limited for the subject TMDL pollutant, the permit fact sheet should explain what information is and is not available. For example, cost information may not be available for the management of bioaccumulative TMDL pollutants such as selenium and mercury.

There is a risk of cost overestimation. To help mitigate this, staff should consider:

1. Getting comparable information from diverse sources.
2. Doing your own estimation, to the degree possible.
3. Ensuring a range of alternatives were considered. There may be a number of reasonably foreseeable means of compliance for a permittee to consider. Each compliance approach will have its own cost. Consider the information in Storm Water Resource Plans and project feasibility studies that compare costs of different project options.
4. Rejecting cost estimates presented with insufficient detail and explanation for verification or auditing. (Keep in mind that in some cases the ideal level of detail may be impossible or unreasonable to expect.) Appropriate methods must be used to develop cost estimates and such methods should be clearly described and documented, including any assumptions used. Assumptions may relate to scaling of costs, calculating life-cycle costs, etc. The TMDL staff report must include a description of the methods used and assumptions. Any additional method documentation must be included in the administrative record.
5. Requiring a range of estimates to account for costs that are highly uncertain. Highly uncertain costs should not just be represented as a single value, such as an average. The range of reasonable cost should be disclosed to avoid overstating the certainty of the cost estimate.

⁶ One option: *GAO Cost Estimating and Assessment Guide: Best Practices for Developing and Managing Capital Program Costs*, United States Government Accountability Office, GAO-09-3SP, 2009.

6. Asking for unit costs (cost per acre treated, per ton avoided, per volume treated, etc.), when applicable, as well as total costs. This can help you understand economies of scale and can help in comparison of different projects. (We can look at unit costs in any rational method, as long as it results in a total cost estimate.)

Guidance on Obtaining Data for Use in Cost Estimation

The best data tend to be from recent, well-documented, open-access, easy-to-use sources. There are many efforts underway to improve data availability and usefulness. Staff should consider:

1. Developing and using a data collection and quality management plan (see box.) For all data sought, staff should specify desired types of data, the standards for data reporting, and ways to ensure (1) data quality is high and (2) the quality of the data is documented.
2. Efforts to get better data or more data. For example, consider the costs and benefits of getting more information about the water quality of water bodies relevant to each proposed permit—that could affect the level of effort the permittee must undertake.
3. What cost data is relevant and reliable given that proven storm water best management practices and technologies continue to evolve. Often more cost-effective technologies are developed over time so older cost analyses may be less relevant or useful than newer analyses. Similarly, cost estimation may be less precise for new or less common approaches.
4. How to document the sources used to develop cost estimates in the administrative record for the TMDL.
5. Giving priority to these valued data sources:
 - a. Published literature.
 - b. Open-access databases (e.g., International Stormwater BMP database).
 - c. Grant proposals and reports submitted to the Water Boards (e.g., Prop. 1, Prop 50, Prop. 84).
 - d. Caltrans Interagency Agreements.
 - e. Conference proceedings (e.g. California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) annual conference).
 - f. Estimates in Storm Water Resource Plans, Integrated Regional Water Management Plans, or other types of Watershed Management Program plans.
 - g. Estimates provided by MS4 permittees or other stakeholders in required annual reporting, in published agency budgets, and in response to specific requests by Regional Water Board staff.
 - h. Estimates provided by other stakeholders (e.g., environmental and industry NGOs, such as the American Society of Civil Engineers, CASQA, and Water Education Foundation).

Plans for data collection and quality management

The quality of data used for cost estimates is important and it may be important enough to justify developing a program plan to help those collecting and submitting data do a good job on data quality assurance and other tasks. The Board has a Quality Management Plan which applies to all our business areas. Staff undertaking new data collection efforts should consider developing a data management plan to help maintain good strategies for the whole data lifecycle and associated interests (e.g., data quality, data accessibility, data resilience, etc.)

The Board's Quality Management Plan is here:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/quality_assurance/.

Our standard template for Data Management Plans is here:

https://forms.office.com/Pages/ResponsePage.aspx?id=JWoY_kl95kGZQXSKB02wTYzSZ1vHHxFnLiGlpSp-6ZUNDVDTDYwQ1FRUUNaUURCSY0NDIUODRONy4u.

The Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) has the Boards' most evolved and current Quality Assurance (QA) Program Plan. SWAMP uses the QA Program Plan to drive better QA Project Plans, here:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/swamp/qapp/swamp_QAPrP_2017_Final.pdf.

Guidance on Consideration of *Overall* Related Costs Permittees Have Paid and Expect to Pay

Each TMDL is distinct, with the common goal to attainment of water quality standards; it is important, however, to publicly consider the cumulative effect of policies (e.g., multiple TMDLs) that require reductions in pollutants from municipal storm water and non-storm water discharges. At a minimum, the Regional Water Boards should identify whether local jurisdictions are already subject to other TMDLs, identify those TMDLs, and consider additional TMDLs they will likely be subject to in the future. (Water quality impairments listed on the 303(d) list would be useful for this.) Staff should also consider whether the reasonably foreseeable means of compliance are the same as, or different from, those to comply with the other existing TMDLs to which the local jurisdiction(s) is subject—this could also be performed as part of the CEQA analysis of cumulative effects.

Further, existing elements of a jurisdiction's stormwater management program, for which it is already making expenditures, may address, wholly or in part, compliance with a pollutant limit. The Regional Water Boards should consider whether existing elements of the jurisdiction's storm water management program are reasonably foreseeable means of compliance with the TMDL. If so, this should be stated in the substitute environmental documentation and the costs that were going to be incurred regardless should not be counted as TMDL compliance costs. Costs associated with these program elements can be taken from permittee-reported costs in permit annual reports or permit reapplication packages.

References

Boardman, A. *et al.*, 1996. Cost-benefit analysis: concepts and practice. Prentiss Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

California State Auditor, 2018. State and Regional Water Boards: They must do more to ensure that local jurisdictions' costs to reduce storm water pollution are necessary and appropriate. (Report Number 2017-118.)

Clary, Jane and Holly Piza, eds. 2017. Cost of Maintaining Green Infrastructure. American Society of Civil Engineers, online at <https://ascelibrary.org/doi/book/10.1061/9780784414897>.

Kenneth J. Arrow, Maureen L. Cropper, Christian Gollier, Ben Groom, Geoffrey M. Heal, Richard G. Newell, William D. Nordhaus, Robert S. Pindyck, William A. Pizer, Paul R. Portney, Thomas Sterner, Richard S. J. Tol, Martin L. Weitzman; Should Governments Use a Declining Discount Rate in Project Analysis?, *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy*, Volume 8, Issue 2, 1 July 2014, Pages 145–163, online at <https://doi.org/10.1093/reep/reu008>.

[State of California, Department of Water Resources, 2008. Economic analysis guidebook.](#)

[U.S. EPA, 2000. Guidelines for preparing economic analysis. \(EPA 240-R-00-003.\)](#)

[United States Government Accountability Office, 2009. GAO Cost Estimating and Assessment Guide: Best Practices for Developing and Managing Capital Program Costs. \(GAO-09-3SP.\)](#)

Weimer, D. & Vining, A., 1992. Policy analysis: concepts and practice. Prentiss Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Appendix 1: Costs that generally should *not* be counted

Costs should be based on a comparison of “with permit policy change” versus “without permit policy change.” Costs that would have been incurred regardless of a TMDL or permit should not be counted.

These activities should not be included as part of TMDL compliance:

1. Street cleaning to the degree that it would otherwise occur.
2. MS4 operation and maintenance activity that would otherwise occur.
3. Enforcement of ordinances prohibiting non-stormwater discharges to MS4.
4. Best management practices already in place for other water quality issues.
5. Best management practices for water conservation, drought management, or stormwater collection for beneficial reuse that would otherwise occur.
6. Any other costs that would be incurred regardless of the TMDL.

Appendix 2: Discounting

When one-time or recurring costs occur is important. A dollar spent today is valued more than a dollar spent years later due to the time value of money. Costs incurred over time should be discounted and brought into net present value (or some other common time period). This allows for a fair comparison of costs that occur in different time periods.

Index the years of costs by t so C_t is the cost in year t .

The net present value of these costs is the sum of the costs from each year discounted using the discount rate r :

$$\sum_{\text{for all years } t} \frac{C_t}{(1+r)^t}$$

Analogous formulas can be used if you have costs by month or if you are using a year other than the current year as your reference.

A real discount rate of 7 percent should be used as a base-case for regulatory analysis, according to the United States Office of Management and Budget Circular A-94.

For long-lived projects, staff are encouraged to use these declining rates so as not to over-discount costs in the more distant future (from Arrow et al., 2014):

Period	Suggested name	Marginal discount rate
Within years 1 to 5 from now	"Immediate future"	4%
Within years 6 to 25 from now	"Near future"	3%
Within years 26 to 75 from now	"Medium future"	2%
Within years 76 to 300 from now	"Distant future"	1%
More than 300 years from now	"Far-distant future"	0%

Appendix 3: Legal considerations

Please note: this general guidance is not binding and does not change or otherwise affect the legal obligations of the Water Boards related to the adoption of TMDLs or waste discharge requirements that implement TMDLs.

The State Water Board's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Certified Regulatory Program regulations apply to TMDLs that are adopted as water quality control plan amendments. California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 3777, subdivisions (b) and (c), are modeled on CEQA's Public Resources Code section 21159. Section 3777 requires that the Water Board's Supplemental Environmental Documentation shall include an environmental analysis, including a reasonable range of economic factors, for the reasonably foreseeable methods of compliance with the TMDL. [California Code of Regulations § 3720 et seq.; Public Resources Code § 21159.](#)

Water Code section 13241 requires the Water Boards to consider certain factors in establishing water quality objectives, including economic considerations. The Water Boards must comply with Water Code section 13241 for any water quality control plan amendment that establishes a water quality objective. Almost all TMDLs implement existing water quality objectives, however, rather than establishing new water quality objectives.

In addition, Water Code section 13241 applies to the adoption of waste discharge requirements that establish site-specific water quality objectives or include more stringent requirements than what would be required under the federal Clean Water Act.⁷ Therefore, to the extent that an MS4 permit includes requirements that are more stringent than what would be required under federal law, the permit writer should include a discussion of the permittee's costs to comply with those more stringent requirements.⁸ In some cases, those more stringent requirements may be related to permit requirements to implement one or more TMDLs.

⁷ In accordance with Water Code section 13263(a), in prescribing permit requirements, a Regional Board must implement any relevant water quality control plan and take into consideration the provisions of Water Code section 13241 among other things. In *City of Burbank v. State Water Resources Control Board* (2005) 35 Cal.4th 613, the California Supreme Court considered whether Regional Boards must comply with section 13241 when issuing waste discharge requirements under section 13263(a) by taking into account the costs a permittee will incur in complying with the permit requirements. The Court concluded that whether it is necessary to consider such cost information "depends on whether those restrictions meet or exceed the requirements of the federal Clean Water Act" (*Id.* at p. 627). The Court also held that Regional Boards may not consider the factors in section 13241, including economics, to justify imposing pollutant restriction that are less stringent than federal law requires.

⁸ The Water Boards' obligation under Water Code section 13241 is to "consider" economic factors. This has been interpreted to include a consideration of cost; however, the Water Boards have broad discretion in the nature and scope of this consideration.

Guidance for Obtaining Past Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit (MS4) Compliance Costs

Purpose. The objectives of this guidance are for the Water Boards and the public to obtain adequate, consistent, and comparable information on the storm water management costs local jurisdictions incur and for the Water Boards to base decisions on that information.

Intended audience. Regional Water Board staff who request information on the cost of permit compliance from municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) permittees.

Secondary audience. This guidance may be valuable to permittees seeking guidance on cost reporting. Please note this guidance does not set Board policy and does not supersede permit requirements. Permittees are encouraged to provide feedback on this guidance.

Legal requirements. Refer to the Appendix for relevant legal requirements. This general guidance is not binding and does not change or otherwise affect the legal obligations of the Water Boards related to the adoption of waste discharge requirements. Rather, this guidance provides best practices to allow staff to conduct a thorough estimation of MS4 permit compliance costs to the extent that sufficient staffing resources exist.

This guidance was developed in part to respond to recommendations of the California State Auditor (2018).¹

Maintenance of this guidance. The State Water Board's Office of Research, Planning, and Performance (ORPP) is currently responsible for updates to this guidance. Please tell ORPP staff (ORPP@waterboards.ca.gov) about your experience using this guidance, including the amount of time and resources required. ORPP staff are not experts in MS4 issues and are happy to work with you to revisit and revise this guidance as more information becomes available and as the guidance is applied. If needed, ORPP staff will support efforts to make this guidance more formal.

Introduction. Storm water issues vary from system to system and possibly region to region, often making it difficult to compare compliance costs for individual MS4 permits. Collecting standardized data on what permittees spend to comply with their MS4 permits will allow the Water Boards and stakeholders to broadly compare across regions and systems and to identify trends over time. Reliable and robust data will allow the Water Boards to confidently draw on reported costs when developing cost estimates for new TMDLs that may involve similar activities.

This guidance is for Regional Water Board storm water permitting staff to follow when requesting information on the costs of MS4 permit compliance from their MS4 permittees.

¹ Among other changes, the State Auditor recommended that, "to ensure that the regional boards obtain adequate and consistent information on the storm water management costs local jurisdictions incur, the State Water Board should develop statewide guidance... for local jurisdictions on methods for tracking the cost of storm water management."

Consistent and reliable cost information may also be critical for municipalities to manage their assets, programs, funding strategies, evaluations, credit programs, and stormwater utility fees.

The Water Boards are aware that the development and implementation of new standardized cost-reporting or information requests will likely result in short-term costs as local jurisdictions transition cost-accounting practices and data systems.

Limitations and warnings. There are several potential pitfalls:

- Permittees may have incentives to over-report costs or report costs they would have incurred regardless of their permit. Only a portion of costs that are listed may actually be related to storm water permit compliance and would not have been incurred regardless.
- Storm water pollution reduction approaches and their costs are difficult to standardize. There are appropriate grounds for differences among municipal storm water permits. What is practicable and prudent in one community may not work in other communities because of differences in population, hydrology, pollution sources, water uses, and municipal infrastructure, among other things. Consequently, this guidance is necessarily general.
- Analysis of cost data supplied by permittees is complex and is not covered here.
- Refer to the Appendix on legal considerations.

Guidance on Cost Reporting Approaches

Encourage use of the categories below. Federal regulations generally require permittees to report annually on their costs of complying with their permit. Therefore, the Regional Water Boards can require cost information in a permit.² Things that don't apply in your region need not be added to your permits.

There is a tension between suggesting general categories that apply in most cases and using more specific categories. ORPP will revisit this guidance periodically as more information becomes available and as it is applied.

Cost categories suggested for use³

1. Stormwater program management (overhead)
2. TMDL implementation/monitoring plan development
3. Trash best management practice compliance
4. Minimum control measures
 - 4.1. Public information, education, outreach, involvement, and participation

² 40 C.F.R. 122.26(d)(2)(vi).

³ These categories may be of value (mainly based on Region 4's requirement for cost reporting by MS4 Permittees and the 2005 NPDES Stormwater Cost Survey, pages 63-68). If results are not adequate, more specific categories may eventually be included. As recommended in the 2005 Cost Survey, costs should be broken down according to cost for personnel, agency overhead, land acquisition/lease (if applicable), construction, and operation and maintenance.

- 4.2. Industrial and commercial facilities programs
- 4.3. Planning and land development programs⁴ (e.g. post construction stormwater management in new development and redevelopment)
- 4.4. Oversight of construction and construction site storm water runoff control
- 4.5. Public agency activities and pollution prevention and good housekeeping for municipal operations
- 4.6. Illicit connections and illicit discharges program (including detection and elimination)
- 4.7. Additional institutional best management practices / “enhanced” minimum control measures
5. Projects
 - 5.1. Distributed projects, including green streets⁵
 - 5.2. Regional projects⁶
 - 5.3. Restoration projects⁷
6. Monitoring
 - 6.1. Effluent/outfall and receiving water quality monitoring
 - 6.2. Best management practice effectiveness monitoring
 - 6.3. Data analysis⁸
7. Watershed management planning, other than alternative compliance pathways such as WMP/EWMPs
8. Alternative compliance plan development⁹
9. Reporting costs
 - 9.1. Information management systems
 - 9.2. Annual reporting
10. Other

⁴ Including environmental review, development project approval and verification, and permitting and licensing.

⁵ Permittees should provide costs for individual green street/distributed projects as separate entries in the table. See also footnotes for Regional Projects and Restoration Projects.

⁶ Costs for Regional Projects should be provided by project, i.e. if a permittee is implementing three projects include one row for each project. Details should also be provided on project design details in order to better understand unit costs (linear miles of green street, acre-feet of stormwater captured). Also, costs should be those incurred within the reporting year. If a Permittee is implementing a project collaboratively, the Permittee should only include the portion of project cost that it is assuming. Permittees should provide overall project cost for multi-year projects if available, but separately, in their routine report submittals.

⁷ See footnote regarding Regional Projects.

⁸ Some permits require the Permittee analyze the data for key trends and basic statistics.

⁹ Costs include development/revision of plans and Reasonable Assurance Analysis costs.

Information suggested to be requested for each cost category

- A. Description of costs counted
- B. Total cost
- C. Capital expenditures (other than for land)
- D. Land costs
- E. Personnel costs
- F. Number and classifications of personnel
- G. Cost of consultants
- H. Overhead costs
- I. Construction costs
- J. Operations and maintenance costs

Other guidance

- In general, permittees should put in reasonable effort to determine and report their costs.
- Consider asking permittees to include the sources of funding for permit compliance.¹⁰ Grants from public agencies and other outside funding should be clearly identified.
- If the Water Boards seek additional data, focus on data the Boards will use or that the public will want.
- Consider asking that supporting documentation be submitted or be available upon request for review. Examples include detailed Capital Improvement Plan budgets, Storm Drainage or Asset Management Plans. Supporting documentation may help you identify inappropriate costs. For example, inspection staff may have multiple responsibilities in addition to storm water inspections. It is not appropriate to count an entire inspector's time (i.e., full-time) as a storm water cost if the inspector is also doing building inspections.
- Required compensation for all costs should be identified if the permittee conducted any enforcement actions related to remediation activities related to elimination of a non-storm water discharge, cleanup, or maintenance on its own.
- Consider suggesting that permittees account for storm water expenditures separately from other expenditures.

References

Boardman, A. *et al.*, 1996. *Cost-benefit analysis: concepts and practice*. Prentiss Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

¹⁰ 40 C.F.R. 122.26(d)(1)(vi)(A).

[California State Auditor, 2018. State and Regional Water Boards: They must do more to ensure that local jurisdictions' costs to reduce storm water pollution are necessary and appropriate. \(Report Number 2017-118.\)](#)

California State University, Sacramento, Office of Water Programs, 2018. Toolkit to Support Financial Planning for Municipal Stormwater Programs. Prepared as product of the U.S. EPA Region 9 Environmental Finance Center at Sacramento State. *Draft*. August 2018.

[California State University, Sacramento, Office of Water Programs, 2005. NPDES Stormwater Cost Survey.](#)

[Department of Water Resources, 2008. Economic analysis guidebook. The Resources Agency, State of California.](#)

U.S. EPA, 2018. Storm Water Financing Strategy Training Course (*in development*).

[U.S. EPA, 2000. Guidelines for preparing economic analysis. \(EPA 240-R-00-003.\)](#)

Weimer, D. & Vining, A., 1992. *Policy analysis: concepts and practice*. Prentiss Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Appendix: legal considerations

This general guidance is not binding and does not change or otherwise affect the legal obligations of the Water Boards related to the adoption of waste discharge requirements.

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. 122.26(d)(1)(vi)(A) pertaining to application requirements require permittees to provide:

A description of the financial resources currently available to the municipality to complete part 2 of the permit application. A description of the municipality's budget for existing storm water programs, including an overview of the municipality's financial resources and budget, including overall indebtedness and assets, and sources of funds for storm water programs.

40 C.F.R. 122.26(d)(2)(vi) requires that as part of a Permittee's management program, they provide a fiscal analysis as follows:

For each fiscal year to be covered by the permit, a fiscal analysis of the necessary capital and operation and maintenance expenditures necessary to accomplish the activities of the programs under paragraphs (d)(2) (iii) and (iv) of this section. Such analysis shall include a description of the source of funds that are proposed to meet the necessary expenditures, including legal restrictions on the use of such funds.

In light of these requirements, for example, the Los Angeles County MS4 Permit, Order No. R4-2012-0175 states, “each Permittee shall conduct a fiscal analysis of the annual capital and operation and maintenance expenditures necessary to implement the requirements of this Order” (Part VI.A.3.a).

Glossary

In progress. If there are other terms that should be included, please email ORPP@waterboards.ca.gov.

Illicit discharge. Any discharge to an MS4 that is not composed entirely of stormwater. This generally describes any discharge to an MS4 which is not directly attributable to precipitation runoff and which MS4s are not designed to accept, process, or discharge.¹¹

Pollution prevention and good housekeeping. This describes activities that alter municipal or facility operations and help ensure a reduction in the amount and type of pollution that: (1) collects on streets, parking lots, open spaces, and storage and vehicle maintenance areas and is discharged into local waterways; and (2) results from actions such as environmentally damaging land development and flood management practices or poor maintenance of storm sewer systems.¹²

¹¹ Copied or adapted from one of US EPA's Phase II MCM Factsheets:

https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-12/documents/epa_stormwater_phase_ii_final_rule_factsheet_2.5_illicit_discharge_12-04-18.pdf.

¹² Copied or adapted from one of US EPA's Phase II MCM Factsheets:

https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-12/documents/epa_stormwater_phase_ii_final_rule_factsheet_2.5_illicit_discharge_12-04-18.pdf.



FY 2019-20 Water Quality Fees Stakeholder Meeting

DATE:	June 11, 2019
TIME:	9:00-11:00 am
LOCATION:	CalEPA Headquarters Building Sierra Hearing Room, 2 nd Floor 1001 I Street Sacramento, CA 95814
WEBCAST LINK:	https://video.calepa.ca.gov/
QUESTIONS:	FeeBranch@waterboards.ca.gov – Questions received prior to and during the meeting will be addressed during the meeting unless otherwise requested.

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Waste Discharge Permit Fund (WDPF) Budget Cost Drivers (Attachment 1)
3. WDPF Recent Program Fee Increases (Attachment 2)
4. Summary of Proposed Fee Changes by Program (Attachment 3)
5. Division of Water Quality
 - a. Redirected Program Information
 - b. Cost of Compliance Information
6. Open Discussion
7. Cannabis Stakeholder Information
(This item may go beyond the scheduled 11:00 am meeting end time but will end no later than 12:30 pm.)

WDPF Budget Cost Drivers
FY 2019-20
(\$000)

A	B	C	D	E (B+C+D)	F	G (E-F)	H (F+G)	I	J	K (G+J)	L (F+K)	M	N	O
WDPF Program	FY 18-19 Fee Budget ¹	BCP Changes	Staff Cost & Program Adjustments ²	FY 19-20 Allocation Budget	FY 19-20 Revenue Forecast	Forecasted Revenue Increase / (Decrease)	FY 19-20 Total Revenue	Average Program Percent Change	Revenue Adjust for 4% Fund Reserve ³	Adjusted Revenue Increase / (Decrease) ⁴	FY 19-20 Adjusted Total Revenue ⁵	Adjusted Average Program Percent Change ⁶	FY 20-21 (Budget Year +1)	FY 21-22 (Budget Year +2)
WDR	\$33,410	\$10	\$489	\$33,909	\$29,735	\$4,174	\$33,909	14.0%	\$0	\$4,174	\$33,909	14.0%	4.0%	4.0%
Land Disposal	\$14,132	(\$101)	(\$581)	\$13,450	\$13,950	(\$500)	\$13,450	-3.6%	\$0	(\$500)	\$13,450	-3.6%	4.0%	4.0%
WQC (401 Cert)	\$12,405	\$1,718	\$983	\$15,105	\$10,394	\$4,711	\$15,105	45.3%	\$0	\$4,711	\$15,105	45.3% Net 18.3%	4.0%	4.0%
Storm Water	\$32,086	(\$243)	\$505	\$32,349	\$32,561	(\$212)	\$32,349	-0.7%	\$0	(\$212)	\$32,349	-0.7%	4.0%	4.0%
NPDES	\$33,036	\$10	\$217	\$33,263	\$29,586	\$3,677	\$33,263	12.4%	\$0	\$3,677	\$33,263	12.4%	4.0%	4.0%
CAF	\$5,138	(\$41)	\$415	\$5,512	\$5,014	\$498	\$5,512	9.9%	\$0	\$498	\$5,512	9.9%	4.0%	4.0%
Ag Lands (ILRP)	\$7,832	(\$58)	(\$12)	\$7,762	\$6,967	\$794	\$7,762	11.4%	\$0	\$794	\$7,762	11.4%	4.0%	4.0%
SUBTOTAL:	\$138,039	\$1,294	\$2,016	\$141,349	\$128,207	\$13,143	\$141,349		\$0	\$13,143	\$141,349			
Cannabis	\$18,124	(\$134)	(\$85)	\$17,905	\$5,027	\$12,878	\$17,905	256.2%	\$0	\$12,878	\$17,905	256.2%	4.0%	4.0%
TOTAL:	\$156,163	\$1,160	\$1,931	\$159,254	\$133,233	\$26,021	\$159,254		\$0	\$26,021	\$159,254			

Footnotes:

- ¹ Includes redirected expenditures for programs like Basin Planning, TMDL, monitoring and enforcement.
- ² Includes resource reallocation for employee compensation, retirement, health care costs, space optimization and pro rata.
- ³ Adjustments to revenue levels while maintaining a prudent reserve.
- ⁴ Recommended revenue level adjustments.
- ⁵ Net revenue levels after adjustments.
- ⁶ Net percentage change impact after recommended adjustments.

BCP Changes:

All WDPF Programs	(\$1,196)	18-19 BCP - CalEPA Space Optimization
WQC (Utility companies)	\$1,831	19-20 BCP - Wildfire Prevention and Recovery (SB 901)
WDR & NPDES	\$525	19-20 BCP - Sewer Service Provision for Disadvantaged Communities (SB 1215)
	\$1,160	

WDPF Fee Paying Programs Recent Program Fee Increases

Program	FY 2016-17		FY 2017-18		FY 2018-19		FY 2019-20		
	Needed Increase	Adopted Increase	Needed Increase	Adopted Increase	Needed Increase	Adopted Increase	Prior Year Deferral	Additional Needed	Projected Increase
WDR	3.0%	-	10.2%	-	18.6%	9.5%	9.1%	4.9%	14.0%
Land Disposal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
WQC (401 Cert)	32.4%	20.0%	22.1%	20% ¹	18.1%	9.2%	8.9%	9.4%	18.3%
Storm Water	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NPDES	3.3%	-	6.8%	-	19.6%	10.0%	9.6%	2.8%	12.4%
CAF	-	-	9.8%	-	12.2%	6.2%	6.0%	3.9%	9.9%
Ag Land (ILRP)	3.1%	-	22.3%	16% ²	17.4%	8.9%	8.5%	2.9%	11.4%
Cannabis									

¹ Average increase over all categories.

² Related to BCP for 5 PYs

FY 2019-20 WDPF Fee Schedule Summary of Proposed Changes by Program

NOTE: The proposed changes described below are only concepts at this time and are based on the data currently available. All final changes will be described in the agenda item for the September 17, 2019 board meeting at which staff will propose the FY 2019-20 fee schedule for the Board's consideration. To be notified when the final agenda item is released and of regular stakeholder information, please be sure you are signed up for the "Fee Regulations – Water Quality" email list at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/resources/email_subscriptions/swrcb_subscribe.html).

Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) – All fee categories for the WDR program will be increased by approximately 14.0 percent.

- **Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements for Winery Process Water Treatment Systems (Winery GO)**

DAS Fees staff is proposing a new fee schedule specific to the Winery GO that is scheduled to be adopted by the State Water Board during FY 2019-20. The proposal, based on the current iteration of the Winery GO, includes tiers based on threat to water quality and whether a discharger can comply with the hydraulic loading rate in the order. DWQ staff is continuing to meet with stakeholders which may result in changes to this fee schedule concept.

Tier	Application Fee	Annual Fee
Tier 1 Largest	\$100,000	\$100,000
Tier 1 Medium	\$50,000	\$50,000
Tier 1 Smallest	\$20,000	\$20,000
Tier 2	\$15,000	\$15,000
Tier 2 NC ¹	\$20,000	\$20,000
Tier 3	\$5,000	\$5,000
Tier 3 NC ¹	\$7,000	\$7,000
Tier 4	\$500	\$500
Tier 4 NC ¹	\$2,500	\$2,500
Tier 5	\$500	\$500

¹ NC refers to non-conforming and is for Tier 2 through 4 facilities that cannot conform with the hydraulic loading rate in the Order.

Land Disposal – No fee changes are proposed for the Land Disposal program.

Water Quality Certification (WQC) – All fee categories for the WQC program will be increased by approximately 18.3 percent, except for the Fill & Excavation **application annual** fee. Staff is proposing to keep the Fill & Excavation **application annual** fee at the FY 2018-19 level to provide stability and predictability to potential applicants that might not apply for permits or

comply with regulations if fees continue to increase and to compensate by increasing the **project fee** impact area per acre multiplier by 19.1 percent.

- **EcoRestore** – DWQ staff is in discussions with the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA) in regards to an entity-specific fee for CNRA EcoRestore projects.
- **SB 901** – DWQ and DAS staff are considering two fee schedule concepts for utility companies that are performing dredge or fill activities pursuant to SB 901 and identified in an approved Utility Wildfire Mitigation Plan (plans are approved by the California Public Utilities Commission). DWQ staff will continue discussions with industry stakeholders to determine the best option to generate the required \$1.8 million in revenue.
 - Option 1: Assess a flat fee on a per project basis.
 - Option 2: Assess a flat yearly fee to each utility based on a prorated determinate (i.e., size of service area, anticipated number of future permits needed, number of transmission poles/overhead lines, etc.).

Storm Water – No fee increases are proposed for the Storm Water program.

- DAS Fees staff is proposing to amend section 2200(b)(1)(A) of the fee schedule to clarify that special districts located within a city or county that does not oversee storm water compliance for the district are required to pay the MS4 fee.

NPDES – All fee categories for the NPDES program will increase by approximately 12.4 percent.

- **California Water Code Section 13142.5(b) Consistency Determination for Seawater Desalination Facilities**
DWQ and DAS Fees staff determined that due to the significant and lengthy process for reviewing and approving consistency determinations for seawater desalination facilities an application fee will be implemented and assessed annually until the permit is issued. Once the permit is issued, the discharger will pay the standard NPDES flow-based fee. DAS Fees staff is proposing the concept below and will be meeting directly with the eight current applicants to discuss the fees.

Intake Type	Proposed Fee
Surface	\$205,200
Subsurface	\$68,400

Confined Animal Facilities (CAF) – All fee categories for the CAF program will increase by approximately 10.0 percent.

- Water Boards staff has determined that some inequities exist in the way fees are assessed to dairy facilities that contain both mature dairy cattle and bred heifers in excess of the industry average. To make the fee schedule more equitable, Fees staff is proposing to amend section 2200(c) of the fee schedule by removing the text “(not a dairy)” from the Feedlots table. This change will bring the table in line with the current fee schedule language requiring the discharger to pay the higher of the two fees if there are multiple animals types at a facility.

Agricultural (Ag) Lands – Division of Water Quality (DWQ) and DAS Fees staff are proposing the fee concept below to assess fees based on what, if any, types of management plan (Irrigation and Nitrogen Management Plans and Pesticide/Toxicity Management Plans) are developed and whether or not a discharger is enrolled in an approved third party group. DWQ staff received preliminary backing from several key stakeholders on this concept and will continue to hold meetings with stakeholders to further develop the concept, including refining definitions and finalizing fee amounts. In addition to the change in methodology, the targeted revenue amount for the Ag Lands program is increasing by approximately 11.4 percent.

Management Plan Tiers	A Individual Enrollment (Not in a 3rd Party Group)	B Enrolled in an Approved 3rd Party Group
1	\$TBD/acre	\$TBD/acre
2	\$TBD/acre	\$TBD/acre
3	\$TBD/acre	\$TBD/acre

~~**Cannabis** – Information for the Cannabis program will be updated prior to the meeting and as part of Agenda Item #7.~~

Scheduled Meetings and Deliverables

July - September 2019

July

2	Monitoring AHTG 10:00 am – 12:30 pm	San Jose City Hall
9	CASQA Board/EPC 9:30 am - 5:00 pm	Geosyntec, Oakland
12	ZLI Steering Committee 9:00 am – 10:00 am	Conference Call
15	MRP 3.0 C.3/GI Work Group 10:00 am – 12:00 pm	EOA, Oakland
16	Trash AHTG 1:00 pm – 3:30 pm	San Jose City Hall Room T-644
18	Management Committee 9:30 am – 11:00 am	Sunnyvale Civic Center West Conference Room
23	BASMAA Trash Committee 10:00 am – 12:00 pm	Regional Water Board Oakland
	MRP 3.0 Trash Work Group 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm	Regional Water Board Oakland
24	BASMAA PIP Committee 1:30 pm – 3:00 pm	Conference Call
25	BASMAA Board of Directors 10:00 am – 3:00 pm	EOA, Oakland
29	C3PO AHTG 1:30 pm – 3:30 pm	1 st Floor Conference Room, Milpitas City Hall

August

1

MRP 3.0 C3-GI Work Group
10:30 am – 12:30 pm

EOA, Oakland

BASMAA Development Committee
1:30 pm – 4:00 pm

EOA, Oakland

2

ZLI Steering Committee
9:00 am – 10:00 am

Conference Call

7

BASMAA Monitoring/POC Committee
9:00 am – 3:00 pm

EOA, Oakland

15

Management Committee
9:30 am – 11:00 am

Sunnyvale Civic Center
West Conference Room

19

MRP 3.0 WQ Monitoring Work Group
9:00 am – 12:00 pm

EOA, Oakland

20

Trash AHTG
1:00 pm – 4:00 pm

San Jose City Hall
Room T-644

September

3

MRP 3.0 Steering Committee
1:30pm – 4:30pm

Regional Water Board
Oakland

4

BASMAA Monitoring/POC Committee
9:00 am – 3:00 pm

EOA, Oakland

6

ZLI Steering Committee
9:00 am – 10:00 am

Conference Call

17

Trash AHTG
1:00 pm – 4:00 pm

San Jose City Hall
Room T-644

18

Management Committee
9:30 am – 11:00 am

Sunnyvale Civic Center
West Conference Room

24

BASMAA Trash Committee
10:00 am – 12:00 pm

Regional Water Board
Oakland

26

BASMAA Board of Directors
10:00 am – 3:00 pm

EOA, Oakland