

MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA Wednesday, August 17, 2022 1:30 PM to 3:30 PM

Join Zoom meeting:

https://zoom.us/j/95398909729?pwd=blhxUkthU1pjYkFjREhncXJtV2NTQT09

Meeting ID: 953 9890 9729 Passcode: 632133 Dial: 1 669 900 6833 One tap mobile: +16699006833,,95398909729#,,,,*632133# US (San Jose)

If you require an accommodation to participate in this meeting, please contact Michael Burger at 925-313-2360 or at michael.burger@pw.cccounty.us, or by fax at 925-313-2301. Providing at least 72 hours notice (three business days) prior to the meeting will help to ensure availability.

VOTING MEMBERS (authorized members on file)

City of Antioch Phil Hoffmeister

City of Brentwood
City of Clayton
Laura Hoffmeister/ Reina Schwartz
City of Concord
Bruce Davis (Vice-Chair)/ Kevin Marstall
Contra Costa County
Michele Mancuso/ Tim Jensen/ Allison Knapp
CCC Flood Control & Water Conservation District
Tim Jensen/ Michele Mancuso/ Allison Knapp

Town of Danville Bob Russell/ Steve Jones/ Mark Rusch

City of El Cerrito Stephen Prée/ Will Provost/ Yvetteh Ortiz/ Christina Leard
City of Hercules Mike Roberts/Jeff Brown/Jose Pacheco/Nai Saelee/F. Kennedy

City of Lafayette Matt Luttropp/ Tim Clark
City of Martinez Khalil Yowakim/ Frank Kennedy

Town of Moraga Shawn Knapp

City of Oakley Billilee Saengcalern/ Frank Kennedy/ Andrew Kennedy

City of Orinda Scott Christie/ Kevin McCourt/ Frank Kennedy

City of Pinole Misha Kaur

City of Pittsburg Jolan Longway/ Richard Abono

City of Pleasant Hill Philip Ho/Ananthan Kanagasundaram/Frank Kennedy (Chair)

City of Richmond Joe Leach/ Mary Phelps

City of San Pablo Amanda Booth/ Karineh Samkian/ Sarah Kolarik/ Jill Mercurio

City of San Ramon Kerry Parker/ Robin Bartlett/ Maria Fierner
City of Walnut Creek Lucile Paquette/ Neil Mock/ Steve Waymire

PROGRAM STAFF AND CONSULTANTS

Courtney Riddle, Program Manager Andrea Bullock, Administrative Analyst

Karin Graves, Sr. Watershed Planning Specialist Alina Constantinescu, Consultant

Yvana Hrovat, Consultant
Liz Yin, Consultant
Liz Yin, Consultant
Lisa Austin, Consultant
Erin Lennon, Watershed Planner

Mitch Avalon, Consultant
Michael Burger, Clerk
Lisa Welsh, Consultant
Hilary Pierce, Consultant

NEXT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, September 21, 2022, 1:30 PM

Contra Costa Clean Water Program MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA Wednesday, August 17, 2022

AGENDA

Public Comments: Any member of the public may address the Management Committee on a subject within their

1:30

Open the Meeting/Introductions/Announcements/Changes to the Agenda:

jurisdiction and <u>not</u> listed on the agenda. Remarks should not exceed three (3) minutes.

Re	gion	al Water Quality Control Board Staff Comments/Reports:	1:32
All Th	mat ere v	nt Calendar: Iters listed under the CONSENT CALENDAR are considered routine and can be acted on by one moti Iters listed under the CONSENT CALENDAR are considered routine and can be acted on by one moti Iters listed under the Constitution of the Management Committee votes on the motion to adopt.	
	1) AC	PROVE Management Committee meeting summary (Chair) July 20, 2022 Management Committee Meeting Summary CEPT the following subcommittee meeting summaries into the Management Committee record: (C Administrative Committee	hair)
	,	July 5, 2022 PIP Committee July 5, 2022	
	3)4)	Monitoring Committee • June 13, 2022 Municipal Operations Committee	
	5)	• June 21, 2022 Development Committee	
Pro	esen	• June 22, 2022 ******************************	1:40
	A.	WQIF grant application guidelines (K. Graves)	
	В.	FY 22/23 Final Adjusted Budget (M. Avalon, A. Bullock) a. See staff report for background information	
	C.	Updates on Provision C.3 (Y. Hrovat) a. C.3 Guidebook scope of work (Conditionally approved budget item) b. C.3 Update Handout	

D. Overview of reports due with the Annual Report (see staff reports) (L. Austin)

c. C.3 Update Municipal Staff Memo

	a.	POC Loads Reduction Report
	b.	Fish Risk Reduction Status Report
	C.	PCBs in Building Materials Report
Ε.	Draft P	yrethroid Baseline Monitoring Report (L. Austin)
	a.	See staff report for background information

Actions: 2:50

- A. APPROVE the FY 22/23 Adjusted Budget.
- B. APPROVE the final budget for the following conditionally approved budget items:
 - a. Update Stormwater C.3 Guidebook

<u>Reports:</u> 2:55

- A. C.3 Bioretention Sizing Guidance Update (K. Graves)
- B. Grant tracking spreadsheet (S. Matthews)
- C. Final Caltrans paid media partnership campaign assets (H. Pierce)
- D. C.3.j Forum at September 28 Development Committee meeting (determine attendees) (E. Lennon)
- E. Trash load reduction table (E. Yin)
- F. AGOL Work Group (E. Yin)

Updates: 3:55

- A. Personnel Update (K. Graves)
- B. BAMSC Steering Committee meeting (K. Graves)
- C. Annual Report (E. Yin)

Information: 4:05

- A. September 21 Management Committee meeting start at 1:00 with closed session (M. Avalon)
- B. Regional Water Board is conducting random auditing of permittee trash capture devices

Old/New Business: 4:10

Adjournment: Approximately 4:30 p.m.

Attachments

Consent Items

- 1. Management Committee Meeting Summary July 20, 2022
- 2. Administrative Committee Meeting Summary July 5, 2022
- 3. PIP Committee Meeting Summary July 5, 2022
- 4. Monitoring Committee Meeting Summary June 13, 2022
- 5. Municipal Operations Committee Meeting Summary June 21, 2022
- **6.** Development Committee Meeting Summary June 22, 2022

Presentation Items

- 7. Staff Report on Final Adjusted Budget
- **8.** Final Adjusted Budget Spreadsheet (highlighted)
- **9.** Final Adjusted Budget Spreadsheet (clean)
- 10. Staff Report on POC Loads Reduction Report

- **11.** <u>POC Loads Reduction Report</u> (available on Group site)
- **12.** Staff Report on Fish Risk Reduction Status Report
- **13.** Fish Risk Reduction Status Report (available on Group site)
- **14.** Staff Report on PCBs in Building Materials Report
- **15.** <u>PCBs in Building Materials Report</u> (available on Group site)
- **16.** Staff Report on Draft Pyrethroid Baseline Monitoring Report
- **17.** <u>Draft Pyrethroid Baseline Monitoring Report</u> (available on Group site)

Reports

- **18.** Grant tracking spreadsheet
- **19.** Caltrans partnership campaign assets

Information

UPCOMING CCCWP MEETINGS			
All meetings will not be held at 255 Glacier Drive, Martinez, CA 94553, but will be held virtually			
September 6, 2022 Administrative and PIP Committee Meeting 9:30 a.m. – 12:00 noon			
1 st Tuesday			
September 12, 2022	Monitoring Committee Meeting, 10am – 12 noon		
2 nd Monday			
September 20, 2022	Municipal Operations Committee Meeting, 10am-12 noon		
3 rd Tuesday			
August 24, 2022	Development Committee Meeting, 1:30 p.m3:30 p.m.		
4 th Wednesday			
September 21, 2022	Management Committee Meeting, 1:30 p.m3:30 p.m.		
3 rd Wednesday			

BAMSC (BASMAA) SUBCOMMITTEE/ MRP 3.0 MEETINGS			
Tim	Times for the BAMSC (BASMAA) Subcommittee meetings are subject to change.		
July 1, 2022 Effective date of MRP 3.0			
1 st Thursday	Development Committee, 1:30 – 4:00 p.m. (even months)		
1 st Wednesday	Monitoring/POCs Committee, 9:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m. (odd months)		
4 th Wednesday	Public Information/Participation Committee, 1:30 – 4:00 p.m. (1st month each quarter)		
4 th Tuesday	Trash Subcommittee, 9:30 a.m12 noon (even month)		



MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

07-20-2022

Attendance:

MUNICIPALITY ATTENDED ABSENT

City of Antioch Phil Hoffmeister

City of Brentwood
City of Clayton
City of Concord
Town of Danville
City of El Cerrito
City of Hercules

Jigar Shah
Reina Schwartz
Bruce Davis
Bob Russell
Christina Leard
Nai Saelee

City of Lafayette Matt Luttrop, Tim Clark

City of Martinez Frank Kennedy

Town of Moraga Shawn Knapp

City of Oakley Frank Kennedy
City of Orinda Frank Kennedy
City of Pinole Misha Kaur
City of Pittsburg Jolan Longway

City of Pleasant Hill Frank Kennedy (Chair)

City of Richmond Joe Leach
City of San Pablo Amanda Booth
City of San Ramon Kerry Parker
City of Walnut Creek Lucile Paquette

Contra Costa County Michele Mancuso, Allison Knapp

CCC Flood Control and Tim Jensen

Water Conservation District

Program Staff: Karin Graves, Erin Lennon, Andrea Bullock, Michael Burger

Program Consultants: Liz Yin, Sandy Matthews, Yvana Hrovat, Hilary Pierce, Lisa Welsh

Members of the Public/Others/Guests:

<u>Introductions/Announcements/Changes to Agenda</u>: Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, the meeting was conducted by video-conference call.

Public Comments: No members of the public called in.

Regional Water Quality Control Board Staff Comments/Reports: Regional Board staff did not call in.



- 1. Roll call was taken and the meeting was convened by the Chair at 1:30 p.m.
- 2. Announcements: There were no announcements. The Chair noted a change to the Agenda, adding a topic concerning the membership of Moraga on the Administrative Committee. Mitch Avalon explained that Moraga would be stepping down from the Administrative Committee and Pleasant Hill would be added as a voting member of the Administrative Committee. The Chair of both the Administrative and Management Committees would transfer to Pleasant Hill, whose representative would remain Frank Kennedy. There were no objections to this administrative change in committee membership.

Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) recommended combining the Personnel Update with the Strategic Staff Plan item.

3. Consent Calendar: The Chair noted a change to the minutes clarifying the Green Infrastructure implementation could be increased through various means. Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) noted a typographical correction and offered comments clarifying the timeline for an Unfunded Mandate Claim and the timeline for the Program's Group Annual Report.

Bob Russell (Danville) motioned to approve the Management Committee minutes with changes noted, Amanda Booth (San Pablo) seconded. The Chair called for a vote. There were no objections or abstentions. The motioned passed unanimously and the consent calendar items were approved with changes noted.

4. Presentations:

a. Strategic Plan for Staffing the Clean Water Program (K. Graves): Allison Knapp (Contra Costa County) began by giving the Personnel Update. There was no additional information regarding the Program Manager position; she noted that the SDI situation would end approximately at the end of August 2022. She believes it is August 27, 2022. She recommended a closed session meeting with Brian Balbas in September to discuss this topic further. Mitch Avalon noted that the closed session could be convened before the Management Committee meeting.

Karin Graves began by explaining the staffing plan. Factors that were covered in the staffing plan were the continued vacancy of one Watershed Management Planning Specialist (WMPS) requiring a continuation of staff augmentation from consultants, Mitch Avalon would be retiring in December 2022 which will result in a need for staffing adjustments, the Program Manager position was still vacant, staffing coverage for each committee, and Arc GIS (AGOL) staff support.



The current Senior WMPS has been acting in the Program Manager position since January 2021. The County would continue the temporary upgrade of the Senior WMPS to Interim Program Manager until the Program Manager absence is resolved. The supervisory responsibilities that had formerly been part of the Senior WMPS position have been shifted to the Interim Program Manager. The new WMPS would provide consultant oversight and will transition into the role of leading the Development Committee and the Municipal Operations Committee. She would also oversee permit provisions covered by consultant contracts relevant to these committees. Lisa Welsh and Lisa Austin (Geosyntec) would continue to oversee the Monitoring Committee and related monitoring contracts. These consultants are budgeted for 20 hours per week. Hilary Pierce (LWA) would formally oversee the PIP Committee with supervision from the Interim Program Manager. The Program planned to hire an additional WMPS, but County Human Resources recommended waiting 6 months until soliciting applicants again. A new application period was anticipated for January 2023 with the position to be filled in July 2023.

Mitch Avalon has been filling in for many of the Senior WMPS duties since August 2019 and will be retiring at the end of 2022. This role is estimated to require about 24 hours of work per week. Liz Yin and Hilary Pierce (LWA) will transfer into staff augmentation for the Senior WMPS. Two consultants will be trained to provide coverage in case one is unavailable. Liz Yin will serve as the primary augmented staff and Hilary Pierce would be cross trained and provide backup support to Liz Yin as needed.

Staff recommend having primary and secondary consultant contracts for technical work and staff augmentation where possible. This will allow cross training to prevent any lapse in coverage. This will also allow a cost savings through delegation of work to consultants paid at a lower rate.

Long range planning recommendations for program structure options were outlined in the Organizational Structure Report for the Management Committee on Feb 17, 2021. The report noted that the Program was, by default, operating with a heavy consultant model. It was the intention of the Program to move toward a heavier staff model when hiring to fill the vacant position was possible.

Liz Yin recently completed an AGOL Assessment which took a comprehensive look at the AGOL needs. One of the recommendations was for the Program to identify staff or consultants to provide support on a more regular basis. It was decided that Liz Yin would provide this support in FY 22/23. The cost estimate for this support was \$35,000 and was included in the cost breakdown. This role is anticipated to require 3 hours per week of staff time.

The new permit contains additional requirements as compared to MRP 2.0. A comprehensive list has been created by Sandy Matthews. This list of requirements will



help inform the level of effort needed and whether our current staffing structure provides enough support to meet permit requirements.

Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) asked for clarification on the terms of the Haley and Aldrich contracts. Karin Graves explained that there were currently 2 contracts with Haley & Aldrich as well as LWA. One covered technical support and one covered augmented staff. Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) asked if the consultants should oversee the budget. Karin Graves explained that, currently, she and Mitch Avalon were overseeing the budget due to Mitch Avalon's knowledge of the Program, but that she has been and always will be heavily involved in the budget.

Jigar Shah (Brentwood) asked how the consultant and staffing costs are reflected on a per city contribution basis. Karin Graves noted that a more in-depth discussion on the budget would be addressed during a later topic. Costs were shared by the Permittees based on population. Jigar Shah (Brentwood) asked if this would increase the costs to the Permittees. Mitch Avalon noted that the SUA funds would not be affected, costs would be taken from the reserve fund instead. Jigar Shah (Brentwood) suggested that student interns could be used to reduce Program costs. Training of these interns could be shared by the Permittees. Mitch Avalon noted that the budget discussion for the next Fiscal Year would begin in November 2022, at which point a more concrete idea of budget needs would be available. This was the appropriate place to identify cost reduction options.

Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) noted that the Program hasn't historically been fully staffed. Mitch Avalon suggested that Permittees could take on additional duties to reduce consultant time.

Karin Graves continued by addressing specific differences of administrative costs. The original budget for on-call staff augmentation was \$100k but was recommended to be increased to \$138k to cover support for the Municipal Operations Committee and Development Committee transition as well as the PIP committee support. Additionally, there was a budget adjustment to add 6 months of staff augmentation, assuming Program Manager position vacancy and need for Senior WMPS support. This is currently covered by Mitch Avalon. This would add \$223k to the budget. The Monitoring Committee staff augmentation was for 12 months and would increase the budget by \$270k. Consultant costs didn't account for vacations and consultants have historically billed less than the budgeted amounts. AGOL staff support was added to the budget as well. Karin also noted that salary savings from two of the currently vacant positions would offset the total increases by about \$470,000.

Jigar Shah (Brentwood) asked if the LWA staff augmentation was \$223k for 6 months and noted that this was \$446k/year which was far above even the salaries of City Managers. Mitch Avalon and Karin Graves noted that these were actually for 9 months,



including a 3-month transition period. It was noted that County salary costs also included benefits and county overhead. Allison Knapp (Contra Costa County) suggested that the county and consultant salaries be broken down to hourly rates for better comparison. The committee discussed ways to compare consultant costs to a county full time employee.

Reina Schwartz (Clayton) noted that recruitment was also a factor for determining cost effectiveness of staffing with full time employees versus consultants. The Committee discussed the challenges of hiring an individual that was a good fit for the Program.

b. FY 22/23 Draft Adjusted Budget (M. Avalon/A. Bullock): Mitch Avalon started by displaying the adjusted budget. The Fiscal Year 22/23 budget had been approved in March 2022. Since then, three things have happened that require adjustments to the budget: staffing changes, MRP 3.0 additions to permit requirements, and advance work that was no longer needed due to schedule changes.

Advance work was included in the FY 21/22 budget, but the work was not completed. The costs for these items would need to be added to the FY 22/23 budget as the work still needed to be completed this fiscal year. There were also a number of conditional budget items that needed Management Committee approval. Mitch Avalon noted that staff costs were already discussed in the prior agenda item. Lines highlighted in the spreadsheet in yellow were budget adjustments. The total adjusted budget was \$989k over the \$3.5M budget cap. Mitch Avalon reiterated that there would be no direct impact on SUA payments with this adjustment, but the reserve would eventually be depleted and that would impact SUA payments. It was also noted that the conditional budget items would require additional scrutiny.

Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) asked if the BAMSC regional projects budget item had specific projects in mind or if this was a floating sum. Karin noted that this was slated for regional items that would be discussed at the next BAMSC meeting; one of these projects was the regional grant application for the WQIF grants. Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) also asked if the PCBs in building materials line items could be tied together and clarify which budget items were estimated costs and which were more concrete costs. Jigar Shah (Brentwood) asked if the PCBs line items were associated with the Monsanto lawsuit. Mitch Avalon noted that the Monsanto item was a separate issue and was not included in this budget.

c. Options to Fill the SUA Funding Gap – an Overview (M. Avalon): Factors to consider while approaching increased funding were political support, community support, a convincing story, consequences of inadequate investments, the public's appetite for taxes, and data to back everything up.



Approaches to generating money include state level constitutional amendments to exempt stormwater, local level propositions (taxes, assessments, property related fee, bonds and a debt service tax), a fee using the process in Senate Bill 231 (could incur a law suit), creation of a street sweeping district, creation of a community facilities district, a partnership with other agencies to restructure business responsibilities, requesting an increased budget from city/town council, and a one-time funding opportunity (such as grants). Other approaches include an unfunded mandate application, a time schedule order, and political advocacy.

Staff was seeking the committee to direct staff to create an options report. This report would review/update the 2012 Community Clean Water Initiative, incorporate lessons learned from the 2012 funding initiative, and identify all potential options with pros/cons.

The report would have two phases. Phase 1 would narrow all potential options to a list of viable options and identify what information was needed to make a decision. Phase 2 would be a pathway to make a final decision.

The Chair noted that a report may be too static and recommended an ongoing discussion with incremental (quarterly or more frequently) updates on the available options. Mitch Avalon noted that this was a good idea, but a report would be a concrete way to form a decision; an ongoing discussion could result in no decision being made.

Amanda Booth (San Pablo) asked if the report would be created internally or would be done by a consultant. Mitch Avalon confirmed that this would be done in house and he would be the one overseeing both phases.

Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) noted a shift in opinion on the value of water that may be a beneficial driver. She further noted that a 5-year budget would be helpful. Mitch Avalon noted that this would be created after the adjusted budget was approved.

d. MRP 3.0 Checklist (S. Matthews): Sandy Matthews began by displaying the checklist spreadsheet. As part of the regionally collaborative effort, this checklist was created to track all the requirements in MRP 2.0 and 3.0, and the changes from MRP 2.0 to 3.0.

Currently, the checklist is being customized for Contra Costa County. The first tab was the summary tab that showed all the requirements. Column E had been added to show which regional committee was handling each Provision.

The spreadsheet was designed to allow Permittees to walk through the information at a high level or a granular level. There was also a section in the detailed workbooks listing the implementation lead.



The next steps were to link to regional projects. This will be completed after the BAMSC meeting later this month.

Sandy Matthews noted that this was ready to be shared as a draft, but there were concerns regarding version control while updates were still being implemented. Christina Leard (El Cerrito) suggested a version date be added.

Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) asked if the spreadsheet available in the packet was an Excel spreadsheet converted to a pdf. Sandy Matthews confirmed this. The Committee asked if this was on Groupsite and if it was going to be distributed as an Excel spreadsheet. It was confirmed that it would be available in Excel, but it wasn't on Groupsite yet. Karin Graves noted that it would be available after the meeting with the understanding that it was a draft document.

5. Actions: There were no action items for consideration by the Committee.

6. Reports:

a. Status of Monsanto Settlement Agreement (K. Graves): Karin Graves noted that the deadline for opting out of the settlement was July 25. The Committee discussed the cities that have opted out and it appeared as though most Permittees have opted out.

Reina Schwartz (Clayton) noted that opting out was not the same as opting into the County's endeavors. Amanda Booth (San Pablo) suggested that a discussion regarding the collection of evidence would need to be had. This discussion would require staff time from both jurisdictional staff as well as Program staff.

b. C.3.j Forum at September 28 Development Committee meeting (determine attendees) (E. Lennon): Erin Lennon reminded the Committee that a forum was planned for the latter half of the September Development Committee meeting. The agenda for this meeting was still under development, but managers were being invited to the meeting to share their experiences. Suggestions of topics, presenters, and members for a Questions & Answers segment were requested.

Mitch Avalon asked if this was focusing on the C.3.j retrofit requirement. Yvana Hrovat noted that this was to discuss the content of the C.3.j provision and develop guidance for Permittees that were undertaking projects under this provision.

Amanda Booth (San Pablo) noted that a specific request for C.3.j retrofit numbers should be sent in before the forum. Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) asked if Geosyntec would research the numbers, since they were pulling data from AGOL. Yvana Hrovat noted that the information would be incomplete. Jolan Longway (Pittsburg) asked if a



table could be created and sent to Permittees to fill out. Michele Mancuso (Contra Costa County) asked if this would be sent to the Management Committee and the Development Committee. This was confirmed to be the case. Yvana Hrovat noted that this would likely go out after the July 27 Development Committee meeting.

7. Updates:

- a. Personnel Update (K. Graves):
 - Status of Program Manager position: This topic was covered in a previous discussion.
- **b. BAMSC Steering Committee meeting (K. Graves):** Karin Graves noted that the BAMSC was working on a regional WQIF grant application proposal.
- c. Annual Report (L. Yin): Liz Yin noted that there had been an issue with some of the forms. A new version had been distributed via Groupsite. The Program's Group Annual Report was under development. Liz Yin reminded the Committee to double-check their SMARTS account. In the event that a Permittee doesn't have an account or has a problem, they should contact Liz Yin.

Misha Kaur (Pinole) noted that there were 4 entries for this year's report when she checked SMARTS. She asked if there were any other Permittees that had encountered this problem. Liz Yin requested a screen shot and she would try to assist.

The Chair asked if the Water Board would send a copy of the instructions. Liz Yin noted that they were available on Groupsite from last year, and it would be copied into the current year's folder. It was further noted that they were outdated and that the Water Board had not updated the information.

8. Information:

- a. Management Committee Agenda Topics for FY 22/23 Q1: See table in the agenda packet.
- **b. Upcoming Grant tracking spreadsheet (K. Graves):** LWA was putting together a spreadsheet that will be available at each Management Committee meeting beginning in September. This will provide updates on grant statuses.
- c. CASQA Summit: Program Attendance (K. Graves): CASQA will be hosting a 3-day bacteria summit in September with representatives from county wide programs (primarily Northern and Southern California groups with bacteria TMDLS). There were



four spots for Bay Area attendees available. The notice will be sent later this week to the Management Committee to gauge interest in attending.

d. Bio-retention as full trash capture: any problems with the Regional Board? (K.Graves): A couple of Permittees have been requested to provide additional information regarding bioretention facility design during C.3 inspections. There have been concerns that bioretention basins were not appropriately sized to count as full trash capture areas. Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) asked if this was regarding the screens not being appropriately sized. Yvana Hrovat indicated that it was a question of the actual size of the basin rather than a screen issue.

Jigar Shah (Brentwood) noted that the state has a clear indication on the sizing of trash enclosures and offered to assist Permittees with questions on sizing.

The Chair suggested that this would be better brought back as a discussion at a later date. Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) noted that this may be best discussed at the Development Committee. Erin Lennon noted that the Permittee in question had been contacted and invited to speak on the subject at the Development Committee meeting.

- **e. WQIF grant process coming up (K. Graves):** The request for applications was released earlier this week and an application would need to be entered by the end of the month.
- 9. Old/New Business: There was no old or new business.
- **10. Adjournment:** The Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:49 p.m.

 $G:\NPDES\01_Management\ Committee\03_Minutes\&Attend\22\ 23\Approved\ Minutes\2022-07-20\DRAFT\ 2022-07-20\ Management\ Committee\ Meeting\ Minutes.docx$



ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE SUMMARY Meeting Minutes Tuesday, July 5, 2022 10:30 – 12:00

VOTING MEMBERS	ATTENDED	ABSENT
Contra Costa County	Michele Mancuso	
CCC Flood Control and Water	Michele Mancuso	
Conservation District		
City of Lafayette		Matt Luttropp
City of Martinez	Frank Kennedy	
Town of Moraga	Frank Kennedy (Chair)	
City of Pittsburg	Jolan Longway	
City of Richmond		Joe Leach
NON-VOTING MEMBERS		

City of Danville Bob Russell
City of Pleasant Hill Frank Kennedy
City of Walnut Creek Lucile Paquette

Program Staff: Karin Graves, Andrea Bullock, Michael Burger

Consultants: Mitch Avalon

Guests:

- 1. Convene meeting and roll call (Chair): The Chair convened the meeting at 10:30 a.m.
- **2. Announcements or Changes to the Agenda (Committee):** There were no announcements or changes to the agenda.
- 3. Approval of June 7, 2022 Meeting Minutes (Chair): Michele Mancuso (Contra Costa County) motioned to approve the June 7, 2022 meeting minutes with no changes, Jolan Longway (Pittsburg) seconded. The Chair called for a vote. There were no objections or abstentions. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting minutes were approved.
- **4. Strategic Plan for Staffing the Clean Water Program (K. Graves):** There have been several staff transitions over the last two years. A Watershed Management Planning Specialist (WMPS) was hired and started last week, her name is Erin Lennon. A plan has been developed for Program staffing moving forward.

For Fiscal Year 22-23, there is still a vacancy for a WMPS. At the end of December, Mitch Avalon will be retiring. The Program Manager is still out on leave. This will necessitate continued staff augmentation through the end of the Fiscal Year. AGOL support will also require staff time.



Karin Graves, the Senior WMPS has been Acting Program Manager since 2021 and the County will continue to approve this substitution until such a time as the Program Manager position has been filled. The Program's supervisory requirements have changed and the Acting Program manager will be responsible for a number of duties that were formerly the responsibility of the Senior WMPS (including WMPS supervision and contract oversight). The WMPS, Erin, will be overseeing consultant work involved in the Development and Municipal Operations subcommittees. There will continue to be staff augmentation for the Monitoring Committee through Geosyntec. LWA will continue to oversee the PIP Committee. The Program will continue to seek to hire an additional WMPS, though the County has recommended waiting for 6 months before relisting the advertisement.

Mitch Avalon has been filling many of the duties for the Senior WMPS,. This workload will continue to be managed by Mitch Avalon through the end of the calendar year. After this, Liz Yin will take over as the primary staff augmentation for this position, with Hilary as a backup.

Consultants have been organized into primary and secondary roles; this cross training will ensure there is no loss of service when primary consultants are unavailable. Staff augmentation consultant contracts had been approved and will begin in July 2022. These contracts were put in place for 3 years with the potential of contract extension for two additional years.

Recommendations for Program structure options were outlined in the Org Structure Report to the Management Committee on February 17, 2021. Program staff, due to the vacancies still present in the organization, recommended continuing this organizational structure through the end of Fiscal Year 22-23. MRP 3.0 represents a significant increase in necessary staffing, and the workload may be reevaluated based on Program needs after the first year of the new permit.

An AGOL assessment has been completed. One of the recommendations of the report was to identify staff or support required to oversee AGOL activities. It was proposed that Liz Yin provide this support and estimated that the necessary workload would be about 3 hours per week (\$35,000 annually).

A comprehensive list of MRP 3.0 requirements will be ready in July. This will inform the Program whether the staffing level is sufficient to deliver services and produce deliverables. Staffing will be evaluated again in January, after the first 6 months of the new permit.

An administrative cost analysis highlighting the cost comparison between a full-time county staffing and current staff augmentation plan has been conducted. The cost was broken down into 3 options: full county staff, full county staff with a 20-hour clerical position, and the current staff augmentation.

The total estimated cost for a full-time county staffing plan was \$1.31M. The total estimated cost for a full-time staff with 20-hour clerical was \$1.30M. The total estimated cost for the current staff augmentation plan was \$1.6M. The increase in costs for staff augmentation was \$229,200 primarily



due to augmented staff overlap for transitions, the Program Manager position's continued vacancy, cost of living and salary increases, and the AGOL support staff position.

Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) asked why there were 10 weekly hours estimated for staff augmentation for the PIP Committee and 20 hours for the Monitoring Committee, suggesting that these totals seem off and that the Monitoring Committee would likely need more hours. Karin Graves noted that these estimates were based on the hours reported in previous years for each service area. Historically, there have been less hours billed in both of these areas. Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) asked what the time frame was for looking for a new Program Manager. Karin Graves noted that this was a decision to be made by the County Risk Management Department and further questions would have to be addressed directly to Allison Knapp or Brian Balbas. An update would be provided at the next Management Committee meeting.

Michelle Mancuso (Contra Costa County) asked if the hours for staff augmentation were averages. Karin Graves confirmed this, hours required during different points in the year would be determined by current projects. It was further stated that much of the technical support had been budgeted in project specific line items, so the total consultant hours may not be visible based on the costs presented in these tables.

Karin Graves made note of the new Org Chart describing the new WMPS and the staff augmentation duties.

5. Review Draft FY 22/23 Adjusted Budget (M. Avalon/A. Bullock): The Management Committee approved the Fiscal Year 22/23 budget on March 15, 2022. MRP 3.0 was approved in May 2022. There are three primary drivers since the budget was adopted that require consideration of budget adjustments: staffing changes, advance work schedules, and MRP 3.0 changes.

Advance work budgets were created for work that was expected to be needed in FY 21/22 based on the submittal requirements created during permit negotiations. As the adoption of the permit drew closer, some of these submittal schedules were moved back or removed; and some of the advance work that was budgeted for was not started. The work would still need to be done so the costs would have to be rolled forward. One of the changes to MRP 3.0 came in the form of receiving water limitations monitoring which was expected to cost about \$30k. The other changes resulted in minor adjustments. The adjusted budget proposed was a draft and would be presented to the Management Committee in July. A final adjusted budget would be presented in August.

Mitch Avalon made note of all the changes to the budget: personnel costs increased from \$1.6M to \$2.1M, AGOL staff support and brochure design would be \$60k, Water Quality Monitoring (C.8)(including the Trash Monitoring Plan) increased from \$535k to \$595k, PCBs controls (C.12) increased from \$431k to \$471k, East County Projects (C.19) increased from \$70k to \$105k, and Cost reporting (C.20) increased from \$10k to \$20k.

The total adjustments to the budget increase costs from \$4.25M to \$4.97M. This represents a \$989k overage of the \$3.5M funding cap.



Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) asked if line 80 (guidance for MRP 3.0 Demo requirements) was for LWA/Geosyntec or if this was for the regional effort. Mitch Avalon noted that this was to address the change in reporting that would fall on the Program. Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) noted that line 77 should be noted as regional to avoid confusion. Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) also asked if the Program had identified items in the budget that could be reduced to help offset the budget overage. Mitch Avalon suggested that discussions on budget reduction were likely premature and should be delayed until discussion of the budget for FY 23/24 began; this would allow the Program and Permittees to identify places that could be comfortably reduced. Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) asked if Line Item 39 was a new item for this budget as it had been noted as such. Mitch Avalon noted that this was for the BAHM model and that the Program would need to participate in paying for the update. Though the item was marked as new, this had been approved by the Management Committee and it was suggested that the note be removed.

6. Overview on Filling the SUA Funding Gap (M. Avalon): With the SUA funding gap (the \$989k overage), the Program should start considering way to offset this increase. What Staff was looking for today was a recommendation from the Administrative Committee to the Management Committee to direct Program Staff to actively pursue funding. Investigation would need to start as soon as possible.

There are many factors to consider when looking to increase funding: political and community support, a convincing narrative, consequences of inadequate investment, acceptance for new taxes, and data. Proposition 218 would require an affirmative vote to approve taxes, assessments, and property related fees. Exceptions include water, sewer, and refuse collection. Corrections attempted in the past included constitutional amendments to make stormwater exempt, an expansion of the definition of "water" to include stormwater (AB 2403 changed it to include water from any source but primarily applies to groundwater), and to redefine "sewer" (as in SB 231, but this still needs to be "tested" through the court system).

There are several options to filling the SUA Funding Gap. Some can be done collectively and would apply to all permittees. Decentralizing funds, a new SUA Assessment through Proposition 218, Senate Bill 231, an unfunded mandate claim, a time schedule order, creation of community facilities districts, creation of a street sweeping district, impact fees, and legislation.

Staff recommended that the Committee direct staff to prepare a formal Options Report that would identify all possible options, describe each one, enumerate the pros and cons of each option, and provide recommendations and the best path forward for the Program. This report would build on the work prepared for the 2012 Funding Initiative and incorporate lessons learned from that effort.

Jolan Longway (Pittsburg) asked if the update would consider each Permittee's SUA gap and identify the gap on a permittee basis. Mitch Avalon noted that this could be done if the Permittees wanted it, but it would require additional funding for consultants to meet and analyze each Permittee's budget individually.



Michele Mancuso (Contra Costa County) asked about the timeline for preparing the update. Mitch Avalon suggested that this would be the first thing addressed once the 5-year budget for the permit was completed. The Committee discussed the process for the options report.

The Committee recommended moving forward with the Options Report.

- 7. Checklist of MRP 3.0 (S. Matthews): Mitch Avalon presented the draft of the MRP 3.0 checklist, giving a brief overview of the format. An additional checklist was displayed for regional projects. Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) asked if this would be distributed to Permittees. It was expected to be included (in draft form) for the Management Committee meeting in July. The Chair asked if the format could be altered so that it was sortable by due date. Mitch Avalon suggested that instructions for this could be added. Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) asked if there was a tab for East County (C.19). Karin Graves noted that Sandy Matthews was working on the C.19 tab.
- **8.** Approve July **20, 2022** Management Committee Agenda (Committee): Mitch Avalon displayed the items on the Management Committee agenda, identifying each of the Presentations, Reports, Updates, and Information items. There were no action items anticipated.

Michele Mancuso (Contra Costa County) suggested that the agenda was full and there could be a need for extra time. Mitch Avalon noted that, typically, presentations at the Administrative Committee go into more detail, so there should be enough time to give the presentations at the Management Committee. Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) asked if the C.3.j item was just an invitation to attend the DC meeting on it. It was confirmed that this was the case.

Jolan Longway (Pittsburg) motioned to approve with no changes, Michele Mancuso (Flood Control District) seconded. The Chair called for a vote. There were no objections or abstentions. The motion passed unanimously and the July 20, 2022 Management Committee Agenda was approved.

- **9. Old/New Business:** There was no old or new business.
- **10. Adjournment:** The Chair adjourned the meeting at 12:14 p.m.

G:\NPDES\02_Admin Committee\03_Minutes&Attend\FY 22-23\Approved Minutes\2022-07-05\DRAFT 2022-07-05 AC Minutes.docx



PUBLIC INFORMATION/PARTICIPATION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES Tuesday July 5, 2022 9:00 am – 10:30 am

Zoom Meeting

Voting Members	Attended	Absent
City of Antioch	Julie Haas-Wadjowicz (Vice-	
	Chair)	
CCC Flood Control and Water	Michele Giolli	
Conservation District		
City of San Ramon		Kerry Parker

Administrative committee Members acting as PIP Members	Attended	Absent
Contra Costa County		Michele Mancuso
City of Lafayette		Jeff Brown
City of Martinez	Frank Kennedy	
Town of Moraga	Frank Kennedy	
City of Pittsburg	Jolan Longway	
City of Richmond	Joe Leach, Mary Phelps	

Program Staff: Karin Graves, Andrea Bullock, Michael Burger

Consultants: Mitch Avalon, Hilary Pierce

Guests: Anna Minard (Sagent), Finnisha Eastman (Sagent), Bob Russell (Town of Danville – Non-Voting Member), Lucile Paquette (City of Walnut Creek), Amanda Booth (City of San Pablo)

- 1. Introductions, Announcements, and Changes to Agenda (Chair): There were no announcements or changes to the agenda. The Committee introduced new members for the Fiscal Year 22-23.
- 2. Consent Items Approval (Chair): The Vice Chair motioned to approve the consent calendar items with edits made on the shared files. Frank Kennedy (Moraga) seconded. The Vice-Chair called for a vote. There were no objections or abstentions. The motion passed unanimously and the consent item calendars were approved with changes noted.
- **3.** Election of Chair and Vice Chair for FY 22-23 (Chair): The Vice-Chair nominated Kerry Parker (San Ramon) for Chair. Julie Haas-Wadjowicz (Antioch) was nominated for Vice-Chair. The Committee accepted the nominations. A vote was called. There were no objections or abstentions. The nominations were approved and the Chair and Vice-Chair were elected.



- **4. Fish Risk Video Draft Update (Sagent):** Anna Minard noted that the video draft edits from the June PIP Committee meeting were shared with the videographer. A new draft was currently under development and would be available at the August PIP Committee meeting.
- 5. Caltrans Outreach Campaign Partnership Update (Sagent): At the last meeting, imagery had been selected and the selection had been sent to Caltrans. A meeting with Caltrans was scheduled for Thursday. Afterward, a more tangible timeline of when the creatives would be available would be clear and relayed to the Committee in August.
- **6. Streets to Creeks Partnership Opportunity (H. Pierce):** Hilary Pierce shared information on a partnership opportunity with Streets to Creeks. Streets to Creeks (STC) is part of the City of Santa Rosa stormwater outreach program. The opportunity arose during a discussion at the BAMSC Committee meeting in regards to collective activities for youth outreach.

An outline of the partner program was placed in the agenda packet. The cost for the toolkit was \$1,500 annually. It would include various tools for tracking and education on spills and youth outreach. Hilary Pierce displayed the website for the program, making note of the tool for anonymously requesting an education campaign for neighborhood education regarding stormwater pollution issues and the action tracker, which could provide tracking for positive stormwater action in your area by creating an account and starting a campaign. This could be shared with neighbors to track small to medium scale volunteer projects at a community level. The youth outreach program would help satisfy youth outreach goals under the MRP. Activity booklets could provide a structured plan for youth to learn about stormwater issues in their communities.

The Vice-Chair asked if there was a concern over Mr. Funnelhead and if the reduced oil grant funding was the reason Staff was investigating this STC program. Hilary Pierce confirmed that this was in part the reason, but also due to the changing ways outreach activities had to be conducted (through Zoom shows and Youtube) which Mr. Funnelhead implemented during Covid. This could require different types of youth outreach from past efforts. The Vice-Chair reminded the Committee that the oil grant funds were used to fund Mr. Funnelhead and made note that this funding had been reduced significantly from its original levels. The Vice-Chair also suggested that tracking programs would be better focused through the current county-wide programs.

Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) asked which MRP provisions this program would fill and in what way it would fill them, making note of historic work plans and our new outreach consultant. Hilary Pierce suggested that the Program was working on a spreadsheet to show all the requirements over the new permit term and deliverables required. This STC program would mainly be used to address C.7.e (school aged children outreach), but it may also address other provisions as well. This would be a year-by-year decision, as these provisions could be addressed through other means already available to the Program. This STC program would primarily be an alternative option to the Mr. Funnelhead program. The Vice-Chair noted that the cost was for materials only and didn't include the actual outreach activities' costs. She further recommended



the Kids for the Bay as another alternative for youth outreach that was available to permittees. Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) asked if the Program as contributing to Kids for the Bay. The Vice-Chair and Amanda Booth (San Pablo) suggested that some Permittees contributed individually but the Program did not.

Erin Lennon suggested that even if the Program didn't partner with Streets to Creeks, that it could serve as an interesting resource that could be shared with the new outreach consultant as suggestions and examples of materials that the Program likes.

After discussion, the general opinion of the Committee was that the Program wasn't interested in pursuing this partnership opportunity.

The Committee discussed surveys for tracking public action and response to outreach. The Vice-Chair noted that there had been surveys in the past that had been done annually, but that was no longer the case. It was believed that the most recent survey was in 2020 (the "effectiveness evaluation report") and the cost for more frequent surveys didn't align with the PIP Committee budget as other needs arose.

Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) noted that the Program website has annual reports from previous years and would likely contain the effectiveness report.

7. Newsletters and Social Media Posts for FY 22-23 Discussion (H. Pierce): Before the Program meets with the new consultant, SGA, a survey of the social media posts and newsletter usage by Permittees had been distributed. The feedback from the Management Committee suggested that they weren't being used, but if they included more engaging topics they could be used in the future. Hilary Pierce requested feedback on ways in which the topics and information could be made more engaging. This information would be taken to SGA before more social media posts were created.

One of the options discussed had been to reduce the frequency of newsletters from monthly to quarterly or to remove them all together. The Vice-Chair suggested a google form for Permittees to solicit information on what topics would be useful for them.

Michelle Giolli (Flood Control District) asked how the newsletter was distributed. Hilary Pierce noted that it was currently distributed to Permittees via the Management Committee for use. The Vice-Chair suggested that they were historically combined with Permittees' monthly newsletters. She asked if there was information on the numbers of individuals who had received the newsletter. Karin Graves noted that it was sent to the Management Committee and it was available on the Program website, but was not currently going out as a separate email blast to the public.

The Committee agreed in general to reduce frequency of newsletters to quarterly, but it would be beneficial to meet with SGA before making any firm decisions.



Hilary Pierce asked if there were any topics that the Committee was particularly interested in that could be incorporated into future newsletters. The Program could create a list of topics to share with the Committee and SGA to better direct the creation of newsletters and social media posts. Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) suggested that this was something the consultants should be providing to Permittees not vice-versa. Hilary Pierce proposed that a seasonal newsletter containing short articles could be distributed to Permittees who could then copy it into their content as desired.

Hilary Pierce asked if the social media posts were being used. The Vice-Chair noted that the posts being created were generally for the Program social media accounts and should be shared by the Permittees. Karin Graves informed the Committee that some Permittees had asked if they could use the content and posts themselves, which was why the posts were currently being distributed in this fashion. Bob Russell (Danville) noted that Danville used the information in this fashion and that it had been helpful.

A survey would be produced and sent to the Committee for outreach topics.

8. Adjournment (Chair): The Vice Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:53 a.m.

 $G: NPDES \setminus 03_PIP_PEIO\ Committee \setminus 03_Minutes \& Attend \setminus FY\ 22-23 \setminus Approved\ Minutes \setminus 2022-07-05 \setminus FINAL\ PIP\ Meeting\ Minutes\ 2022-07-05.$

Monitoring Committee Meeting Minutes June 13, 2022

VOTING MEMBERS		
MUNICIPALITY	ATTENDED	ABSENT
City of Pittsburg	Joe Camaddo (Chair)	Jolan Longway
CCC Flood Control District	Beth Baldwin (Vice-Chair)	Michelle Giolli
City of Antioch	Phil Hoffmeister	
City of Pinole	Misha Kaur	
City of Richmond	Terri Mason	
City of Walnut Creek	Lucile Paquette	
Non-Voting Members		
City of San Pablo	Amanda Booth	
City of Lafayette	Francine Kuykendall	
Program Staff and Consultants		
Augmented Staff	Lisa Welsh / Lisa Austin	
Program Staff		Karin Graves
Program Consultant	Mitch Avalon	

- Introductory Remarks, Announcements, and Changes to the Agenda. Joe Camaddo opened the meeting with a quorum. Misha asked if the PCBs in Building Demo data request was for all of FY21-22 and if the spreadsheet needed to be completed for all demolished structures. Lisa W. confirmed that it was for the entire FY and that the spreadsheet should be completed for all applicable structures with PCBs > 50ppm. However, tracking all structures moving forward would be helpful. Regarding MRP 3.0, Mitch clarified that City managers were notified that Baykeeper filed a petition to appeal MRP 3.0. As part of the process, CCCWP should have an opportunity to comment.
- May 2022 Meeting Summary. City of Walnut Creek (L. Paquette) moved to approve the May 2022 meeting summary. City of Pittsburg (J. Camaddo) seconded and City of Antioch (P. Hoffmeister) abstained.
- MRP 3.0 Summary of Required Actions. Lisa A. described that the Program is coordinating regionally to develop a detailed spreadsheet for each provision by the end of the month. The spreadsheet will track deadlines, identify new requirements for MRP 3.0, and identify who is the lead (e.g., Program vs Permittee). The spreadsheet will also include an "at-a-glance" summary across provisions.
- **Recent Monitoring-Related Summaries.** Lisa W. summarized outcomes from three recent monitoring-related meetings.

- O SFEI RMP SPLWG Annual Meeting (May 23 & 25) Outcomes and Project Prioritization: SFEI presented updates on projects from the previous year and project proposals for the upcoming year. The workgroup and the advisors discussed and ranked five proposals. The top-ranked proposal was Small Tributaries Loading Legacy Pollutant Discrete Monitoring to Support Modeling. The budget request for the upcoming year was \$10,000, and the group felt that reconnaissance monitoring is still important for modeling. The second-ranked proposal was Regional Model Development to Support Watershed Loads and Trends, followed by Tidal Area Remote Sampler Development and Pilot Testing" The two CECs-related proposals (monitoring and modeling) were ranked last, though these would likely be top priorities next year.
- June 6 Trash Monitoring Outfall Selection Workgroup Meeting: Geosyntec met with an informal group to discuss the results of a desktop analysis and prioritization scheme for identifying trash management areas suitable for outfall monitoring. The group discussed potential locations and criteria for outfall selection. A shortlist of potential locations will be identified and discussed with the group at the next meeting.
- June 8 MRP 3.0 Monitoring TAG TAG Meeting: This workgroup agreed to regularly meet mornings on the first Wednesday of the off-MPC months (e.g., June, Aug, Oct). Non-standard times may be needed for meetings with external TAG members. The discussion was focused on trash monitoring the permit details and key characteristics of outfall site selection (e.g., catchment size, outfall size, natural vs. engineered channel, access). For the meeting in August, the programs should come prepared to discuss potential sites for outfall monitoring and criteria for selection. The group discussed submitting a collaborative WQIF grant via a sub-workgroup with representatives from each program to work through the grant submittal process together. Trash and LID external TAG members were identified and would be contacted over the summer to gauge level of interest. Coordination with Fish & Wildlife is also underway to begin discussions about permitting. The Programs will have separate LID monitoring plans developed through regional coordination. The QAPP will be a regional effort.

For LID monitoring site selection, the Development Committee and Haley & Aldrich will be involved. Work on this effort will kick off in the fall. For trash outfall monitoring, Civic Park in Walnut Creek might be an option. Pilot testing may be an option, too.

FY21/22 Annual Report Attachments. Lisa W. reviewed the timeline for review and approval of three attachments – POCs Loads Reduction Report, PCBs in Building Demo Status Update, and Fish Risk Reduction Report – to the Program's Annual Report. For the POCs Loads Reduction Report, the committee agreed that a "bare-bones" report that summarized the load reductions achieved would be sufficient and that it would be okay not to include maps. A summary of the review and approval schedule is below:

Date	Action	Responsible
Mon, Aug 1, 2022	Draft Reports	Geosyntec to Mon Com for review
Mon, Aug 8, 2022	Discuss Draft Reports	Monthly Mon Com Meeting
Wed, Aug 10, 2022	Draft (or Revised) Reports	Lisa W. for Management Committee Packet
Wed, Aug 17, 2022	Staff Presentation on Reports	Monthly Management Committee
Wed, Aug 31, 2022	Comments/Redline on Reports	Permittees to Geosyntec
Mon, Sept 12, 2022	Recommend Approval	Monthly Mon Com Meeting
Mon, Sept 12, 2022	Approval	Management Committee (Special "meeting")

- Mon Com Meeting Topics Planning. Lisa W. reviewed the meeting topic schedule for the remainder of the year. In Q3 and Q4 of 2022, we will discuss the overlap between C.3 and C.11/12. Lisa A. will reach out to Brian Rowley at Caltrans D4 to follow up on the status of the bridge spec.
- Review CCCWP Monitoring Assessment Website. Lisa W. requested that the committee review the Program's webpage, and specifically the Monitoring Assessment page, for updates and revisions. Check links, text, reports, and videos for any corrections and anything that needs to be updated. The group discussed how it would be valuable to have more of the Program's reports available for download, including: trash receiving water monitoring, 5-year bioassessment, POCs loads report, Control Measure Implementation Plan, HDS monitoring study, bioretention media study, and more. Lisa A. and Lisa W. will review and send a list of reports and recommended updates to Mon Com.
- CCCWP Brochures. The committee discussed brochure needs for the upcoming year(s). It
 would be great to have a general flyer for "Only Rain Down the Drain." The content would
 remind its audience to properly dispose of drain, paint, oil, and concrete. The County is
 putting together a website where people can enter an address and learn where to dispose
 of specific waste types. The brochure could include a link to this website (when ready to
 launch).

The group also discussed:

- How Green Halo has an existing brochure on construction waste disposal. Green Halo also provides an example of how waste could be tracked for the PCBs in Building Demo program.
- Gathering the info that Kristine had compiled for cigarettes.
- O Having brochures in a print-friendly template.
- **Draft Fish Risk Video.** Lisa W. played the draft fish risk video and the committee had the following comments:
 - Slightly long and maybe a bit repetitive;
 - The video appeared glitchy at times, which could have been due to the viewing platform (Microsoft Edge).

- Asked if it could be subtitled in other languages;
- Noted there are a few instances when a commentator is talking and it is windy in the background, making the voice hard to hear. Maybe it is possible to decrease the background noise;
- Add a fish to the fish-cleaning sink when the water is running to not suggest wasting water during a drought.

• Next Steps / Action Items

- o Lisa A. to reach out to Caltrans regarding the status of the bridge spec.
- Lisa W. to forward CCCWP website review information to the Monitoring Committee, including a list of reports that could be added to the Program's website.
- o Lisa W. to send comments on flyers and brochures to Hilary and Karin.
- Lisa W. to reach out to Liz on getting a new layer in AGOL PCBs sediment sample location and results.
- o Lisa W. to send comments on the fish risk video to Karin and Hilary.
- Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 pm.

Next Scheduled Monitoring Committee Meeting: Monday, July 11, 2022, 10:00 AM- 12:00 noon, Zoom meeting.

 $\label{lem:g:NPDES} G:\NPDES\05_Monitoring Committee\\03_Minutes&Attend\FY 21-22\Approved Minutes\\2022-06\01_2022_Jun_13_MonCom_Minutes_Approved.docx$



Municipal Operations Committee (MOC) Meeting Minutes June 21, 2022

MUNICIPALITY	ATTENDED [via Web/Phone]
VOTING	
City of Antioch	Jeff Cook
City of Brentwood	
City of Concord	
Contra Costa County	Beth Baldwin, Michele Mancuso, Michelle Giolli (Vice Chair)
City of El Cerrito	Stephen Prée
City of Martinez	
City of Pittsburg	Jolan Longway, Joseph Camaddo (Chair)
City of Richmond	Terri Mason
.City of San Pablo	
City of Walnut Creek	Lucile Paquette
NON-VOTING	
Town of Danville	Bob Russell
City of El Cerrito	
PROGRAM STAFF and CONSULTANTS	
Staff Augmentation	Elizabeth Yin
Staff Augmentation	Mitch Avalon
Staff Augmentation	
.Program Staff	Erin Lennon
.Program Staff	
GUESTS	
.County Ag Commission	Beth Slate
.LWA	Chloe Celniker

- 1. **Introductions/Announcements:** Joe Camaddo (City of Pittsburg) welcomed the group to the Zoom call and asked for announcements. No announcements were made.
- 2. **County Agriculture Commission Presentation:** Beth Slate (County Agriculture Commission) presented on pesticide monitoring and inspections. During annual audits the inspector checks for safe pesticide use and storage; organized records; and correct PPE and safety documents. Beth discussed best management practices (BMPs) for training, use, and storage of pesticides. The County Ag Commission is planning a pesticide collection event this year.
 - The Committee also discussed:
 - i. How long people should stay off a park grass/field treated with pesticides by a city. Pesticides have a treated time limit on their labels, agricultural field have a minimum time limit of 4 hours. Landscaping is considered treated until the pesticide is dried. Once the time limit has past, the field is no longer considered treated and people can return to the site.

- ii. Specifics of the upcoming pesticide collection event. The event organizers are searching for a location to host this event. It is unclear if there is a limitation to the volume of pesticides each person can bring in, but there will be a survey before the event so people can notify the organizers on the volume and types of pesticides to expect. The goal of this event is to safely dispose of pesticides that are not being used, so anyone who historically has had pesticide permits is encouraged to join the collection event.
- 3. **Approval of Minutes:** El Cerrito made a motion to approve the May 17, 2022 Meeting Summary. Pittsburg seconded the motion. No objections were raised. The Committee voted to approve the May 17, 2022 Meeting Summary.
- 4. **Trash Discussion:** Various committee members provided updates on trash monitoring and the compliance schedule under MRP 3.0.
 - Private Land Drainage Area (PLDA) Presentation: Michelle Mancuso (Contra Costa County Watershed Program) introduced the need for inspecting private lands for trash monitoring. Michelle Giolli (Contra Costa County Watershed Program) described the PLDA analysis process of using GIS to identify parcels >10k sq. ft. with high trash generation, assessing those parcels in the field and collecting land use and trash information, and comparing field assessments to previous GIS data. Overall, the results show less trash than the baseline loads when revisiting PLDA areas. An initial estimate of the overall potential trash load reduction for these assessments to total approximately 1-4% reduction. Next steps are to complete follow-up inspections, perform additional calculations to not double-count OVTA results, and incorporate findings into annual reports.
 - The Committee discussed issues in trash generation in/near BART stations and BART ROWs.
 - MRP 3.0 Trash Load Reduction Timelines: Elizabeth Yin (Program Staff, consultant) discussed the schedule of deadlines to comply with MRP 3.0. In 2024, annual reports need a trash generation area map that includes PLDAs. By 2023, trash load must be reduced to 90% of baseline levels. Permittees who will not be at 90% by 2023 must submit a Revised Trash Load Reduction Report. Permittees must also submit a Regional Impracticability Report if full trash capture is impractical, and describe the process for which impracticability is determined. Permittees can use new source control credits until 2025, and creek/shoreline credits until 2025. Permittees with a Direct Discharge Control Plan can use credits through 2025.
 - CCCWP Permittee Trash Data and Needs: Elizabeth Yin presented the next steps for CCCWP Permittees to comply with the MRP 3.0 timeline. Contra Costa County and San Pablo need to submit Direct Discharge Control Plans by 2023. Permittees need to submit Impracticability Reports by March 2023 and submit Revised Trash Load Reduction Reports by September 2023. Next steps are provide 2021-2022 trash data to Program Staff ASAP so Permittees can know whether to submit Impracticability and Revised Trash Load Reduction Reports. It's recommended to share this information with the larger Contra Costa County group, so all Permittees are aware of the tight turnaround.

5. Program Update

- Annual Report Schedule
 - i. The Annual Report Schedule was discussed last meeting.

• Clean Water Program Website

i. Discussion on updates to the Clean Water Program website for municipal operations was tabled and will be discussed at the next meeting.

• Stormwater Inspector Training (June 22, 2022)

i. The C.4/C.5 Stormwater Inspector Training is June 22, 2022. Topics for the training include: MRP 3.0 update, a presentation on enforcement from the County DA's office, notes from the field, and strategies and best practices for cleaning up trash from encampments.

• Staffing Changes

 The Clean Water Program welcomes its new Watershed Management Planning Specialist, Erin Lennon. Erin will be transitioning into the role of leading Municipal Operations committee.

6. Old/New Business:

- The City of El Cerrito suggested inviting a member from BART to attend future MOC meetings, specifically for trash.
- 7. Adjournment: Chair Joe Camaddo adjourned at 12:01 PM.

 $G:\NPDES\06_MOC\ Committee\02_Minutes\&Attend\FY\ 21-22\Approved\ Minutes\2022-06-21\MOC\ Meeting\ Minutes\ 20220621\ Final_Approved.docx$



Meeting Summary (Approved)

Development Committee
June 22, 2022

1:30 PM - 3:30 PM

Voting Members:

Municipality Attending Absent

City of Antioch Phil Hoffmeister City of Brentwood Aman Grewal City of Clayton Larry Theis City of Concord Mitra Abkenari Contra Costa County John Steere Town of Danville **Bob Russell** City of Lafayette Matt Luttropp Town of Moraga Frank Kennedy

City of Pittsburg Joe Camaddo (Chair)

City of Pleasant Hill Frank Kennedy

City of San Ramon Rod Wui

City of Walnut Creek Joel Camacho, Lucile Paquette

Program Staff/Consultants

Erin Lennon Staff

Mitch Avalon Consultant
Dan Cloak Consultant
Alina Constantinescu Consultant
Yvana Hrovat Consultant

Guests

John Brown City of Hercules

Introductions, Announcements, and Changes to Agenda

The meeting was held via Zoom. There was one announcement: introducing Erin Lennon, new hire for CCCWP. Erin will transition into the role of Committee staff support over the next two month. Yvana Hrovat (Haley and Aldrich) will continue in the technical support role.

Approve Previous Meeting Summaries

On a motion by Frank Kennedy (Moraga), seconded by John Steere (CoCo County), the summary of the May 25, 2022, meeting was accepted.

Report on C.3 Annual Training

Dan discussed the C.3 LID Workshop that took place on May 24. A staff report was included in the agenda packet, including the feedback from the attendee survey. Workshop materials have been posted on the CCCWP <u>website</u>.

Municipal Regional Permit 3.0 Updates

The following items were discussed regarding the newly adopted MRP 3.0 permit:

- The adopted permit is available on the Water Board website.
- Dan Cloak discussed a June 15, 2022, staff memo previously shared with the Management Committee. The memo (included in the meeting agenda packet) reviews 'Urgent Permittees Implementation Issues' related to the C.3 provision in MRP 3.0. Attendees further discussed these issues and next steps for staff and Committee members:
 - 1) Staff will prepare a memo for Permittees to share with their staff re: changes to regulated projects and road construction and maintenance
 - 2) Staff will prepare a 'Counter Handout' with C.3 updated for Permittees to distribute to developers and project applicants
 - 3) Committee will host a C.3.j Retrofit Forum to discuss the retrofit requirements in MRP 3.0 (acreages assigned to each permittee are listed in MRP Attachment H).

Staff will develop drafts of items 1) and 2) above and bring to a future C.3 Committee meeting for discussion. For item 3), the Forum will be planned for the September Committee meeting. Staff/committee will work on the agenda at the July/August meetings and will also decide appropriate staff that will be invited (such as management, planners, Public Works engineers, etc.)

A regional effort is underway to compile all MRP 3.0 submittals into one spreadsheet; staff is working to customize it for CCCWP submittals. Once this is finalized, the C.3-related items will be shared with the Committee. Related to this issue, it was noted that there were several non-C.3 items in the permit that relate to retrofits and new development such the bridge inventory, PCBs in building materials, and possibly others. There is a need to capture all of these and understand how they fit in with C.3-related requirements.

Annual Report Schedule

Staff shared a reminder that Annual Reports are due in SMARTS by September 30th. A schedule was included in the agenda packet. AR forms are available on <u>Groupsite</u>.

Commented [HY1]: Not sure where it fits but I also have in my notes that we discussed the announcement of the new RWQCB EO Eileen White (formally of East Bay MUD)

Review of C.3 Website

There was a short discussion item on the CCCWP C.3 website. Staff requested that permittees review website and provide feedback re: updates, outdated items, broken links, etc. Some feedback has already been provided and staff will work on incorporating it.

Hydromodification Options Report

Yvana noted that Haley & Aldrich is working on an 'HM Options Report' to evaluate CCCWP permittee options for compliance with MRP 3.0 C.3.g requirements. A draft report will be presented at a future Development Committee meeting and the final report and recommendations will be discussed with the Management Committee as well. Estimated costs and timeline for the options will vary and will be informed by the report.

Compliance options being considered are:

- Use Direct Simulation of Erosion Potential to calculate updated sizing factors. Update Table 4-6 in the C.3 Guidebook and insert revised sizing factors into an updated IMP Sizing Calculator.
- 2) Use BAHM to calculate updated sizing factors based on a generic unit impervious area. Update Table 4-6 in the C.3 Guidebook and insert updated sizing factors into the IMP Sizing Calculator.
- 3) Direct applicants for development projects subject to HM requirements to use BAHM to demonstrate HM compliance.
- 4) Direct applicants for development projects subject to HM requirements to use the IMP Sizing Calculator. Municipal staff would forward the Stormwater Control Plan and IMP Sizing Calculator output to a designated BAHM reviewer to run the project in BAHM and determine if the project design meets HM criteria.

If Options 2 or 3 is selected, CCCWP would work with Alameda, San Mateo, and Santa Clara counties to update BAHM in FY 2022/23.

Stormwater C.3 Guidebook, 8th Edition

Dan provided an update on the status of the project to date. Several chapters and appendices are complete or will be complete by the end of FY 2021/22. Those not yet complete will be drafted by Haley & Aldrich, and reviewed by Dan, in the following fiscal year. The goal is for the 8th Edition to be released in Fall 2022.

On the topic of the *C.3 Guidebook*, it was also mentioned that work on the Green Infrastructure Design Guidance and Standard Specifications is expected in FY 2022/23. Program consultants would draft design drawings, solicit Permittees staff input, and revise and finalize accordingly. The design guidelines will be posted on the CCCWP website and referenced in a future edition of the *Guidebook*, most likely the 9th Edition as the 8th Edition is anticipated before the guidelines are finalized.

Open Discussion of C.3 and C.6 Implementation Issues

There was a discussion on construction site control for PCBs – more control (and related tracking/reporting) are required by MRP 3.0 Provision C.12. There is a concern that building inspectors are not trained in PCB controls; but building permits will need to account for these

issues, even at non-CGP sites (less than 1 acre). Building inspectors will need to communicate these to the stormwater environmental compliance staff for proper tracking/ reporting.

Next Meeting Date

Wednesday, July 27th, 2022 (1:30p-3:30p)

Action Items

None.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:16 PM.

NEXT DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING:

Wednesday, July 27th, 2022 1:30 PM - 3:30 PM

Via videoconference

Attachments to 6/22/2022, Meeting Summary

None



Date: August 17, 2022

To: Management Committee

From: Mitch Avalon, Consultant

Subject: FY 22/23 Final Budget Adjustment

Recommendation:

Accept report from staff on the FY 22/23 final budget adjustment, provide staff with any comments, and approve final budget adjustment.

Background:

The Management Committee approved the FY 22/23 budget at its March 16, 2022 meeting. There are three primary drivers since the budget was adopted that require consideration of a budget adjustment: staffing changes, modified advance work schedules, and changes due to MRP 3.0. A draft adjusted budget was reviewed by the Management Committee at its July 20, 2022 meeting at which time questions were raised about the comparison of hourly rates and about two PCBs related budget items.

Hourly Rate Comparison

It is difficult to compare consultant costs to Program employee costs, as consultants charge an hourly rate while employees are paid a salary based on a monthly amount. To compare them, Program employee salaries need to be broken down into an hourly rate. To do this an assumption needs to be made on the number of billable hours available that Program employees charge against Program projects. In the past, the Program has used 1650 billable hours per year, which is supported by analysis of County Public Works employee charges. The County starts with 2000 working hours in a fiscal year, which does not include holidays. Subtracting from the total working hours average vacation hours, military leave, state workers compensation, floating holiday time, jury duty, administrative leave and a few other minor items, results in 1650 billable hours. This has been reviewed by the Program in detail several times in the past as part of the County's overhead charges.

A Program employee's effective hourly rate can then be calculated by dividing their salary by 1650 billable hours. This calculation results in the following, using all positions at their top step and fully burdened salaries that include benefits and overhead charges:

Program Manager. Annual salary of \$321,852 with an hourly rate of \$195.06 **Senior Watershed Management Planning Specialist.** Annual salary of \$266,763 with an hourly rate of \$161.67

Watershed Management Planning Specialist. Annual salary of \$213,058 with an hourly rate of \$129.13

Administrative Services Assistant III. Annual salary of \$222,731 with an hourly rate of \$134.99

Senior Clerk. Annual salary of \$133,313 with an hourly rate of \$80.79

Consultant charges vary from consultant to consultant, however the bulk of the Program work is conducted in the \$150 to \$220 per hour range by mid-level staff at consultant organizations. There are some charges by high level consultant staff in the \$270 to \$290 per hour range, and there are some charges by lower-level consultant staff at less than \$150 per hour. Comparing how much of the budget is performed by Program staff and how much by consultant staff reveals the following:

Program Labor: \$824,299 (19%) Consultant Staff: \$3,188,892 (72%)

Consultant Staff Augmentation: \$740,678

Consultant Legal: \$95,000

Consultant Technical Support: \$342,000 Consultant Project Support: \$2,011,214

Operational Costs \$33,978 (1%)

Dues/Payment to Others: \$344,577 (8%)

Total Program Budget \$4,391,746 (100%)

Program Labor costs are based on current staffing and include the salary savings noted at the end of the budget. The Total Program Budget does not include the contingency.

PCBs Budget Items

One PCBs budget item (\$30,000), Annual Progress Report on Controlling PCBs, is the report prepared every year on all the control measures used to meet PCBs load reduction requirements, including the annual PCBs in building demolition materials report. The other PCBs budget item (\$20,000), Guidance on MRP 3.0 Building Demolition Requirements, is for developing a one-time guidance document for use by permittees to modify their building demolition program so it meets the new MRP 3.0 requirements and gathers the correct data. More

detailed information on these two budget items was requested at the last Management Committee meeting and is provided below.

Annual Progress Report on Controlling PCBs

- \$30,000 budget is for two reports attached to the Program's Annual Report
 - PCBs and Building Demolition Status Summary
 - POCs Load Reduction Report.
- These reports were required with MRP 2.0 and are now required with MRP 3.0.
- These standard cost estimates from previous years include:
 - o \$10,000 for the PCBs and Building Demolition Status Summary Report.
 - \$20,000 for the POCs Load Reduction Report.
- Includes a new template for MRP 3.0
- Permittees will need to compile data on bridges, infrastructure, utilities, source properties, old industrial areas, building demolition, and Caltrans specifications.

Guidance on MRP 3.0 Building Demolition Requirements

- \$20,000 budget: regional effort led by Sandy Mathews (LWA) & Jon Konan (EOA).
- \$20,000 is placeholder estimate (budget adopted before MRP 3.0).
- Sandy and Jon will soon complete an updated scope and budget.
- Updated budget unlikely to exceed \$20,000.
- This guidance will meet the new MRP 3.0 requirements in C.12.g for site inspections, enhanced control measures and programs, and tracking of when demolition occurs to notify RWB and EPA, verification that PCBs in building demolition waste are being adequately managed.
- New forms and training will likely be required.

Administrative Committee Meeting

The Administrative Committee reviewed the final adjusted budget and agreed with the proposed adjustments. There was a question about the AGOL budget items and whether now is the time to increase the budget to address the needs in the AGOL system. There was discussion about this and it was decided the best approach would be to leave the adjusted budget as proposed, let the GIS Work Group complete its work and make its recommendations, and then address the AGOL budget needs through the conditionally approved budget process (\$15,000 for minor upgrades of the AGOL budget item was conditionally approved with the adopted budget).

Summary

All adjusted budget line items are highlighted in yellow in the attached spreadsheet. Also attached is a clean version of the adjusted budget, which would be the version to be adopted. Unlike the budget adjustment last year, this one covers the entire fiscal year and will not need to be adjusted again in December, unless something unforeseen arises. The adopted budget included \$803,300 of conditionally approved budget items (16 budget items), two of which were discussed with the Strategic Staffing Plan and are being addressed with this budget adjustment. The "Staff Augmentation Watershed Resources Consulting for 6 months" budget item was conditionally approved for \$109,200 and remains unadjusted for that amount, and the "On-Call Staff Augmentation as needed, LWA, GC, H&A" budget item was conditionally approved for \$100,000 and is adjusted to a new budget of \$138,000.

Fiscal Impact:

Approval of the adjusted budget increases the adopted FY 22/23 budget by \$239,063, of which \$125,000 is advance work that is being "carried over" from FY 21/22.

Attachments:

FY 22/23 Final Adjusted Budget

G:\NPDES\Admin Committee/Agendas/FY 22-23/2022-08\Staff Report Budget

Budget Row	wo	0#	Description/Expenditure	ADOPTED Adj FY 2021/22 Dec 15, 2021 ¹	FY 21/22 Advance Work ²	Adopted FY 22/23 Mar 16, 2022	FY 22/23 Conditional Budget Items ³	Unspent Advance Work	Adjusted FY 2022/23 August 2022 (DRAFT)	FY 2022/23 Notes
1			nistrative/Personnel (See Admin Worksheet)			\$1,575,009			\$2,064,798	
2	76		Staff Salaries and Benefits + County Overhead			\$1,345,809				5% COLA increase; Reduced Clerk to 20hrs/wk
3	76		Staff Augmentation (Watershed Resources Consulting for 6 months)			\$109,200	\$109,200		\$109,200	Assumes PM position vacancy, SWMPS Support
4	76		On-Call Staff Augmentation (as needed) (LWA, GC, H&A)			\$100,000	\$100,000		1	MOC and DC transition support + PIP Support (LWA)
4a	76		Staff Augmentation (LWA for 6 months plus transition)			\$0				Assumes PM position vacancy, SWMPS support
4b	76	09	Staff Augmentation (Geosyntec)			\$0			\$270,478	MonCom staff support
5	76		Staff Training and Conferences			\$10,000			\$10,000	
6	76	12	Non-Program County Staff Labor			\$10,000			\$10,000	
7		Gene	ral Supplies & Equipment			\$7,788			\$7,788	
8	76	505	Misc. Office Equipment/Supplies not covered by County Overhead			\$6,600			\$5,640	
8a	76	05	Zoom annual fee						\$960	trainings/training recordings/subcommittee meetings
9	76	505	Groupsite Annual Fee			\$1,188			\$1,188	
10		Asso	ciation/Memberships/License Fees			\$33,554			\$33,554	
11		11	ESRI (AGOL Annual License Fee)			\$10,000			\$10,000	
12	76	11	California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA)			\$23,554			\$23,554	3% annual increase
13			Services			\$95,000			\$95,000	
14	76	606	County Counsel and Contract Administration			\$10,000			\$10,000	
15	76	10	MRP 3.0 Appeal (Richards, Watson & Gershon)			\$35,000	\$35,000		\$35,000	Will be needed for Baykeeper appeal
16	76	10	On-Call Legal Services (Richards, Watson & Gershon)			\$30,000			\$30,000	
17	76	13	Alternative Compliance Legal Review (Richards, Watson & Gershon/County Counsel)			\$20,000			\$20,000	
18		Regio	onal Projects/Regional Cooperation			\$230,000			\$230,000	
19	76	18	BAMSC			\$30,000			\$30,000	
20	76	18	SFEI - RMP			\$180,000			\$180,000	3% increase
21	76	18	SFEI - CECs			\$20,000			\$20,000	
22		Gene	ral Consultant Services/Projects (See Consultant Services/Projects Worksheet)			\$282,000			\$342,000	
23	76	16	5-Year MRP 3.0 Budget (LWA/GC)			\$10,000			\$10,000	
24	76	509	Financing Plan Strategy for MRP 4.0 (LWA/GC)			\$20,000			\$20,000	
25	76	16	MRP 3.0 Compliance Checklist (LWA/GC)			\$10,000			\$10,000	
26	76	16	Grant Tracking & Application (LWA/GC)			\$40,000			\$40,000	
27	76	16	Alternative Compliance Administrator Set Up (LWA/GC)			\$55,000	\$55,000		\$55,000	
28	76	16	Project Management, Technical Review, Regulatory Compliance, etc. (LWA/GC)			\$97,000			\$97,000	
29	76	65	GIS/AGOL Maintenance, Minor Upgrades (Psomas)			\$50,000	\$50,000		\$50,000	Conditional approval is only for \$15,000 for minor upgrades
29a	76	65	GIS/AGOL Support Staff (LWA)			\$0			\$35,000	Staff Support 3hrs/wk
29b	76	20	Brochures (TBD)			\$0			\$25,000	
30	76	54 Muni	cipal Operations (C.2) - Training/Workshop (See MOC Worksheet)			\$3,100	\$3,100		\$3,100	
31			Development/Redevelopment (C.3) (See Development Committee Worksheet)			\$436,000			\$436,000	
32	76	41	Hydromodification Management Modeling, CCCHM and/or BAHM (TBD)			\$100,000	\$100,000		\$100,000	
33	76	41	Hydrograph Management Compliance Options Report (H&A)			\$10,000			\$10,000	
34	76	41	Hydromodification Management Maps (Psomas)			\$15,000			\$15,000	
35	76	41	Hydromodification Management Calculator (TBD)			\$41,000	\$41,000		\$41,000	
36	76	41	Green Infrastructure Design Guidelines (H&A)			\$40,000	\$40,000		\$40,000	
37	76	41	Peak Flow Control Calculator (TBD)			\$52,000	\$52,000		\$52,000	
38	76	45	Update Stormwater C.3 Guidebook (H&A)			\$36,000	\$36,000		\$36,000	
39	76	41	BAHM Update (EOA/Clear Creek)			\$25,000			\$25,000	
40	76	45	Alternative Compliance Program Implementation (2 Pilot Projects)(LWA/GC)			\$50,000	\$50,000		\$50,000	
41	76	45	Frequently Asked Questions			\$5,000			\$5,000	
42	76	45	Annual C.3 Training/Workshop (H&A)			\$12,000	\$12,000		\$12,000	

	Adjusted August 17, 2022 (DRAFT)											
Budget Row	WO#		Description/Expenditure	ADOPTED Adj FY 2021/22 Dec 15, 2021 ¹	FY 21/22 Advance Work ²	Adopted FY 22/23 Mar 16, 2022	FY 22/23 Conditional Budget Items ³	Unspent Advance Work	Adjusted FY 2022/23 August 2022 (DRAFT)	FY 2022/23 Notes		
43	7645		General Technical Services Support (H&A)(LWA/GC)			\$50,000			\$50,000	3% increase		
44			trial/Commercial Controls (C.4) - Training/Workshop (See MOC Worksheet)(LWA)			\$3,100		\$3,10				
45			Discharge/Detection and Elimination (C.5) (See MOC Worksheet)			\$0			\$0			
46			ruction Controls (C.6) (See Development Committee worksheet (LWA)			<u>\$0</u>			\$0			
47		Public Information/Participation (C.7) (See PIP Committee Worksheet)				\$159,300			\$159,300			
48	7617		School-Aged Children Outreach (SGA)			\$9,000			\$9,000			
49	7617		Watershed Stewardship Green Business Program			\$6,000			\$6,000			
50	7617		Public Outreach through Bringing Back the Natives Garden Tour (Kathy Kramer-Sponsor)			\$16,500			\$16,500			
51	7617		Used Oil/Student Outreach /Youth Programs (Matt Bolender)			\$2,000			\$2,000			
52	7617		Outreach Campaign, Public Education, Citizen Involvement (SGA)(Caltrans)			\$70,800			\$70,800			
53	7617		Public Outreach through Website Maintenance and Hosting (WebSight Design)			\$15,000			\$15,000			
54	7617		General Youth/Public Outreach; Media Management (SGA)			\$35,000				3% increase		
55	7617		Outreach Contingency			\$5,000 \$5,000			\$5,000			
56	7017		Quality Monitoring (C.8) (See Monitoring Committee Worksheet)			\$525,000			\$605,000			
57	7618	Water	LID Monitoring Plan (KEI)(LWA/GC)			\$60,000			\$60,000			
58	7618		Trash Monitoring Plan (LWA/GC)(KEI)		\$75,000	\$30,000		\$40,000		\$55,000 for outfall mapping		
59	7618		Trash Monitoring (KEI)(LWA)		\$75,000	\$195,000		φ-10,000	. ,	moved \$10,000 to Mon Mgmt Support (63c)		
60	7618		Pollutants of Concern Monitoring (KEI)(LWA/GC)			\$50,000 \$50,000				Does not include source properties		
61	7618		Pesticides and Toxicity Monitoring (KEI)(LWA/GC)			\$70,000 \$70,000			\$70,000			
62	7618		Comprehensive Bio-assessment Final Report WY 2012 – 2021 (KEI)(LWA/GC)			\$15,000			\$70,000	will remove line 62 (\$15K added to line 63b) Work will not be completed in		
63	7618		Urban Creeks Monitoring Report (POC, Pesticides and Toxicity, Trash, LID)(KEI)(LWA/GC)			\$15,000			φοο οοο	reduced by \$5,000		
63a	7618		Creek Status Monitoring Follow-Up			\$93,000 ¢0				Bio assessment follow up/lab reporting		
63b	7618		POC Receiving Water Monitoring			\$0 ¢0			1 -7	needs MC approval		
63c	7618		Monitoring Management Support			<u> </u>				new item		
	7618		All Monitoring Contingency			\$10,000				Contingency for all monitoring items		
64	7010		ide Toxicity Control (C.9) (See MOC Worksheet)			\$10,000 \$81,023			\$81,023			
65	7636	PESLICI	Our Water Our World Local Outreach and Training (Plant Harmony)									
66	7636					\$69,500			\$69,500	formerly paid through BASMAA		
67	7636		Our Water Our World Outreach Materials (Paid to CASQA)			\$5,080				formerly paid through BASMAA		
68	7636		Pesticide Regulatory Coordination Program (Paid to CASQA) Outreach to Pest Control Professionals			\$5,943 \$500						
69		Trach I	Load Reduction (C.10) (See MOC Worksheet)			\$500 \$60,000			\$500 \$60,000			
70	7620	Hasiii	Trash Load Reduction Plan (LWA)									
71	7620		Trash Reduction and Impracticability Report (LWA)			\$10,000			\$10,000			
72			ry Controls (C.11) (requirements addressed under C.12)			\$50,000 \$0			\$50,000 \$0			
73			Controls (C.11) (requirements addressed under C.12) Controls (C.12) (See Monitoring Committee Worksheet)			\$430,914			\$460,914			
74	7618	PCBS C			¢30,000			¢30,000				
75	7618		Old Industrial Area PCBs Control Measure Plan (LWA/GC) Old Industrial Area PCBs Treatment Project (first project to implement the Plan) (TRD)		\$30,000	\$10,000 #200,000		\$30,000	\$40,000 \$200,000			
76 77	7618		Old Industrial Area PCBs Treatment Project (first project to implement the Plan) (TBD) Annual Progress Report on Controlling PCBs (LWA/GC)		¢10,000	\$200,000 \$20,000		\$10,000		project development includes guidance on funding O & M bldg demo, \$10,000 for new report format; regional collab/In-kind		
	7618				\$10,000			\$10,000	1 - 1 - 1	moved \$10,000 to Mon Mgmt Support (63c)		
78	7618		Source Property Investigation (KEI) (LWA/GC)			\$150,000			\$140,000 \$10,000			
79			PCBs in Electrical Utilities (LWA/GC)			\$10,000				regional collab/In-kind		
80	7618 7618		Guidance for MRP 3.0 Building Demolition Requirements (LWA/GC)			\$20,000						
81			Provide Fish Risk Flyers/Signs			\$5,305			\$5,305 *10,600			
82	7618 7618		Distribute Fish Risk Flyers (KEI)			\$10,609			\$10,609			
83	1019		Annual Fish Risk Status Report (KEI)			\$5,000 \$1 5 ,000			\$5,000 \$1 5,000			
84	7617		pted and Conditionally Exempted Discharges (C.15)(See PIP Committee Worksheet)			\$15,000			\$15,000			
85	7617		Firefighting Discharges (LWA/GC)			\$15,000			\$15,000			
86	7616		eltered Homeless Discharges (C.17) (See MOC Worksheet)			\$120,000			\$120,000			
87	7616		Homeless Mapping (TBD)			\$20,000	\$20,000		\$20,000			

	Adjusted August 17, 2022 (DRAFT)									
Budget Row	WO#		Description/Expenditure	ADOPTED Adj FY 2021/22 Dec 15, 2021 ¹	FY 21/22 Advance Work ²	Adopted FY 22/23 Mar 16, 2022	FY 22/23 Conditional Budget Items ³	Unspent Advance Work	Adjusted FY 2022/23 August 2022 (DRAFT)	FY 2022/23 Notes
88	7616		BMP Report (TBD)			\$50,000	\$50,000		\$50,000	
89	7616		Implementation Plan (TBD)			\$50,000	\$50,000		\$50,000	
90		East C	ontra Costa County Projects (C.19) (See Monitoring Committee Worksheet)			\$70,000			\$105,000	
91	7618		Methylmercury Monitoring for Delta TMDL (LWA/GC)			\$20,000			\$20,000	
92	7618		Marsh Creek Dissolved Oxygen Monitoring (LWA/GC)			\$30,000			\$30,000	Includes SSID response to Jan 3, 2022 RB letter
93	7618		Annual Mercury Monitoring Plan (LWA/GC)		\$15,000	\$10,000		\$15,000	\$25,000	
94	7618		Pyrethroid Control Program Baseline Monitoring Report (LWA/GC)			\$5,000			\$5,000	
95	7618		East County TMDL Control Measure Plan (LWA/GC)		\$30,000	\$5,000		\$20,000	\$25,000	
96		Cost R	eporting (C.20) (see PIP Committee Worksheet)			\$10,000			\$20,000	
97	7617		Cost Reporting Framework (LWA/GC)		\$15,000	\$10,000		\$10,000	\$20,000	
98		Asset	Management (C.21) (see Development Committee Worksheet)			\$30,000			\$30,000	
99	7645		Asset Management Framework (TBD - H&A)			\$30,000			\$30,000	
100			ADVANCE WORK SUBTOTAL		\$175,000			\$125,000		
101			CONDITIONAL BUDGET ITEMS SUBTOTAL				\$803,300			
102			GROUP PROGRAM BUDGET SUBTOTAL	\$4,137,667		\$4,166,788			\$4,871,577	
103	7698		2% CONTINGENCY	\$82,753		\$83,336			\$97,432	
104			TOTAL GROUP ACTIVITIES BUDGET	\$4,220,421		\$4,250,124			\$4,969,008	
105			CONTINGENCY EXPENSE	\$0		\$0			\$0	
106			SALARY CREDIT (PM)(12 Months)	(\$107,782)		\$0			\$0	
107			SALARY SAVINGS (SWMPS 12 months)	\$0		\$0			(\$266,763)	
108			SALARY SAVINGS (WMPS 12 months)	(\$406,802)		\$0			(\$213,058)	
109			SUBTOTAL	(\$514,584)		\$0			(\$479,821)	
110			NET SUBTOTAL GROUP PROGRAM BUDGET	<i>\$3,705,837</i>		<i>\$4,250,124</i>			<i>\$4,489,187</i>	
111			SUA FUNDING CAP	\$3,500,000		\$3,500,000			\$3,500,000	
112			NET TOTAL GROUP PROGRAM BUDGET	\$3,705,837		\$4,250,124			\$4,489,187	
113			SUA FUNDING GAP	(\$205,837)		(\$750,124)			(\$989,187)	

NOTES

- Budget totals are shown for the Midyear Adjusted Budget for FY 21/22, but line item budget numbers are not shown as there are significant changes and rearrangement of budget line items in the new FY 22/23 budget.
- ² Advance work is the work that must be completed prior to July 1, 2022 to meet the permit schedule in the MRP 3.0 Tentative Order.
- ³ Conditionally approved budget items will require prior discussion to confirm task amount and when to begin work. Amounts will be removed from the conditional column once approved.

Budget Row	wo#	# Description/Expenditure	ADOPTED Adj FY 2021/22 Dec 15, 2021 ¹	FY 21/22 Advance Work ²	Adopted FY 22/23 Mar 16, 2022	FY 22/23 Conditional Budget Items ³	Unspent Advance Work	Adjusted FY 2022/23 August 2022 (DRAFT)	FY 2022/23 Notes
1		Administrative/Personnel (See Admin Worksheet)			\$1,575,009			\$2,064,798	
2	7608				\$1,345,809			\$1,304,120	5% COLA increase; Reduced Clerk to 20hrs/wk
3	7609				\$109,200	\$109,200			Assumes PM position vacancy, SWMPS Support
4	7609	9 On-Call Staff Augmentation (as needed) (LWA, GC, H&A)			\$100,000	\$100,000		\$138,000	MOC and DC transition support + PIP Support (LWA)
4a	7609	Staff Augmentation (LWA for 6 months plus transition)			\$0			\$223,000	Assumes PM position vacancy, SWMPS support
4b	7609	Staff Augmentation (Geosyntec)			\$0			\$270,478	MonCom staff support
5	7608	8 Staff Training and Conferences			\$10,000			\$10,000	
6	7612	Non-Program County Staff Labor			\$10,000			\$10,000	
7		General Supplies & Equipment			\$7,788			\$7,788	
8	7605	Misc. Office Equipment/Supplies not covered by County Overhead			\$6,600			\$5,640	
8a	7605	Zoom annual fee						\$960	trainings/training recordings/subcommittee meetings
9	7605	Groupsite Annual Fee			\$1,188			\$1,188	3
10		Association/Memberships/License Fees			\$33,554			\$33,554	
11	7611	1 ESRI (AGOL Annual License Fee)			\$10,000			\$10,000	
12	7611	California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA)			\$23,554			\$23,554	3% annual increase
13		Legal Services			\$95,000			\$95,000	
14	7606				\$10,000			\$10,000	
15	7610				\$35,000	\$35,000			Will be needed for Baykeeper appeal
16	7610				\$30,000	, ,		\$30,000	
17	7613				\$20,000			\$20,000	
18		Regional Projects/Regional Cooperation			\$230,000			\$230,000	
19	7618				\$30,000			\$30,000	
20	7618				\$180,000			\$30,000 \$190,000	3% increase
21	7618				\$20,000			\$20,000	
22	7010	General Consultant Services/Projects (See Consultant Services/Projects Worksheet)			\$282,000			\$342,000	
23	7616				\$10,000			\$342,000	
	7609								
24	7616				\$20,000			\$20,000	
25	7616				\$10,000			\$10,000	
26	7616				\$40,000			\$40,000	
27					\$55,000	\$55,000		\$55,000	
28	7616				\$97,000			\$97,000	
29	7665				\$50,000	\$50,000			Conditional approval is only for \$15,000 for minor upgrades
29a	7665				\$0				Staff Support 3hrs/wk
29b	7620				\$0			\$25,000	
30	/654	4 Municipal Operations (C.2) - Training/Workshop (See MOC Worksheet)			\$3,100	\$3,100		\$3,100	
31		New Development/Redevelopment (C.3) (See Development Committee Worksheet)			\$436,000			\$436,000	
32	7641				\$100,000	\$100,000		\$100,000	
33	7641				\$10,000			\$10,000	
34	7641				\$15,000			\$15,000	
35	7641				\$41,000	\$41,000		\$41,000	
36	7641				\$40,000	\$40,000		\$40,000	
37	7641				\$52,000	\$52,000		\$52,000	
38	7645				\$36,000	\$36,000		\$36,000	
39	7641				\$25,000			\$25,000	
40	7645				\$50,000	\$50,000		\$50,000	
41	7645	5 Frequently Asked Questions			\$5,000			\$5,000	
42	7645	Annual C.3 Training/Workshop (H&A)			\$12,000	\$12,000		\$12,000	
43	7645	5 General Technical Services Support (H&A)(LWA/GC)			\$50,000			\$50,000	3% increase
44		4 Industrial/Commercial Controls (C.4) - Training/Workshop (See MOC Worksheet)(LWA)		\$3,100			\$3,100	
45		2 Illicit Discharge/Detection and Elimination (C.5) (See MOC Worksheet)			\$0			\$0	
46		8 Construction Controls (C.6) (See Development Committee worksheet (LWA)			\$0			\$0	
47		Public Information/Participation (C.7) (See PIP Committee Worksheet)			\$159,300			\$159,300	
48	7617				\$9,000			\$9,000	
49	7617	January Control of the Control of th			\$6,000			\$6,000	
50	7617				\$6,000			\$6,000	
51	7617				\$10,500			\$10,500	
51	7617				\$2,000 \$70,800			\$2,000	
52	/01/	7 Outreach Campaign, Public Education, Citizen Involvement (SGA)(Caltrans)			\$/0,800			\$70,800	<u>'I</u>

Budget Row	wo	0#	Description/Expenditure	ADOPTED Adj FY 2021/22 Dec 15, 2021 ¹	FY 21/22 Advance Work ²	Adopted FY 22/23 Mar 16, 2022	FY 22/23 Conditional Budget Items ³	Unspent Advance Work	Adjusted FY 2022/23 August 2022 (DRAFT)	FY 2022/23 Notes
53	76		Public Outreach through Website Maintenance and Hosting (WebSight Design)			\$15,000			\$15,000	
54	76		General Youth/Public Outreach; Media Management (SGA)			\$35,000			\$35,000	3% increase
55	76		Outreach Contingency			\$5,000			\$5,000	
56			r Quality Monitoring (C.8) (See Monitoring Committee Worksheet)			\$510,000			\$605,000	
57	76		LID Monitoring Plan (KEI)(LWA/GC)			\$60,000			\$60,000	
58	76		Trash Monitoring Plan (LWA/GC)(KEI)		\$75,000	\$30,000		\$40,000	\$70,000	\$55,000 for outfall mapping
59	76		Trash Monitoring (KEI)(LWA)			\$195,000				moved \$10,000 to Mon Mgmt Support (63c)
60	76		Pollutants of Concern Monitoring (KEI)(LWA/GC)			\$50,000			\$50,000	Does not include source properties
61 62	76	18	Pesticides and Toxicity Monitoring (KEI)(LWA/GC)			\$70,000			\$70,000	
63	76	18	Urban Creeks Monitoring Report (POC, Pesticides and Toxicity, Trash, LID)(KEI)(LWA/GC)			\$95,000			\$90,000	reduced by \$5,000
63a	76		Creek Status Monitoring Follow-Up			\$0				Bio assessment follow up/lab reporting
63b	76		POC Receiving Water Monitoring			\$0				needs MC approval
63c	76		Monitoring Management Support			ΨΟ			\$20,000	
64	76		All Monitoring Contingency			\$10,000				Contingency for all monitoring items
65			cide Toxicity Control (C.9) (See MOC Worksheet)			\$81,023			\$81,023	
66	76		Our Water Our World Local Outreach and Training (Plant Harmony)			\$69,500			\$69,500	
67	76		Our Water Our World Outreach Materials (Paid to CASQA)			\$5,080				formerly paid through BASMAA
68	76		Pesticide Regulatory Coordination Program (Paid to CASQA)			\$5,943				formerly paid through BASMAA
69	76		Outreach to Pest Control Professionals			\$500			\$500	
70			Load Reduction (C.10) (See MOC Worksheet)			\$60,000			\$60,000	
71	76		Trash Load Reduction Plan (LWA)			\$10,000			\$10,000	
72	76		Trash Reduction and Impracticability Report (LWA)			\$50,000			\$50,000	
73			ury Controls (C.11) (requirements addressed under C.12)			\$0			\$0	
74			Controls (C.12) (See Monitoring Committee Worksheet)			\$430,914			\$460,914	
75	76		Old Industrial Area PCBs Control Measure Plan (LWA/GC)		\$30,000	\$10,000		\$30,000	\$40,000	
76	76		Old Industrial Area PCBs Treatment Project (first project to implement the Plan) (TBD)		400/000	\$200,000		700/000		project development includes guidance on funding O & M
77	76		Annual Progress Report on Controlling PCBs (LWA/GC)		\$10,000	\$20,000		\$10,000	\$30,000	bldg demo, \$10,000 for new report format; regional collab/In-kind
78	76		Source Property Investigation (KEI) (LWA/GC)			\$150,000		, ,,,,,,,,		moved \$10,000 to Mon Mgmt Support (63c)
79	76		PCBs in Electrical Utilities (LWA/GC)			\$10,000			\$10,000	
80	76		Guidance for MRP 3.0 Building Demolition Requirements (LWA/GC)			\$20,000			\$20,000	
81	76	18	Provide Fish Risk Flyers/Signs			\$5,305			\$5,305	
82	76:	18	Distribute Fish Risk Flyers (KEI)			\$10,609			\$10,609	
83	76	18	Annual Fish Risk Status Report (KEI)			\$5,000			\$5,000	
84		Exen	npted and Conditionally Exempted Discharges (C.15)(See PIP Committee Worksheet)			\$15,000			\$15,000	
85	76	17	Firefighting Discharges (LWA/GC)			\$15,000			\$15,000	
86		Unsh	neltered Homeless Discharges (C.17) (See MOC Worksheet)			\$120,000			\$120,000	
87	76	16	Homeless Mapping (TBD)			\$20,000	\$20,000		\$20,000	
88	76	16	BMP Report (TBD)			\$50,000	\$50,000		\$50,000	
89	76	16	Implementation Plan (TBD)			\$50,000	\$50,000		\$50,000	
90			Contra Costa County Projects (C.19) (See Monitoring Committee Worksheet)			\$70,000			\$105,000	
91	76		Methylmercury Monitoring for Delta TMDL (LWA/GC)			\$20,000			\$20,000	
92	76		Marsh Creek Dissolved Oxygen Monitoring (LWA/GC)			\$30,000				Includes SSID response to Jan 3, 2022 RB letter
93	76		Annual Mercury Monitoring Plan (LWA/GC)		\$15,000	\$10,000		\$15,000	\$25,000	
94	76		Pyrethroid Control Program Baseline Monitoring Report (LWA/GC)			\$5,000			\$5,000	
95	76		East County TMDL Control Measure Plan (LWA/GC)		\$30,000	\$5,000		\$20,000	\$25,000	
96	<u> </u>		Reporting (C.20) (see PIP Committee Worksheet)			\$10,000			\$20,000	
97	76		Cost Reporting Framework (LWA/GC)		\$15,000	\$10,000		\$10,000	\$20,000	
98			t Management (C.21) (see Development Committee Worksheet)			\$30,000			\$30,000	
99	76	45	Asset Management Framework (TBD - H&A)			\$30,000			\$30,000	
100	1		ADVANCE WORK SUBTOTAL		\$175,000			\$125,000		
101	1		CONDITIONAL BUDGET ITEMS SUBTOTAL				\$803,300			
102			GROUP PROGRAM BUDGET SUBTOTAL	\$4,137,667		\$4,151,788			\$4,871,577	
103	769	98	2% CONTINGENCY	\$82,753		\$83,036			\$97,432	
104	1		TOTAL GROUP ACTIVITIES BUDGET	\$4,220,421		\$4,234,824			\$4,969,008	
105	-		CONTINGENCY EXPENSE	\$0		\$0			\$0	
106	-		SALARY CREDIT (PM)(12 Months)	(\$107,782)		\$0			\$0	
107	1		SALARY SAVINGS (SWMPS 12 months)	\$0		\$0			(\$266,763)	

Budget Row	WO#	Description/Expenditure	ADOPTED Adj FY 2021/22 Dec 15, 2021 ¹	FY 21/22 Advance Work ²	Adopted FY 22/23 Mar 16, 2022	FY 22/23 Conditional Budget Items ³	Unspent Advance Work	Adjusted FY 2022/23 August 2022 (DRAFT)	FY 2022/23 Notes
108		SALARY SAVINGS (WMPS 12 months)	(\$406,802)		\$0			(\$213,058)	
109		SUBTOTAL	(\$514,584)		\$0			(\$479,821)	
110		NET SUBTOTAL GROUP PROGRAM BUDGET	\$3,705,837		\$4,234,824			\$4,489,187	
111		SUA FUNDING CAP	\$3,500,000		\$3,500,000			\$3,500,000	
112		NET TOTAL GROUP PROGRAM BUDGET	\$3,705,837		\$4,234,824			\$4,489,187	
113		SUA FUNDING GAP	(\$205,837)		(\$734,824)			(\$989,187)	

NOTES

- Budget totals are shown for the Midyear Adjusted Budget for FY 21/22, but line item budget numbers are not shown as there are significant changes and rearrangement of budget line items in the new FY 22/23 budget.
- 2 Advance work is the work that must be completed prior to July 1, 2022 to meet the permit schedule in the MRP 3.0 Tentative Order.
- 3 Conditionally approved budget items will require prior discussion to confirm task amount and when to begin work. Amounts will be removed from the conditional column once approved.



To: Management Committee

From: Lisa Welsh, Lisa Austin (Geosyntec), Augmented Staff

Subject: Review the Draft Mercury and PCBs Watershed/Management Areas,

Control Measures, and Load Reduction – Update 2022, due with the

2022 Annual Report submittal to the Regional Water Board

Recommendation:

Accept the draft Mercury and PCBs Watershed/Management Areas, Control Measures, and Load Reduction – Update 2022 for review and comment.

Background:

This report fulfills the requirements of MRP Provisions C.11.a.iii.(3), C.11.b.iii(2), C.12.a.iii.(3), and C.12.b.iii.(2) for annually updating the list of control measures reported as necessary to account for new control measures and to report loads reduced by these control measures using the Interim Accounting Methodology.

The following MRP reporting requirements are addressed within this report:

- The list of Watershed/Management Areas (W/MAs) where control measures are currently being implemented or will be implemented during the term of the Permit;
- The number, type, and locations and/or frequency (if applicable) of control measures;
- A cumulative listing of all potentially PCBs-contaminated sites Permittees have referred to the SFBRWQCB to date, with a brief summary description of each site and where to obtain further information;
- The description, scope, and start date of PCBs control measures;
- For each structural control and non-structural best management practice (BMP), interim implementation progress milestones (e.g., construction milestones for structural controls or other relevant implementation

milestones for structural controls and non-structural BMPs) and a schedule for milestone achievement;

- Clear statements of the roles and responsibilities of each participating Permittee for implementation of identified control measures;
- Mercury and PCBs loads reduced using the approved assessment methodology to demonstrate cumulative mercury and PCBs load reduced from each control measure implemented since the beginning of the Permit term, including supporting data and information necessary to substantiate the load reduction estimates; and
- An estimate of the amount of mercury and PCBs load reductions resulting from green infrastructure implementation during the current term of the MRP, including a description of all data used and a full description of models and model inputs relied on to generate this estimate.

The list of control measures and estimates of mercury and PCBs load reductions are derived from the C.3 and C.10 project data entered by the permittees into the ArcGIS Online (AGOL) database. The data used for this draft report may be incomplete for projects constructed in FY 2021/22 for the following permittees: Clayton, Hercules, Moraga, Orinda, Pinole, Pleasant Hill, Richmond, and San Ramon. Geosyntec will continue to work with permittees to make corrections to the treatment areas reported and resulting pollutant load reductions through the end of August. The final report will note which permittees have incomplete data for FY 2021/22.

Attachment: Mercury and PCBs Watershed/Management Areas, Control Measures, and Load Reduction – Update 2022 (<u>Groupsite link</u>).



To: Management Committee

From: Lisa Welsh, Lisa Austin (Geosyntec), Augmented Staff

Subject: Review the Fish Risk Reduction Program for Mercury and PCBs: 2022

Status Report, due with the 2022 Annual Report submittal to the

Regional Water Board

Recommendation:

Accept the Fish Risk Reduction Program for Mercury and PCBs: 2022 Status Report for review and comment.

Background:

MRP Provisions C.11.e and C.12.h require permittees to conduct an ongoing risk reduction program to address public health impacts of mercury and PCBs in fish within the San Francisco Bay and Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta. In each fiscal year, the CCCWP, in conjunction with the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, conduct and maintain a public health outreach program designed to reach a minimum of 3,000 individuals annually who are likely consumers of San Francisco Bay or Delta-caught fish.

This status report provides an overview of the Fish Risk Reduction Program and summarizes progress achieved by CCCWP during FY 2021/22. The report highlights ongoing activities, suggestions for outreach improvements, and considers options to maximize the program's effectiveness since being implemented under the MRP.

CCCWP estimates the Fish Risk Reduction Program has the potential to reach well over the program's minimum target of 3,000 individuals annually. In FY 2021/22, CCCWP delivered 30 to 100 brochures to each of 35 locations (see Tables 1 and 2). It is conservatively estimated that this effort reached over 1,000 individuals throughout the County. In addition, CCCWP Permittees, in coordination with Contra Costa Health Services and the East Bay Regional Parks District, collectively implement fish risk reduction activities by posting, maintaining and inspecting fish consumption warning signs on an annual basis at 15 fishing piers and regional shoreline locations (see Table 3). It is conservatively estimated that more than 3,000 individuals annually will view the signage alone.

Additional measures were also adopted in FY 21-22. Brochures and flyers are currently made available to bait and tackle shops in English, Spanish, Simplified Chinese, Laotian and Vietnamese. In addition to the provided languages currently established, business operators have expressed interest in providing outreach material in additional languages such as Russian and Tagalog. During FY 2021-2022, CCCWP began documenting the languages and locations that business operators expressed interest in expanding the availability of outreach material to subsistence fishermen. Distribution of this additional material is planned to begin in FY 2022-2023 at interested bait and tackle shops. In addition to bait, tackle, and fishing supply stores identified in Table 2, there are 17 additional locations (big box retailers) where recreational fishing supplies and licenses are available for purchase (see Table 4). This list of big box retailers is kept current while CCCWP coordinates program participation with corporate offices of these retailers.

Attachment: Fish Risk Reduction Program for Mercury and PCBs: 2022 Status Report (Groupsite link).



To: Management Committee

From: Lisa Welsh, Lisa Austin (Geosyntec), Augmented Staff

Subject: Review the PCBs in Building Materials Management Program – Fiscal

Year 2021/22 Data Summary, due with the 2022 Annual Report

submittal to the Regional Water Board

Recommendation:

Accept the PCBs in Building Materials Management Program – FY 2021/22 Data Summary for review and comment.

Background:

MRP Provision C.12.f requires Permittees to manage PCBs-containing materials and wastes during building demolition activities. The MRP permittees have developed and implemented a process, beginning in July 2019, for managing materials with PCBs concentrations of 50 ppm or greater in applicable structures when applicable structures undergo demolition. Applicable structures include commercial, public, institutional, and industrial buildings constructed or remodeled between 1950 and 1980 that are undergoing full-building demolition. Single-family residential and wood frame structures are exempt.

This technical memorandum documents the following items for the Contra Costa County Permittees, as required by MRP Provision C.12.f.iii.(4):

- a. The number of applicable structures that applied for a demolition permit during the reporting year; and
- b. A running list of the applicable structures that applied for a demolition permit (since the date the PCBs control protocol was implemented) that had material(s) with PCBs at 50 ppm or greater, with the address, demolition date, and a brief description of the PCBs control method(s) used.

<u>Attachment:</u> PCBs in Building Materials Management Program – Fiscal Year 2021/22 Data Summary (Groupsite link).



To: Management Committee

From: Lisa Welsh, Lisa Austin (Geosyntec), Augmented Staff

Subject: Review the Pyrethroid Control Program Baseline Monitoring Report, due

on September 19 to Regional Water Board 2 and 5

Recommendation:

Accept the Pyrethroid Control Program Baseline Monitoring Report for review and comment.

Background:

On May 11, 2022, the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board issued MRP Order R2-2022-0018 (MRP 3). With the issuance of MRP 3, East Contra Costa County Permittees continue monitoring under the jurisdiction of the SF Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Region 2), while also incorporating requirements from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Region 5) TMDLs and Control Programs such as those outlined in Resolution R5-2017-0057 and Provision C.19 of MRP 3.

This staff report documents the following items required by Provision C.19.f.ii.(3) that East Contra Costa County Permittees must include in a report that:

- (a) Summarizes the pyrethroid and toxicity monitoring results from 2012 through 2019;
- (b) Assesses the compliance of the discharge with the conditional prohibition triggers in the Basin Plan established by Resolution No. R5-2017-0057;
- (c) Summarizes toxicity of water and sediment samples to the test organism Hyalella azteca; and
- (d) Summarizes any other pyrethroid monitoring data collected by the East County Permittees during the above reporting period.

Regarding C.19.f.ii.(3)(d), the Program is not aware of other data collected outside of MRP 1 and 2 requirements and is asking East County Permittees to share other data if it exists. The report will be updated accordingly.

<u>Attachment:</u> Pyrethroid Control Program Baseline Monitoring Report (<u>Groupsite link</u>).