



**CONTRA COSTA
CLEAN WATER
PROGRAM**

MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

Wednesday, November 17, 2021

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 (Chair)
City of Brentwood	Meghan Laporta (Vice-Chair)/ Allen Baquilar
City of Clayton	Laura Hoffmeister/ Reina Schwartz
City of Concord	Bruce Davis/ 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/ Ana Bernardes
City of Hercules	Mike Roberts/Jeff Brown/Jose Pacheco/Nai Saelee/F. Kennedy
City of Lafayette	Matt Luttrupp/ Tim Clark
City of Martinez	Khalil Yowakim
Town of Moraga	Frank Kennedy/ Shawn Knapp
City of Oakley	Billilee Saengcalern/ Frank Kennedy/ Andrew Kennedy
City of Orinda	Scott Christie/ Jason Chen/ Kevin McCourt
City of Pinole	Misha Kaur
City of Pittsburg	Jolan Longway/ Richard Abono
City of Pleasant Hill	Ananthan Kanagasundaram/ Frank Kennedy
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
Dan Cloak, Consultant	Mitch Avalon, Consultant
Liz Yin, Consultant	Michael Burger, Clerk
Lisa Austin, Consultant	Lisa Welsh, Consultant

NEXT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, December 15, 2021, 1:30 PM

**Contra Costa Clean Water Program
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA
Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

AGENDA

Open the Meeting/Introductions/Announcements/Changes to the Agenda: **1:30**

Public Comments: Any member of the general public may address the Management Committee on a subject within their jurisdiction and not listed on the agenda. Remarks should not exceed three (3) minutes.

Regional Water Quality Control Board Staff Comments/Reports: **1:35**

Consent Calendar: **1:40**

All matters listed under the CONSENT CALENDAR are considered to be routine and can be acted on by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless requested by a member of the Management Committee or a member of the public prior to the time the Management Committee votes on the motion to adopt.

- A. APPROVE** Management Committee meeting summary (Chair)
 - 1) October 20, 2021 Management Committee Meeting Summary
- B. ACCEPT** the following subcommittee meeting summaries into the Management Committee record: (Chair)
 - 1) Administrative Committee
 - October 5, 2021
 - 2) Monitoring Committee
 - September 13, 2021
 - 3) Municipal Operations Committee
 - September 21, 2021
 - 4) Development Committee
 - September 22, 2021

Presentations: **1:50**

- A. Report on the Regional Monitoring Program (Jay Davis, SFEI)
- B. End of year budget report for FY 20/21 (A. Bullock)
 - a. See attached spreadsheet
- C. Budget Adjustment, FY 21/22 (M. Avalon/A. Bullock)
 - a. See staff report for background information
- D. Budget Process for FY 22/23 (M. Avalon/A. Bullock)
 - a. See staff report for background information

Actions: **2:40**
A. DIRECT staff to prepare a FY 21/22 Adjusted Budget for review and approval at the December 15, 2021 Management Committee meeting.

Reports: **2:45**
B. Status of Monsanto Settlement Agreement (M. Avalon)
C. Status of the Tentative Order comment letter

Updates: **2:50**
A. Personnel Update (A. Knapp)
B. BAMSC Steering Committee meeting (K. Graves)
C. Update on 1-800-No-Dumping program (K. Graves)
D. Status of RFQ process for new contracts (K. Graves)

Information: **3:20**

Old/New Business: **3:25**

Adjournment: Approximately 3:30 p.m.

Attachments

Consent Items

1. *Management Committee Meeting Summary October 20, 2021*
2. *Administrative Committee Meeting Summary October 5, 2021*
3. *Monitoring Committee Meeting Summary September 13, 2021*
4. *Municipal Operations Committee Meeting Summary September 21, 2021*
5. *Development Committee Meeting Summary September 22, 2021*

Presentation Items

6. *End of year report spreadsheet*
7. *Staff Report on Budget Adjustment for FY 21/22*
8. *Budget Adjustment spreadsheet*
9. *MRP 3.0 Technical Services Worksheet*
10. *Staff Report on Budget Process for FY 22/23*
11. *FY 22/23 budget process timeline*
12. *Our Water Our World letter*

Action Items

Report Items

UPCOMING CCCWP MEETINGS

All meetings **will not** be held at 255 Glacier Drive, Martinez, CA 94553, but will be held virtually

December 7, 2021 1st Tuesday	Administrative and PIP Committee Meeting 9:30 a.m. – 12:00 noon
December 13, 2021 2nd Monday	Monitoring Committee Meeting, 10am – 12 noon
December 14, 2021 3rd Tuesday	Municipal Operations Committee Meeting, 10am-12 noon
November 24, 2021 4th Wednesday	Development Committee Meeting, 1:30 p.m.-3:30 p.m.
December 15, 2021 3rd Wednesday	Management Committee Meeting, 1:30 p.m.-3:30 p.m.

BAMSC (BASMAA) SUBCOMMITTEE/ MRP 3.0 MEETINGS	
Times for the BAMSC (BASMAA) Subcommittee meetings are subject to change.	
TBD	Regional Water Board adoption hearing on MRP 3.0 Final Order
1st Thursday	Development Committee, 1:30 – 4:00 p.m. (even months)
1st Wednesday	Monitoring/POCs Committee, 9:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m. (odd months)
4th Wednesday	Public Information/Participation Committee, 1:30 – 4:00 p.m. (1 st month each quarter)
4th Tuesday	Trash Subcommittee, 9:30 a.m.-12 noon (even month)



CONTRA COSTA
CLEAN WATER
PROGRAM

MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

10-20-2021

Attendance:

MUNICIPALITY	ATTENDED	ABSENT
City of Antioch	Phil Hoffmeister (Chair)	
City of Brentwood	Meghan Laporta	
City of Clayton	Laura Hoffmeister	
City of Concord	Bruce Davis	
Town of Danville	Bob Russell	
City of El Cerrito	Stephen Prée	
City of Hercules	Frank Kennedy	
City of Lafayette	Matt Luttrop	
City of Martinez	Khalil Yowakim	
Town of Moraga	Frank Kennedy	
City of Oakley	Frank Kennedy, Andrew Kennedy	
City of Orinda	Scott Christie	
City of Pinole	Misha Kaur	
City of Pittsburg		Jolan Longway
City of Pleasant Hill	Frank Kennedy	
City of Richmond	Joe Leach	
City of San Pablo	Karineh Samkian	
City of San Ramon	Robin Bartlett	
City of Walnut Creek	Lucile Paquette	
Contra Costa County	Michele Mancuso, Allison Knapp	
CCC Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Tim Jensen	

Program Staff: Karin Graves, Andrea Bullock, Michael Burger

Program Consultants: Mitch Avalon, Dan Cloak, Liz Yin, Lisa Welsh, Sandy Matthews, Alina Constantinescu, Lisa Austin

Members of the Public/Others/Guests: Karen Cowan (CASQA Exec. Director), Nancy Gardiner (Haley & Aldrich), Yvana Hrovat (Haley & Aldrich)

Introductions/Announcements/Changes to Agenda: 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.



CONTRA COSTA
CLEAN WATER
PROGRAM

1. **Roll call was taken and the meeting was convened by the Chair at 1:30 p.m.**
2. **Announcements:** Mitch Avalon announced there was a change to the agenda. The presentation item on the Construction General Permit was to be continued. An item on the Hydromodification Management Plan was added to the update portion.
3. **Consent Calendar:** Frank Kennedy (Moraga) motioned to accept, Joe Leach (Richmond) seconded. The Chair called for a vote. There were no objections or abstentions. The motion passed unanimously and the consent calendar was approved.
4. **Presentations:**
 - a. **Annual report on CASQA accomplishments: FY 20/21 (Karen Cowan):** The Chair introduced Karen Cowan and described the presentation in brief. Karen Cowan noted that last year the CASQA board had adopted a new strategic vision and plan to achieve sustainable stormwater management. This plan had four principles.

The first principle has three parts. Part one of this was stormwater capture and re-use, which looks at securing source water and keeping pollution out of the waterways. This program had received a grant to conduct this work. The second part was source control and pesticides. CASQA will be taking over management of Our Water, Our World in January and will try to expand this program state-wide. Of particular note was zinc from tire wear, which was one of the leading causes of stormwater contamination.

The second principle is in regards to legislation and ordinance. This work focuses on working with state bodies to manage programs as well as provide advice on the Phase II permits. It was noted the fees would be going up this year. AB377 was also discussed; which addresses stormwater effluent limits and was converted to a 2-year Bill. Work on educating officials on Stormwater programs was also discussed.

The third principle was public education and engagement. CASQA is trying to shift the public image that Stormwater is a resource and not a pollution source.

The fourth principle was about funding. Stormwater management is not funded through normal means and CASQA has been working at different levels to secure funding and grants to support stormwater projects. The EPA OSG bill was discussed. This bill was written without consideration of the status of western states' infrastructure but work has been done to include local stormwater projects on the list of eligible projects.

Karen Cowan discussed the new BMP handbook and other resources that were included in a newly restructured CASQA website.



CONTRA COSTA
CLEAN WATER
PROGRAM

Mitch Avalon asked what the timeline for funding projects was under the OSG. Karen Cowan noted that this would likely not happen for several years until there was a better understanding of how the legislation is applied. Stormwater funding needs versus available funding was also discussed.

The Chair asked if there was any news on unfunded mandates or if there were any cities looking at Prop 218 fee increases. Karen Cowan noted that there was no specific information, but suggested that there had been some progress on the legal side of things. She also noted that there was a Bay Area city that had been looking into creating an Prop 218 test case (SB231), but the specifics were still confidential.

Karin Graves asked if the OSG funding was filtering down through the state and if CASQA had guidance. Karen Cowan noted that initial funding was \$7M and had already been allocated by the state. New processes were being worked on to handle additional funding in the future. Karen Cowan also noted that the EPA was going to reevaluate the stormwater needs survey which would be used to show the municipal needs of stormwater programs.

- b. Process to develop an assessment of AGOL needs (K. Graves):** Karin Graves began by giving a brief overview of the AGOL assessment process. Staff was recommending that a needs assessment should be conducted for AGOL. AGOL had been used since 2015 for MRP requirements. Minor modifications had been made but several major modification needs have been identified over the last year. It had been decided to defer these modifications until the release of MRP 3.0. Now that the Tentative Order had been released, it was a good time to proceed.

Staff would be identifying what was working for the Program, modifications that were desired by the Permittees, and any changes that were needed for new mapping requirements under MRP 3.0. Staff support to conduct this assessment was also discussed. The general process had already begun, led by Elizabeth Yin and with assistance from Beth Baldwin of the Contra Costa County Watershed Program.

The next step would be to form a small ad hoc GIS workgroup with any active AGOL users. Staff would draft a survey with input from the GIS workgroup and County DoIT personnel. This survey would be distributed to Permittees. Answers would then be evaluated by staff to identify the needs of Permittees. A report on the assessment would be delivered to the Management Committee. Work on this would begin in late November with the survey going out in December or January. The report for Management Committee was anticipated for March 2022. The budget line item for \$50,000 was noted and explained.

The Chair asked what was the criteria for invitation to the ad hoc committee. Karin



CONTRA COSTA
CLEAN WATER
PROGRAM

Graves clarified that all active AGOL users would be invited, but if there were any Permittees that were not active users that wanted to attend could request an invitation. A maximum number of members was discussed.

Andrew Kennedy (Oakley) noted that he had been an active user for 7 Permittees on AGOL and volunteered to attend the ad hoc committee. He suggested improving how layers talk to each other in AGOL to prevent the need for redundant data entry. Karin Graves suggested that he would be welcome on the ad hoc committee. Mitch Avalon mentioned that the report to the Management Committee in March would be a good time to include new AGOL line items in the budget, if needed.

Dan Cloak noted that the Development Committee had discussed the potential for having seamless links of the IMP calculator output to AGOL.

- c. **Construction General Permit (S. Matthews):** This topic was continued to the December Management Committee meeting.
- d. **Tentative Order status and special approval meeting (M. Avalon):** Mitch Avalon began by describing the October 12 and 13 workshop and shared a Power Point presentation with highlights. Eight elected officials from Contra Costa County had testified. He noted that the board members remarked on the positive attitude of the testimony overall. The approach of the workshop was to continue working with regional board staff on improving the TO and suggest changes to timelines to make them more manageable.

The first comment was on road maintenance. Contra Costa County had indicated that the current Tentative Order reduced the PCI of Permittee streets and offset pavement improvement gains from SB1. This would result in less effective maintenance treatment. It was anticipated that there would be additional items on the exempted maintenance work but GI would likely need to be included in some projects.

Trash Credits and Offsets were written to be eliminated by 2025. Half the Permittees would be unable to meet the load reduction deadline without the credits and offsets. Volunteer work and creek cleanups connect people with their watershed and this fact seemed to be highly effective in moving Water Board member' opinion. It was anticipated that there would be support for credits and slowing down the elimination of offsets.

Water Board members agreed with Contra Costa County that power analyses was not necessary.

Minimum GI within the Tentative Order undermines the GI Plans and more time to implement GI plans was requested. MRP 3.0 encourages smaller, simple projects and



CONTRA COSTA
CLEAN WATER
PROGRAM

discourages more complex projects. Board members noted they would like to see larger scale projects.

PCBs Load reduction required the County to treat 1,119 acres as written. The testimony suggested that acreage based requirements wouldn't maximize PCBs load reduction and suggested that PCBs based requirements would be better by treating "hot" areas. In addition, most PCBs were located on private property making it difficult for stormwater programs to implement and enforce permit requirements. It was anticipated that there was support for PCBs based requirements but that concerns of handling private property was not shared by Water Board members.

Homelessness requirements was a very difficult topic. It was discussed that pollutants should be addressed and the focus on the homeless population be removed. Potential outcomes such as credits for homeless work were positively discussed.

Overall, the Board wanted more specificity in comments and extended the submittal date for written comments by one week.

Karineh Samkian (San Pablo) asked if a copy of the Power Point presentation could be distributed and Mitch Avalon said that he would send it out to committee members.

Tim Jensen (Flood Control) discussed the overall good relationship between the Program and the other organizations. The Committee discussed their impressions of the testimony during the workshop and thanked Program Staff for their effort.

Michele Mancuso (Contra Costa County) asked how many revisions could be made to the Tentative Order without requiring another issuance of the Tentative Order. Mitch Avalon noted that Permittees had asked for an extension and an additional issuance cycle. A one week extension on the comment period was granted, but Water Board members did not approve any additional rewrites. Frank Kennedy (Moraga) suggested that there was a level of modification that would result in a fundamental rewrite of the Tentative Order. Mitch Avalon suggested that the Water Board's attorney would make a decision based on the changes if there would need to be an extended recirculation and comment period. Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) shared links to the workshop videos.

A draft comment letter had been distributed to Permittees by Program staff. That letter would help form the final draft after subcommittees had a chance to formulate language. A special meeting would have to be discussed to approve the letter. The deadline for submitting the letter was November 16.

- e. **Tentative Order legal questions for Program's attorney (K. Graves):** Karin Graves noted that a summary of the questions that the Program had asked their attorney about the Tentative Order so far was included in the agenda packet. The attorney would be



CONTRA COSTA
CLEAN WATER
PROGRAM

reviewing the comment letter and a meeting was scheduled for next week. Karin Graves pointed out that there were a couple questions where answers were still being considered and hadn't been received. These questions were in regards to the hydromodification management, and firefighting foam provisions.

Karin Graves asked if the Committee had any further questions. Robin Bartlett (San Ramon) asked if provision C.3.b.i.(2) requires projects that are currently under construction on the date of the project to comply with the new requirements; this could potentially be a legal matter for approved projects. The Chair noted that there were exemptions for projects under construction. Robin Bartlett (San Ramon) suggested that the concern was for planned projects that had not begun construction. Dan Cloak agreed that there was concern regarding the language of the provision.

Karineh Samkian (San Pablo) suggested that the Chair and Amanda Booth (San Pablo) had expressed concern regarding the legality of C.5 in requiring surveillance of the homeless.

Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) noted that there was concern regarding the data that was used to determine the calculations and definition of affordable housing. Dan Cloak noted that Oakland had brought up this issue at the October 12 and 13 Workshop. The Committee discussed that the data change may not matter as far as the acceptability of the provision and whether there was a cutoff for retroactive implementation of MRP 3.0 requirements.

Bruce Davis (Concord) asked if C.10 (FTC on private property) was legal. Karin Graves noted that the attorney had responded and that the State Water Board had said in the past that existing developments were not within Permittees' jurisdiction but new developments could be required to have full trash capture. The Committee discussed the installation of trash capture devices in public right of way that would capture trash from multiple private properties.

5. Actions:

- a. **APPROVE holding a special meeting of the Management Committee to approve the comment letter on MRP 3.0 Tentative Order for transmittal to the Regional Water Board and SELECT a date and time for the special meeting:** Mitch Avalon noted that an email had been sent out to Management Committee members that requested input on days and times for a special meeting. Wednesday, November 10 was suggested as the best day. The committee discussed times. The Committee determined 12:30 p.m. – 1:30 p.m. was the best time.

Karineh Samkian (San Pablo) motioned to approve the special meeting, Michele Mancuso (Contra Costa County) seconded. The chair called for a vote. There were no



**CONTRA COSTA
CLEAN WATER
PROGRAM**

objections or abstentions. The motion passed unanimously and the special meeting to APPROVE the comment letter was approved for November 10, 2021 at 12:30 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.

- b. VOTE on the CCCWP selection for CASQA Board of Directors Election with ballots cast no later than October 29, 2021 (roll-call vote):** Mitch Avalon noted that Andrea Bullock was the Program’s representative at the CASQA Board of Directors meetings. Each year the Committee provided guidance to the representative on a vote for the board of directors.

The Chair motioned to approve voting for nominees other than TJ Moon, Bob Russell (Danville) seconded. The Chair called for a vote. There were no objections. Karineh Samkian (San Pablo) abstained. The motion passed and the votes were approved.

Commented [MB1]: I missed who abstained for the vote, I believe it was Karineh.

6. Reports:

- a. Status of Monsanto Settlement Agreement (M. Avalon):** The judge has not issued an order yet. There were no further updates.

7. Updates:

- a. Hydromodification Management Compliance Options (K. Graves):** Karin Graves began by laying out the purpose of the update. The Program has been working with Water Board staff to get approval to move forward with the sizing factors as lined out in the report, but has encountered gridlock. The Tentative Order for MRP 3.0 approves the methodology of the report but imposes stricter sizing factors.

Karin Graves provided additional background on the process to date. The LID and sizing factor approach to Hydromodification Management has been in use since 2006 with upgrades in 2009. The process to develop CCCWP’s approach has cost about \$1M and the work and cost to revise sizing factors still needs to be created and approved. The Tentative Order imposes a larger “base case” sizing factor of 6.5% (vs. Program’s 5%) which would cause some facilities to be calculated at a much larger size. An IMP calculator uses assigned sizing factors for each facility.

Several permittees voiced concern with potential impacts of the larger sizing factor on development projects and to the LID focused approach in Contra Costa County. It was recommended that the Development Committee discuss this issue along with any comments on the Tentative Order at its October meeting.

- b. Personnel Update (A. Knapp):** Allison noted that the two Watershed Management Planning Specialist positions were under review by the County’s human resources office.



CONTRA COSTA
CLEAN WATER
PROGRAM

Advertisement for the positions is anticipated in the next two weeks with interviews happening as soon as December.

- c. **BAMSC Steering Committee meeting (K. Graves):** There were no updates from the BAMSC Steering Committee. The next meeting is October 28.
 - d. **Update on 1-800-No-Dumping program (K. Graves):** This item was continued to the November Management Committee meeting due to time constraints.
 - e. **Status of RFQ Process for new contracts (K. Graves):** Staff is moving forward with the RFQ solicitation. The Program has decided to use a single RFQ with multiple service areas. The RFQ should be posted in the next two weeks and would be open for 30 days. Proposals were expected to be received by early December. Permittees that had volunteered previously will review proposals in January or early February. Karin Graves noted that other reviewers were still potentially needed.
8. **Information:** There were no information items.
9. **Old/New Business:** Karineh Samkian (San Pablo) noted that Lisa Austin had shared the Alternative Compliance Plan and requested Management Committee members have their city attorneys review the plan.
10. **Adjournment:** The Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:50 p.m.



ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE SUMMARY

Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, October 5, 2021

10:30 – 12:00

VOTING MEMBERS	ATTENDED	ABSENT
City of Antioch	Phil Hoffmeister (Chair)	
City of Brentwood		Megahn Laporta
Town of Danville	Mark Rusch	
Contra Costa County	Tim Jensen	
CCC Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Tim Jensen	
City of Hercules	Jeff Brown	
City of Pleasant Hill		Ananthan Kanagasundaram
NON-VOTING MEMBERS		
City of Walnut Creek	Lucile Paquette	

Program Staff: Karin Graves, Andrea Bullock

Consultants: Mitch Avalon

Guests: Allison Knapp

- 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 changes to the agenda. Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) announced that a CASQA meeting will be held on October 26 and 27.
- 3. Approval of September 7, 2021 Meeting Minutes (Chair):** Tim Jensen (Flood Control) motioned to approve the minutes, Jeff Brown (Hercules) seconded. The Chair called for a vote. There were no objections or abstentions. The vote passed unanimously and the minutes were approved as submitted.
- 4. Tentative Order Status (M. Avalon):** Mitch Avalon began by sharing the Power Point presentation from the agenda packet. The MRP 3.0 schedule was discussed and he described that the BAMSC presentation coordination meetings for October 4, 6, and 11 had been added to the schedule. A brief overview of the October 12 and 13 workshop was given. The presentations for October 12 were discussed in the BAMSC coordination meeting yesterday. It was indicated that Mitch Avalon would be giving the introduction at the October 12 workshop. A list of speakers that the PMA was

considering was shared and mostly consisted of elected officials. Mitch Avalon shared each of the planned speakers and the topics on which they would be presenting. Time slots for the speakers were in the process of being finalized. Permittees would need to work with their elected officials on talking points. Program Staff is still analyzing the Tentative Order and developing positions on each topic to offer to Permittees for coaching their elected officials. The overall presentation would be addressing the key issues in the Tentative Order but not the issues unique to each Permittee or subset of Permittees. These would need to be identified by each Permittee individually. The key topics identified by BAMSC were reiterated and the committee was reminded that the workshop was organized by provision rather than by topic.

The modules for each provision were divided into 15 minute segments during which speakers would be making their presentations. Any remaining time would be allotted for Public comments.

Comments on the Tentative order were being divided into two themes: changes to permit language that will be requested throughout the presentations and requests to change the implementation schedule of new permit requirements. The desired outcome is to request the Regional Board members to direct staff to clarify ambiguous language, correct inaccurate data or assumptions, and modify language. Mitch Avalon noted that some Permittees may be asked to testify during the public comment portion.

Permit requirements that will be appealed will need to be identified before the submittal of the comment letter so that an appeal could be filed at a later date.

Program Staff has prepared a document that breaks down each provision that is a key issue to identify talking points. Provided are provision requirements, problem statements, consequences of adoption, and a recommended response. Also provided were bullet points of talking points and key asks. This information was intended to assist in drafting talking points for elected officials.

Tim Jensen (Flood Control) asked if Supervisor Burgis had been contacted. Mitch Avalon noted that he and Karin Graves had scheduled a meeting with her tomorrow. The Chair asked if the document would be available today. The document would hopefully be available by the end of the day or early tomorrow and would be sent to the Management Committee, the PMA subcommittee, and the City-County Engineers. The difficulty of the compressed timeline was discussed briefly. The Chair asked if homelessness provisions were on the document and it was confirmed that it was included.

It was noted that BAMSC had recommended that the homelessness provision be modified to require Permittees to participate in a regional taskforce to address the issue of homelessness. Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) asked if a regional taskforce would be at the county level or a Bay Area-wide effort. There was a brief discussion on the effectiveness of a Contra Costa County taskforce versus a Bay Area wide effort. Mitch Avalon agreed and indicated that he would change the language to reflect the taskforce be at a County level rather than regional. Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) noted that there was already a homelessness taskforce on a regional scale. The Program does not have an official representative on the taskforce, but Mitch Avalon mentioned that one could be appointed.

- 5. Tentative Order Legal Questions (K. Graves):** The staff report on the subject of legal questions was displayed. As part of the process of analyzing the Tentative Order several legal questions had been discussed with the Program attorney.

The first question was regarding advance work that would need to be done prior to the Permit implementation; the attorney suggested that there was nothing preventing the Water Board to set a deadline right after the implementation of the MRP.

The second question was regarding full trash capture devices on private land; the attorney indicated that while Permittees could require new developments to install full trash capture devices, requiring Permittees to install these devices on already developed private property may violate constitutional rights.

The third question was regarding challenging permit language and what could be done now to preserve the ability to appeal in the future; the attorney indicated that all administrative options in the negotiation process needed to be exhausted before appeals and challenges could be made. The comments on the Administrative Draft would not be considered, so any comments need to be entered into the record at the workshop and in the comment letter for the Tentative Order. Including the minutes from the C.3 workgroups was discussed. Tim Jensen (Flood Control) asked if there was anything to learn from the organizations that appealed MRP 2.0. Mitch Avalon gave a brief description of the appeals that had been entered for MRP 2.0. The appeals were held in abeyance and could be activated at any time while implementing the permit. Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) asked if the Program would need to make an impracticability report in order to appeal. Mitch Avalon noted that the comment letter would include the infeasibility of the provision requirements.

The fourth question was regarding the Hydrograph Modification Management requirements (in C.3.g of the Tentative Order) and whether the permit language would allow the Water Board to impose additional requirements through a conditional approval of the report CCCWP will be required to submit. The concern is that it may be impossible to challenge additional requirements that are part of a conditional approval, as the permit would already be in effect. The attorney indicated that a more in depth conversation regarding the clarity of the language would be needed.

The fifth question was also regarding the Hydrograph Modification Management requirements and whether the Water Board could require Permittees to use a proprietary computer model known as the Bay Area Hydrology Model (BAHM) to simulate pre-project and post-project runoff. Further discussion with the attorney to clarify this question would also be needed.

- 6. Process to Develop Assessment of AGOL Needs (K. Graves):** An assessment for the AGOL system had been in discussion for some time and it was indicated that now was an opportune time to undertake this project. The Program has been using AGOL since 2015 and it has been used to meet reporting requirements with minor modifications since then. Major modification to the platform were deferred until the MRP 3.0 requirements were known. The Program budget already included a \$50,000 line item for this work.



The goal for the assessment was to identify what does and doesn't work, modifications and customizations that could improve the AGOL experience, system needs for MRP 3.0, and what staff support was needed to improve the AGOL experience. The assessment is already underway and is currently being overseen by Program consultant Elizabeth Yin. Beth Baldwin from the Contra Costa County Watershed Program was also assisting in this process.

The structure of the process was discussed, noting that it would begin with forming an ad hoc workgroup to oversee the process. Program staff, Permittees, and County DoIT personnel would provide input on the process and develop survey questions. A survey would be distributed to identify what Permittees would like to see in regards to customaziation. The survey was indicated to be conducted before the end of the year with response reviews happening some time between December and January. It was expected that the AGOL assessment and report would be completed and presented to the Management Committee by March 2022.

Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) asked if the \$50,000 in the budget was for Elizaeth Yin or Beth Baldwin. Karin Graves clarified that the \$50,000 was for Elizabeth Yin's oversight with Beth Baldwin serving on the workgroup and providing input there. Lucile Paquette (Walnut Creek) asked if the \$50,000 was to just assess the AGOL platform or did it include the possibility to explore changing platforms and consultants (PSOMAS). Mitch Avalon noted that the first part of the process is to determine what is needed to comply with MRP 3.0 requirements before searching for a system that encompasses more items that the Permittees may want. The Committee briefly discussed the current AGOL system and what information it provides as well as ongoing issues experienced in AGOL support from consultants. The Chair noted that this may be a topic for the ad hoc committee.

- 7. Approve October 20, 2021, Magaement Committtee Agenda (Committee):** The agenda was discussed with each presentation, action, report, and updates noted. The Committee discussed the special meeting to approve the comment letter. The date and time to hold this meeting was still to be determined. Tim Jensen (Flood Control) motioned to approve, Jeff Brown (Hercules) seconded. The chair called for a vote. There were no objections or abstentions. The motioned passed unanimously and the agenda was approved.
- 8. Old/New Business:** There was no old or new business.
- 9. Adjournment:** The Chair adjourned the meeting at 11:52 a.m.

**Monitoring Committee
Meeting Minutes
September 13, 2021**

VOTING MEMBERS		
MUNICIPALITY	ATTENDED	ABSENT
City of Pittsburg	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	
Program Staff and Consultants		
Staff Augmentation	Lisa Welsh / Lisa Austin	
Program Staff	Karin Graves	
Guests:		
ADH Environmental	Christian Kocher	

- **Introductory Remarks and Announcements.** Beth Baldwin opened the meeting with a quorum. Beth Baldwin (Vice-Chair) had previously agreed to host the meeting in Joe Camaddo's (Chair) absence.

Announcements:

- Early registration for the CASQA annual conference closes on September 13, 2021. Final registration closes on October 19, 2021 at 5:00 pm.
- The BAMSC MPC meeting is scheduled for September 29, 9:30 am to 3:30 pm.
- Workshop #2 for the Caltrans Clean California Local Grant Program is on October 7, from 10 am to noon.
- The MRP 3.0 Tentative Order was released on September 10, 2021. Regional Water Board workshops are scheduled for October 12 and 13. Comments are due on November 9, 2021.
- **August 2021 Meeting Summary.** Walnut Creek (L. Paquette) moved to approve the August meeting summary and the City of Pinole seconded (M. Kaur). There were no objections.
- **WMAs, Control Measures, and Load Reduction Annual Report FY20-21.** Lisa Welsh described that minimal revisions were made to the report since it was last presented and discussed at August Monitoring Committee Meeting. Revisions to the tables (acres treated and loads reduced) and figures were made to reflect the recent permittee updates to AGOL. No changes had been made to the main text. Lucile noted that there was a hanging

footnote in Table 2-1, CCCWP Contaminated Sites Referred to the SFBRWQCB and Self-Abated Properties, which should be removed. Committee members also noted that page numbers were missing in the second half of the report.

With the footnote and page number revisions, the City of Walnut Creek (L. Paquette) made a motion to recommend to Management Committee to approve the report. The CCC Flood Control District (B. Baldwin) seconded the motion. There were no objections.

- **PCBs in Building Materials Status Report FY20-21.** Lisa Welsh described that there were no changes to the report since August's committee meeting. Lucile asked if the table in Attachment A is a list of the applicable buildings demolished in FY20-21. Lisa A. responded that it is a cumulative list, including FY19-20 and FY 20-21.

The City of Pittsburg (J. Longway) made a motion to recommend to Management Committee to approve the report. The City of Pinole (M. Kaur) seconded it. There were no objections.

- **Fish Risk Reduction Program Status Report FY20-21.** Lisa Welsh described the Fish Risk Reduction report with the committee. This report is similar to last year's report and meets the annual permit requirement to provide an overview of the fish risk reduction program and summarize the progress achieved during the last year. The outreach effort to notify the public about the potential risks associated with fish caught in the Bay includes signs at harbors, marinas, and along shorelines and flyers distributed at bait, tackle, and fishing supply stores.

Michelle G. asked if there were additional signs that were put up at Bay Point this year? Christian K. responded that additional fliers may have been distributed but there were no additional new placards this year. The EBRPD does the signage; if the County wants to put more up, let ADH know. The committee generally agreed that the program has improved significantly over the last few years, with improved signage and outreach to big box stores where the public is likely to shop.

The City of Walnut Creek (L. Paquette) made a motion to recommend to Management Committee to approve the report. City of Pittsburg (J. Longway) seconded it. There were no objections.

- **POCs Monitoring Draft Report.** Christian K. reviewed the main contents of the report with the committee. The POCs Monitoring Report satisfies the annual permit requirement (C.8.h.iv) to summarize the sampling conducted in WY20-21 and the plan for monitoring in WY21-22. He noted that urban sediment sampling is typically conducted at the end of the dry season (e.g., August/September) to try to maximize accumulation. He noted that CCCWP can also take credit for POC samples collected by SFEI/RMP in Contra Costa County. In addition, sampling is conducted in East County, including continuous water quality data in

Marsh Creek to monitor for and investigate the causes of fish kills. The following additional items were discussed with the committee:

- Beth B. noted that she likes the summary tables and finds them helpful in demonstrating what has been collected and what was required per the permit.
- Lisa A. noted that in the MRP 3.0 Tentative Order, the PCBs sampling requirements include a minimum of eight per year and 50 in total. This includes expanding out to additional subareas in East County. Christian responded that the minimum of eight per year is the same as MRP 2.0, but 50 samples in total is less (as well as sampling in additional subareas). Lisa A. also noted that a methylmercury monitoring plan is now due by the start date of the MRP 3.0 permit term (July 1, 2022).
- Lucile asked if there is a plan to sample the upper Marsh Creek watershed if it flowed. Christian replied that the intent is to characterize those flows if/when there is discharge. Lisa A. noted that the permit does focus only on MS4 discharges. While it is helpful to understand the non-MS4 discharges, it is not required.
- Lucile asked if sampling dry weather discharges was a high priority. Christian replied that the largest source of dry weather flows is from irrigation discharges and that ADH was planning to collect samples over the next few weeks when there are dry weather flows.
- Beth B. asked if the monitoring results are submitted with the UCMR in March. Christian replied that, yes, the monitoring results are submitted with the UCMR in March and that the monitoring report, which does not include results, is an appendix to the UCMR.
- Lisa A. noted that this POC Monitoring Report is the last year the report will be submitted in October. The MRP 3.0 Tentative Order now requires the report to be submitted in March with the UCMR.
- Lucile asked if there was anything in C.19 (East County) that is different with respect to reporting. Lisa A. replied that nothing is different except that the methylmercury monitoring plan is due July 1, 2022. Everything else is combined with C.8.
- Lisa A. stated that for the upcoming year, RMP is piggybacking POC reconnaissance monitoring with CEC monitoring. They are looking for highly urban or highly undeveloped watersheds to sample. There will be a total of five reconnaissance monitoring samples collected throughout the Bay Area, including Marin County. Lisa A. and Lisa W. have already reviewed the locations and will advocate for CCCWP, putting forward at least two sites for the County. The watershed requirements are >1km² with >90% urban or <10% urban.
- The CCC Flood Control District (B. Baldwin) made a motion to recommend to Management Committee to approve the report. The City of Pittsburg (J. Longway) seconded it. There were no objections.

- **Source Control Load Reduction Accounting Report for RAA.** Lisa A. summarized that this report was initially submitted to the RWB in Fall 2020 and requires EO approval under MRP 2.0. The RWB provided feedback on the report in April 2021. The report describes the accounting process for source control measures (i.e., all control measures except GSI). The RWB was generally okay with the methodologies, the inputs, and the output. They noted that there was extraneous information in the discussion of the report. The RWB requested that the report include only the load reduction accounting methodologies and the appendices to support the methodologies. In response to this input, the report has been revised to meet the RWB requests and reorganized to match the flow of MRP 3.0 Provisions C.11/C.12. In response to additional internal MRP 3.0 C.11/C.12 Workgroup discussions, the report was also revised so that credit can be obtained for actions conducted on any old industrial area, not just old industrial source properties. Lisa A. described that the process at this point is that the Monitoring Committee recommends to Management Committee that the BAMSC (formerly known as BASMAA) Steering Committee submit the report to the RWB. RWB staff will review it again, after which it may be approved by the EO. The following additional items were discussed:
 - Michelle asked if this report defined how load reduction accounting will be completed under MRP 3.0? Lisa A. responded yes.
 - Lucile noted that the RWB wanting more revisions has a financial impact on the program. Lisa A. responded that the most recent round of revisions was not too costly and that the cost was shared between ACCWP, CCCWP, and SCVURPPP. The RWB stated they would have conditionally approved the report, but the programs decided that a stand-alone report was better.
 - Lucile asked if CCCWP was trying to get this submitted before additional SMARTS requirements came into play and each program would have to submit the report individually. Karin replied that there is a meeting next week to discuss how the Program's reports will be submitted to the RWB. Karin will check in with Jill Bicknell about adding this report to the next BAMSC meeting so that other programs can provide feedback.
 - Jolan wanted to clarify if credit could be obtained by adding control measures to old industrial areas with direct discharge to the Bay? Lisa A. stated that she thought credit should be given to any old industrial area, including direct discharge. Though she noted that the report is silent about direct discharge properties. For the City of Richmond, two direct discharge properties with plans to be redeveloped were referred last year to the RWB. Load reduction credit was not taken at that time, but the credit will be applied at the time the property is abated or at 10 years. This way credit will be obtained by the 2030 TMDL milestone.
 - The City of Pittsburg (J. Longway) made a motion to recommend to Management Committee to recommend to BAMSC to submit the report to the RWB. The City of Walnut Creek (L. Paquette) seconded it. There were no objections.

- **MRP 3.0 Tentative Order Review Schedule.** Lisa W. reviewed the MRP 3.0 Tentative Order schedule for Monitoring Committee. The schedule includes key meeting dates (e.g., Workshops on October 12 and 13) as well as review periods for draft positions/letters.
- **MRP 3.0 Tentative Order Review.** Lisa A. walked through a summary of Tentative Order Provisions C.8, C.11, C.12, C.14, and C.19 with the committee. She highlighted how the RWB responded to comments submitted on the Administration Draft as well as new requirements. A summary of the provisions discussed is below:
 - C.8.d – GSI Monitoring. Tentative Order language generally mirrors the proposed language provided to the RWB via the workgroups. The Tentative Order requires a monitoring plan, a TAG, as well as different/new parameters to be sampled. An explanation needs to be provided if a required parameter is not monitored.
 - C.8.e – Trash. Tentative Order language generally mirrors the proposed language provided to the RWB via the workgroups. For Contra Costa County, the Tentative Order requires three wet weather events sampled annually at two sites. This provision also requires a TAG and a monitoring plan to be submitted by September 30, 2022 (it will be important to start this fiscal year). Lucile asked if the Tentative Order discussed what to do if there were not enough qualifying rain events for a given year. Would more samples need to be collected in subsequent years? Lisa A. replied that the Tentative Order appeared to be silent on this.
 - C.8.f. – POC Monitoring. Tentative Order language is generally as expected with some changes compared to MRP 2.0 CCCWP has to collect 70 PCBs, 50 Mercury, with a minimum of 8 per year for each parameter. Sixteen of the samples have to be for Monitoring Type 4&5 (trends), which is twice as many as required in MRP 2.0. Emerging contaminants have to be sampled but can be through RMP. The programs requested that the GSI monitoring could include CECs, but the RWB did not grant that request.
 - C.8.g – Pesticides and Toxicity Monitoring. This sub-provision appears to be the same as MRP 2.0. Lucile shared that CASQA just put out more info on pesticides.
 - C.8.h. – Reporting.
 - Staff will need to clarify what data needs to give data to CEDEN. Lucile explained that ADH will sometimes submit data directly to the RWB (e.g., timeseries).
 - The Tentative Order requires a comprehensive analysis of all bioassessment monitoring conducted for WY2012-2021 by March 31, 2022. Lucile stated that this reporting requirement was expected. Lisa A. added that a bioassessment summary report was completed relatively recently so it needs

to be updated to include the most recent water years. This effort will be conducted through regional collaboration.

- C.11.d.iii. The recommended edit to change from reporting mass to volume (i.e., barrel counting) was not made in the Tentative Order. Beth B. asked if maybe it was just an oversight. Lisa A. replied that she thought it was intentional to require reporting by mass. There is a calculator that was used in MRP 1 which will likely be used again.
- C.12. PCBs Controls. More discussion on this provision to follow in subsequent meetings. This provision still includes 1.6 kg/yr load reduction (600 g/yr by Old Industrial). The Tentative Order now requires that 1,119 acres of old industrial require treatment or 203 g/yr. This is a very high number, CCCWP had recommended treating 266 acres of Old Industrial. This is now the most important monitoring issue.
- **Next Steps / Action Items.**
 - Lisa W. will send the MRP 3.0 Tentative Order review schedule and the response summary on Provisions C.8, C.11, C.12, C.14, and C.19 to Monitoring Committee ASAP.
 - Lisa W. will send draft positions on the Tentative Order to the Monitoring Committee by Thursday, September 16. Monitoring Committee to send a review of draft positions to Geosyntec by Monday, September 20. Select Committee will meet on Tuesday, September 21 to discuss positions, topics, and speakers, for the Workshops.
- **Adjournment.** The acting Chair adjourned the meeting at 12:00 pm.

Next Scheduled Monitoring Committee Meeting: Monday, October 11, 2021, 10:00 AM- 12:00 noon, Zoom meeting.



Municipal Operations Committee (MOC)
Meeting Minutes
September 21, 2021

MUNICIPALITY	ATTENDED [via Web/Phone]
VOTING	
City of Antioch	<i>Phil Hoffmeister</i>
City of Brentwood	<i>Melissa Barcelona</i>
City of Concord	<i>Jesse Crawford</i>
Contra Costa County	<i>Michelle Giolli (Vice Chair), Beth Baldwin</i>
Town of Danville	
City of El Cerrito	<i>Stephen Prée</i>
City of Martinez	
City of Pittsburg	<i>Joseph Camaddo (Chair), Jolan Longway</i>
City of Richmond	
City of San Pablo	<i>Karineh Samkian</i>
City of Walnut Creek	<i>Lucile Paquette</i>
NON-VOTING	
PROGRAM STAFF and CONSULTANTS	
Staff Augmentation	<i>Elizabeth Yin</i>
Program Staff	<i>Mitch Avalon</i>
GUESTS	

1. **Introductions/Announcements:** Joe Camaddo (City of Pittsburg) welcomed the group to the Zoom call and asked for announcements. No announcements were made.
2. **Approval of Minutes:** Quorum was achieved late in the meeting. Phil Hoffmeister (City of Antioch) made a motion to approve the August 17, 2021 Meeting Summary. San Pablo seconded the motion. The Committee voted to approve the August 17, 2021 Meeting Summary
3. **MRP 3.0 Tentative Order:**
 - Overview
 - i. The MRP 3.0 Tentative Order was released on Sept 10, with a comment period ending on Nov 9. The SFRWQCB will hold workshops on Oct 12, Oct 13. Final Approval of MRP 3.0 is expected in February 2022.
 - ii. Elizabeth Yin (CCCWP) provided an update on the Program’s schedule for responding to the MRP 3.0 Tentative Order, including staff review assignments, committee participation requirements, and schedule for providing testimonies at workshops and developing written comments.
 - iii. Elizabeth provided a review of the topics identified by the Program and the Select Committee as being key topics for providing testimonial at the MRP 3.0 Workshops.
 - Tentative Order

- i. Elizabeth walked through a summary of Tentative Order Provisions C.2, C.4, C.5, C.9, C.10, C.13, C.15, and C.22 with the Committee. She highlighted how the SF Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board) responded to comments submitted on the Administrative Draft as well as any new changes to the provisions. Overall, very few of the comments the Committee developed and submitted on the Administrative Draft were addressed. The Committee decided to carry previous comments forward for any comments or areas that were not addressed by the Regional Board.
- ii. A summary of the provisions discussed is below:
 - C.2 – Municipal Operations. Comments submitted for the Administrative draft were not addressed. Committee decided to carry the previous comments forward.
 - C.4 – Industrial and Commercial Site Controls. Although the Tentative Order contained a few editorial changes in this Provision as compared to the Administrative Draft, no substantive changes were made to address the Committee’s previous concerns. A discussion was held regarding the feasibility of conducting inspections on new categories of businesses, such as mobile businesses. Comments on this Provision will be carried forward to the Tentative Order, with additional request to clarify language regarding the implementation of inspecting a mobile businesses.
 - C.5 – Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination. Although the Tentative Order contained a few editorial changes in this Provision as compared to the Administrative Draft, no substantive changes were made to address the Committee’s previous concerns. A discussion was held regarding the feasibility of conducting inspections on new categories of businesses, such as mobile businesses. Comments on this Provision will be carried forward to the Tentative Order, with additional request to clarify language regarding the implementation of inspecting a mobile businesses.
 - C.9 – Pesticides Toxicity Control. The Regional Board did respond to a comment within this Provision. The Committee discussed comments that were not addressed by the Regional Board, such as new language and requirements in C.9.c.i. The Committee recommended carrying comments forward to the Tentative Order for comments that were not addressed by the Regional Board.
 - C.10 – Trash Load Reduction. While the Tentative Order was updated with a few minor changes to deadlines in this section, no substantive changes were made to address the Committee’s comments and concerns. Additional language was added in the Tentative Order that increased the requirements for Direct Discharge Control Plans. The implications of all requirements proposed by this Provision were discussed by the Committee. Several items were identified to be brought forward during the MRP 3.0 workshop. Comments not addressed by the Regional Board will be brought forward into comments on the Tentative Order.
 - C.13 – Copper Controls. Comments submitted for the Administrative draft were not addressed. Committee decided to carry the previous comments forward.

- C15 – Exempt and Conditionally Exempted Discharges. The Administrative Draft included new requirements for Provision C.15.b.iii, which were expanded upon in the Tentative Order. The Committee discussed the new requirements under this provision, and decided to carry the previous comments forward.

4. Program Update:

- Annual Report Status
 - i. Elizabeth gave a status update on the Annual Report. Permittees should complete their Municipal Annual Reports and submit them to the Program after final submissions are completed on September 30th.
- AGOL
 - i. Elizabeth announced that a formal process for evaluating AGOL will begin in November.
- RFQ Process
 - i. Elizabeth provided a reminder that the Program will be using existing committees to review existing RFPs and to provide feedback to Karin Graves (CCCWP).

5. Old/New Business:

- Elizabeth provided a reminder for the Committee to review their respective No Dumping Call lines. The No Dumping Call line has been updated with new scripts. MOC members should review all menus and call flows work according to the design. Anything that needs correction will be updated and compiled by Karin and then sent to Michael Burger (CCCWP).

6. Adjournment: Chair Joe Camaddo adjourned at 11:50 AM.



Meeting Summary
Development Committee
September 22, 2021
1:30 – 3:30

Voting Members:

Municipality	Attending	Absent
City of Brentwood	Aman Grewal	
City of Clayton		Laura Hoffmeister
City of Concord	Mitra Abkenari	
Contra Costa County	Michele Mancuso/Michelle Giolli	
Town of Danville	Bob Russell	
City of Lafayette	Matt Luttrupp	
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	Lucile Paquette, Joel Camacho	

Program Staff/Consultants

Mitch Avalon	Consultant
Alina Constantinescu	Consultant
Dan Cloak	Consultant

Introductions, Announcements, and Changes to Agenda

The meeting was held via Zoom. Dan noted publication of the City of San Jose's Green Stormwater Infrastructure Maintenance Field Guide, which is available via a link on that City's [Green Stormwater Infrastructure webpage](#). It was noted that at last month's meeting, it was announced that CASQA has updated their Development BMP Handbook. It is now available by subscription for \$1,800 per year (11-25 users), and \$450 for each annual renewal. Dan said that he had obtained and reviewed the current version. Initial review indicates that it is largely made up of material in the previous handbook, plus some additional information in the public domain (for example, the [San Mateo County Sustainable Green Streets and Parking](#)

[Lots Design Guidebook](#) (2009)). It was suggested that no action regarding a subscription is needed at this time.

There were no changes to the agenda.

Approve Previous Meeting Summaries

On a motion by Frank Kennedy, seconded by Joe Camaddo, the summaries of the July 27, 2021 and August 25, 2021 meetings were accepted.

Municipal Regional Permit 3.0

The Committee reviewed and discussed the September 22, 2021 memorandum, “Provision C.3—Major Issues in the MRP 3.0 Tentative Order,” which was included in the agenda packet. Discussion included the following points:

- The requirements for single family homes in the range of 5,000 to 10,000 SF of impervious are created or replaced still seem ambiguous.
- AB 9 will stimulate subdivision and construction on smaller residential lots. It is not yet clear which stormwater requirements these projects will typically have to implement.
- The addition of some road maintenance projects to the category of Regulated Projects, plus the permit requirement that now explicitly requires treatment of runoff from pavement within the public ROW that is new or replaced as part of a Regulated development project, plus the minimum acreage of Green Infrastructure to be constructed as non-Regulated projects during the permit term—in combination these requirements create the need for complex tracking of square footage, for example, when Green Infrastructure is built in the street frontage of a development project.
- The new roads requirements are to be implemented immediately when the permit takes effect.

Development Committee members agreed to send any additional comments on the memo or on the Tentative Order to Alina and Dan.

Stormwater C.3 Guidebook, 8th Edition

Dan directed the Committee’s attention to the “Working List of Objectives and Tasks for Guidebook Revisions” included in the agenda packet (it was also included in the agenda packet for the previous meeting on August 25).

To begin the revisions, Dan drafted a new “Start” chapter for the 8th Edition, retitled “Do These Things First.” Dan noted this 2-page introductory section had been rewritten to emphasize the need to focus on LID design early in the land development process.

Lucile noted, and other participants concurred, that there was a need to call out changes that will be new for MRP 3.0—possibly using different font or other way to easily identify the changes. Dan agreed, and also noted that a memorandum listing key changes will be

prepared and posted alongside the new edition on the website, as has been done with previous updates.

Dan directed the Committee's attention to the table, "Proposed Revisions to *Stormwater C.3 Guidebook* Chapter One," included in the agenda packet. He noted that many of the changes in Chapter One will be to align with new requirements in MRP 3.0; therefore work on the changes will need to wait until permit adoption. However, revisions to the section on requirements for subdivision maps are not driven by permit changes and can be worked on now.

In response to Dan's questions, the participants discussed the current (7th Ed.) *Guidebook* requirements, which are on pp. 7-9. It was noted that implementing the requirements is more difficult on smaller subdivisions as compared to larger ones. It is still somewhat common to have bioretention facilities located on individual residential lots, rather than in the private street ROW or common areas, as is recommended. Frank, Mitra, and Joel agreed to participate in an informal work group (perhaps entirely by email) to review and provide input for redrafting of this section of Chapter One.

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

No items were brought up.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 PM.

NEXT DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING:

Wednesday, October 27, 2021

1:30 PM – 3:30 PM

Via videoconference

**FY 2020-21 Year-End Carryover Report
November 2021**

		Description/Expenditure	Adopted FY 2020/21	Adjusted FY 2020/21 Dec 15, 2020		FY 20/21 Expenditure	Unspent Budget in FY 20/21
1		Administrative/Personnel (See Admin Worksheet)	\$2,047,318	\$2,337,856		\$ 1,121,620	\$ 1,216,236
2	7608	Staff Salaries and Benefits + County Overhead	\$1,533,362	\$1,559,143		\$ 519,646	\$ 1,039,497
3	7609	Staff Augmentation (Larry Walker Associates, Inc. for 12 months)	\$124,552	\$249,103		\$ 180,596	\$ 68,508
4	7609	Staff Augmentation (Wood E&I Solutions, Inc. for 12 months)/Geosyntec	\$132,005	\$264,010		\$ 235,670	\$ 28,340
5	7609	Staff Augmentation (Watershed Resources Consulting for 6 months if PM is on leave)	\$101,400	\$210,600		\$ 155,000	\$ 55,600
6	7609	Staff Augmentation (Transition Training)	\$50,000	\$0		\$ -	\$ -
7	7609	On-Call Staff Augmentation (as needed)	\$100,000	\$49,000		\$ -	\$ 49,000
8	7608	Staff Training and Conferences	\$6,000	\$6,000		\$ -	\$ 6,000
9	7612	Non-Program County Staff Labor	\$0	\$0		\$ 30,708	\$ (30,708)
10		General Supplies & Equipment	\$7,435	\$7,435		\$ 1,998	\$ 5,437
11	7605	Misc. Office Equipment/Supplies not covered by County Overhead	\$6,600	\$6,600		\$ 1,188	\$ 5,412
11	7605	PLACEHOLDER Groupsite replacement	\$10,000	\$0		\$ -	\$ -
12	7605	Groupsite Annual Fee	\$835	\$835		\$ 810	\$ 25
13		Association/Memberships/License Fees	\$81,174	\$81,174		\$ 67,132	\$ 14,042
14	7611	Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association (BASMAA)	\$49,118	\$49,118		\$ 38,152	\$ 10,966
15	7611	ESRI (AGOL Annual License Fee)	\$10,000	\$10,000		\$ 10,000	\$ -
16	7611	Bay Friendly Landscape Coalition (BFLC)	\$0	\$0		\$ -	\$ -
17	7611	California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA)	\$22,056	\$22,056		\$ 18,980	\$ 3,076
18		Legal Services	\$40,000	\$60,000		\$ 26,172	\$ 33,828
19	7606	County Counsel and Contract Administration	\$10,000	\$10,000		\$ 15,379	\$ (5,379)
20	7610	On-Call Services Legal Services (Richards, Watson & Gershon)	\$30,000	\$30,000		\$ 10,793	\$ 19,207
21	7613	Alternative Compliance Legal Review (Richards, Watson & Gershon/County Counsel)	\$0	\$20,000		\$ -	\$ 20,000
22		Regional Projects	\$193,646	\$193,646		\$ 184,169	\$ 9,477
23	7618	BASMAA	\$20,000	\$20,000		\$ 9,743	\$ 10,257
24	7618	SFEI-RMP	\$173,646	\$173,646		\$ 174,426	\$ (780)
25		Technical Services (See Technical Services Worksheet)	\$497,100	\$497,100		\$ 419,258	\$ 77,842
26	7616	Project Management, Technical Review, Regulatory Compliance, etc. (LWA/Geosyntec)	\$122,000	\$122,000		\$ 126,717	\$ (4,717)
27	7616	Project Management, Technical Review, Regulatory Compliance, etc. (Wood)	\$20,000	\$20,000		\$ 11,924	\$ 8,076
28	7645	Project Management, Technical Review, Regulatory Compliance, etc. (Dan Cloak)	\$160,000	\$160,000		\$ 153,213	\$ 6,788
29	7665	GIS/AGOL Maintenance, Minor Upgrades (Psomas)	\$35,000	\$35,000		\$ 35,000	\$ -
30	7617	Youth/Outreach; Media Management (ProPose aka Sagent)	\$160,100	\$160,100		\$ 92,404	\$ 67,696
31	7654	Municipal Operations (C.2) - Training/Workshop (See MOC Worksheet)	\$3,000	\$3,000		\$ -	\$ 3,000
32		New Development/Redevelopment (C.3) (See Development Worksheet)	\$113,000	\$113,000		\$ 11,527	\$ 101,473

**FY 2020-21 Year-End Carryover Report
November 2021**

33	7641		Hydromodification Management Modeling (Dubin)	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$ 11,527	\$ 23,473
34	7641		Hydromodification Management Maps (Psomas)	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$ -	\$ 15,000
35	7641		Hydromodification Management Calculator (TBD)	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$ -	\$ 40,000
36	7641		Green Infrastructure Design Guidelines (TBD)	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$ -	\$ 20,000
37	7645		Annual C.3 Training/Workshop	\$3,000	\$3,000		\$ 3,000
38	7664		Industrial/Commercial Controls (C.4) - Training/Workshop (See MOC Worksheet)	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ -
39	7662		Illicit Discharge/Detection and Elimination (C.5) (See MOC Worksheet)	\$0	\$0	\$ -	\$ -
40	7628		Construction Controls (C.6) See Development worksheet (LWA)	\$0	\$0	\$ -	\$ -
41			Public Information/Participation (C.7) (See PIP Worksheet)	\$64,600	\$64,600	\$ 47,332	\$ 17,268
42	7617		Misc. Outreach (Updating materials for other Permit provisions)	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$ -	\$ 5,000
43	7617		Watershed Stewardship (Green Business Program)	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ -
44	7617		Bringing Back the Natives Garden Tour (Kathy Kramer-Sponsor)	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$ 16,000	\$ -
45	7617		Used Oil/Student Outreach /Youth Programs (Matt Bolender)	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$ 1,982	\$ 18
46	7617		Outreach Effectiveness Evaluation (TBD)	\$20,600	\$20,600	\$ 17,774	\$ 2,826
47	7617		Website Maintenance and Hosting (WebSight Design)	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$ 5,577	\$ 9,423
48			Water Quality Monitoring (C.8) (See Monitoring Worksheet)	\$502,815	\$502,815	\$ 402,969	\$ 99,846
49	7618		Creek Status and Pesticides Monitoring	\$272,950	\$272,950	\$ 237,023	\$ 35,927
50	7618		UCMRs	\$77,765	\$77,765	\$ 77,710	\$ 55
51	7618		POC Monitoring and Reporting	\$20,600	\$20,600	\$ 5,493	\$ 15,107
52	7618		MeHg Study (Only)	\$5,150	\$5,150	\$ -	\$ 5,150
53	7618		Monitoring and Reporting Support	\$20,600	\$20,600	\$ 17,313	\$ 3,287
54	7618		Provide Fish Risk Flyers/Signs	\$5,150	\$5,150	\$ 816	\$ 4,334
55	7618		Distribute Fish Risk Flyers	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$ 22,173	\$ (11,873)
56	7618		Effectiveness Evaluation and Status Report	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$ -	\$ 10,300
57	7618		TMDL Implementation Plan/RAA	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$ 20,577	\$ 14,423
58	7618		East County RAA	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$ 21,864	\$ 13,136
59	7618		Monitoring Contingency	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$ -	\$ 10,000
60			Pesticide Toxicity Control (C.9) (See MOC Worksheet)	\$66,100	\$66,100	\$ 45,607	\$ 20,493
61	7636		Our Water Our World (Debi Tidd Consulting)	\$65,600	\$65,600	\$ 45,607	\$ 19,993
62	7636		Outreach to Pest Control Professionals	\$500	\$500	\$ -	\$ 500
63	7620		Trash Reduction (C.10) (See MOC Worksheet)	\$0	\$0	\$ -	\$ -
64	7618		Mercury Controls (C.11)	\$0	\$0	\$ -	\$ -
65	7618		PCBs Controls (C.12)	\$0	\$0	\$ -	\$ -
66	7618		Managing PCBs during Building Demolition - Data Collection	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$ 19,914	\$ 87
67	7665		GIS Modification Needs Assessment	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$ -	\$ 50,000
68			GROUP PROGRAM BUDGET SUBTOTAL	\$3,689,188	\$3,999,726	\$ 2,350,697	\$ 1,649,029
69	7698		2% CONTINGENCY	\$73,784	\$79,995		\$ 79,995
70			TOTAL GROUP ACTIVITIES BUDGET	\$3,762,972	\$4,079,720		\$ 1,729,024

**FY 2020-21 Year-End Carryover Report
November 2021**

71		CONTINGENCY EXPENSE	\$0	\$0		\$ -
72		SALARY CREDIT (6 Months)	(\$46,686)	(\$93,372)		\$ (93,372)
73		SALARY SAVINGS (Other)	\$0	\$0		\$ 5,576
74		SALARY SAVINGS (WMPS)	(\$243,189)	(\$486,378)		\$ (486,378)
75		SUBTOTAL	(\$289,875)	(\$579,750)		\$ (574,174)
76		<i>NET SUBTOTAL GROUP PROGRAM BUDGET</i>	<i>\$3,473,097</i>	<i>\$3,499,970</i>		
77		SUA FUNDING CAP	\$3,500,000	\$3,500,000		
78	7640	RESERVES EXPENSE	\$0	\$0		\$ 1,154,850
79		NET TOTAL GROUP PROGRAM BUDGET	\$3,473,097	\$3,499,970		
80		<i>Reserves Balance</i>	<i>\$1,390,807</i>	<i>\$1,883,094</i>		\$ 3,037,944



Date: November 17, 2021

To: Management Committee
From: Mitch Avalon, Program Consultant
Subject: Budget Adjustment for FY 21/22

Recommendation:

Accept the staff report and direct staff to prepare an adjusted budget to be reviewed and approved at the December 15, 2021 Management Committee meeting.

Background:

There are two drivers for adjusting the FY 21/22 budget:

Staffing. The approved FY 21/22 budget assumed full staffing, however at the beginning of the fiscal year, on July 1, 2021, the two watershed planner positions were vacant. A budget adjustment was approved by the Management Committee on August 18, 2021 to provide staff augmentation services until December 31, 2021. The County will be advertising the two vacant watershed planner positions soon and expect to have interviews to fill the positions around the first of the year. Assuming a successful selection process, the positions could be filled by March or April. It is certain the positions will not be filled by December 31, so another budget adjustment will be necessary to continue staff augmentation services until the positions are filled. Staff is recommending adjusting the budget for a full six months of staff augmentation, until June 30, 2022, and show six months credit for staff vacancies. Whenever staff positions are filled, the budget will pick up the new salaries and end staff augmentation services.

MRP 3.0. There are several new requirements in the MRP 3.0 Tentative Order that will require advance work in FY 21/22 to meet the submittal schedules in the proposed permit provisions. For example, the Cost Reporting Framework is due on December 31, 2022 and the PCBs Treatment Report, outlining the control measures to treat 1,119 acres in old industrial areas, is due on September 30, 2022. The comment letter on the Tentative Order submitted to the Regional Water Board requested changes to the permit language to provide reasonable and workable schedules. However, if the schedules in the Tentative Order are not changed, advance work will have to be done in FY 21/22. Attached is a worksheet showing the anticipated advance work needed for MRP 3.0 scheduling outlined in the Tentative Order.

Attached is a spreadsheet showing the first draft of the adjusted budget, using the adopted adjusted budget for the first six months of the fiscal year as a baseline for the proposed adjusted budget for the last six months of the fiscal year. The spreadsheet shows increased budget for staff augmentation in the "Administrative/Personnel" section and a new line item in the "Technical Services" section for MRP 3.0 advance work. The total increase in the adjusted budget exceeds the \$3.5 million budget threshold by \$271,000, which would have to be taken out of reserves. Some adjustments could be made to reduce reserve drawdown, such as eliminating the budget line item for On-call Staff Augmentation. This line item, which would not be needed as we are budgeting staff augmentation for the full fiscal year, would save \$50,000. It is recommended the Committee provide staff with direction on preparing the final draft Adjusted Budget for approval at the December 15, 2021 Management Committee meeting, including specific line item adjustments.

Fiscal Impact:

The adjusted budget will increase technical services costs by approximately \$155,000, and staff augmentation costs by approximately \$385,000. The total increase is \$540,000, however this is offset partially by salary savings of about \$257,000, so the actual budget increase is approximately \$283,000 (disregarding any budget contingency).

Attachment:

FY 21/22 First Draft Adjusted Budget
MRP 3.0 Technical Services Worksheet

Contra Costa Clean Water Program (CCCWP)
Fiscal Year 2021/22 Group Program Budget -ADOPTED
ADJUSTED December 15, 2021 (DRAFT)

		Description/Expenditure	Adopted FY 2020/21	Adjusted FY 2020/21 Dec 16, 2020	Adopted FY 2021/22	Adjusted FY 2021/22 August 18, 2021	Adjusted FY 2021/22 Dec 15, 2021 DRAFT (1)	FY 2021/22 Notes	FY 2020/21 Notes
1		Administrative/Personnel (See Admin Worksheet)	\$2,047,318	\$2,337,856	\$1,528,583	\$1,804,859	\$2,190,337		
2	7608	Staff Salaries and Benefits + County Overhead	\$1,533,362	\$1,559,143	\$1,308,383	\$1,308,383	\$1,308,383	6 FTE + 3% COLA	
3	7609	Staff Augmentation (Larry Walker Associates, Inc. for 12 months)	\$124,552	\$249,103	\$0	\$154,963	\$309,926		
4	7609	Staff Augmentation (Geosyntec, Inc. for 12 months)	\$132,005	\$264,010	\$0	\$121,314	\$242,628		increased by \$5,628
5	7609	Staff Augmentation (Watershed Resources Consulting for 12 months)	\$101,400	\$210,600	\$109,200	\$109,200	\$218,400		
6	7609	Staff Augmentation (Transition Training)	\$50,000	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000		
7	7609	On-Call Staff Augmentation (as needed)	\$100,000	\$49,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000		
8	7608	Staff Training and Conferences	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000		
9	7612	Non-Program County Staff Labor	\$0	\$0	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000		
10		General Supplies & Equipment	\$7,435	\$7,435	\$7,788	\$7,788	\$7,788		
11	7605	Misc. Office Equipment/Supplies not covered by County Overhead	\$6,600	\$6,600	\$6,600	\$6,600	\$6,600		
12	7605	Groupsite Annual Fee	\$835	\$835	\$1,188	\$1,188	\$1,188	New rate for G/S (old rate \$810)	
13		Association/Memberships/License Fees	\$81,174	\$81,174	\$72,720	\$72,720	\$72,720		
14	7611	Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association (BASMAA)	\$49,118	\$49,118	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	For interim Regional coordination	assume 3%
15	7611	ESRI (AGOL Annual License Fee)	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000		
16	7611	Bay Friendly Landscape Coalition (BFLC)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
17	7611	California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA)	\$22,056	\$22,056	\$22,720	\$22,720	\$22,720	assume 3% increase	assume 3%
18		Legal Services	\$40,000	\$60,000	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000		
19	7606	County Counsel and Contract Administration	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000		
20	7610	On-Call Services Legal Services (Richards, Watson & Gershon)	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$10K for BASMAA MOA	MRP 3.0 negotiations
21	7613	Alternative Compliance Legal Review (Richards, Watson & Gershon/County Counsel)	\$0	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000		
22		Regional Projects	\$193,646	\$193,646	\$178,855	\$178,855	\$178,855		
23	7618	BASMAA	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$0		see MOU
24	7618	SFEI-RMP	\$173,646	\$173,646	\$178,855	\$178,855	\$178,855	assume 3% increase	assume 3%
25		Technical Services (See Technical Services Worksheet)	\$497,100	\$497,100	\$483,300	\$583,300	\$738,300		
26	7616	Project Management, Technical Review, Regulatory Compliance, etc. (LWA/Geosyntec)	\$122,000	\$122,000	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$125,000	assume 3% increase	
27	7616	Project Management, Technical Review, Regulatory Compliance, etc. (Wood)	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000		Added \$20K
28	7645	Project Management, Technical Review, Regulatory Compliance, etc. (Dan Cloak)	\$160,000	\$160,000	\$160,000	\$160,000	\$160,000		
29	7645	Development Committee Projects (TBD)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000	Projects TBD; \$50K LWA	
30	7665	GIS/AGOL Maintenance, Minor Upgrades (Psomas)	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000		\$15K for hydromaps moved to Development
31	7617	Youth/Outreach; Media Management (ProPose aka Sagent)	\$160,100	\$160,100	\$113,300	\$113,300	\$113,300		3% increase
32	7616	MRP 3.0 Advance Work	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$155,000		
33	7654	Municipal Operations (C.2) - Training/Workshop (See MOC Worksheet)	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000		
34		New Development/Redevelopment (C.3) (See Development Worksheet)	\$113,000	\$113,000	\$178,000	\$178,000	\$178,000		
35	7641	Hydromodification Management Modeling (Dubin)	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000		
36	7641	Hydromodification Management Maps (Psomas)	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000		
37	7641	Hydromodification Management Calculator (TBD)	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000		
38	7641	Green Infrastructure Design Guidelines (TBD)	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000		
39	7641	Peak Flow Control Calculator	\$0	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000		

Contra Costa Clean Water Program (CCCWP)
Fiscal Year 2021/22 Group Program Budget -ADOPTED
ADJUSTED December 15, 2021 (DRAFT)

		Description/Expenditure	Adopted FY 2020/21	Adjusted FY 2020/21 Dec 16, 2020	Adopted FY 2021/22	Adjusted FY 2021/22 August 18, 2021	Adjusted FY 2021/22 Dec 15, 2021 DRAFT (1)	FY 2021/22 Notes	FY 2020/21 Notes
40	7645	Annual C.3 Training/Workshop	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000		
41	7664	Industrial/Commercial Controls (C.4) - Training/Workshop (See MOC Worksheet)	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000		
42	7662	Illicit Discharge/Detection and Elimination (C.5) (See MOC Worksheet)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
43	7628	Construction Controls (C.6) See Development worksheet (LWA)	\$0	\$0	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000		
44		Public Information/Participation (C.7) (See PIP Worksheet)	\$64,600	\$64,600	\$44,000	\$44,000	\$44,000		
45	7617	Misc. Outreach (Updating materials for other Permit provisions)	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000		
46	7617	Watershed Stewardship (Green Business Program)	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000		
47	7617	Bringing Back the Natives Garden Tour (Kathy Kramer-Sponsor)	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,000		
48	7617	Used Oil/Student Outreach /Youth Programs (Matt Bolender)	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000		
49	7617	Outreach Effectiveness Evaluation (TBD)	\$20,600	\$20,600	\$0	\$0	\$0		due 9/2020
50	7617	Website Maintenance and Hosting (WebSight Design)	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000		
51		Water Quality Monitoring (C.8) (See Monitoring Worksheet)	\$502,815	\$502,815	\$568,674	\$571,674	\$571,674	assume 3% increase	C.12 Project Services
52	7618	Creek Status and Pesticides Monitoring	\$272,950	\$272,950	\$281,139	\$281,139	\$281,139		
53	7618	UCMRs	\$77,765	\$77,765	\$80,098	\$80,098	\$80,098		
54	7618	POC Monitoring and Reporting	\$20,600	\$20,600	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000		
55	7618	MeHg Study (Only)	\$5,150	\$5,150	\$5,305	\$5,305	\$5,305		
56	7618	Monitoring and Reporting Support	\$20,600	\$20,600	\$41,218	\$41,218	\$41,218		
57	7618	Provide Fish Risk Flyers/Signs	\$5,150	\$5,150	\$5,305	\$5,305	\$5,305		
58	7618	Distribute Fish Risk Flyers	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$10,609	\$10,609	\$10,609		
59	7618	Effectiveness Evaluation and Status Report	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000		
60	7618	Marsh Creek Monitoring	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000		added \$5,000; Project Services (LWA)
61	7618	TMDL Implementation Plan/RAA	\$0	\$0	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	LWA monitoring	
62	7618	POC Load Reduction Report	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	LWA monitoring	
63	7618	Manage Building Material PCB's	\$0	\$0	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	Geosyntec	
64	7618	East County RAA	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	LWA monitoring	Project Services (LWA)
65	7618	East County Pyrethroid Management Plan Monitoring Report	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,000	\$3,000	ADH	
66	7618	Monitoring Contingency	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000		
67		Pesticide Toxicity Control (C.9) (See MOC Worksheet)	\$66,100	\$66,100	\$67,993	\$67,993	\$67,993	assume 3% increase	
68	7636	Our Water Our World (Debi Tidd Consulting)	\$65,600	\$65,600	\$67,493	\$67,493	\$67,493		assume 3%; up to 36 store count
69	7636	Outreach to Pest Control Professionals	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$500		
70	7620	Trash Reduction (C.10) (See MOC Worksheet)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
71	7618	Mercury Controls (C.11)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
72	7618	PCBs Controls (C.12)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
73	7618	Managing PCBs during Building Demolition - Data Collection	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$0		LWA
74	7665	GIS Modification Needs Assessment	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000		
75		GROUP PROGRAM BUDGET SUBTOTAL	\$3,689,188	\$3,999,726	\$3,262,913	\$3,642,189	\$4,182,667		
76	7698	2% CONTINGENCY	\$73,784	\$79,995	\$65,258	\$72,844	\$83,653		
77		TOTAL GROUP ACTIVITIES BUDGET	\$3,762,972	\$4,079,720	\$3,328,172	\$3,715,033	\$4,266,321		
78		CONTINGENCY EXPENSE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
79		SALARY CREDIT (PM)(12 Months)	(\$46,686)	(\$93,372)	(\$63,666)	(\$53,891)	(\$107,782)	34% salary credit for 6 months	25% savings credit for 6 months

Contra Costa Clean Water Program (CCCWP)
 Fiscal Year 2021/22 Group Program Budget -ADOPTED
 ADJUSTED December 15, 2021 (DRAFT)

		Description/Expenditure	Adopted FY 2020/21	Adjusted FY 2020/21 Dec 16, 2020	Adopted FY 2021/22	Adjusted FY 2021/22 August 18, 2021	Adjusted FY 2021/22 Dec 15, 2021 DRAFT (1)	FY 2021/22 Notes	FY 2020/21 Notes
80		SALARY SAVINGS (Other)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
81		SALARY SAVINGS (WMPS)(12 months)	(\$243,189)	(\$486,378)	\$0	(\$203,401)	(\$406,802)		6 mo savings for two vacancies
82		SUBTOTAL	(\$289,875)	(\$579,750)	(\$63,666)	(\$257,292)	(\$514,584)		
83		NET SUBTOTAL GROUP PROGRAM BUDGET	\$3,473,097	\$3,499,970	\$3,264,506	\$3,457,742	\$3,751,737		
84		SUA FUNDING CAP	\$3,500,000	\$3,500,000	\$3,500,000	\$3,500,000	\$3,500,000		
86		NET TOTAL GROUP PROGRAM BUDGET	\$3,473,097	\$3,499,970	\$3,264,506	\$3,457,742	\$3,751,737		

Adjusted Budget Needs FY 21/22: Pre-MRP 3.0 Technical Services

Task	Cost	Description of Work
Task A.2 MRP 3.0 Support	\$15,000	Support CCCWP for the final review and comment process for the MRP 3.0 adoption hearing in February.
Task A.5.1 Cost Reporting Framework (Provision C.20)	\$15,000	Per the MRP 3.0 Tentative Order, the cost reporting framework is due December 31, 2022. If this date is not changed, work on the framework will need to begin in FY 21/22.
Task B.6.1 Special Project to scope mapping storm drain outfall catchments for TMAs (Provision C.8.e.v.i)	\$5,000	Per the MRP 3.0 Tentative Order, the trash receiving water monitoring plan must be submitted by September 30, 2022. A primary data need for this task is mapping the storm drain outfall catchments. This task would scope the work effort to refine the cost of Task B.6.2
Task B.6.2 GIS delineation of storm drain outfall catchments for TMAs (Provision C.8.e.v.i)	\$50,000	Per the MRP 3.0 Tentative Order, the trash receiving water monitoring plan must be submitted by September 30, 2022. A primary data need for this task is mapping the storm drain outfall catchments. We estimate that this work would need to be completed by March 2022 to complete the trash monitoring plan by September. This cost is a placeholder; the cost of this task would be refined based on Task B.6.1.
Task E.3.2 East County RAA (Provision C.19.d.ii)	\$30,000	Preparation of the TMDL Control Measure Plan, which is due on August 1, 2022.
Task E.6.1 Program for Old Industrial Area Treatment (Provision C.11.c/C.12.c)	\$30,000	PCBs Treatment Report, outlining treatment of 1,119 acres in old industrial areas, is due September 30, 2022. If this date is not changed, this report will need to be written in FY 21/22.
Task F.4 POCs Load Reduction Accounting/Reporting (C.11.d,e/C.12.b,d,e)	\$10,000	The 2022 Annual Report (September 30, 2022) requires new information, including source properties, bridge inventory, Caltrans specifications, and municipal utility data. This budget is to format the new report.
Total	\$155,000	



Date: November 17, 2021

To: Management Committee
From: Mitch Avalon, Program Consultant
Subject: Budget Process for FY 22/23

Recommendation:

Accept the staff report and provide input on the process to develop a budget for FY 22/23.

Background:

Attached is an overview of the schedule for developing the FY 22/23 budget. A more detailed schedule of the process will be provided at the December meeting when the budget process begins in earnest. At that meeting, we will begin with a look at estimated expenditures for the current fiscal year (based on projected expenditures at end of the calendar year), policy considerations of what we want the budget to achieve for us (for example how do we want to handle distributing the costs for PCBs load reduction projects), and the assumptions staff will be using to develop budget information, including MRP 3.0 assumptions. Other potential budget items are changes caused by the dissolution of BASMAA, which should be cost neutral but will require some budget changes. For example, see attached letter from CASQA on Our Water Our World.

Fiscal Impact:

No impact at this juncture in the process.

Attachment:

FY 22/23, Budget Schedule Overview
CASQA letter regarding Our Water Our World

Contra Costa Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2022/23 Budget

Budget Schedule Overview

December 7, 2021 AC	Review budget timeline, policy, and assumptions
December 15, 2021 MC	
January 4, 2022 AC	Present first draft FY 2022/23 budget
January 19, 2022 MC	
February 1, 2022 AC	Review second draft of FY 2022/23 budget including midyear actuals for FY 2021/22
February 16, 2022 MC	
March 1, 2022 AC	Approve final draft of budget
March 16, 2022 MC	
March 17, 2022	Budget for FY 2022/23 is finalized and printed
July 1, 2022	Budget for FY 2021/22 becomes effective

Note: AC is the Administrative Committee date where the topic is introduced, and MC is the Management Committee date where the topic is approved.