CITY OF PINOLE

CITY HALL

2131 Pear Street
Pinole, CA 94564

Phone: (510) 724-9000
FAX: (510) 724-9826

July 8, 2015

Bruce Wolfe, Executive Officer
California Regional Water Quality Control Board
San Francisco Bay Region
1515 Clay St.
Oakland, CA 94612

Via email to: mrp.reissuance@waterboards.ca.gov

Subject: Opposition to the Tentative Order Reissuing the Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit (MRP 2.0)

Dear Mr. Wolfe and Members of the Board:

The City of Pinole is a community committed to improving water quality, however, it is a community with limited funds. We therefore believe that all elements of the new Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit must be effective in improving water quality and provide a clear path to compliance. The current Tentative Order includes unrealistic timeframes, unclear compliance language and methodology, and burdensome reporting that provides minimal water quality benefits. Therefore, the City of Pinole opposes MRP 2.0 as it is currently drafted, asks that your Board consider the following comments, and direct Water Board staff to work with permittees to revise the Tentative Order.

The draft Tentative Order includes a new mandate to develop Green Infrastructure Plans. This coordinated, multi-year effort requires comprehensive long range plans that will consume significant financial resources. For permittees to achieve this we ask that the following critical changes are included:

- The draft Tentative Order requires all permittees to assess each planned infrastructure project and add Green Infrastructure features where feasible. *We ask that permit language is clarified to allow permittees to analyze and consider factors such as: grading and drainage, pollutant loading associated with adjacent land use, use of available space within the project area, condition of existing infrastructure and potential funding to support LID elements.*

- The draft Tentative Order requires staff to develop and have council approve a new Green Infrastructure Framework within one year of the permits' effective date. *This is a very short timeframe to coordinate and educate upper level staff*

and elected officials, prepare the frameworks, conduct resource planning and accommodate lead times for bringing the framework to governing bodies. We ask that this timeframe is extended by 9 months.

Considerable time and effort has been spent discussing how to reduce levels of pollutants of concern flowing into our waterways, particularly PCBs. Failure to achieve the reductions specified in MRP 2.0 could result in our City being held in noncompliance. However, as drafted, MRP 2.0 provides no clear path for permittees to avoid noncompliance. Some examples include:

- The draft Tentative Order mandates achieving specified reductions in the total quantity of PCBs discharged from municipal storm drains. A major means of achieving these reductions is through removal of PCBs during building demolitions. However this fails to acknowledge that permittees have no control over timing of when properties redevelop. *We ask that development of a program to control PCBs during building demolitions, rather than applying controls to a specified number of buildings demolished, should represent compliance with this requirement.*

- The Tentative Order includes (in the Fact Sheet) an incomplete method to achieve stipulated reduction credits for each building demolished with PCB controls, for each redeveloped site with new bioretention facilities, and for finding and abating concentrated sources of PCBs. Permittees can't guarantee that they will find PCBs and be able to abate them. *We ask that development of a program to systematically identify and review potential sources, and refer them to appropriate agencies for abatement, be the basis for credit toward compliance.*

- The draft Tentative Order allows only four (4) months after Permit adoption for permittees to submit a more complete "measurement and estimation methodology and rationale" for stipulating PCB reduction credits. *We ask that BASMAA's PCBs programs accounting methodology be finalized, incorporated into the permit, and then used to calculate PCBs load reductions during permittee annual reporting.*

- Water Board staff has stated the threat of noncompliance is intended to strongly encourage permittees to find and abate hidden PCBs, and that Water Board staff would use "enforcement discretion" if and when permittees are unable to meet the mandated PCB load reductions. From a municipal government perspective, new financial and staffing commitments must be based on agreed upon goals and objectives. *We ask that the load reduction performance criteria not be the point of compliance. Most factors that are key to meeting the load reduction performance criteria are not within permittee control (e.g., extent of source properties that will be found, building demolition rates, and redevelopment rates), making achievement of compliance uncertain.*

The major new mandates in the Tentative Order will require a significant, sustained effort to implement, absent any new or additional funding source. The attached table summarizes adjustments that have been presented to Water Board staff that would

improve program efficiencies or eliminate certain less beneficial tasks. We look forward to resolution of the remaining issues and to implementing MRP 2.0.

Sincerely,

Peter Murray
Mayor

Attachment:
Requested Adjustments to Improve Efficiency in the Municipal Regional Permit, Including Elimination of "Less Beneficial Tasks".

Requested Adjustments to Improve Efficiency in the Municipal Regional Permit, Including Elimination of "Less Beneficial Tasks"

Provision	Task or Requirement	Requested Adjustments
C.2.f.	Corporation Yard inspection requirements.	Eliminate this requirement, as it duplicates the requirements for inspections already included in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPPs) for these same facilities.
C.3.b.i.	Eliminates grandfathering of Regulated Projects with vested tentative maps approved prior to advent of C.3 requirements	Allow municipalities flexibility to require these applicants to implement stormwater treatment requirements only to the extent not in conflict with state law and existing development agreements
C.3.b.ii.(4)	Certain Roads Projects are Regulated Projects under Provision C.3	Delete this requirement as the intent is superseded by the Green Infrastructure requirements in Provision C.3.j.
C.3.b.ii.(1)(c)	Requires projects where 50% or more of existing impervious area is redeveloped to provide treatment for entire area.	Delete this requirement as the intent is superseded by the Green Infrastructure requirements in Provision C.3.j.
C.3.e.ii.	Special Projects—allowance to use non-LID treatment on smart growth development projects that meet specified location and gross density criteria.	To avoid a disincentive for including pedestrian amenities, allow public plazas to be omitted from calculation of project gross density.
C.3.e.v.(1)	Requires Permittees to track Special Projects that have been identified (application submitted) but not approved.	Delete this requirement, as the number of projects, and amount of impervious area, has proven to be small.
C.3.e.v.(2)	Requires Permittees to conduct and document an analysis of the feasibility of LID treatment for Special Projects.	Delete this requirement, as it creates considerable additional effort for applicants and Permittees without any expected water-quality benefit.
C.3.g.vii.	Requires Contra Costa municipalities (through CCCWP) to submit a technical report describing how Contra Costa will implement current Permit hydromodification management requirements.	Delete requirement to submit a technical report. CCCWP submitted a 2013 report on the results of a multi-year monitoring study that concluded current policies and criteria meet these requirements.
C.3.g.iv.	Allows Permittees to propose a different method for sizing hydromodification management facilities that is not biased against Low Impact Development, but requires a Permit amendment before using the method.	Delete requirement for a Permit amendment before the method is used. Note: the Fact Sheet accompanying the Tentative Order states that Water Board Executive Officer approval would be required, not a Permit amendment.
C.3.h.ii.(6)(b)	Requires Permittees to inspect 20% of Regulated	Delete the annual requirement to allow flexibility in scheduling

Provision	Task or Requirement	Requested Adjustments
and (c)	Projects annually, as well as every project at least once every 5 years.	inspections.
C.3.j.i.(1)	Requires each Permittee to prepare and implement a Green Infrastructure Plan (framework for Plan due in 12 months; Plan due in 2019)	Extend the time for submittal of the required framework to a minimum of 20 months.
C.4, C.5, C.6	For inspections of businesses and construction sites, and for response to illicit discharges, requires that corrective actions of "actual or potential non-stormwater discharges" be implemented before the next rain event, but no longer than 10 business days after potential or actual non-stormwater discharges are discovered.	Delete references that specify types of corrective actions and timeframes for implementation, as these create a disincentive for identifying minor problems and create unproductive administrative work.
C.5.e.iii.	Requires Permittees to report a list of mobile cleaners operating in their jurisdiction.	Delete, as this information is unavailable.
C.5.e.iii.	Requires Permittees to report a list and summary of specific outreach events and education conducted to the different types of mobile businesses	Delete and clarify that requirements to inspect mobile businesses and abate discharges is covered by existing requirements elsewhere in Provisions C.4 and C.5.
C.7.a.	Permittees are required to mark and maintain "no dumping" markings on storm drain inlets.	Move this task to Provision C.2.
C.7.b.	Requires Permittees to participate in or contribute to "advertising" campaigns on specified subjects and assess results.	Change "advertising" to "outreach" to make explicit that a variety of methods, including social media, may be used. Delete references to specific subjects. Allow more flexibility.
C.9.c.	Requires Permittees to observe pesticide applications by their contractors.	Delete requirement.
C.10.a.i.a.	Requires Permittees to achieve a 70% load reduction by July 1, 2017	Extend this compliance date to 2018.
C.10.a.ii.b.	Requires Permittees to ensure private properties plumbed directly to municipal storm drains are equipped with full trash capture devices or to verify "low" trash generation rate. Requires Permittees to investigate and map these properties.	Delete the mapping requirement and integrate inspections and enforcement into Provision C.4 (Commercial and Industrial Inspections).
C.10.b.1.a.	Specifies maintenance frequencies for full trash capture devices based on trash generation rates.	Set minimum frequency of 1x/year for all devices, to be adjusted based on maintenance experience. Required maintenance frequency