

**Technical Advisory Group
Meeting Notes
San Pablo Avenue Stormwater Spine (SPASS)
Meeting #1, Regional Water Quality Control Board, RM1411 or Conference Call
Tuesday, September 25, 2012 11am – Noon**

In Attendance: Josh Bradt (SFEP); Ken Kortkamp (SFPUC); Mike Adamow (SFPUC); Brian Rowley (Caltrans); Wilfung Martono (Caltrans); Dale Bowyer (Water Board); Keith Lichten (Water Board); Dan Cloak (CCCCWP); Jerry Bradshaw (El Cerrito); Jen Hunt (SFEI); Rainer Hoenicke (SFEI); Erica Yelenski (USEPA)

Introductions: Self Introductions made

SPASS Project Overview & Status Update: Bradt provided powerpoint overview of project goals, major components, funding sources and schedule. Further info on project available on SFEP webpage at: <http://www.sfestuary.org/projects/detail2.php?projectId=56>.

Sites selected, available data provided by City partners & requested from utilities. Topo surveys and potholing activities are on-deck. Schematics will be ready in October for initial city review/feedback. Contracts are in process for City partners and Caltrans. Contracts are under development for SFEI and Bay Friendly Coalition.

TAG Role & Anticipated Topics: TAG can assist SPASS project by anticipating challenges and sharing lessons learned. TAG can also suggest ways the SPASS project can fill existing green infrastructure/LID data gaps or resolve other unknowns. Anticipated topics include:

- Shared public/private stormwater treatment facilities
- Maintenance planning & Long-term performance monitoring for City staff
- Irrigation systems (permanent or temporary) or not (2 seasons truck watering)
- Can project achieve credit as Full Trash Capture Devices? How?
- On-going Design review and feedback, starting at schematic phase
- Critical design features (i.e. inlet design and monitoring needs)
- Development of LID standards for pre-qualifying potential contractors
- Materials sourcing

Water Quality Monitoring: Bradt reviewed current concept of influent/effluent monitoring in 2nd year after construction at subset of sites. Analytes would be chosen based on site context. TAG members briefly discussed:

- Sampling methodology: Grab sampling can miss first flush events, while composite sampling is more costly, requiring infrastructure.
- Value of inlet sampling—Cloak cautioned that influent sampling can be misleading for individual storms. He suggested sampling effluent in under-drain only (prior to mixing with bypass or other flows). Key is to determine consistency of pollutant levels in effluent, which can be compared to

actual pre-project baseline conditions or assumed baseline conditions (from previous studies or generic modeling by land use type).

- Need for more hydromodification data—potentially from flow monitoring, saturation level monitoring, and evapotranspiration monitoring.
- Challenge of baseline data collection including measuring flows, pollution loads.
- Looking back at previous SFEI studies to determine what approaches worked and what did not.

Soil Testing: Bradt posed question of pre-construction soil testing v. testing by the construction contractor. Martono's advice is to conduct pre-construction soil testing for hazardous materials, since this is more in-line with the Caltrans 2010 Specifications to protect public safety. This would also be opportunity to test soil porosity. Findings can influence GI facility type, need for liners, and bid costs for spoils disposal.

Next Meeting: Bradt will provide potential dates to coincide with presentation of schematic designs. Likely in October.