GreenPlan Bay Area
Technical Advisory Committee
Meeting Notes
Wednesday, April 29, 2015

In Attendance:

SFEP: *Jenifer Krebs, Josh Bradt*; SFEI: *Lester McKee, Pete Kauhanen*; City of San Mateo: *Ken Chin*; City of San Jose: *Suzanne Thomas, Jeff Sinclair*; City of Oakland*: Becky Tuden, Kristin Hathaway*; City of Richmond: *Joanne Le*; City of Sunnyvale: *Elaine Marshall*; City of Fremont: *Shannon Young*; EOA: *Jill Bicknell, Peter Schultz-Allen*; CCAG: *Matt Fabry*; ABAG: *Mark Shorett*; USEPA: *Luisa Valiela*; Water Board: *Keith Lichten*; Dan Cloak Environmental: *Dan Cloak*

Welcomes/Introductions

Review Agenda/Meeting Purpose

San Jose GI Planning Overview (Suzanne T & Jeff S, Pete K & Lester M, Jill B)

- SJ staff discussed opportunities for integrating GreenPlan-IT outputs with planning efforts underway: 1) Urban Villages and 2) San Jose Storm Sewer Master Plan (SSMP). The Urban Village plans (in City's General Plan) will increase walkability and concentrate commercial/residential land use in Priority Development Areas. GI plans are useful as these Urban Village areas undergo street redesigns and infrastructure improvements. The SSMP will ID capital improvement projects to upgrade the capacity from a 3yr-storm to a 10-year storm. GI can help City achieve water quality and capacity goals. GreenPlan-IT can ID potential retrofit locations.
- Pete reviewed SFEI's process for implementing the GreenPlan-IT tool in San Jose. Keith asked about the criteria for "knockouts" applied in the San Jose process. Pete responded that the City wanted to focus on the PDA public right-of-way, so wetlands and building footprints were excluded. Pete also touted the inclusion of .KML files as tool outputs enabling GoogleEarth view of the GP-IT output locations. Lester noted that while it would be useful to have city catch-basin GIS layers to gain higher resolution in the modeling component, this is a planning level tool. It's possible to achieve greater and greater resolution, but the trade-off comes in very lengthy modelling run times. Lester added this has been a learning process with excellent participation from the partner cities as the tool was iteratively developed.
- Closing comments on San Jose discussion was reaffirmation from staff that the Storm Drain Master Plan and the Urban Village plans would benefit from the GreenPlan-IT findings. Jill suggested that San Jose is now well on its way to comply with the GI planning requirements in current MRP 2.0 language. She also mentioned other related SJ planning efforts under development: Green Alleys program and Complete Streets design standards. Krtistin asked how institutional knowledge can help guide GP-IT outputs? Lester said institutional knowledge can help focus analyses on known problem areas.

San Mateo Sustainable Streets Plan Overview (Ken C, Pete K)

- Ken described the complex planning process that combines Complete Street and Green Street principles. This effort had huge public outreach component, and a large number of tasks to manage. Plan recommends City goal of using GI on 10% of roadways citywide and on 20% of roadways within the downtown PDA. Pete reviewed SFEI's process and outcomes for

GreenPLan-IT analyses. Ken's major lessons learned were the dearth of local GIS data sets and benefits of the KML file formats in the tool. Keith asked if the resolution outputs are sufficient for planning. Matt suggests additional work is necessary to meet MRP 2.0: where are optimal locations for WQ? How much load reduction is possible? The SSP is driven by other priorities. Ken says that San Mateo has now taken a huge "baby-step" in GI implementation planning with these the next steps: secure funding, standard drawings, design work, and pass off to PW to build and Parks to maintain.

- Q & A followed with discussion of funding approaches not just for capital costs but also for O&M. Matt suggested consideration of the Adopt-A-Block concept, example of Green Street support program in Portland. Becky asked about the proposed Impact Fees, that Ken said the City would amass from developers to make bike/ped (estimated at $180M) and GI improvements. Becky suggested the City use outside contractors to build the facilities because municipal staff may not have necessary training. Peter S-A suggested the City consider Urban Forestry perspective where street trees planted in Silva Cell technology could provide high-level storm water management without really changing existing O&M practices.

Breakout Session:
What would/wouldn't work in your city? What GP-IT outputs needed to achieve MRP 2.0?

- Oakland (Kristin): San Mateo Plan is really good. Tool is limited by data available, needs consistency. The MRP timing is difficult, different cities have different initiatives. Cross-departmental coordination is valuable. Fee would be great but goal needs to be established prior. We want MTC to fund GI measures. Parks Department may not be ready to take on maintenance without adequate funding/personnel.
- Sunnyvale (Elaine): See GP-IT application specifically for 400 acre Peery Park project already underway. GP-IT could also be used citywide. Sees need for ensuring maintenance costs are specifically addressed in plans. San Mateo got good upper management support, did great education/outreach, and had good interdepartmental coordination.
- Fremont (Shannon): Need to GI master Plan before maintenance planning, however PW Department challenged to adequately maintain existing streets. Lots of concern regarding maintenance, especially irrigation. Developer concerns about giving up more land for GI. There is a break point where C3 is too costly. Emergency vehicle access is also critical to maintain. Plant lists with maintenance requirements are needed.

Alternative Compliance – Group discussion on: What is needed to move this forward?

- Elaine – The math is the challenge. What does it cost to comply on-site versus what it would cost to pay into a central fee accrual system?
- Matt – alternative compliance policy – came up with a $/gal cost for stormwater. Like Dan is saying – unless you have large sizing – its more feasible to manage on site – only a small % of sites would not be able to do it on sites – more need an ongoing fee system to do stuff in the public right-of-way. Need to adopt a county wide impact fee – imposed by the county agency - Portland changes an impact fee based on the linear frontage length and increased vehicle trips generated – some kind of nominal fee for businesses – need to pool it at the countywide level – then you would have enough money to do real things. Could or would be in addition to doing things on-site.
- Elaine – what would be the political process? Voter approval?
- Kristin – Green Bond funding – source of funding? A meeting about financing?

- Becky – GI need to be shoehorned into the PDAs – alternative compliance for PDA…
- Matt – water board might have an expectation to have a tracking system to links the fee back to the equivalent mitigation?

Summary: Alternative compliance is worth exploring, but nexus studies needed to develop costs/fees and program needs to be well defined – there will be few regional projects – so individual project will be the trend, and may be hard to track/manage/report– Offsite in the public right-of-way fits the definition of a regional project – but it should be a regional green infrastructure plan for many smaller GI projects—perhaps City's should do all the work first and create a fee to recoup costs after the fact.

GreenPlan-IT Webinar Planning

Group discussed upcoming (June 11) GreenPlan-IT training webinar. Debate over who the appropriate audience should be at this stage: high-level management, stormwater managers, or GIS specialists? Perhaps split into 2 webinars? A subgroup of Peter, Jill, Luisa, Elaine, Shannon, Joanne, and Matt volunteered to help with the Webinar planning/design.