



**MEETING AGENDA**  
***BMP Retrofit Pilot Program Quarterly Status Meeting No. 15***

**DATE:** January 9, 2002 Wednesday  
**TIME:** 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.  
**PLACE:** RBF, 14725 Alton Pkwy, Irvine, CA 92619 phone: (949) 472-3505  
**ATTENDEES:** Distribution  
**COPIES TO:** File: JN 34123, 34218  
**SUBJECT:**

---

**AGENDA ITEMS**

- |  |             |
|--|-------------|
| 1. Introductions and Objectives of the Meeting   | 10:00-10:30 |
| 2. Plaintiff's specific comments concerning the draft report, including any responses from Caltrans and a process for further work on a final report.  | 10:30-11:30 |
| 3. Implementation of a retrofit program, including how the reporting should discuss recommendations and conclusions for such a program   | 11:30-12:00 |
| Lunch  | 12:00-1:00  |
| 4. Review of Pilots Capital Cost Items   | 1:00-1:30   |
| a. How pilot program costs should be reflected in the reporting on the program;  |             |
| b. What lessons can be gleaned from the experiences of other jurisdictions, including other departments of transportation;   |             |
| c. What recommendations for savings can serve to assist any future implementation  |             |
| 5. Poorly Performing Devices (how reported in Final Report)  | 1:30-1:45   |
| 6. Final Report Recommendations/conclusions  | 1:45-2:45   |
| a. The conclusions that can be drawn from the retrofit pilot program about the effectiveness of various devices, including proprietary devices and/or those devices that performed adequately but not as effectively as other tested devices |             |
| 7. Final Report Dedication to P. Van Riper   | 2:45-2:50   |
| 8. Closure and Meeting Adjourn   | 2:50-3:00   |

**Distribution:**

Dave Beckman, NRDC

Chris May, NRDC

Rich Horner, NRDC

Steve Fleischli, SM Baykeepers

Bruce Reznik, SD Baykeepers

John Welch, SWRCB

Jeremy Johnstone, EPA

Ken Smarkel, Caltrans

Brian Currier, UCDavis/Caltrans

Steve Borroum, Caltrans

Richard Gordon, District 7

Paul Thakur, District 7

Doug Failing, District 7

Everett DeLano, NRDC

John Frederick Smith, District 11

Sayra Ramos, District 11

Jeffrey Joseph, District 11

Lanny Chronert, District 11

Mike Barrett, UT/RBF

Anna Lantin, RBF

Laura Hansen, RBF

Scott Taylor, RBF



JN: 100979, 100980

**STORMWATER PLANNING SERVICES  
CONTRACT NO. 43A0051  
Meeting Minutes**

**ISSUE VERSION: Draft**

**MEETING NO.:** 15

**DATE:** January 9, 2002

**TIME:** 10:00 am to 2:30 pm

**LOCATION:** RBF Consulting

**SUBJECT:** Quarterly Status Meeting No. 15 – BMP Retrofit Pilot Program

---

**Prepared by:** S. Taylor

**Approved by:** \_\_\_\_\_

(Signature)

**Date Prepared:** 07/02/02

**Attendee Names / Company**

Mike Barrett, UT  
Brian Currier, UC Davis- Caltrans  
Everett DeLano, Representing Plaintiffs  
Steve Fleischli, Santa Monica Baykeepers  
Richard Gordon, Caltrans D7  
Laura Hansen, RBF  
Richard Horner, NRDC  
Anna Lantin, RBF  
Chris May, NRDC  
Sayra Ramos, Caltrans District 11  
Bruce Reznik, San Diego Baykeepers  
John Frederick Smith, Caltrans Legal, D11  
Scott Taylor, RBF  
Paul Thakur, Caltrans D7  
Ken Smarkel, Caltrans HQ  
John Welch, SWRCB  
Bill Evans, Caltrans Legal D7  
Bill Reagan, Caltrans D7

**Copies To:**

File

The following items presented summarize the substantive items discussed or issues resolved at the above meeting to the best of the writer's memory.

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: January 9, 2002

Page 2

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	STATUS	OPENED	DUE	ACTION FOR:
01	<p><b>Agenda Item 1 (Introductions and Objectives):</b> It was noted that Jeremy Johnstone's father was ill, and Jeremy could not join the meeting. The Plaintiffs asked that all handouts and materials from the meeting be forwarded to him. It was also noted that Steve Borroum and Doug Failing could not attend. In the future, Plaintiffs want to ensure that decision makers from Caltrans are present at the meetings. The Plaintiffs also expressed concern relative to information (via presentations and professional papers) that is being distributed about the Pilot Program, and requested that this practice be stopped.</p>	FYI	1/09		Caltrans
02	<p><b>Agenda Item 2 (Review of Pilot Capital Cost Items):</b> The last Plaintiff/Caltrans meeting on this issue was on Jan 3, when the team went through each cost section for each chapter of the final report, discussed revisions, and incorporated the comments into the chapters. The updates to each chapter were subsequently sent to the meeting participants for final comment. RBF also distributed a revised version of the Cost Chapter from the final report at the meeting. Plaintiffs asked for tracking (as to what portions of the text was incorporated into the final report, and what portion was excluded) of the final comments in Chris Mays and Rich Horners two memorandums on cost. It was noted that most of the 'recommendations' memo was included in the final cost chapter, and that none of the 'magnitude of potential savings' memo was included in the final cost chapter.</p> <p>Caltrans indicated that including the 'Glenrose Engineering' capital cost numbers from other parts of the country was not appropriate since this is a focused retrofit study, and the costs compiled by Glenrose Engineering are not a direct comparison for the data in the final report, and would be out of context. Plaintiffs responded that this has been an issue for a long time, and that looking at other jurisdiction's costs are a part of the program. Plaintiffs note that the numbers can provide valuable reference for discussion in the report. Parties agreed to disagree on this issue.</p> <p>Plaintiffs noted that other jurisdictions are implementing BMP retrofits, but that the costs may not have been tracked with the 'rigor' that they would prefer. Plaintiffs fear that Caltrans will use the Pilot Program data to show that BMP retrofit is not economically feasible. In other jurisdictions BMP retrofit is occurring, and this is the primary objective. Plaintiffs want Caltrans to use the pilot program cost numbers to evaluate how they can bring down costs to allow implementation of the devices.</p> <p>Caltrans responded that the Storm Water Management Plan does include pilot BMPs, so they are not using the costs from the Pilot Program to avoid BMP implementation. Rather, the goal is to produce retrofit cost numbers that reflect the Caltrans environment, and that is what the study has produced.</p> <p>The Plaintiffs reiterated that they don't want to say that the country-wide data collected by Glenrose has no 'value', and that the ideas for cost savings from other jurisdictions need to be carried forward. Caltrans agreed that bringing the ideas forward will assist in making the program more successful. It was</p>	New	1/02		Caltrans

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: January 9, 2002

Page 3

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	STATUS	OPENED	DUE	ACTION FOR:
	<p>noted that some of these ideas were incorporated into the current version of the cost chapter.</p> <p>Plaintiffs again, reiterated that the costs from the other jurisdictions must be included in the final report, and that the Holmes and Narver/Glenrose report must be included as an appendix to the final report. Plaintiffs noted that all of the changes made to the final report thus far in collaboration with their technical representatives, are not acceptable to the Plaintiffs. The Plaintiffs also requested that Caltrans clarify who has 'approval' authority for the final report within the organization.</p> <p>O&amp;M cost: There are two current cost accountings, what was experienced for the Maintenance Indicator Document (MID) as the project was completed, and an estimate based on the final revised version of the MID (Version 16). The Plaintiffs feel that the estimates have a number of problems, and they don't agree with either version. Specifically, the Plaintiffs agree with MID Version 16 maintenance items, but the number of hours applied to each item is a subject of disagreement. A solution that both parties agreed to on a preliminary basis is to include the MID v.16 document in the final report without an estimate of cost to implement it.</p>				
03	<p><b>Agenda Item 3 (Devices that Performed Less Effectively):</b> Plaintiffs want the characterization in the final report of the devices that did not perform as well as others not to condemn them as ineffective. Rather, continue to leave open the possibility of application of the device for other conditions. The Plaintiffs will suggest language changes to the report relative to how the less effective devices are discussed. Both parties agreed that they are not that far apart on this language, and Plaintiffs will suggest refinements.</p>	FYI	1/02		Plaintiffs
04	<p><b>Agenda Item 4 (Final Report Recommendations and Conclusions):</b> Caltrans noted that when each chapter was drafted, phrases such as 'should be considered' were used. Plaintiffs suggested that the language be revised to make more positive recommendations. This change was subsequently made, but Caltrans upper management did not approve of this change. In the interim, the Caltrans SWMP has been approved, and the Caltrans Storm Water Advisory Teams (SWATs) are a part of the Caltrans storm water program approval process. With a formal approval process is now in place, the policy decisions lie with this defined process and associated committees, and a research report can not put forth policy type language. Caltrans is amenable to phrase things such as, "future guidelines should consider the results of the study that showed....." The important concepts can be in the report, but the way the statements are made must be changed. The Plaintiffs disagree that the report should not put forth recommendations, and that the Stipulation and Consent Decree have specific language to this effect. Caltrans agreed to reconsider this point. Plaintiffs reiterated that if the strong recommendation type language is not put in</p>	New	1/02		Caltrans

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: January 9, 2002

Page 4

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	STATUS	OPENED	DUE	ACTION FOR:
	<p>the report, this would not be acceptable to the Plaintiffs.</p> <p>Plaintiffs noted that decision makers from Caltrans need to be engaged on the issues noted above.</p> <p>Summary of outstanding issues: Recommendations/conclusions language and the third party cost data - are they included? O&amp;M costs, Glenrose Engineering costs and how the study phrases the conclusions and recommendations to respond to Plaintiff concerns.</p>				
05	<p><b>Agenda Item 5 (Final Report Dedication to Peter Van Riper)</b> Doug Failing was unable to attend meeting, and in his absence, the decision was deferred.</p>	Old	9/26	7/10	Caltrans