



Evaluation Form

C.3.h INSPECTION AND O&M STORMWATER SYSTEM WORKSHOP

San Mateo, CA

Tuesday, May 5, 2015

AFTERNOON SESSION 24 Evaluations

1. **Overview of C.3.h Requirements in MRP 1.0 and the Future** – Given by Kristin Kerr, SMCWPPP Program Staff

Very Useful 13 Somewhat Useful 11 Not useful

Comments:

- New systems still somewhat vague about requirements and how to implement them. Who is responsible?
- Good update on requirements and 2.0 proposals for new MRP.
- Explain more on the history/background of MRP 1.0/O&M program.

2. **Inspecting, Operating and Maintaining Stormwater Treatment Systems** - Given by Peter Schultze-Allen, SMCWPPP Program Staff

Very Useful 17 Somewhat Useful 5 Not useful 1

Comments:

- Did not explain what to look for, did not explain standard specifications for treatment systems or where specific systems we're applicable.
- Photos useful.
- Lots of examples. Great!
- Good info and base knowledge related to C.3./C.6. relationships and Comm. C.3./C.6. inspectors in reference to M+R and examples to SW R/O.
- Understood by examples.
- BMP examples scattered in order of presentation (felt like we "jumped around" a bit). Not much about LID what qualifies what doesn't.

3. **Group Exercise** – Facilitator, SMCWPPP Program Staff

Very Useful 13 Somewhat Useful 9 Not useful

Comments:

- Prizes, no break out was good; discussion instead.
- I really enjoyed the group exercises.
- Interesting solutions.
- Good examples to show simplicity of possible problem mitigations.
- Stimulating discussion of options.

4. **Did this training meet your expectations? Yes: 23 No: 1**

5. **What parts of the training were most useful to you?**

- Practices of common problems and discussion.
- Examples/photos.
- Anecdotes – successful vs. unsuccessful. Define terms where meaning was changed over time.
- Group exercises.
- C.6. morning session.
- Photo discussion.
- Experience of presenters.
- Discussions.
- Examples of good and bad bioretention landscapes.
- Good and bad examples.
- Pictures and examples.
- The illustrations.
- Problem areas from installed treatments.
- C.3. requirements and 2.0 Proposed changes.
- Pictures.

6. **What would have made this training more useful?**

- Move information on inspection practices for treatment facilities.
- Field trip to look at LIDs.
- More practical cases.
- How effective are we? How do we compare to where we were 5 years ago? 10 years ago?
- Which pollutants have we released?
- What can we improve?
- A bit more in depth on relationship between C.6./C.3 cooperation ie. Effect of SW mitigation on municipal systems.

7. **What topics would you recommend for a future training?**

- See above.
- N/A
- Lessons learned.
- Interceptor tree – pros and cons.

- Detailed way of inspection for pervious pavement as part of treatment facilities.
- Coffee in the afternoon would be great.
- Responsibility or roles between private, public and consultants representing a jurisdiction.
- I would be interested if you have the same problem for green roof implementation.

8. **General Comments?**

- Great training!
- None.
- Thanks!
- Good job.
- Good training.
- Thanks for feeding us, but limit lunch to ½ hour if there will be food on site.
- Good workshop.
- Coffee with lunch.
- G/f options.
- Good conference room.
- A good update/refreshers on SWPP policy and this year, proposed chg. for MRP 2.0 recommendations.