

Environmental Cleanup Allocation Committee Meeting Minutes

September 10, 2009

Committee Members Present:

Chairperson, Garry Brown, Orange County Coastkeeper
Vice-Chair Mary Anne Skorpanich, County of Orange-Watershed and Coastal
Resources Program
Mark Adelson, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
John Bahorski, Doug Danz, City of Cypress
Gene Estrada, City of Orange
Paul D. Jones, Irvine Ranch Water District
Joe Parco, City of Santa Ana
Hector B. Salas, Caltrans
James Smith, San Diego Water Quality Control Board
Sat Tamaribuchi, Environmental Consultant
Dick Wilson, City of Anaheim

Committee Members Absent:

Tim Casey, City of Laguna Niguel
William Cooper, UCI

Orange County Transportation Authority Staff Present:

Marissa Espino, Senior Community Relations Specialist
Janice Kadlec, Public Reporter
Hal McCutchan, Environmental Programs Manager
Monte Ward, Consultant

Guests:

David Hunt, Willdan Engineering,
Ken Susilo, Geosyntec Consultant
Dr. Wallace Walrod, OCBC
Katie Wilson, Willdan Engineering

1. Welcome

Chairman Garry Brown began the meeting at 10:10 am and welcomed everyone. Introductions were given around the room. Chairman Brown announced the receipt of a resignation letter from committee member Karen Baroldi. Staff is looking for a

replacement for this committee seat. The classification for this committee seat is "Potable Water or Waste Water", if there are recommendations from the committee for this seat please let staff know.

2. Approval of the July 2009 Minutes

Chairman Garry Brown asked if there were any corrections to the July 9, 2009 meeting minutes. No corrections were suggested. A motion was made by Vice-Chair Mary Anne Skorpanich and seconded by Committee member Paul Jones to approve the July 9, 2009 meeting minutes as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Structural BMP Prioritization Methodology Presentation

Ken Susilo from Geosyntec gave a presentation on the GIS-Based Structural BMP Prioritization and Analysis Tool (SBPAT). Ken gave a history of the project, methodology prioritization, and examples of the modeling results.

Committee member Sat Tamaribuchi asked if any effort had been given to including irrigation or low flow run-off? Ken said it would be a separate module or overlay. A committee member asked how could the areas of low-flow be calculated given the great deal of variables throughout the county? Ken said it would only be as good as the assumptions put into the module.

Vice-Chair Mary Anne Skorpanich asked what were some of the management decisions that have come out of this process so far? Ken said it has not been applied for grants as yet, which is one of the original purposes. It has been applied for teambuilding processes.

Committee member Sat Tamaribuchi asked how SBPAT would deal with the fact that some watersheds have a great deal of historical data and some have minimal data? Ken said they have reliable implicit assumptions for certain areas such as industrial areas and residential. The quality of the data is there, but also included is monitoring data so the model can be adjusted as top priorities are identified.

Committee member James Smith asked if SBPAT gave water bodies that needed to be protected high values? Ken said SBPAT has the ability to go back to smaller areas of concern and geographically isolate it.

Committee member Sat Tamaribuchi asked what was the total cost? Ken said for the first phase of models was approximately \$250,000 and the second the budget was \$400,000.

Monte Ward asked what the timeframe for the project was? Ken said five years; some of this was development of the base line areas and the catchment areas. Monte asked what the timeframe would be to duplicate the process for another area?

Ken said it would depend a lot on the data availability and the preprocessing. Preprocessing would take the same amount of time.

4. BMP Implementation Modeling Discussion

Monte Ward said guidance is needed on how Tier 2 funding will be allocated as a precursor to making a recommendation to the OCTA Board of Directors before the end of 2010.

Hal McCutchan gave a summary of the Teleconference meetings on July 16, 2009 and September 8, 2009.

Committee member Paul Jones asked what would be the needed for the scope of work? Hal said the scope of work would need three things:

- City input on what types of projects they would like to see funded,
- Watersheds with the highest priorities would need to be looked at, and
- Effectiveness of the project.

Chairman Garry Brown suggested the subcommittee move forward and develop a scope of work. The starting place would be to see what the County has done toward this type of project. Take this information and see how it can be modified to fit the constraints and objectives of M2. Monte Ward said scope of work needs to serve two purposes: 1.) Let applicants know what the ECAC is looking for, 2) Provide how the benefits of the project would be assessed. The committee discussed how they would want to do this.

Questions that would need to be addressed for the Scope of Work include:

1. What are the project objectives?
2. An outline for a scope of work relative to available data
3. How would it be implemented?
4. How would it be procured and managed?

Committee member Sat Tamaribuchi said the most challenging thing would be the implementation side or the weighing of the projects. Who would be in the group deciding this? Monte said the ECAC would receive input and make a recommendation to the OCTA Board.

5. Funding Guideline Revisions

Katie Wilson went over the corrections made at the last ECAC meeting to the Environmental Cleanup Allocation Program Funding Guidelines. The Program Funding Guidelines will be presented to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) on September 23rd for their review.

Doug Danz suggested a few changes to the performance measures, which may want to be revised. Katie Wilson said there are suggestions in the document on how to address the issues he described. There are ways to eliminate a lot of subjectivity, but it is almost impossible to eliminate it all.

Committee member James Smith suggested sending the documents to the TAC, let them make their comments, and then sending it back to the ECAC to review the TAC comments. The committee agreed.

6. Infrastructure Report Card for Surface Water Quality

Due to time constraints, Vice-Chair Mary Anne Skorpanich asked to have this item tabled until the next ECAC meeting.

7. Next Meeting – October 8, 2009

The next ECAC meeting will be October 8, 2009.

8. Committee Member Reports

Monte Ward reported on a request made at a previous meeting concerning the use of M2 funds on private (HOA) property. If improvements to system on private property are being made to a system that carries runoff to a public system, M2 money can be used. For example, catch basin screens can be put into storm drains on private roads if those storm drains hook into the public storm drain system.

9. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.