



Minutes

Environmental Cleanup Allocation Committee

Committee Members Present

*Garry Brown, Chair
Keith Linker, Vice Chair
Alex Waite, City of Tustin
Danny H. Kim, California State University, Fullerton
Grant Sharp, OC Public Works
Jarad Hildenbrand, City of Laguna Hills
Lorrie Lausten, Trabuco Canyon Water District
Matt Collings, Moulton Niguel Water District
Michael Jones, Santa Ana RWQCB
Thomas Wheeler, Lake Forest, 3rd District
Tyler Holst, Rancho Mission Viejo*

*Orange County Transportation Authority
550 South Main Street, Conference Room 07
Orange, CA
September 12, 2024*

Member(s) Absent

*Erica Ryan, San Diego RWQCB
Hector Salas, Caltrans District 12
Peter Grant, City of Cypress*

1. Welcome

Garry Brown called the Environmental Cleanup Allocation Committee (ECAC) meeting to order and introduced new members Jarad Hildenbrand and Thomas Wheeler.

2. Approval of December 7, 2023, Minutes

A motion was made by Tyler Holst, seconded by Keith Linker to approve the December 7, 2023 ECAC meeting minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Tier 1 and Tier 2 Programming Recommendations

Alison Army, OCTA presented an overview of the programming recommendations.

Committee Member Comments:

A committee member, Grant Sharp, commented that although he was on the committee's scoring committee he did not participate in scoring the County's projects.

A committee member asked why the City of Orange and City of Buena Park applications were rejected. OCTA Staff member responded one of them did not meet their MOE (Maintenance of Effort) benchmark and the other attributed ineligible costs to their Local Fair Share Program. Both agencies are deemed ineligible until the OCTA Board deems them eligible.

A committee member commented that for San Clemente this is the third Capital Improvement project in the same location and asked if this is different than the previous ones. Alison Army responded that the current Tier 2 project proposal would be operational 24/7. Grant Sharp responded the current system is a UV treatment discharge disinfection system which is affected by high tide and wet weather. The proposed new project is in a different location and is a straight run-off diversion/re-use project. It will completely replace the facility that is there now.

A committee member commented for the San Clemente Reclamation Project the funding is to build the facility and asked, after it is built, have they secured funding to maintain and replace the equipment. Alison Army responded that the city submitted Operation and Maintenance plan as required by the application. OCTA Tier 2 funds do not fund operations and maintenance, only capital improvements (equipment and installation).

A committee member asked if the O&M feasibility of a project is part of the criteria. Alison Army responded yes, it is not a scored portion but makes the application complete in that they took time to address it.

A committee member referenced the San Clemente project, commented that the SMWD (Santa Margarita Water District) would be reclaiming some of that water and asked if the application discussed partnership with them. Alison Army responded not at this time, but there is potential in the future. Grant Sharp commented that there are existing agreements with other cities, and this could possibly supplement those opportunities.

A committee member questioned why Anaheim's project score was less than Santa Ana's score when Anaheim's number of acres captured was greater for less money. Alison Army responded that the scoring took into consideration several factors, but one contributing aspect could have been that the existing water quality score (strategically effective area) was higher for the Santa Ana project indicating a greater need.

Action Recommendations:

- A. *Concur with the application review committee's recommendation and recommend approval to the Board of Directors to allocate \$3,712,423 in Tier 1 Environmental Cleanup Program funding for eleven projects.*

B. Concur with the application review committee's recommendation and recommend approval to the Board of Directors to allocate \$6,967,250 in Tier 2 Environmental Cleanup Program funding for four projects

Both items were taken as one motion, with the motion to approve made by Keith Linker, Thomas Wheeler seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

4. Future of Tier 2 Program

Dan Phu, OCTA presented an overview of the Tier 2 Program's future and asked for input from the committee.

Committee Member Comments:

A committee member commented that as they are small and share services, they rely on other agencies to help obtain grants and asked if supplying assistance to write grants and help with technical resources was something that smaller agencies could be helped with. Dan Phu commented they need to be careful in providing technical assistance and to not imply or guarantee that a project would be funded until the entire process has been completed, but technical assistance is available to all 34 cities and the county and may need to be better communicated that assistance is available.

A committee member asked if something similar to the Long-Range Transportation Plan could be considered for storm water planning for the cities. Dan Phu responded there is a tool that looks at the entire county and shows where cities can benefit from that. Alison Army commented that in 2012 the entire county had been mapped out with areas showing strategically effective areas and updated to include sub-basins that show the most needs in the county. This can be overlaid with potential projects to show where the most needed projects would be.

A committee member commented that OCTA could have an on-call consultant on contract that cities could have come in and review their capital programs and identify potential opportunities. Agencies could fund that rather than having to go out and procure their own consultants.

A committee member commented that if the larger agencies with more experience could receive compensation for helping/spending time with smaller agencies. It could be more beneficial than a consultant. Alison Army commented that it could be a type of mentor program.

A committee member commented on the history of the ECAC, its creation, function and structure and proposed that staff look back, reassess, and ask what could we do better. Do Tier 1 and Tier 2 still serve the same purpose as they did 14-15 years ago? Could addendums be added to grants rather than having to go through the whole process and how to expedite once funding decisions are made? Discussion continued about these suggestions and: upcoming projects; the history, future and

complexities of Tier 1 and Tier 2 continuing to be separate programs or combined; the need for development help as that is the gap between having the project idea and getting it completed; financial considerations of the projects; and staying true to the Measure M Ordinance.

A committee member commented that a future meeting could be scheduled to discuss potential changes. Dan Phu commented they would take that as direction to communicate with the larger committee and perhaps form a subcommittee, too.

5. Master Purchase Agreement for Tier 1 Equipment and Installation

Alison Army, OCTA presented the overview of the Tier 1 Equipment and Installation Agreement.

Committee Member Comments:

A committee member commented that tours related to the projects could be beneficial to the committee members.

6. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

7. Committee Member Reports

A committee member commented that having the potential subcommittee meet before the January 2025 meeting would be helpful.

8. Next Meeting – January 2025.

9. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.