

Environmental Cleanup Allocation Committee

**May 8, 2008
Meeting Minutes**

Committee Members Present:

Mark Adelson, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
John Bahorski, City of Cypress
Dan Dancs, City of Cypress Public Works
Karen I. Baroldi, Orange County Sanitation District
Garry Brown, Orange County Coast Keeper
Tim Casey, City of Laguna Niguel
Joe Parco, City of Santa Ana
Tony Olmos, City of Brea
Mary Anne Skorpanich, County of Orange-Watershed and Coastal Resources Program
Sat Tamaribuchi, The Irvine Company
Dick Wilson, City of Anaheim

Committee Members Absent:

Paul D. Jones, Irvine Ranch Water District
Hector B. Salas, Caltrans

Orange County Transportation Authority Staff Present:

Monte Ward
Ellen Burton
Dan Phu
Marissa Espino
Lissa Moon

1. Welcome

Chair Brown welcomed the committee members and called the meeting to order at 10:14 a.m.

2. Minutes

Mr. Wilson had further explanation on page 8; paragraph three, under Section B. Scoring Criteria Sample. He clarified that he does not want to make the scoring process so difficult that applicants have to do a higher level of scientific research, but rather the scoring criteria should be straightforward enough so it is not burdensome.

The minutes were approved with changes.

3. Ad Hoc Group Report

Mr. Brown said that the Ad Hoc Group meeting was held on April 30, 2008, and Mr. Ward would give an overview of the meeting.

Mr. Ward said there were two items discussed: the Countywide Catch Basin/Filter Program and meeting the Capital Improvement Program requirements.

The first part of the discussion was about the catch basin filter projects since it is likely going to be a priority for the first round of the Renewed Measure M water quality funding program.

Mr. Ward said the second portion of the discussion was on how to address the capital improvement program through the “call for projects” process. There were some concepts discussed at the Ad Hoc Group meeting as summarized below:

- Develop the first Capital Improvement Program (CIP) through the initial call for projects/programming process.
- Consider focusing the early programming cycles on two priorities: catch basin filters/devices and major capital projects with defined percentages of each.
- Use clearly defined evaluation criteria and program guidance to shape the first CIP and the types of projects being submitted.
- Consider focusing the early programming cycles on two priorities: catch basin filters and major capital projects.
- Emphasize collaborative/regional projects in subsequent programming cycles.
- Focus on a simple program initially with an emphasis on ease of application; broad opportunity for participation and early impact on water quality improvements.
- Mirror OCTA Measure M Transportation Programming process as much as possible; recognize differences in sophistication and purpose of transportation CIP's.
- Conduct outreach to likely program applicants (especially city public works) in the development of program guidelines and CIP requirements.
- Use programming cycle to regularly update the CIP, but allow individual jurisdictions to update at any time if they have a need.
- Consider allowing any water quality jurisdiction (not just eligible jurisdictions) to request additions/updates to the CIP.
- Acknowledge the Watershed Management Area (WMA) planning process and integrate it in subsequent programming cycles as the County completes North County WMA plan and determine update processes for all areas.

In summary, based on the Ad Hoc Group discussion, Mr. Ward said he would like to get views and feedback from those who were not participating in the Ad Hoc Group, and have further discussion on what the priorities should be.

Concern was expressed about not allowing cities to provide their input in the creation of the water quality program's CIP.

It was noted that the first program cycle should focus on the catch basin filters, with an emphasis on getting some success earlier in the process. It was stressed that the committee should focus on tangible projects that do not need a lot of planning or development work. Also, the program guidelines and the funding program itself should be structured like the OCTA road funding program.

It was indicated that the first round projects would come from three sources:

- What has been accomplished in the WMAs
- There will be tier one funding for something like general storm drains.
- Cities should be able to submit projects that are ready, regardless of the WMA process.

It was stated the committee needs to make sure that North and Central County have preliminary input into the building of the CIP before actually having to come up with an application for a project.

There could be program guidelines that say that applicants can submit in three ways:

1. Filters – anything that is in that category
2. If they have projects in progress and have participated in the WMA process
3. If they have not participated in WMAs nor have something else that fits the criteria.

It was suggested to establish a solicitation to cities that included a checklist of what is to be considered for funding so the cities would know what they need to do to be funded.

Letters to the city managers should include the following messages:

- There is a need to develop a countywide water quality program CIP.
- Solicit projects
- Request that they provide a description of their project.
- Indicate there is \$200 million in funds available.
- Give us a sense of what projects of theirs meet the eligibility criteria.

It was also noted that the committee should initially go to the OCTA Board with a report on how the committee is going to implement this solicitation process in order to obtain OCTA Board support.

4. Countywide Catch Basin Filter Program

Mr. Bahorski provided an example of a spreadsheet of costs for the city of Cypress and said it could be used as a template for the county as a whole to get a feel for the total costs agencies could incur. He also noted that the worksheet page shows the number of catch basins per agency. However, he said that catch basin numbers are a moving target. He was surprised at the total capital requirements and the number of catch basins per agency.

Mr. Bahorski said that each agency has to weigh in, work through the numbers, and assess their priorities.

It was discussed that Capital Projects letter be submitted to public works directors requesting them to verify the catch basin numbers. Not all catch basins are priorities so the committee does not want the total number of catch basins, but rather we should identify which ones are priorities for water quality and how many have already been installed to date.

Committee members indicated that a catch basin program is a program that allows all cities to participate easily and offers quick results and would help build momentum for the program. It is also a visible improvement that is used for source control/trash control.

It was suggested that a price agreement would be good – to work with manufacturers to base a price on a volume for all cities, or most cities, buying major quantities so that everybody gets a price break.

It was also requested OCTA ask legal counsel if an applicant city could use these funds as a pass-through or a grant.

Some methods on how to allocate funds were discussed and included: allocating according to population and not necessarily the number of catch basins each city has, or creating a scoring system that allows for more equity amongst the county storm drains.

It was also suggested the committee solicit projects by reviewing the applications and determining where it leads the committee in terms of land area and population. If all money is awarded then it is done, if not, then it can be rolled over. If a running tab is kept, then the committee can encourage involvement from the cities who have not participated.

Mr. Ward said the committee should have representatives and staff go to the OCTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and present this plan to get the TAC's input. We should then develop a communications program targeted at jurisdictions, inform the OCTA Board to show what the committee is doing, and proceed. In the

meantime, the committee can look at how to develop communications, a checklist, criteria, etc. He also advised that the committee needs to map a schedule on when to go to the TAC to determine when we send out a letter.

The following italicized language was discussed at June 12, 2008 ECAC meeting:

Mary Anne Skorpanich questioned the May 8, 2008 minutes reference to catch basin filters, asking if the term meant specifically filter-type devices, or devices in general. There was general committee agreement that the description should be more general to include additional storm water filtering systems.

Mary Anne asked if the minutes reflected the committee's decision to allow only eligible water district to apply. She thought any group was allowed to team with a jurisdiction to apply. Garry said that eligible jurisdictions would include cities that didn't already have project listed. Mary Anne asked if the committee wanted to leave it open in terms of groups eligible to apply for the Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Dick Wilson said that the committee wasn't limiting who could add ideas to the CIP. Monte Ward said that an eligible jurisdiction is a requirement for receiving funding, and asked the committee if applications could come through an eligible jurisdiction or be open to all.

Paul Jones said that applications would have to come through eligible jurisdictions. Monte said that applications would come through eligible jurisdictions, but they would receive the funds. Paul summarized the committee discussion, saying that any eligible jurisdiction would be able to apply, individually or in partnership. Monte said that this criteria was clear enough and could be reflected in the guidelines.

The minutes were approved unanimously with corrections.

5. Next Step for Program Guidelines

Mr. Ward said the guidelines should be worked out by end of year and that the committee needs to get an item on the Technical Advisory Committee.

At the next meeting, the committee will discuss the renewed estimate of sales tax revenues and what the compounding effect will be when we project on a lower base.

6. Public Comments

No public comments.

7. Next Meeting – June 12, 2008

8. Committee Member Request

No committee member requests.

9. Adjournment

The committee meeting was adjourned at 11:35 a.m.