

## **Environmental Cleanup Allocation Committee**

**June 12, 2008  
Meeting Minutes**

### **Committee Members Present:**

Mark Adelson, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board  
John Bahorski, City of Cypress  
Karen I. Baroldi, Orange County Sanitation District  
Garry Brown, Orange County Coast Keeper  
Tim Casey, City of Laguna Niguel  
Tony Olmos, City of Brea  
Mary Anne Skorpanich, County of Orange-Watershed and Coastal Resources Program  
Dick Wilson, City of Anaheim  
Paul D. Jones, Irvine Ranch Water District  
William Cooper, UCI  
Tony Felix, San Diego Water Quality Control Board (teleconference)

### **Committee Members Absent:**

Hector B. Salas, Caltrans  
Sat Tamaribuchi, The Irvine Company  
Dan Dancs, City of Cypress Public Works  
Joe Parco, City of Santa Ana

### **Orange County Transportation Authority Staff Present:**

Monte Ward  
Ellen Burton  
Marissa Espino  
Ryan Maloney

#### **1. Welcome**

Chair Garry Brown began the meeting at 10:05 a.m. and welcomed Tony Felix, representing the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board. Kirk Phillips introduced OCTA's new in-house water quality specialist, Hal Ketchin, who will be working to support the committee.

#### **2. Approval of May 2008 Minutes**

Mary Anne Skorpanich questioned the 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.

### **3. Outreach Program: Catch Basin Survey**

Monte said that the Catch Basin Survey, an committee priority for early funding, would be the focus of an outreach program to local jurisdictions. The outreach program would survey local jurisdictions to confirm and update information. The program would also gather feedback from the jurisdictions, primarily the city public works directors, about any issues that might arise.

Monte presented a draft outreach letter and survey to the committee for their review and suggestions. The outreach program would lead to a technical advisory committee, consisting of the public works directors of all cities, which could provide the committee with the environmental program results. This feedback could be used to shape program guidelines in the first few years and then be blended into a broader program.

Mary Anne commented that the letter refers to a paper survey, but suggested their would be an improved response from an electronic survey, as well as having the data directly inputted. Paul asked if the letter could include the web address to fill out the survey online. Monte suggested that the letter could offer the paper survey, but encourage people to use the web site to complete the survey.

Mary Anne commented that she had used SurveyMonkey.com in the past and recommended it. Monte said he had also used this site in the past, but OCTA had ways to develop the survey internally and staff would look for the best solution.

Tim Casey suggested that question three of the survey include an estimate of the purchase and installation cost per unit.

Paul asked about question five on the survey, asking why replacement was offered when the goal of the program is to get new facilities installed. John Bahorski commented that some jurisdictions may have an older model or old filter materials which might be a consideration. Garry commented that the committee needed to clarify

if this program would focus on new capital projects or replacement or maintenance. Tim said that the committee should focus on new capital projects, if the current installed system is ineffective, the jurisdiction should replace it based on maintenance of effort.

Dick commented that whole survey focused on catch basins and doesn't address capital programs. He suggested that the letter should explain that capital projects will follow, or reference them in survey. If a open ended question regarding capital projects was included in the survey, it might generate some general responses. Tony Olmos commented that such a question might burden responses and that a notice of a later survey might be preferable. Garry commented that the letter could also cover the early discussion of catch basins.

Mary Anne suggested a question to gauge participation in a later capital improvement program, in order to identify the few jurisdictions that might not participate.

Garry asked if the survey could be more open-ended in terms of what catch basin technology would be installed. Paul suggested asking "if funding was made available to purchase catch basins, CDS units, filters or equivalent systems, would your city be interested in applying?" Mary Anne suggested describing the devices in greater detail on the survey. Paul said to change question six to reflect devices in general rather than specific systems.

Tony commented that with the volume of catch basin to be installed, cities might be interested in a standardized contract as an alternative to taking the funding. Garry said that if several cities wanted similar types of devices, bulk purchasing might reduce costs. He suggested asking cities what manufacturers they were considering, or asking if they were flexible.

Paul confirmed that the survey would use "device" rather than a specific type of system. Monte suggested explaining the types of devices available and defining a term early in the survey to clearly define a general term for catch basin devices.

Monte said the survey could be revised to prepare for the TAC meeting.

Mary Anne said that in cities might be able to respond with a cost estimate based on numbers of storm water drains. Monte asked if multiple data sources would be required to confirm city estimates. Paul said that some cities could generate estimates based on storm drains per mile, while other cities will have more exact GIS counts of storm drains.

Dick said that the \$240 million dollar figure in the letter may need to be qualified, since it makes people think its available immediately rather than a thirty year plan. He suggested including a estimate of available bonded funds. Tony asked if it would be possible to approximate the estimate funds for the first call for projects. Monte said that an estimate would be possible based on a two percent cash flow.

Garry said the committee was ready to move forward with the letter and asked for it to be distributed for comment. Monte, with committee consensus, said that he would make the revisions requested and then distribute the letter and survey to the TAC meeting. Monte asked Garry to present information on the items to the committee.

#### **4. Funding guidelines**

Kurt Brotcke, Director of Strategic Planning, discussed criteria for scoring project submissions and provided a prepared general scope of work to the committee. He said the goal was to keep scoring simple and easy to evaluate, but with achievable results. He said the effort would take about six months.

Kurt discussed how funds could be passed through agencies, and discussed requirements and what needed elements were in place. Kurt said a call for projects would result in CIP, and the committee would need to provide guidance what that CIP looks like.

Kurt said that the Renewed Measure M ordinance included a maintenance of effort requirement, and that a consultant was expected to help develop guidelines. Task three includes program requirements and will look for committee action.

John asked if there were enough meetings so that public works directors are in the loop and citizen committees know that the consultant will be working with these groups. He suggested including a specific number of meetings. Kurt said the number of meetings could be clarified in the scope. He also commented that the committee may want to consider if a subcommittee meeting is needed as well, as that could double the number of meetings.

John asked if Measure M was similar. Monte said that Measure M had a technical working group. While this committee makes the decision, consultation is important.

Mary Anne asked to emphasize urban streams and waterways, in addition to beaches, to explain that all waterways were a focus.

Tony asked if part of the committee would be part of approval process. Monte said that committee members would be included in awarding proposals, but could also bring others with experience. Garry said that both Mary Anne and himself would participate in the procurement. Monte said that the procurement is a public process and said information on the process was available.

Paul said the scope should not be limited by certain statements, and suggested adding other devices and leaving flexibility for other technologies. Mary Anne said that the scope should be corrected to reflect that bioswells filter more than oil runoff. Kurt said he would generalize the language to be more flexible.

Kurt asked the committee what the optimal period for a project window. He said that a five year window has been discussed, with a target call for projects for fiscal year 2009-2010.

Dick asked if OCTA would be contract administrators or would the committee need to hire administrators. Kurt said that contract administration would be the city's responsibility unless the committee directs otherwise. OCTA would act as the funding agency, administering application and funding processes.

Monte said that the road program used consultant to develop guidelines. The committee makes recommendations and should be most active during the program setup in the first two to three years. After that period, the committee should move to a quarterly meeting rather than monthly.

Dick said it would be a good idea for OCTA to provide management for the committee. Monte said that the committee was expected to require a full time position with some assistance. In peak periods it may be necessary to bring people onboard for technical expertise.

Tony asked if it was possible to follow the water quality and roadway projects in terms of project tracking and administration. Mark asked if there would be a need to audit the program and if so, was an audit included in the program scope for the consultant. Kurt said there would be audits, which was not included in the scope but was explained in the transportation funding program.

Mary Anne asked if the audit would use internal or external auditors. Kurt said that OCTA has an audit process. Monte said that the Taxpayer Oversight Committee oversees funds and takes their role seriously. OCTA has an audit program, but also does an overview of entities that receive funds. Measure M included audits with sampling.

Tim Casey expressed that it should be explained that projects will receive a post-completion audit. Monte said that it would be included, similar to streets and roads program. Monte said the auditing was performed on a sampling basis and said he would make sure that the guideline describe the auditing process.

With no further committee member comments, Garry said to ensure it goes out.

## **5. Sales Tax Revenues**

Andy Oftelie, Manager of Finance, provided a summary of long term projections, using three local universities to provide forecast. Andy discussed how all projects had changed to reflect the economic situation, with low or no growth in 2008. He said their would be a significant impact to long term projections, and recommended waiting for the final numbers for any official documents.

Monte said that for both Renewed Measure M and the original Measure M would be impacted. For Measure M, even with a worse case scenario, the program will finish with a small surplus. The impact will be significant in comparing the nominal forecast, as it lowers the base upon which the projection is based.

Monte said that the economic status didn't seem likely to affect the catch basin program as the initial expenses were low. Regarding long term capital programs, Monte commented that the Orange County tax base tends to rebound and grow quickly.

Tim asked how sales tax revenues were provided to OCTA and if there were any significant changes. Andy confirmed that OCTA receives sales tax in a series of advances and a later reconciliation. Current revenues are down one percent from last year.

Mary Anne asked if the financial forecasts included ranges. Andy said that the ranges were provided and used to generate averages for the combined forecast.

Monte said that in the past the forecast was based on an assumption of 95% of the Chapman University forecast, and now it was based on the average of three university estimates without a 95% limit. The OCTA Board decided to change the system to be more consistent with the private sector in using a board of predictions.

Paul commented that a percentage change over twenty years leads to a significant change.

Andy commented that the original forecast was from a year ago, and the new forecast showed lower consumer confidence and higher gas prices. The significant percent decrease is expected only over 2009 and 2010, with a slight decrease in future years.

Paul asked if the sales tax revenues exceeded the 95% budget with Chapman's forecast. Monte confirmed that revenues were higher than the 95% limit. Andy said that Chapman's forecast was very accurate and was on target with the Consumer Price Index (CPI) and also the closest on sales tax.

Monte said he predicts that feedback between the three universities will improve estimates.

Mary Anne said that the last forecast showed the first year of the environmental program as a small dollar amount. Monte said that 2011 was a partial year, and may impact the starting period of the program.

## **6. Public Comments**

No public comments.

## **7. Next Meeting – July 10, 2008**

## **8. Committee Member Reports**

William said the University of New Hampshire have a storm water research center and the committee may want to invite them to speak. Richard Watson of Richard Watson Associates, suggested that the University of Davis was doing work for Caltrans and might be willing to speak. Tony said it would be helpful to receive the results of the study for use when developing a catch basin program.

Richard also suggested the committee look at research by the City of Los Angeles on flow capture to address a trash TMDL. He said they had reviewed several certified flow capture devices. Tim asked if anyone from Los Angeles would be available to speak to the committee.

Richard asked if the committee was primary interested in filtering trash from waterways. Mark Adelson said the committee was also interested in filtering pesticides. Richard said that he had low confidence in catch basins for pesticides and asked if the committee was looking to reduce or eliminate runoff. Garry said that was a longtime committee goal. Richard recommended that the committee work with the City of San Diego on their work on pavement and runoff reduction.

Mary Anne asked if Caltrans had done any research on filtering regarding transportation. Richard said that a pilot program with Caltrans had been completed, trying bioswells and infiltration. Garry said the committee would talk to committee member Hector Salas to get more information. Richard said he would get more information on the research from Caltrans headquarters.

Tim Casey recommended that research from Caltrans and the City of Los Angeles be presented at the next meeting.

## **9. Adjournment**

The committee meeting was adjourned at 11:18 a.m.