

## **Environmental Cleanup Allocation Committee**

**August 14, 2008  
Meeting Minutes**

### **Committee Members Present:**

Garry Brown, Orange County Coast Keeper  
John Bahorski, City of Cypress  
Tim Casey, City of Laguna Niguel  
William Cooper, UCI  
Chad Loflen, San Diego Water Quality Control Board  
Joe Parco, City of Santa Ana  
Hector B. Salas, Caltrans  
Mary Anne Skorpanich, County of Orange-Watershed and Coastal Resources Program  
Sat Tamaribuchi, The Irvine Company  
Dick Wilson, City of Anaheim

### **Committee Members Absent:**

Mark Adelson, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Karen I. Baroldi, Orange County Sanitation District  
Paul D. Jones, Irvine Ranch Water District  
James Smith, San Diego Water Quality Control Board

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

Monte Ward  
Ellen Burton  
Hal McCutchan  
Marissa Espino  
Ryan Maloney

#### **1. Welcome**

Garry Brown welcomed committee members and started the meeting at 10:10 a.m.

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

The meeting minutes from July were approved.

#### **3. Presentation Items – Catch Basin Survey Results**

Hal McCutchan presented the results on the July Questionnaire that was disseminated to all cities within Orange County soliciting the number and type of catch basins in each jurisdiction, the extent of screens/filters already installed, any existing experience with equipment life cycles and maintenance intervals, costs, as well as a sense of the level of interest and priority a catch basin system funding program would have for each jurisdiction.

Based on the Questionnaire for the potential catch basin system funding program, more than 90 percent of the cities indicated interest in applying for funds as well as a

preference for a consolidated purchasing agreement. Another key finding was that less than 10 percent of catch basins in the County have some type of device to screen trash and debris. This suggests that significant benefits could accrue in the short term with a focus on these improvements. Projected capital cost of a catch basin funding program is estimated to be \$20 million with annual maintenance budget of 1.3 million.

John Bahorski suggested that when talking with cities, the committee might want to ask about their experience with maintenance of early filters since current usage of filters and screens greatly reduces maintenance costs. John commented that the estimate cost on screens was high and that staff may want to include other products.

Due to the number of catch basins with drop inlets in the county, John suggested that those catch basins be removed from the total since they are not capable of accepting a filter. Mary Anne said that it might not make sense to put a screen on all catch basins. Hal said that terrain and flooding concerns would also need to be considered.

Monte Ward asked the committee how much they wanted to manage the installation of catch basins with the cities.

Hal said that the capital project announcement needs to be based on timelines for the city budget. Garry suggested that a slide be added to the presentation to define a generic screen or filter device.

Bill Cooper said that the catch basins could be mapped to consider recharging groundwater by filtering storm water. The Committee may also want to protect groundwater from runoff, possibly with different goals based on location.

Bill asked if the maintenance of the catch basins was within the purview of the committee. Garry said that maintenance of the devices was still being considered by the committee. John said that cities were required to clean catch basins once a year, unless they filled more frequently. The expectation of high maintenance cost may be based on past perceptions. Hal suggested that there might be a difference in response from the city manager's office versus street maintenance crews.

Hector Salas asked if replaceable media would be included in costs since it needs to be replaced after each storm. He also asked if media would be considered a capital cost or ongoing cost. John said that some catch basin installations include a one- or two-year maintenance program. Mary Anne asked if cities were asked about interest in a consolidated maintenance program.

Monte said that the committee would be discussing the parameters of a possible maintenance program. It is likely to obtain certain improvements that the committee will need to fund maintenance. John suggested that maintenance could be provided for a fixed period of time as an incentive.

Mary Anne said that cities may have their own priorities based on maintenance requirements, but the committee may want to address this with discretionary funds in order to get the most benefits.

#### **4. City of Los Angeles' Presentation – "TMDL Compliance with Catch Basin Inserts & Opening Covers"**

Alfredo Magallanes from the City of Los Angeles discussed how the City is meeting Los Angeles RWQCB's Trash TMDL requirements. The Trash TMDL requires a reduction in by 10 percent a year with an eventual goal of zero percent. Los Angeles has currently installed 54,000 catch basins, covering 1,700 miles of storm drains.

In 2002, Los Angeles performed a trash generation study in order to identify hotspots and target BMPs. The study determined that 15 percent of the city generates 60 percent of the trash. Los Angeles tested a variety of systems and catch basin methods with a 5 mm mesh size to capture cigarette butts, sized for a 10-year storm.

Alfredo said that the use of a screen cover and filter does reduce maintenance. He also commented on the importance of doing hydraulic analysis to prevent upstream flooding. Larger catch basin filters can be 10-12 feet in diameter and require a crane and road closures in order to clean.

In response to questions from Sat Tamaribuchi, Alfredo said that netting filtration systems used by Los Angeles are 5 mm, but the manufacturer can change the size. Alfredo commented that the netting system works well, but fills very quickly. In order to address maintenance and capacity issues, Los Angeles found that a vertical stainless steel filter was the most efficient. The design of the filter allows the storage of trash and includes an overflow outlet if the filter becomes full.

Alfredo said that after trying a variety of screens, Los Angeles had found that self opening street screens set close to the curb provided the best benefit. The screens open when water height reaches 50 percent of curb height.

Alfredo said the total cost of the program was \$85 million, with catch basin retrofits costing \$72 million and online BMPs costing \$13 million. The installation of the filters and screens has not increased operations or maintenance costs, but maintenance crew hours are shifted to the wet season.

In response to a question from Sat, Alfredo said the cost of a single vertical filter insert was \$700 and that there is a discount for bulk orders. John said that Los Angeles might want to familiarize building inspectors with the catch basin program in order to address pool or stucco cleanup that can damage screen units.

Mary Anne asked if any educational measures had been taken, such as increasing the number of trash cans. Alfredo said that Metro funded installing additional trash cans and has been ensuring that trashcans are emptied more frequently.

Mary Anne said that the presentation might be of interest to Orange County's city engineers. She also commented on screens and the effectiveness of street sweeping.

## **5. NRDC's August Report – "Testing The Waters"**

Garry Brown presented the summer results of water testing and said that results had been affected by low rainfall. San Diego and Los Angeles counties show a reduction in pollution while Orange County shows an increase of five percent. Garry said that despite attempts to treat water at some Orange County beaches, there isn't a known solution. Garry said that there should be tests performed for indicator bacteria, which will take a more skilled individual and lab in order to complete the tests.

## **6. Funding Guidelines RFP Update**

Hal said that the request for bids went out August 1. He said an information conference would be held for those bidding and interviews would begin September 9.

## **7. 2020 Committee/OCTA Board Status Report**

Monte said that staff was preparing a committee status report for the 2020 Committee and the OCTA Board. The report discusses the initial direction on funding guidelines, with catch basin filters as the first step and major capital programs as the second. The report also discusses upcoming issues the committee will be evaluating. The report discusses the opportunities for pooled purchasing and maintenance. Monte will bring the Board an update before the end of the year to keep them appraised and obtain Board policy recommendations.

## **8. Major Capital Projects Ad Hoc Committee Report**

Monte said that the ad hoc group met 10 days ago to discuss planning for capital projects. Sat had suggested a workshop to strategically review the county in terms of major capital programs. The ad hoc is suggesting a longer meeting of roughly four hours with four components:

1. Review of county status and map information, applicable TMDLs and details provided by the water board
2. Review of the nexus to transportation of issues identified
3. Evaluate solutions and methods currently in use
4. Plan discussion session to map out future capital programs

Monte said that while it was intended to include all elements in a 3-3.5 hour period, the planning discussion could be moved to a follow up workshop. Sat suggested that a presentation would be provided on the three major watersheds and have representatives for the watersheds participate in a discussion of priorities. Mary Anne

said that with the existing GIS information, the first element of discussion would not take a lot of time to present.

Monte said that given the level of discussion, it may be necessary to break up the meeting and have question and answer sessions, followed by a facilitated session. Sat suggested that the first three items be covered in order to get an overall sense of priorities. Monte said that staff and the Ad Hoc Committee would begin planning the meeting and developing an agenda. He said that the planned date for this meeting was September 11, but that may move back based on required planning.

## **9. Public Comments**

No public comments.

## **10. Next Meeting – September 11, 2008**

## **11. Committee Member Reports**

There were no committee member reports.

## **12. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.