

# **Environmental Cleanup Allocation Committee**

## **April 8, 2010, Meeting Minutes**

### **Committee Members Present:**

Chairperson, Garry Brown, Orange County Coastkeeper  
Vice-Chair Mary Anne Skorpanich, County of Orange, Watershed and Coastal Resources Program

John Bahorski, City of Cypress  
Tim Casey, City of Laguna Niguel  
Paul D. Jones, Irvine Ranch Water District **(Teleconference)**  
Chad Loften, San Diego Water Quality Control Board  
Sat Tamaribuchi, Environmental Consultant  
Dick Wilson, City of Anaheim

### **Committee Members Absent:**

Mark Adelson, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board  
William Cooper, UCI  
Gene Estrada, City of Orange  
Joe Parco, City of Santa Ana  
Tom Rosales, Southern California Wastewater Authority  
Hector B. Salas, Caltrans

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

Marissa Espino, Senior Community Relations Specialist  
Rodney Johnson, Deputy Treasurer  
Janice Kadlec, Public Reporter  
Hal McCutchan, Environmental Programs Manager

### **Guests**

Ted von Bitner, County of Orange, Watershed and Coastal Resources Program  
Ryan Hansen, Parsons, Inc.  
Veronica Seyde, Parsons, Inc.

#### **1. Welcome**

Chairman Garry Brown welcomed everyone and began the meeting at 10:05 p.m.

## **2. Approval of the March 2010 Minutes**

Approval of the March 11, 2010 minutes was tabled until the next meeting due to a lack of a voting quorum.

## **3. Fullerton Creek Trash and Litter Monitoring Program**

Ted von Bitner provided presentation of the Fullerton Creek Trash and Litter Monitoring Program. He said the goal of the Monitoring Program was to identify sources and pathways that promote cost efficient management opportunities. He gave a history of the program, went over the objectives, and presented a brief review of the program. At the end of the presentation he gave a summary of the first year and went over future work.

Chair Garry Brown asked Ted von Bitner if he was going to share the information on the projects with engineers from Flood Control to see if there might be some solutions to public access areas. Ted said yes, they went over the critical issues with Flood Control. Mary Anne Skorpanich said there are critical issues for Flood Control but the issues should also be discussed with the roadway engineers.

Chair Garry Brown also asked if monitoring for the Program also includes picking up and cleaning up. Ted said they did pick up trash at the beginning of the Program at specific sites to better understand where the trash was coming from. The rest of the Program was spent determining how to prevent the trash from getting into Fullerton Creek.

Tim Casey said the monitoring information was gathered from July to November 2008 and it seems like not much has happened to date. Ted von Bitner said the point of his study was to provide a two year baseline study, educate people on better management, and hopefully see a decline.

Sat Tamaribuchi asked if Ted had taken a look at what was being picked up in the catch basin. Ted von Bitner said no, this would be done later in the program. Most of the material is roadway debris and it is hard to determine what roadway trends are.

John Bahorski said limiting access to the channel might be nonproductive. In the long term use of the San Gabriel River (riding bike, jogging, walking, etc.) it was found people tend to take better care of the area.

Mary Anne Skorpanich said Ted made a good point in how much of the trash problem is being solved in having corporate clean-up days. The greater value of a clean-up day is as an educational opportunity as it gets people to start thinking "how did the trash get there".

*At this time Paul D. Jones joined the ECAC on Teleconference.*

#### **4. Updated ECP Financing Evaluation**

Hal McCutchan led off the discussion indicating an updated Water Quality Program financing plan was developed to evaluate the Tier 1 Program on a pay as a go basis and the Tier 2 Program strictly through financing. Rodney Johnson, OCTA Deputy Treasurer presented the cash flow scenario. The Tier 1 Program can be funded on a pay as you go basis at \$19.5 million from FY2011-12 through FY 2017-18. The Tier 2 Program could be financed at \$38 million at a 6% interest for 30 years.

Chair Garry Brown asked if they are still looking at funding projects in 2011. Rodney said yes they are, although a 2011 funding depends if approval can be obtained for Commercial Paper. OCTA has a quarter of a million dollars available in Commercial Paper. It would take the Board's action to access these funds.

Chair Brown asked if Tier 1 could be started in July 2011. Rodney said it seems likely, although Tier 1 is a pay-as-you-go program and it depends the amount of money that has cumulated.

Paul Jones asked if the Tier 1 money would be available in fiscal year (FY) 2011-2012 and if so when would it be. Rodney said that the \$2.8 million for Tier 1 is a cumulative number throughout the year so it would not be available in its entirety at the onset of FY 2011-12.

Sat Tamaribuchi asked when the \$19.5 million would be available for the Tier 1 Program. Rodney Johnson said it depended on the type of financing; it could conceivably be available July 1, 2011.

Paul Jones observed Tier 2 funding could be available earlier than Tier 1 funding. The question is could the debt be issued any earlier for Tier 2 and some of it used to start Tier 1 and then in the first year of the Tier 1 cash flow, pay back the Tier 2 program? Rodney said he did not see any reason why this could not happen as long as there is a commitment by the Committee that there is flexibility to do so.

Chair Garry Brown said he liked the idea Paul Jones contributed, to start both programs in July 1, 2011.

A motion was made by Sat Tamaribuchi and seconded by Paul Jones to adopt Environmental Clean-up Program funding and financing plan. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **5. Tier 2 Planning Study Scope of Work Development**

Ryan Hansen and Veronica Seyde, Parsons, Inc., presented the Tier 2 Grant Program Planning Study Scope of Work development. The report included the following:

- Initial Screening
- Secondary Screening
- Rank and Prioritize STBMP Sites
- Cost Effectiveness Analysis
- Develop Tier 2 Grant Program Funding Guidelines
- Draft and Final Tier 2 Grant Program Planning Study

John Bahorski asked if the consultants would be asked to purchase parcel data information. Veronica Seyde said the consultants will go to the County and local agencies to get the data and if the data is not available they will develop a plan on how to get the data. Mary Anne Skorpanich said the County data is proprietary. Hal McCutchan said OCTA has access to the data.

Dick Wilson questioned why the project sites the stakeholders submitted be looked at first than other identified potential sites identified by the Study. Tim Casey said he had a similar question. It seemed like the Scope of Work is going to produce a type of countywide Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for this piece of Measure M. Once this is done the stakeholders plans are going to be required to conform to it and this seems backwards. Hal McCutchan indicated that the intent of the Study was to “seek out” regional, multi-jurisdictional projects to determine the most strategically effective areas for pollutant mitigation.

Tim Casey said it seemed to him any plans the cities may have would take a secondary priority to the results of the modeling process. Dick Wilson said the stakeholder must have interest in doing the project; particularly with the matching funds needed. If they are not interested in doing the project then it won't get done. He suggested taking the list the stakeholders presented and decide which of those would have the maximum benefits. Hal McCutchan said there can be additional incentives to help with the matching side of a having regional projects by lowering the requirement. In addition, Hal also indicated that the M2 Ordinance includes a performance metrics provision that would be further defined from the Study.

Chairman Garry Brown said both sides have good points; it would be ideal if the analysis was done and the cities projects would all fit in. This may not happen, but if a good solid background can be obtained then it can be used to judge which city's project are going to be the most effective.

Sat Tamaribuchi said the \$500,000 budgeted did not seem like it was enough money to do the project. Hal McCutchan said he received two quotes on what it would cost.

to do the project and will also have Parsons perform an independent cost estimate. Mary Anne Skorpanich if the work effort was trimmed back it would enable the focus to be more on standards. The grant applicants would decide where they could fit the project. The focus would be how to achieve the load reduction and how to achieve the benefit. Sat Tamaribuchi said essentially it would be a tool to evaluate projects.

Chair Garry Brown said originally when the project was discussed it was going to be an effort to not only benefit the ECAC but the County under the MS4 and watershed requirements. The GIS data said information is County proprietary, yet it is going to benefit the County. Couldn't the data be shared between the County and OCTA? Mary Anne Skorpanich said yes, and OCTA may already own the data.

Tim Casey said looking at the project objectives it seems like it may be a step toward a required countywide CIP. The other significant deliverable would be recommended funding guidelines. Dick Wilson said the project has to be something the city is interested in. He said everyone agrees this is important, but to include all of Orange County in the Study might be beyond the scope of what the ECEC can afford to do. He suggested looking at the projects to see where they play out as a benefit. Tim Casey said the identification and evaluation of potential sites should include things already identified as to priorities.

Sat Tamaribuchi said he thought it was fair and all of Orange County should be covered by the model. A great deal of the data needed can be obtained from the cities. The problem is the idea of a potential project list. He suggested taking the stakeholders project list and use the modeling tool to evaluate the projects.

Mary Anne Skorpanich asked if the primary objective was to have a tool to evaluate the application projects and a secondary purpose is to define what projects would be of maximum benefit. John Bahorski said the model will shape the projects and be used as a ranking tool. Dick Wilson said he saw the opportunity of feedback which can modify a project to have greater benefits.

Mary Anne Skorpanich asked if this process would evaluate the project on a standalone basis only or could it be useful in the future. Veronica Syede said she considered it only a standalone project evaluation.

Sat Tamaribuchi said there is need for criteria to be developed for the type of projects to be considered. There is no point in having 100 projects because the funding is not available.

## **6. Tier 1 BMP Purchasing and Installation Cooperative Agreement**

Mary Anne Skorpanich indicated discussions with OCTA and the ECAC have focus on exploring saving money by having a consolidated purchasing and installation program. OCTA has approached the County about being the consolidated buyer and

contractor. She asked for input on how this type of program could be operated assuming there is a consensus on moving forward with this approach.

John Bahorski asked how many variations of filters were reported in the recent survey of the cities. Hal McCutchan said approximately four different types of screens are being used by the cities. John Bahorski said as far as his city was concerned it would be better to continue using their current product. Chairman Garry Brown said the idea is to get four or five different products and ask the City's Public Works Directors what the preferred product was. John Bahorski said he would just like to keep the process easy on staff.

Tim Casey asked if it was known were any of the products covered by other governmental agencies. Some of these agencies may allow OCTA to piggyback on existing contracts. Hal McCutchan said some of the products were covered under the Gateway Cities Program, which were presented at the last ECAC meeting.

Dick Wilson asked if this concept would be brought before the Public Works Directors at the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). Chair Brown said they did not want to introduce something off the wall or different. Public Works Directors may be able to let us know which the best or preferred technology that would be suitable. Dick Wilson said these are the people who would have the most input; it would be worthwhile to discuss this with them.

Chair Brown suggested taking the survey results, breaking the products into categories, and ask the Public Works Directors what they feel works the best for them. Then compile a focus list to start discussions on.

Mary Anne Skorpanich asked if there was any desire to give preferred funding to whatever products are on the consolidated purchasing agreement. John Bohorski said he did not think this was very important, there are only two or three products everyone would like. Mary Anne Skorpanich said she thought there would be a high preference for whatever the city is currently using.

Chair Brown asked if there should be a discussion on installation. John Bahorski suggested lump all the components together and let the participants pick and choose. Dick Wilson said he thinks it could work, but there may be some concern the contractor is not working for the city and not answerable to the city. Mary Anne Skorpanich said she would talk to the purchasing department and see if it can be set up as a Master Purchase Agreement. It could be bid out to get more favorable pricing and each city could be in control of the purchase. Hal McCutchan said he does have a copy of the Master Purchasing Agreement for the Gateway Cities project to use as an example.

## **7. BMP Field Visit/Technology Fair**

Hal McCutchan said based on the discussion at the last ECAC meeting staff is moving forward in planning a BMP field tour. They are starting out by looking at the survey of citywide potential projects that was submitted in January. Currently the tour is planned for July 2010. In addition plans are going forward for a BMP technology fair which will be held at OCTA and will target the ECAC, city and county staff, and the OCTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) which consists of Public Works Directors from all jurisdictions. The Technology Fair should take place in August or September 2010.

Sat Tamaribuchi suggested holding the Technology Fair in September in order to work around summer vacation schedules.

Tim Casey asked if ECAC members could bring along their experts on the field trip. Hal said definitely.

#### **8. Next Meeting – June 10, 2010**

The May 2010 ECAC meeting has been canceled and the next meeting of the ECAC will be Thursday, June 10, 2010 at 10:00 a.m. at the Orange County Transportation Authority.

#### **9. Committee Member Reports**

There were no Committee Member reports.

#### **10. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.