

Environmental Cleanup Allocation Committee

March 11, 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
William Cooper, UCI
Gene Estrada, City of Orange
Paul D. Jones, Irvine Ranch Water District
Chad Loften, San Diego Water Quality Control Board
Joe Parco, City of Santa Ana
Tom Rosales, Manager of the Southern California Wastewater Authority
Hector B. Salas, Caltrans
Sat Tamaribuchi, Environmental Consultant
Dick Wilson, City of Anaheim

Committee Members Absent:

Mark Adelson, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board

Orange County Transportation Authority Staff Present:

Kurt Brotcke, Director of Strategic Planning
Janice Kadlec, Public Reporter
Charlie Larwood, Manager of Planning and Analysis
Hal McCutchan, Environmental Programs Project Manager

Guests

Ryan Hansen, Parsons, Inc.
Elroy Kiepke, Willdan Engineering

1. Welcome

Chairman Garry Brown welcomed everyone, and began the meeting at 10:00 p.m. He introduced Chad Loften as the new representative to the ECAC from the San Diego Water Quality Control Board.

2. Approval of the January 2010 Minutes

Chairman Garry Brown asked if there were any corrections to the January 7, 2010 meeting minutes. No corrections were suggested. A motion was made by Paul Jones and seconded by Gene Estrada to approve the January 7, 2010 meeting minutes as presented. The motion passed with the following abstention: John Bahorski abstained from voting because he was not at the January meeting.

3. T2020 Committee/Board Meetings Recommendations

Charlie Larwood said at the last ECAC meeting staff presented a maximum borrowing scenario for both the Tier 1 and 2 programs. The idea was to provide the maximum funding as early as possible to be used in combination for either of the programs. Staff briefed the T2020 Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman in anticipation of the coming Board Meetings. As a result of this meeting, the Chairs would like the ECAC to revisit the funding scenario for Tier 1, specifically the bonding approach. They raised the concern about bonding the Tier 1 capital projects for 30 years when they only have a seven to ten year expected life. They are comfortable with the two Tier approach and the guidelines for the Tier 1 grant program. Staff plans to come back to the ECAC at the next meeting with a couple of different scenarios for funding Tier 1 which will include spreading the \$18 million programmed for the project over a few fiscal years.

Paul Jones asked if the concern was the Tier 1 projects would be ineligible because of their useful life. Charlie said the projects would not be ineligible but bonding would not be the best way to go for these projects.

Mary Anne Skorpanich asked if it was true the catch basin screens would only last for seven years. Hal said the cities are suggesting the screens would last from seven to ten years. Paul Jones asked to have this verified by the manufacturers. There should not be any problem with the Tier 2 projects because they consist of tangible capital facilities.

Mary Anne Skorpanich said the ECAC primary motivation was to deliver results sooner rather than later. There was a tradeoff between paying interest and bringing the water quality improvements forward in the near term.

John Bahorski suggested getting a more realistic time line from the Public Works Directors because it is inevitable some projects slated for early delivery will slip and can be funded in the following fiscal year.

4. January 2010 Citywide Potential Grant Projects Interest Survey

Hal McCutchan presented the results of the Environmental Cleanup Program January 2010 Citywide Interest Survey. The purpose of the Survey was to determine the interest of Orange County agencies in the Tier 1 and Tier 2 Grant Program and to determine their potential funding needs. Hal said for the Tier 1 Program, 18 agencies

(51%) responded they were interested in the program with a potential funding need of \$17.5 million. The Tier 2 program had 17 agencies (49%) respond with a potential funding need of \$178 million. Hal went over the conclusions drawn from the survey and distributed detailed spreadsheets showing the agencies' funding needs and project information for the Tier 1 and Tier 2 program.

Paul Jones said to be careful not to conclude the potential funding needs identified for the Tier 2 projects of \$178 million will be the full funding needs. Some agencies may not have included all their potential projects. Hal said the survey asked for only a five year look ahead and some agencies do not know exactly what they are going to do yet.

Tom Rosales asked if the potential projects not identified in the survey would be picked up in the call-for-projects. Hal said this was correct, the call-for-projects is expected to be released in early fall of this year. The Board item will be presented in late May.

John Bahorski asked if the funding needs reflected the matching funds needed. Hal said no. Chair Garry Brown said the funding numbers in the survey should not be taken as set in stone. Hal said correct, the survey is only a "snap shot" in time and if another survey was taken this month the numbers would be totally different. The Survey just provides a guideline. Hector Salas said the survey is of tremendous benefit by doing a great bit of marketing and getting the program out to the cities so they can start thinking of what they can do.

Mary Anne Skorpanich said in the survey results a couple of projects were identified as not eligible. Is this based on an initial screening of whether the project was not critical enough? Hal said this was a subjective screening of whether the project fit the program guidelines. Mary Anne Skorpanich asked if these projects were excluded from the statistics of the survey. Hal said yes.

Paul Jones questioned the exclusion of projects such as conversion of landscape in the road medians to artificial landscape. Over irrigation in the medians is a substantial contributor to transporting pollutants from the road surface into the storm drains. Hal said this was discussed during formation of the funding guidelines. There are some fixes for these problems and funding can be accessed under the Local Streets and Roads Program. Chair Garry Brown said some of this is terminology – a Water Conservation project would mean something different if called an Urban Runoff Reduction project.

Mary Anne Skorpanich asked if the ECAC or a subcommittee would be forming a consolidated purchasing program to decide the best types of products for the for the different Tier 1 projects. Hal said there has been no decision on this as yet. Chair Garry Brown suggested the ECAC should start gathering ideas on holding a Technology Fair. Part of this Technology Fair would be explaining the ECAC's thoughts on the program.

5. Gateway Cities Presentation – Drain Catch Basin Retrofit Project

Elroy Kiepke from Willdan Engineering presented the Los Angeles Gateway Region Integrated Regional Water Management Joint Powers Authority (JPA) Catch Basin Insert Project which is currently under contract in Los Angeles County. He gave a history of the project including Funding, Filter Selection, Timelines, and Benefits.

Mary Anne Skorpanich asked if the bid package was for one firm to purchase the devices and install them. Elroy Kiepke said the contract was given to one general contractor and this contractor has a subcontractor who is the manufacturer of the units. Mary Anne asked if the purchase of the units was included in the contract. Elroy said yes.

Gene Estrada asked where the screens were tested. Elroy said they were tested at one of Los Angeles County's catch basin system. The product has the ability to release water as it approaches the catch basin. He explained the connector pipes make the system a full capture device. The automatic retractable screen reduces the amount of maintenance needed to keep the amount of trash out of the catch basin.

John Bahorski asked if Board approval was needed for the project. Elroy said the Regional Board holds the trash TMDL, the Authority is the receiver of the funds and the contracting agency, and the permits needed are from the Flood Control Districts. The Flood Control Districts wants to limit the types of equipment in their catch basins; they need to know the storm drains will function during a storm. Sat Tamaribuchi said his understanding is the Regional Board must approve the devices and if they are installed it is considered compliance with the zero trash regulations. Elroy said this is correct; the Regional Board has six systems they have approved for Los Angeles County as full capture systems.

6. Tier 2 Planning Study Scope of Work Development

Ryan Hansen, Project Coordinator for Parsons, Inc. made a presentation on the Environmental Cleanup Allocation Program Tier 2 Grant Program Planning Study and Scope of Work Development. He went over Parsons, Inc.'s experience on these types of projects, Goals, Initial Screening methods, Evaluation and Prioritization of Structural Treatment Best Management Practices (STBMP), Secondary Screening based on STBMP Prioritization, Modeling Analysis of Watershed/BMP Model, and the final steps to:

- Rank and Prioritize Potential Retrofit Sites
- Develop Tier 2 Grant Program Funding Guidelines, and
- Prepare Draft and Final Tier 2 Grant Program Planning Study

Chair Garry Brown said the Parsons, Inc. program seem very good but would caution them on one point – the purpose of the Tier 2 program is not to remove pollutants

from the roadways. The Tier 2 program is for wider larger vision projects which may have benefits to multiple cities. Ryan Hansen said his presentation did present a number of road projects but Parsons, Inc. does understand the Tier 2 program will be very different from what was presented but the analyzing, evaluation, and screening processes will be very similar.

Ryan also provided the members with a Draft Scope of Work for the program. At the next ECAC meeting in April there will be a more finalized version. Hal McCutchan said he has talked to Paul Jones and assured him all the stakeholders in the Tier 2 process will receive a copy of the Draft Scope of Work for their comments. Dick Wilson said feedback is certainly needed from the cities and it would be a good thing to know what the cities are looking for in the program. This is a big investment for the cities and they will not participate in the program for altruistic reasons; it has to be for something they want. Hal said staff will make sure they meet with the cities and the key players are in attendance at the meetings.

Kurt Brotcke said he wanted to talk to the issue of the life cycle of the projects included in the Tier 1 and 2 programs. It would be helpful to as add a useful life discussion to projects presented for the program.

Chad Lofton said he observed “captured renewed” is missing from the list of structural treatment BMPs presented. It should be included; it would be very important in terms of modeling and cost effectiveness.

Mary Anne Skorpanich said an important piece of the study will be the extent to which there are BMPs or treatment systems that address more than one pollutant. Mary Anne Skorpanich asked if there was any information on timelines being developed. Hal said the first draft of the Scope of Work should be ready in April and, depending on adjustments to the Scope of Work, the release of the RFP should be in May. The consultant could be on-board sometime during the summer.

7. Next Meeting – April 8, 2010

The next meeting of the ECAC will be Thursday, April 8, 2010 at 10:00 a.m. at the Orange County Transportation Authority.

8. Committee Member Reports

Chair Garry Brown asked if the Committee should hold a workshop with the cities inviting City Managers and Public Works Directors. Hal said they could do this as part of the Technology Fair. William Cooper said they may need a fairly big area for all that is planned for this Technology Fair. Kurt Brotcke said OCTA meets with the City Public Works Directors once a month and any time the Committee wanted to make a presentation they could be added to the meeting agenda.

Chair Garry Brown said he was very concerned about the 59% and 41% interest factor on the Grants Survey. He understands many of the cities cannot contemplate new projects because of their reduced budgets, but he feels there is some lack of understanding and it would be good to have some sort of outreach.

Hector Salas said he would like to see a presentation from someone who actually has done a pilot project on screens or some other type of BMP than listen to a vendor.

9. Adjournment

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