

# **Environmental Cleanup Allocation Committee**

## **June 9, 2011, Meeting Minutes**

### **Committee Members Present:**

Chair Mary Anne Skorpanich, County of Orange-Watershed & Coastal Recourses Program  
Vice Chair Garry Brown, Orange County CoastKeeper  
John Bahorski, City of Cypress  
Tim Casey, City of Laguna Niguel  
William Cooper, UCI  
Gene Estrada, City of Orange  
Joe Parco, City of Santa Ana (**Teleconference**)  
Hector B. Salas, Caltrans  
Dick Wilson, City of Anaheim

### **Committee Members Absent:**

Mark Adelson, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Paul D. Jones, Irvine Ranch Water District  
Chad Loflen, San Diego Water Quality Control Board  
Tom Rosales, Manager of the Southern California Wastewater Authority  
Sat Tamaribuchi, Environmental Consultant

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

Marissa Espino, Senior Community Relations Specialist  
Janice Kadlec, Public Reporter  
Charlie Larwood, Planning & Analysis Section Manager  
Abbe Mclenahan, Program Manager  
Dan Phu, Project Development Section Manager

### **Guests**

Wallace Walrod, Orange County Business Council

#### **1. Welcome**

Chair Mary Anne Skorpanich welcomed everyone, and began the meeting at 10:05 a.m.

#### **2. Approval of the April 2011 Minutes**

Chair Mary Anne Skorpanich asked if there were any additions or corrections to the April 14, 2011 meeting minutes. There were no corrections or additions requested. A motion was made by Gene Estrada and seconded by Dick Wilson to approve the April 14, 2011 meeting minutes as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

### **3. Tier 1 Grant Call for Projects Applications**

Chair Mary Anne Skorpanich presented a handout of the Environmental Cleanup Program 2011 Tier 1 Call for Projects Funding Recommendations. All projects submitted were ranked by an evaluation committee and listed on the document according to rank. Chair Skorpanich noted the ECAC would review the ranking process and consider changes for the next round of funding at a future meeting.

Charlie Larwood reviewed the funding recommendation process. He gave a brief history of the project and described some of the various projects approved. Charlie noted every jurisdiction who submitted applications (24 out of 35 Orange County jurisdictions) were awarded grant funds for the first round of Tier 1 Projects pending approval by the OCTA Board. The total funds recommended for allocation is \$2,861,786.

Garry Brown said the process was very successful but acknowledged the evaluation committee did encounter some defects but nothing that cannot be remedied at the next call for projects.

Tim Casey asked if the eleven cities that did not apply were contacted to find out why they did not apply. Charlie Larwood said staff will follow-up with these cities.

John Bahorski said the only issue he had was some of the cities listed “replacement of existing landscape” as part of the project. He felt maybe local match money should be been used for this. Garry Brown said the evaluation committee discussed this issue and agreed it needed to be tied down better. John Bahorski said he would not be against going forward with the recommendations but acknowledged it needed to be changed in the future. Garry Brown said the evaluation committee had the identical discussion.

Gene Estrada questioned the prioritization of some of the projects. In his opinion, some of the better projects were not prioritized as high as others. Charlie Larwood said there are no points for the merit of the projects because of the way the scoring is all or nothing. The cities prioritized the projects, not the scorers.

Garry Brown said the scoring of the projects – either all the points or nothing – was a problem. He suggested awarding points by project value – the higher the project merit the higher the point score. Gene Estrada agreed, those that did a better job should be rewarded. Chair Mary Anne Skorpanich also agreed, the concept of all or nothing scoring caused more ties in the scoring.

Tim Casey asked why one of the City of Mission Viejo’s projects scored 80 and was ranked at 31 and another of the city’s projects scored 80 ranked at 37. Was Mission Viejo asked or was an assumption made on prioritization. Chair Mary Anne Skorpanich said the city was asked which project should be prioritized. It was not

discussed in the RFP package how tied scores were going to be handled. This document is staff's recommendation; the ECAC can discuss another way to handle it if they choose.

Tim Casey asked what the process was going forward. Charlie Larwood said on August 1 the recommendations will be presented to the Highways Committee and if it is approved it will go the OCTA Board for approval on August 8. All projects need to be completed within one year. Each project will be given 75% of the funding up front and at the conclusion of the project, after all receipts have been submitted, they will receive the final 25%.

John Bahorski asked how many jurisdictions were buying through the County MOU. Charlie Larwood said staff would get back to him.

Gene Estrada asked if the recommendation is approved August 8, when would the jurisdictions be notified. Charlie Larwood said staff will follow-up with the cities, but once the OCTA Board approves the recommendation it is final.

Chair Mary Anne Skorpanich asked for a correction on the project rating score. The County of Orange's project number two should be 82.5 points and project 30 should have been given the points as the County's priority project. Charlie Larwood said staff will investigate why the scores were listed incorrectly.

Gene Estrada asked for more information on how projects should be prioritized for future grant funding under this program. Charlie Larwood said staff will address this.

Tim Casey asked what would happen if a project is withdrawn from the list after the OCTA Board approves the recommendations on August 8. Charlie Larwood said there has not been any discussion on this but he could only speculate they would look at the remaining 14 projects and come up with a replacement and bring it back to the committee for approval.

Abbe Mclenahan said the project is administered in accordance with the funding guidelines. According to the guidelines, if a project falls out after Board approval, the money allocated for that project would fall to the next round of funding. This can be changed if the Board recommendation includes a tiered list of projects and a designation is made in the recommendation that any remaining funds would go to the next project on the list.

A motion was made by Garry Brown, seconded by John Bahorski and passed unanimously to endorse the corrected ranking of the 47 Tier 1 applications to be considered for approval by OCTA's Highways Committee and Board of Directors in August.

Garry Brown congratulated OCTA staff on the great deal of work that went into the ranking and scoring process.

Tim Casey asked if the ECAC was comfortable having unused funds from this Call For Projects roll over to the next round of funding or would they prefer the unused funds go to the next project on the list. After discussion the consensus of the ECAC was to roll any unused funds over to the next round of funding.

Chair Mary Anne Skorpanich asked for clarification that the project funding recommendation was \$61,786 more than the allocation. Charlie Larwood said yes, the program is funded as a pay-as-you-go program. The allocation for this program is approximately \$2.8 million and staff felt this could be stretched to cover the \$61,786.

#### **4. Tier 2 Study Update**

Charlie Larwood gave an update on the Tier 2 Study which will be much more complicated than Tier 1. Recently the consultant Geosyntec has been working on getting the data input and trying to determine the lowest common denominator. He discussed the different blocks of data.

Chair Mary Anne Skorpanich asked if workshops had been considered to get the information out to the public. Charlie Larwood said this has been considered, currently OCTA has been using the NPDES Permittee's meetings to get the word out. When asked if there were any other organizations she would like to recommend, Chair Mary Anne Skorpanich said no. Once a list has been established she would like it put on the website so people can comment on it.

Gene Estrada asked if the Tier 2 Survey is currently on the OCTA website for use. Charlie Larwood said the Tier 2 Online Survey was activated on June 6 and will close on June 24.

Gene Estrada asked when Geosyntec would make their next presentation to the ECAC. Charlie Larwood said Geosyntec will make a presentation at the next ECAC meeting.

Dick Wilson asked if there will be any follow-up with jurisdictions who did not participate in the Tier 2 Survey. Charlie Larwood said it was a voluntary survey but staff will follow-up with those who did not participate.

#### **5. Public Outreach**

Charlie Larwood introduced Dan Phu, Manager of Environmental Programs, who will manage both M2 Environmental Programs – the Water Quality Program and the Freeway Mitigation Program.

Marissa Espino gave an update on Public Outreach efforts:

- A presentation on the Tier 2 Grant Program was made at the NPDES Permittees Meeting on April 28.
- The Online Tier 2 Survey was activated on June 6 with a deadline of June 24.
- A presentation on the Water Quality Program will be made to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) on June 22.

John Bahorski suggested talking to the TAC about why some cities did not apply for the Tier 1 projects and ask for suggestions to make the program better at the June 22, meeting.

Garry Brown asked if there will be a campaign or announcement about the Tier 1 Program to the general public after the August 8 Board meeting. Marissa Espino said there will be a press release and an article in OCTA's CEO Weekly Update. Charlie Larwood said they are also trying to get photos of some of the projects.

**6. Public Comments**

No one from the public spoke.

**7. Committee Member Reports**

There were no committee member reports.

**8. Next Meeting – July 14, 2011**

The next meeting of the ECAC will be Thursday, July 14, 2011 at 10 a.m. in the OCTA offices.

**9. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11 a.m.