

# **Environmental Cleanup Allocation Committee Meeting Minutes**

**March 12, 2009**

## **Committee Members Present:**

Chairperson, Garry Brown, Orange County Coast Keeper  
Vice-Chair Mary Anne Skorpanich, County of Orange-Watershed & Coastal Resources Program  
Mark Adelson, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board  
John Bahorski, City of Cypress  
Karen I. Baroldi, Orange County Sanitation District  
Gene Estrada, City of Orange  
Joe Parco, City of Santa Ana  
Hector B. Salas, Caltrans  
Sat Tamaribuchi, Environmental Consultant  
Dick Wilson, City of Anaheim

## **Committee Members Present via Teleconference:**

James Smith, San Diego Water Quality Control Board

## **Committee Members Absent:**

Tim Casey, City of Laguna Niguel  
Paul D. Jones, Irvine Ranch Water District  
William Cooper, UCI

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

Marissa Espino, Senior Community Relations Specialist  
Janice Kadlec, Public Reporter  
Charlie Larwood, Manager of Planning and Analysis  
Hal McCutchan, Environmental Programs Manager  
Monte Ward, Director of Special Projects

## **Guests:**

David Hunt, Willdan Engineering,  
Katie Wilson, Willdan Engineering  
Wallace Walrod, OCBC  
Nancy Palmer, City of Laguna Niguel  
Keith Linkler, City of Anaheim  
Doug Dancs, City of Cypress

## **Members of the Public**

No one from the public attended

### **1. Welcome**

Chairperson Garry Brown welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were given.

### **2. Approval of the January 2009 Minutes**

Chairperson Garry Brown asked if there were any corrections to the January 8, 2009 meeting minutes. A motion was made by Vice-Chair Mary Anne Skorpanich to approve and seconded by Committee member Gene Estrada to approve the January 8, 2009 meeting minutes as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

### **3. Follow-Up Citywide Tier 1 Funding Program Survey**

Hal McCutchan, OCTA Environmental Programs Manager, presented the results of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Catch Basin Funding Program questionnaire, which was solicited on a citywide basis, including the County. The Questionnaire concluded that:

- Information is limited on what HOAs are doing in managing their own catch basins.
- Trash and bacteria has the highest funding interest for mitigation.
- Screens (72%), inlet inserts (19%), and filters (8%) have the highest interest for catch basin BMP funding.
- Inspections, maintenance, and operations of catch basins are somewhat equally split via in-house and outsourcing.
- The survey found that 44% of the entities questioned have adequate funding for installations and O&M operations for potentially funded BMPs.
- For entities with limited funding, significant in-kind contribution could be made for O&M.
- Projected capital costs associated with this potential funding program (screens/inserts) would be \$17,610,000 million with an annual maintenance budget of \$1.1 million.

Committee member Mark Adelson indicated that the cities placed a strong emphasis on BMPs related to trash mitigation, but also emphasis should be placed on bacteria, HCPs, herbicides, fertilizers, and metals.

Committee member Gene Estrada said there are few BMPs capable of removing all pollutants and would limit overall funding due to their expense. Committee member John Bahorski suggested imitating the catch basin funding program and continue to educate the public on the other areas of pollution control.

Monte Ward, OCTA Director of Special Projects, summarized the discussion with the following questions: 1) Is there anything in the survey seen as a flaw to taking the first step in phase 1 of the program? 2) What recommendations need to be made about capital and maintenance? 3) How does the committee want the financing structured? These three questions are a key to moving the program forward. If these can be answered then the program can be structured and the funding program can be initiated.

Chairperson Garry Brown said suggested designating the Tier 1 projects for trash removal. The Committee then discussed the subject of matching funds required and whether maintenance should be figured into these costs.

The Committee discussed the use of filters versus screens and inserts and what would be the most effective and cost beneficial for the cities. Chairperson Garry Brown asked for a consensus from the ECAC that maintenance of the screens/inserts would be the responsibility of the individual cities. This suggestion received a general agreement from the Committee.

Monte Ward suggested taking a more detailed version of the questionnaire results to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for their input. This information will be brought back to the ECAC as well as funding information. The Committee will then develop the policies and recommendations for the program.

#### **4. Draft Program Prerequisites – Funding Guidelines**

A presentation on the draft Program Prerequisites, which consists of eligibility, maintenance of efforts (MOE), the transportation pollution nexus, cooperative agreements, capital improvement policies, and matching requirements; was provided by Katie Wilson, Willdan Engineering and Wallace Walrod, OCBC.

The Committee discussed how to interpret the MOE Section requirements and whether they could be used for maintenance. The Committee agreed MOE should refer only to capital projects (Tier 2 Program), not the catch basin funding program (Tier 1 Program). Chairperson Garry Brown suggested making the MOE requirements as easy and simple as possible to encourage participation.

The ECAC provided input on the Eligibility Requirements Section and discussed the Transportation Pollution Nexus Section. They asked questions about eligible projects and ineligible projects. Committee members were asked to provide examples of eligible and ineligible projects.

In the Cooperative Agreements Section, Committee Member Sat Tamaribuchi asked about agreements between cities and landowners. Katie Wilson said her understanding is private is excluded. Monte Ward said private funds could be used if, for example, the city has an agreement with the developer regarding a design that would address an existing condition that could be retrofitted.

In regards to the Matching Funding Requirements Section, Katie Wilson asked if other M2 funds could be used as matching funds. Monte Ward said there are instances where M2 funds could be used indirectly. Katie suggested, "Projects that are being funded with other M2 funds can be counted towards a match for retrofit projects." Monte said the language needs to be tightened.

**5. Update on MS4 Permit, Santa Ana RWQCB**

Due to time constraints, Chairperson Brown tabled the Update on MS4 Permit update for another meeting.

**6. Prop. 84 – Storm Water Grant Program**

Katie Wilson from Willdan Engineering presented a synopsis of Proposition 84 Storm Water Grant Program Guidelines. Approximately \$82 million will be available to local public agencies for the reduction and prevention of storm water contamination of rivers, lakes, and streams. Preferences will be given to projects that do one or more of the following: 1) projects that support sustained, long-term water quality improvements, 2) project which are coordinated or consistent with any applicable integrated regional water management plans. Katie also brought to the attention of the Committee the basic provisions as they relate to the funding guidelines being developed for the Environmental Cleanup Program Guidelines.

**7. Public Comments**

No one from the public spoke.

**8. Next Meeting – April 9, 2009**

**9. Committee Member Reports**

No reports were provided.

**10. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.