

Measure M 2 Environmental Cleanup Allocation Committee

June 28, 2012

Meeting Minutes

Committee Members Present:

Vice Chair Garry Brown, Orange County CoastKeeper
John Bahorski, City of Cypress
Scott Carroll, Costa Mesa Sanitary District
Tim Casey, City of Laguna Niguel
Tom Rosales, General Manager, South Orange County Wastewater Authority
Hector B. Salas, Caltrans
Sat Tamaribuchi, Environmental Consultant

Committee Members Absent:

Mark Adelson, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
William Cooper, UCI
Gene Estrada, City of Orange
Chad Loflen, San Diego Water Quality Control Board
Chair Mary Anne Skorpanich, O. C. Watersheds
Dick Wilson, City of Anaheim

Orange County Transportation Authority Staff Present:

Alison Army, Senior Transportation Analyst
Marissa Espino, Senior Strategic Communications Officer
Janice Kadlec, Public Reporter
Dan Phu, Project Development Strategic Planning Section Manager

Guests

Wallace Walrod, Orange County Business Council

1. Welcome

Vice Chair Garry Brown welcomed everyone and began the meeting at 10:00 a.m.

2. Approval of the April 12, and May 10, 2012 Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Tim Casey, seconded by Sat Tamaribuchi, and carried unanimously to approve the April 12, 2012 Environmental Cleanup Allocation Committee (ECAC) meeting minutes as presented.

A motion was made by Scott Carroll, seconded by Sat Tamaribuchi, and carried unanimously to approve the May 10, 2012 ECAC meeting minutes as presented.

3. Tier 1 Call for Projects Applications

Dan Phu gave an update on the second round of Tier 1 call for projects. The Tier 1 call for projects closed on April 21, 2012 and 50 applications were received from 25 cities and the County of Orange.

Dan Phu said the City of Rancho Santa Margarita has recently notified OCTA that they are likely to withdraw their application. Alison Army said the city indicated they wished to further test the effectiveness of their proposed BMP and would likely apply next year for funding. Dan Phu said this will result in freeing up approximately \$84,000, and, after reviewing the applications again, the City of Fullerton's score was elevated and joined the list of projects recommended for funding.

Tom Rosales asked if every Orange County entity and municipality received funding. Dan Phu said no. Tom Rosales asked if everyone received an application. Dan Phu said OCTA doubled their efforts in reaching out to all and everyone received information.

John Bahorski asked why the City of La Habra scored so low. Chair Garry Brown said he could not specifically address the way the application point structure worked, but gave the example if the applicant discharged to a 303D water body and listed the pollutants they could score 5 points. Some applicants did not discharge to a 303D water body. This is just an example, but there is more to the questions and answers than just the project. Alison Army said, in reviewing the application, the City of La Habra fell short on a couple of other questions.

Scott Carroll asked how the project priorities were set. Dan Phu said the priorities were set by the applicant. For example, if an applicant had five projects to submit, they needed to rank them (1 through 5) according to their priority. This doesn't necessarily mean they will score accordingly on OCTA's end because the scoring compares them to the rest of the applications.

Scott Carroll asked what ARS stood for. Alison Army replied ARS stood for Automatic Retractable Screens.

Garry Brown observed that, this year, when reviewing the irrigation system projects, the evaluation committee made sure landscape costs were not a part of the proposed projects. This was a recommendation from the ECAC from the previous round of funding.

John Bahorski suggested maybe next year landscaping could be allowed by simply showing all other grant opportunities have been exhausted. Garry Brown said this could be a very good thing to discuss for the next call for projects.

John Bahorski noted there seemed to be a very good mix of projects for this round of funding. Chair Garry Brown seconded this observation.

Sat Tamaribuchi asked what the percentage of the local match was. Dan Phu said it was a minimum of 25% for Tier 1. Tim Casey said some of the applicants are over matching. Sat Tamaribuchi asked if anything was given for over match. Alison Army said a half a point was given for every 5% of over match up to five points.

John Bahorski asked if, after this second round, if there are cities who have not applied in either round of funding. Garry Brown said Rancho Santa Margarita and Laguna Woods did not apply for either round of funding. Dan Phu said he does not know the answer to this yet. OCTA is doing a tabulation internally of all rounds of funding up to round seven. The preliminary report on the first two rounds of funding should be ready in a couple of months and will be presented to the ECAC.

Tom Rosales asked if OCTA anticipates seven rounds of funding. Dan Phu said yes. With the Early Action Plan funding the program actually goes through 2041. The program will be revisited after the initial Early Action Plan funding to see whether there will continue to be a call for projects issued on an annual basis or whether there will be a less frequent cycle.

A motion was made by Tim Casey, seconded by John Bahorski, and passed unanimously to endorse the ranking of the 50 Tier 1 applications to be considered for approval by OCTA's Executive Committee and Board of Directors in August.

Tim Casey shared his city's (Laguna Nigel) experience with Tier 1 round one funding. After receiving top points for their Tier 1 project they went out to bid and found out the bids were in excess of what the city anticipated. They have since rejected all bids and have asked OCTA for a onetime grant extension. Once the current Tier 1 round of funding goes to the OCTA for approval, Laguna Nigel will repackage the project and go out to bid again with all five segments of the project at once and with conditional value engineering, hoping for sales because of the economy.

Dan Phu added that all applicants have a one-time up to twoyear extension of their projects available under the Combined Transportation Funding Programs guidelines.

4. Tier 2 Call for Projects Update

Dan Phu gave an update on the Tier 2 call for projects. Marissa Espino gave an overview of the Tier 2 Workshops and outreach efforts.

Chair Garry Brown asked if the comments from the cities were generally positive or if there were specific complaints. Marissa Espino said they have been hearing comments on the 50% match. Dan Phu has been very good in explaining the process on how to bring down the match. Dan Phu said the ECAC can be credited with coming up with a formula to reduce the 50% match. There is very positive feedback from the applicants once they understand this.

Dan Phu polled the ECAC on their feelings of signage on the Tier 2 project sites indicating things like “This project is funded by Measure M 2” or “Your tax dollars at work.” Tim Casey said he felt it was totally appropriate for Tier 2 project sites. The remaining ECAC members indicated agreement.

Dan Phu said once the Tier 2 projects are evaluated in September they can figure out how this can be incorporated into the contracts with the various agencies.

5. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

6. Committee Member Reports

Tim Casey announced this would be his last ECAC meeting. He will be retiring November 1, 2012. He said it had been a pleasure serving on the ECAC. Garry Brown thanked him for his many contributions to the ECAC.

7. Next Meeting – TBD

The ECAC decided not to meet in July 2012. The next meeting of the ECAC will be August 9, 2012 in the OCTA offices.

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:35 a.m.