

Clean Beach Task Force Meeting Minutes
UCSB Campus – June 8, 2004

Attendees

- Mark Fong, SWRCB
- Christopher Stevens, SWRCB
- Wayne Pierson, SWRCB
- Leslie Laudon, SWRCB
- Connie Perkins, SWRCB
- Laura Peters, SWRCB
- Bruce Locken, SWRCB
- John Dorsey, Loyola Marymount University
- Monica Mazur, Orange Co. Health Care Agency (*via phone*)
- Trish Holden, UC Santa Barbara
- Jim Kuykendall, Boyle Engineering
- Jack Petralia, (former SWRCB Consultant)
- Steve Weisberg, So. Calif. Coastal Waters Research Project
- Charles McGee, Orange Co. Sanitation District
- Guangyu Wang, Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission
- Mark Beyeler, Coastal Conservancy (*via phone*)
- Kara Kemmler, Coastal Conservancy
- Richard Lechenfels, San Louis Obispo County
- Mark Gold, Health the Bay
- John Ricker, Santa Cruz County (*via phone*)
- Jack Gregg, Coastal Commission (*via phone*)

Introductions & Announcements

- All present introduced themselves for the benefit of new attendees.
- No announcements were made.

Agenda Approval

- The Task Force discussed the agenda, and decided to address items in the following order as time permits: project status, project reviews, future rounds of funding, circulation symposium/data evaluation report, and oceans conference in October 2004.

Project Status Update

- Christopher S. summarized the status of projects funded under Props. 13 and 40. 91% of the Prop. 13 funds will be encumbered by June 30, 2004; to date approximately \$10 million has been committed from the Prop. 40 funds. The remaining \$10 million from Phase I of Prop. 40 funding should be committed by September or no later than end of the year.
- The Task Force briefly discussed the six Prop. 13 projects that did not get Phase II funds. CBTF members suggested that state staff contact these agencies and encourage them to apply for Prop. 40 and 50 funds.
- Jack G. expressed a desire to see some CBI funding go towards other goals, such as epidemiology studies, if possible.

Clean Beach Task Force Meeting Minutes
UCSB Campus – June 8, 2004

Individual Project Reviews

City of Dana Point, Project #44 (Laura P.)

- The project is a storm drain diversion with a CDS unit. A grant of \$500,000 for this project would put the City at the \$5 million limit per agency for Prop. 40 funds.
- Monica M. has concerns with maintenance of the diversion system. She expressed concerns that the pipes would become clogged with sand because they are buried. Pico Kenter storm drain, as well as other drains, had problems in the past with clogging. (Mark G.)
- This project will also reduce the potential for erosion of the bluff because all of the existing flow will be routed to one point and diverted to the sanitary sewer. (Laura P.)
- Mark G. could support this project because Doheny is one of the most polluted beaches in the state and the project is a small dollar amount. Steve W. also expressed support for the project. He indicated that the project might not be significant in and of itself, but it may be necessary to do multiple projects at certain locations in order to see a positive result.
- Several members expressed concern that funding the project might be interpreted as using CBI funds to help the City build a new storm drainage system. The CBTF stressed the project approval should make clear that the CBI funds are intended to address the existing water quality problem and not establish a precedent for other projects that want funding to improve infrastructure.
- The project was recommended for funding by CBTF with the understanding the state staff would review the City's plans for maintenance and that the approval makes clear that funds are being used to address an existing urban runoff problem. The funds are not being used to help the City build a new drainage system.

City of Ventura, Project #98 (Bruce L.)

- The project was reviewed previously by CBTF in August 2003
- The City completed its feasibility study. The City is now focusing on five drains out of a total of nine. The plan is to divert the urban runoff from these five to the City's wastewater treatment plant.
- Bruce L. indicated that the City's project has improved because they are focusing on the highest priority drains, but it is still unclear what the connection is between the drains and beach water quality. It was also unclear from the City's proposal if just dry season flows would be diverted or whether year round dry weather flow will be diverted.
- There was some confusion about which area of beach the City was referring to in its proposal versus other people's name for the different beach areas in Ventura. Mark G. pointed out the problem area is Surfer's Point at Seaside. It was unclear from the City's proposal whether the City was targeting the same area as Mark G. was referring to.
- Bruce L. indicated that the proposal does not indicate flow rates in the drains.
- Guangyu W. believes more planning needs to be done on this project to get more answers.
- Mark G. volunteered to work with Bruce L. and the City to make this a better project.
- Project was not recommended by CBTF at this time.

Clean Beach Task Force Meeting Minutes
UCSB Campus – June 8, 2004

Consideration of Funding Future CBI Projects

- Christopher S. indicated that the current schedule for Phase II of Prop. 40 funding (approximately \$23 million) calls for sending out an invitation later in June and requested input on whether state staff should use the same approach or a different approach.
- Mark G. suggested that we shift the focus for future funds to the most recalcitrant and prominent problem beaches rather than using funds for easy, but less prominent, locations. Mark G. indicated that when the CBI program was conceived, the idea was solve the problems at the most polluted beaches. He believes that the focus has shifted to solving the easiest problems, but that after solving the easy problems there won't be much to show for our efforts. He indicated that there are perhaps 30 high priority problem beaches. If CBI can fund some of these and have success, then the CBI program will have made good use of the grant monies.
- Wayne P. indicated that the Task Force should bear in mind the need to move efficiently to avoid losing spending authority. Prop. 40 funds must be encumbered by December 31, 2006, and funds must be expended by December 31, 2008. Prop. 50 funding is currently anticipated in fiscal year 2005/2006.
- The CBTF members discussed how to approach directing the funds to those more difficult locations. It was suggested that the upcoming circulation symposium being spearheaded by John L. would be a good forum to motivate and guide agencies responsible for the most troublesome locations to take on effective projects. Agencies would be invited to go to the Enclosed Bay Circulation Symposium in Fall 2004 and apply for grant funding in Spring 2005. This would give agencies enough time for contract execution and project construction/evaluation.
- The CBTF discussed the possibility of developing some official statement from the Task Force that would articulate the Task Force's desire to solve the most prominent problems and establish a basis for deciding which projects should be funded. Wayne P. offered the possibility of having the SWRCB adopt a Resolution to this effect.
- Wayne P. indicated that Prop. 40 language was amended to provide the SWRCB greater flexibility on the types of projects to fund. State staff would need to look closely at each specific project to see if other types of projects could be funded.
- John D. noted that the last two bullets in the "draft" invitation include projects other than for bacterial reduction.
- The CBTF members discussed their role in motivating agencies to take on projects at problem beaches.
- Mark G. agreed to circulate to CBTF members the list of the 30 worst beaches for bacterial problems so that others can review the list.

Enclosed Bay Circulation Symposium/Data Evaluation Report for the SWRCB (Steve W.)

- Steve W. indicated that he sees himself as merely distributing the grant money for this project. He really sees the project as belonging to the CBTF.
- John D. suggested that the purpose of the symposium should be to give agencies responsible for enclosed beach circulation problems a "bag of tools" to come up with a solution. He

Clean Beach Task Force Meeting Minutes UCSB Campus – June 8, 2004

suggested that anyone worldwide with experience at solving similar problems be invited to share their experiences and solutions.

- John L. should be educating the audience on possible solutions to the problem of bacterial water quality in enclosed bays.
- Guangyu W. suggested that the symposium address not only enclosed bays, but also other severely polluted beaches.
- The following members offered to assist John L. with developing expectations and providing information on potential solutions for the symposium: John D., Jack G., and Mark G.
- John D is handling the data evaluation aspect of the project. John D. sees the overall goal of the evaluation as: did projects work and did we meet beach standards? John believes that SCCWRP's data management system used for bacterial regional monitoring will be a valuable tool in evaluating the projects. Larry Cooper of SCCWRP will be assisting with data management. John hopes that the data will lend themselves to statistical testing, although they may be too limited for this sort of an assessment. There will be other data unique to project itself that can also be included in the evaluations. John would like to make overall recommendations about each category of projects (i.e. diversions, etc.). John would like to look at some of the early final project reports and work with state staff to get a guidance letter out to grant recipients on what data we need in the final reports. John D. would like to get started on the project during the summer. Mark G. volunteered his organization's services. The Task Force discussed whether to evaluate all projects that received a Prop. 13 grant, or just those that actually constructed a project. The Task Force agreed that all projects should be evaluated. If time or money was limited, though, the analysis should focus on those projects that implemented a project.
- John D. offered to provide a 30-minute summary at each CBTF meeting to update the Task Force on the Data Evaluation process.

Ocean Conference

- Steve W. indicated that he is on the steering committee for the conference. He provided a rundown of the current plans for the conference, and requested input on other topics that should be covered at the conference. The conference is scheduled for October 13 – 15.

Schedule of Next Meeting

- Christopher got a consensus from the CBTF members to have the next meeting on September 13, 2004, at SCCWRP's office.