

**Beaches and Creeks TMDL Cost-Benefit Analysis
Steering Committee Meeting
July 27, 2016**

Committee Members Present

Jeremy Haas, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board
Ruth Kolb, City of San Diego, Storm Water and Transportation
Todd Snyder, County of San Diego, Watershed Protection Program
Jeff Van Every, City of San Diego Public Utilities Division
Ted Shaw, Atlantis Group, representing San Diego County Taxpayers Association
Chris Crompton, County of Orange, Stormwater Quality Planning

Supporting Roles

Lewis Michaelson, Katz & Associates
Bree Robertoy, Katz & Associates
Jian Peng, County of Orange, Stormwater Quality Planning
Michelle Mata, San Diego Regional Quality Control Board
Jo Ann Weber, County of San Diego
Mark Buckley, Eco Northwest
Clint Bosen, Tetrattech (Participating via phone)
Chad Praul, Environmental Incentives
Maso Matlow, Environmental Incentives
Nick Arhontese, County of Orange consultant

Meeting Notes Review

- The committee did not have any questions, comments or edits regarding notes from the previous meetings.

Technical Advisory Committee Comments

- The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed and commented on the draft work plan at a meeting held on July 11, 2016.
- The consultant plans to address all comments provided by the TAC in the revised work plan and scope of work.

Economic Impact Analysis

- The TAC felt the EIA would not necessarily guide the decision making process and, therefore, is not as important a part of the process if something needs to be scaled back.
- The consultant's strategy is to include the EIA in an optional secondary phase of the project. The primary phase of the project will include the screening portion of the Financial Capability Analysis (FCA) required by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).
- T. Snyder: It was my understanding the TAC felt the EIA might skew results of the CBA by leading to a preferred scenario based on tangential alternatives, as opposed to identifying a preferred scenario from a water quality standpoint.

- M. Buckley: There are other options that wouldn't be as relevant (e.g., REMI Model and Implant Approach). The EIA would identify jobs, income and industry level output. It was offered as an option because that was what the committee was initially interested in. It is a common analysis to perform.
- There might be some whittling of alternatives in the primary phase that will lead to this analysis being more relevant and efficient.
- Including this as an optional secondary phase analysis also addresses the TAC's concern with the aggressive timeline in respect to the number of scenarios included in the CBA.

Decision Making Process

- The TAC advised the committee to identify a decision making process, specifically defining who will select the scenarios to be developed and how the scenarios will be selected.
- The consultant's strategy is to draft a decision making process and present it to the steering committee for approval. The consultant recommended performing an initial analysis first, then identifying hybrid scenarios to be analyzed in a secondary phase, and finally taking the preferred scenario to the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Conceptual Model

- The TAC recommended developing a detailed conceptual model to assess potential consequences of best management practices (BMPs) and link water quality improvements to the CBA.
- The consultant will not be able to complete a detailed conceptual model for the work plan portion as there will still be uncertainties, but the conceptual model will be embedded in the work product as a section in the CBA. It will be a table showing the potential positive and negative consequences of each primary action considered. A section identifying co-benefits and co-costs will be included in the CBA as well.
- The consultant will work with engineers and review existing literature to develop the conceptual model.
- T. Shaw will provide a list of members of the local Building Industry Association stormwater task force for the consultant to reach out to to better understand intended and unintended impacts of BMPs.
- The consultant could use conceptual models developed for Water Quality Improvement Plans (WQIP) as a guide.
 - T. Snyder: The WQIPs were developed with constraints (e.g., wastewater systems and stream restoration were not considered in models).
 - J. Haas: Stream restoration is different than in-stream treatment. Federal and State do not allow in-stream treatment, but do promote stream restoration. The consultant can reach out to the Regional Water Quality Control Board for more information if they are unsure about the difference.
 - C. Crompton: The CBA and Orange County's WQIP are being developed concurrently.
- C. Crompton: The timing of developing this conceptual model is a concern, as this is usually the first thing done.
- T. Snyder: An analysis of unintended consequences could be conducted by engineering firms outside of this project's scope of work, then provided to the consultant for use in the CBA.

- J. Haas: The conceptual model could complicate the overall approach if scale is not considered. Do not recommend dwelling on it.
- The conceptual model could be added to page 9 of the work plan. A third arrow would be added extending from the cost of BMPs box showing additional consequences.

Future Assumptions

- The TAC advised the consultant to clearly identify the baseline and future changes in the work plan. The consultant will revise the work plan to make those components more explicit.

Draft Data Plan

- The consultant is working with various sources to identify and close data gaps, and put together data plans. There will be an opportunity for the steering committee to review and provide written comments on the data plan within the next version of the work plan.
- J. A. Weber: The consultant has been working hard with engineers, wastewater and contractors to develop the data plans. They are taking feedback from the TAC regarding the data plans very seriously.
- C. Crompton: Measuring pathogens versus indicators should be called out in the data plans.

Public Participation

- Public review is a requirement. The steering committee is committed to having the public review the work plan before beginning work on the CBA.
- A public workshop will be held August 31, 2016. It will be advertised and will likely attract primarily special interest groups.
- The public can provide comments during the 30-day public comment period, from August 17 through September 16.
- Responses to public comments will be routed through the steering committee. Responses to public comments submitted will be itemized in a table.
- C. Crompton: Two to three weeks should be allotted between the end of the public comment period and the revision of the work plan to allow for committee discussion of the public comments.
- J. Haas: The CBA workgroup scheduled on September 28 could be used to discuss public comments.

Scope and Schedule for Analysis Phases I & II

- The consultant recommends breaking the analyses into phases in order to complete the screening portion of the FCA and the initial benefits analysis by November 2016.
- The consultant's proposed Phase I would be completed in November 2016 and would include:
 - A screening analysis, to include acquisition of all data and analysis of benefits and costs of all scenarios;
 - The screening portion of the FCA written as a MEMO;
 - Peer reviewed costs;
 - Documented findings with separate sections (i.e., not a comprehensive report);
 - Steering committee review of the work product;
 - TAC review of the work product; and

- A decision making workshop to be held in January 2017.
- The consultant’s proposed Phase II would be completed by mid-2017 and would include:
 - Production of the full FCA, to include all counties and indicators;
 - Optional completion of an EIA;
 - A full property analysis;
 - A true, detailed report with a full methods section;
 - Additional steering committee meetings;
 - Optional completion of a fact sheet for interest groups;
 - A public workshop;
 - Three rounds of review; and
 - Development of a proposal to the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- Phase II would go into more detailed discussion in conjunction with more advanced modeling. Some scenarios will be less precisely defined in the screening analysis. Phase II would provide more detail on those, assuming the selected hybrid scenarios included them.
- The consultant has revised the task order descriptions, and a finalized version will be shared with J. A. Weber.

Comments Regarding the Phased Approach

- Since Phase II is optional, the work product from Phase I should stand alone and be usable in case the budget doesn’t allow for Phase II.
- The final report needs to be included in Phase I.
 - The consultant may need to extend the timeline for Phase I into early 2017 in order to complete a full report in Phase I.
- The public workshop to review the final product needs to be included in Phase I.
- T. Snyder: The property value analysis should be cut.
- J. Haas: The phased approach is a good idea, but I’m worried it will extend the timeframe.
- T. Snyder: By end of Phase I, if the steering committee decides not to move forward with Phase II, would the information be sufficient enough to group scenarios?
 - The scenarios will be as discreet as possible, but some scenarios could be additive. Different scenarios have varying outputs. The work product will be built out to be modified later to the extent possible.
- J. Haas: The Regional Water Quality Control Board’s ultimate decision will almost certainly be a hybrid scenario. I’m comfortable with a screening level analysis that will at least feed into the decision of what action to take, even if it doesn’t identify a clear solution.
- Additional funds would need to be procured to take a phased approach and complete the second phase.

Budget

- The conceptual model is estimated at \$8,000, but it could cost more.
 - C. Crompton: The conceptual model should be fairly straightforward, so the cost shouldn’t be high.
- The committee is hoping to provide a lot of data to the consultant to reduce costs.
- C. Crompton: Meetings could be a place to reduce costs (e.g., participating via calls instead of in-person or reducing the number of meetings).

- J. A. Weber and J. Peng are to work with the consultant to adjust the scope of work, reduce the cost of the CBA and obtain needed data.