

Clean Beach Task Force (CBTF) Meeting
Southern California Coastal Water Research Project (SCCWRP)
December 13, 2005

Attendees:

Charlie McGee, Orange Co. S.D.	Monica Mazur, County of Orange HCA
Mark Gold, Heal the Bay	Patricia Holden, UCSB
Peter Mangarella, Geosyntech	Jack Petralia, SCCWRP
Dean Peterson, San Mateo County (T)	

Leslie Laudon, SWRCB	Laura Peters, SWRCB
Robin McCraw, SWRCB	Kari Holmes, SWRCB
Michael Gjerde, SWRCB	Mark Fong, SWRCB
Dayne Kendrick, SWRCB	

(T) – Participated via telephone

Members Absent:

Guangyu Wang, SMBRC	Richard Wagener, Los Angeles Co.
Philip Smith, Marin Co.	Jack Gregg, Coastal Commission
John Largier, UC Davis	John Ricker, Santa Cruz County
John Dorsey, Loyola Marymount Univ.	Steve Weisberg, SCCWRP
Richard Lichtenfels, San Luis Obispo Co.	Marc Beyeler, Coastal Conservancy

Changes/Additions to Agenda:

Additions: Discuss Colorado Lagoon (PIN #4936) receiving entire requested grant amount as requested in a letter issued by the City of Long Beach to the State Water Board.

Proposition 40 Phase 2 Undecided Projects:

Port of Los Angeles – Inner Cabrillo Beach: Kari Holmes recapped the meeting at the Port of Los Angeles (Port of LA) concerning the Proposition 40 Inner Cabrillo grant application reviewed at the October 12, 2005 CBTF meeting. The December 1, 2005 Port of LA meeting was well attended by representatives from the Port of LA, the Mayor’s office, the 15th District Council office, the Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Heal the Bay, and the State Water Board. John Foxworthy from the Port of LA discussed ten proposed projects that the Port intends to complete to improve water quality at Inner Cabrillo Beach. Of the ten proposed projects, it was concluded that three projects would be eligible for Proposition 40 CBI funding. As a result, the Port has resubmitted an application containing these three projects to the Water Board to be reviewed by the CBTF. The three projects submitted are:

- 1) Redesign and extension of the bird exclusion structure
- 2) Removal of an abandoned sewer line
- 3) Removal of the boat launch ramp groin

The estimated total cost of the three projects is \$3.2 million. The Port of LA is requesting \$2 million in Proposition 40 Clean Beaches Initiative funding.

Discussion:

1. Is the configuration of the bird exclusion structure going to be the most effective design since it does not appear to extend down to the swash zone where birds generally congregate? In addition, it was recommended that the sound abatement devices should be considered only as a last resort if the bird exclusion netting fails.
2. Should the abandoned sewer line be removed or should it instead be capped? Who is connected to this abandoned sewer line? CBTF agreed that removing the line is the failsafe way of knowing the problem is removed.
3. Can the boat launch groin be removed in the proposed two days? There were concerns regarding the cost of this portion of the proposed project. Is the budget accurate?
4. The proposed budget included contingency and overhead items. Proposition 40 does not cover these items; therefore, the Water Board staff will work with the Port of LA to revise their budget.

CBTF Recommendation: *CBTF moves to fund this project not to exceed \$2 million. No overhead, contingencies, or sound abatement devices should be funded.*

City of Oceanside – Buccaneer Beach at Loma Alta Creek: The City is proposing a constructed wetland with a large settling pond in front of an ultraviolet light (UV) treatment facility, and a discharge to the surf zone for the disinfected water. Approximately 1.4 million gallons per day (mgd) currently travels down the creek channel. It is proposed that the constructed wetland and pond will capture and settle solids out of the water before the UV treatment. Currently, the City diverts the flow to the wastewater treatment plant (WWTP), however, due to capacity issues at the WWTP and in the sewer system, they are proposing to treat, rather than divert the urban runoff. The City is currently expanding the WWTP, however the expansion is not planned to include the 1.4 mgd from Loma Alta Creek. The wastewater treatment plant's current capacity is 29.1 mgd. The area east of the railroad trestle was proposed for the wetlands and included a parking lot and an interpretative center, which would require land acquisition and industrial site cleanup. The total cost of the project is \$4.75 million and the funds being requested from Proposition 40 Clean Beaches Initiative totals \$4.75 million. The City also submitted a \$2.355 million budget for the facilities west of the railroad trestle, which included a settling pond, the UV facility and the outfall to the surf zone.

Discussion:

1. There was a discussion about the WWTPs capacity issues with dry weather flows. What happens with wet weather flows? Is there an inflow and infiltration (I/I) issue? What does I/I look like during storm events? What are peak flows?
2. PBSJ, the consulting firm working on the system design, cited that they estimate a 20 – 30 percent reduction in solids at the settling basin. Members of the CBTF say this estimate seems reasonable.
3. Design costs seem high compared to construction costs. There were also concerns that the 12% construction management costs were high.
4. Is this Project creating a bird magnet with the creation of the wetlands? If the treatment of the water is of high quality the bird contribution shouldn't be an issue.
5. What is the range of peak flows through the treatment facility?

6. Consider the timing of this Project. Have the landowners been approached yet? Is the soil contaminated in the industrial area? There was a discussion about how much water quality improvement at the beach would result from the improvements planned on the east side of the railroad trestle.

CBTF Recommendation: CBTF recommends funding the construction of the settling pond west of the railroad trestle and the implementation of UV treatment, filters, and outfall. The CBTF recommended funding the portion of this project not to exceed \$2.355 million.

Proposition 40 Phase 2 New Proposals:

PIN # 8793

Pacific Grove – Lover’s Point: Urban runoff diversion Project, Phase III. Funds requested: \$3.5 million.

Discussion:

1. Proposal doesn’t match questionnaire.
2. Is this Project needed to achieve the goals of the CBI program?
3. Lack of information for a \$3.5 million Project.
4. City is rehabilitating sewer lines concurrently.
5. This beach is not on the Competitive Location List (CLL).

CBTF Recommendation: Cannot be funded because it is not on the CLL. Staff will inform the City that the State Water Board will be considering the addition of other impaired beaches to the CLL at the January 2006 Board meeting. Staff will also notify the City of the upcoming Consolidated Grants solicitation and encourage them to apply for Ocean Protection Council funds since the storm drains currently flow to an ASBS.

PIN #8778

Montara Water and Sanitary District – Fitzgerald Marine Reserve: Renovation of Kanoff pump station and Niagara pump station. Funds requested: \$800,000.

Discussion:

1. Not a complete proposal.
2. It is not believed that the pump station overflows are a chronic problem. It appears that this Project would be preventative rather than reactive since the pump stations are currently under capacity.
3. Fitzgerald Marine Reserve is quite a large area.
4. When and if the Kanoff Street pump station overflows, it flows over the beach.
5. The CBTF would like more information on the proposed project.
6. The Project would be eligible for 25% of the total project cost because it is a sewer infrastructure project and Proposition 40’s resolution states this as a limitation.

CBTF Recommendation: Need more information regarding the Project from the Montara Water and Sanitary District. Staff will inform them of the sewer infrastructure funding limitation.

PIN #8715

City of San Luis Obispo – Avila Beaches: Drainage inlet replacements. Funds requested: \$75,000.

Discussion:

1. The proposal was vague and incomplete, and did not tie the project to water quality at the beach.
2. The City of Newport Beach installed filters in drop inlet filters with minimal success. Saltwater corrosion is deteriorating the hinges in the inlets and the maintenance staff has had a lot of problems with the units.

CBTF Recommendation: Do not fund Project as defined.

Status of Proposition 40 funding:

The CBTF has recommended funding 12 projects for a total of \$15,754,988. This leaves a balance of \$6,445,012.

Other Issues

City of Long Beach – Colorado Lagoon: At the August 2, 2005 CBTF meeting, the CBTF decided to recommend partially funding Colorado Lagoon’s \$3.8 million dollar Project (PIN #4936) in the amount of \$2.5 million. This decision to partially fund the Project was because the CBTF did not want to fund trash separation devices as part of the stormwater diversions. The City of Long Beach (City) wrote a letter to the Water Board requesting the entire amount be funded as other trash separation devices have previously been funded through CBI. The trash separation devices are an integral part of this Project because they are required by the County of Los Angeles in order to install diversion structures.

Discussion:

1. The CBTF would like the City to reevaluate the extremely high costs of the Project, however, agrees that the trash separation devices should be funded as the CBTF should be consistent and has previously funded these devices.
2. One member voted against fully funding this Project and noted that Colorado Lagoon’s beaches are not highly used. He thought that the CBTF was more than generous to award \$2.5 million.
3. There are no guidelines for Proposition 40 CBI projects; the Project is on the CLL; and the City is requesting less than the \$5 million cap for a legitimate project, therefore, it was decided that it should be funded in it’s entirety.

CBTF Recommendation: The CBTF moves to fully fund this Project not to exceed \$3,823,868. The CBTF would like to make sure the City understands that the cost of the trash separation devices seemed highly inflated and that was why the original granted funding amount was lower than the requested amount.

City of Capitola – Capitola Beach: This Project was also granted less funding than the City requested because the CBTF did not want to fund silt and grease traps.

Discussion:

1. Silt and grease traps are an untested technology.
2. Do not fund silt and grease traps, as they are not proven to remove bacteria.

CBTF Recommendation: *No need to reconsider additional funding.*

County of Orange – Baby Beach: This Project was also granted less funding than the County requested because the CBTF thought the Oloids were overpriced.

Discussion:

1. Oloids seemed to be overpriced as compared to the Newport Beach project also using Oloids.
2. The CBTF acknowledged the different configuration and decided they would revisit the budget after the design portion is submitted for review.

CBTF Recommendation: *No need to reconsider additional funding.*

City of Santa Monica – Santa Monica Beach at Montana:

Discussion:

The cost estimates that the City submitted do not justify the additional \$600,000 that was awarded at the October 12, 2005 CBTF meeting. There are also questions about their funding sources.

CBTF Recommendation: *Do not give preliminary funding until the City goes out to bid so that there is no question of the funding amount needed.*

CBI Proposition 50 Guidelines:

The Water Board must prepare guidelines for the Proposition 50 CBI funding. Example guidelines were passed around from the 2005-2006 Consolidated Grants Program for reference.

Discussion:

1. The CBTF discussed the issue of Disadvantaged Communities (DAC) since Proposition 50 requires that special consideration be given to DACs. Can the CBTF expand the definition of DACs to include visitor users to a beach or just the people living adjacent to them? Water Board staff think that the definition of communities can be expanded in the new guidelines. The project criteria question will ask if the beach serves a DAC.
2. There is a match requirement similar to Proposition 13 CBI projects.
3. Types of projects Proposition 50 can fund include: 1) projects designed to improve water quality at public beaches, 2) projects to provide comprehensive capability for monitoring, collecting, and analyzing ambient water quality, 3) sewer collection and septic system improvement projects, and 4) storm water and runoff pollution reduction and prevention programs.
4. CBTF would like to steer away from funding strictly monitoring type projects. It would be beneficial to have brand new monitoring programs with new technologies. The CBTF would like to have monitoring projects in the realm of CBTFs list of priority types.
5. Approximately \$23 million available in Proposition 50 for CBI projects. Funds must be encumbered by June 2008 and spent by June 2010.

6. CBTF would like to consider a range of funds to commit for certain types of projects (i.e. \$5-10 million for epidemiological studies and ~\$13 million for water quality projects).
7. The CBTF would like to have the FFAST system check for eligibility before the applicant continues with the application.
8. Need to know what the estimated load reduction is and how it will be measured (i.e. load densities, number of postings and closures).
9. Will there be any discretion as to what counts towards match? Need to define what is eligible. Water Board staff will have lawyers check into this language.
10. Water Board staff will also determine the status of the requirement that recipients waive litigation rights if they accept CBI grant funds.

CBTF Recommendation: *Water Board staff will circulate draft guidelines for CBTF comment when they are ready.*

Ocean Protection Council (OPC):

Discussion:

1. Projects submitted will have to address State Water Board and OPC priorities.
2. CBTF comments were sent to the Water Board in October to be added to the priority list.
3. The monies are still with the Water Board and will be distributed through the 2005-06 Consolidated Grants solicitation.

Other Issues:

There is still approximately \$3 million remaining under Proposition 13 for future CBI projects.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, February 22, 2006, at a northern California site to be determined.

Agenda Suggestions:

1. Continuing problem beaches but few applicants for funding. Need to discuss how the CBTF can get them involved. What beaches are not applying and why? Should the CBTF/Water Board start soliciting personally?
2. What have we received as a whole for the CBI program where we funded projects, and what projects have been successful and unsuccessful. How can we improve with the next round of funding?