

**Clean Beach Task Force (CBTF) Meeting  
Loyola Marymount University  
October 12, 2005**

**Attendees:**

Charlie McGee, Orange Co. S.D.	John Dorsey, Loyola Marymount Univ.
Monica Mazur, County of Orange HCA	Mark Gold, Heal the Bay
Richard Lichtenfels, San Luis Obispo Co.	Peter Mangarella, Geosyntech
Patricia Holden, UCSB	Steve Weisberg, SCCWRP
John Largier, UC Davis	John Ricker, Santa Cruz County (T)
Marc Beyeler, Coastal Conservancy (T)	Jack Petralia, SCCWRP
Leslie Laudon, SWRCB	Laura Peters, SWRCB
Robin McCraw, SWRCB	Kari Holmes, SWRCB
Mark Fong, SWRCB	Gregory McMahan, SWRCB

(T) – Participated via telephone

**(Non-members)**

Sean McBride, LMU	Ying Poon, Everest Consultants
-------------------	--------------------------------

**Members Absent:**

Guangyu Wang, SMBRC	Richard Wagener, Los Angeles Co.
Philip Smith, Marin Co.	Dean Peterson, San Mateo County
Jack Gregg, Coastal Commission	

**Changes/Additions to Agenda:**

*Agenda adopted as proposed.*

**Proposition 40 Funding Status:**

Ms. Laudon gave a brief status report on funding. \$21.5 million of the Proposition 40 Phase I funds have been committed and approximately \$10 million of the \$22 million of Phase II funds have been recommended for projects by the CBTF. Division staff is working with the recipients to commit the recommended funds.

*CBTF: There is a need to seek the best project at the right location.*

**Update on other DFA Grant opportunities**

**Consolidated Grants:** The Ocean Protection Council (OPC) has been authorized to recommend the allocation of \$10 million of Proposition 50 funds previously planned for the CBI program. This \$10 million will be included in the Consolidated Grants solicitation. The State Water Resources Control Board will develop Guidelines that identify mutual priorities and include review and recommendation by the OPC of projects for funding. Proposition 50 states that projects should have multiple benefits. OPC is accepting comments on project priorities. The Water Board's recommended priorities could not be presented at the September OPC meeting because they were not on the meeting's agenda.

*CBTF members reiterated the position of the CBTF that it should advocate how these funds are spent by the OPC. Members Gold and Weisberg will try to get on the January 2006 OPC meeting agenda to speak for the CBTF. Mark Gold will send a letter to OPC and SWRCB enumerating the CBTF priorities.*

### Discussion on Priorities:

1. Many high profile beaches do not meet state bacterial standards over significant periods of time but the source of the problem has not been identified. Funds should not be spent to fix problems before the problems have been adequately identified.
2. The development of rapid indicators should be tied to epidemiology studies.
3. Posting protocols/methods should be developed that accurately depict the bacterial conditions at the time. The preferable method might be to develop an empirical model based on transport that can accurately predict the probability of bacterial levels at a given beach or segment of a beach.
4. Rankings:
  - a. Source tracking (Recommendation #4) should be moved to rank #2. This is required in order to develop transport models.
  - b. The development of new indicators should be combined with the development of rapid indicators. New epidemiology studies will be required to assess health risk using these indicators.
5. The emphasis of studies has been on dry-weather conditions; there is a need to study various aspects of wet-weather impacts on ocean water quality.

The priority list developed by members Gold and Weisberg was discussed.

- Accuracy is more important than speed of coming up with a solution.
- Rank 1 thru 4 at the same "level".
- All priorities listed are inter-related.
- Add Assessing Wet-Weather Health Risks as #7.

The CBTF priorities include the priorities developed by the Beach Water Quality Workgroup (BWQW) and the recommendations developed at the Enclosed Beaches Conference in August (BWQW priorities were distributed). These priorities/recommendations include conducting additional epidemiology studies, research projects centered on indicators of sewage contamination, beach sand contamination, circulation studies and the efficacy of "best management practices" that have been utilized in reducing bacterial densities in urban runoff.

*CBTF Recommendation: Combine the first four recommendations (rapid indicators, epidemiology studies, development of new indicators, and source tracking) into "level 1" and recommendation #5 (BMP effectiveness), #6 (transport mechanisms), and #7 (Assessing Wet-Weather Health Risks) into "level 2" recommendations.*

### **Proposition 50 Guidelines (Leslie Laudon):**

Approximately \$23 million will be available. Staff is targeting next spring for the circulation of the draft Guidelines. CBTF proposal criteria will be a topic of the next meeting.

No discussion of or action was taken regarding Proposition 50 funds at this meeting.

### **Circulation Workshop (John Largier & Steve Weisberg):**

Dr. Largier gave a summary of the 2-day conference held at Dana Point in August.

- Approximately 80 persons attended the first day of the conference that was open to all interested persons. Various presenters discussed the water quality problems associated with enclosed bays.
- Approximately 40 persons attended the second day of the conference that was open to invitees. The day's proceedings focused on three beaches; Campbell Cove, Kiddie Beach and Inner Cabrillo Beach. At the end of the day, recommendations were developed for dealing with these types of beaches.

Dr. Weisberg recommended that:

- All projects should be phased beginning with a study to show what fix is appropriate.
- Communication is important; what does the CBTF want?
- Dr. Weisberg proposed having a task force member work with each applicant. Another proposal was made that there should be a one page pre-application for projects so an initial screening can be conducted and applicant advised as to suitability of project.

### **Monitoring Plans (John Dorsey):**

Dr. Dorsey distributed a proposal identifying specific data that must be included in approved monitoring plans for the evaluation of CBI projects. Numerous data-related issues exist, ranging from holes in the reported data to a genuine lack of both quantity and quality in the data presented at the time of application and in the final evaluation.

Dr. Dorsey presented his current findings on 20 Proposition 13 projects, and noted the following from his ongoing analysis of monitoring data:

- Some beaches funded for projects only occasionally exceeded AB411 standards. CBTF may need to require more compelling evidence of the magnitude of a problem before the candidate beach receives granting funding.
- Monitoring plans should be designed so that it can determine if the project was successfully implemented and operating, served to significantly reduce the level of fecal indicator bacteria (FIB) on a before-and-after basis, and whether or not AB411 water standards were actually met after project implementation.
- Most projects submitted some data. However, the lack of data quality, quantity and methodology made it difficult to compare the effectiveness of projects, and these deficiencies also frustrated efforts to determine project effectiveness from a before-and-after comparative standpoint.
- Several projects had too few data points for adequate statistical analysis, while others had lots of data. Dr. Dorsey suggested that data be taken weekly before and after project implementation for at least 52 weeks.

Some members were concerned as to what data is available via other sources, and what data needs to be collected at the site of the proposed project, as well as data taken at adjacent or similar sites which could substitute for data taken on site.

Types of data desired by Dr. Dorsey include, but are not limited to the following:

- Average volume treated (MGD) with variance estimate (standard deviation) and ranges for period in question.
- Record of anomalies including O&M problems.
- Operational logs detailing when and how long project was/was not operating, causes of problems and associated run-off by-passed to beach.
- FIB parameters: total coliform, fecal coliform or E. coli, and enterococcus bacteria concentrations.
- Rainfall estimates should be submitted from point nearest to the project.

### **Discussion:**

- Invite/require grantee to make a presentation to CBTF evaluating the effectiveness supported by water quality data of their project.
- Should there be a requirement to monitor for salinity levels and water temperature?
- Should a fixed format be developed for the presentation of monitoring data? Should they be given a template?
- Other monitoring data sets (TMDL, non-point source) are available and should be used where applicable. County websites may have links to relevant data sets.

- Use 303(d) criteria where other criteria may not be applicable.

**Public Comments:**

No comments from the public were received.

**Proposition 40 Phase 2 Conditionally Approved Projects:**

**Dana Point Harbor Baby Beach Circulation (PIN #6784) –**

*Project:* Improve circulation using several Oloids at Baby Beach (\$1,614,000 requested). Mr. Ying Poon made a presentation on behalf of the County of Orange. Extensive monitoring data is available and on-going extensive monitoring is being conducted (twice-daily sample collection at 6 sites at Baby Beach in Dana Point Harbor).

**Discussion:**

1. The problem at Baby Beach is not understood. The source has not been determined. Bacterial levels vary at different rates.
2. The issue was raised as to whether this engineering fix, moving the water, could be effective? Will moving water at waist depth increase circulation at ankle depth? Is this a type of project that should be approved?
3. It was noted that this was a “last ditch effort” to solve a water quality problem at this beach. It will also serve as a study into the effectiveness of this mitigation measure.

***CBTF Recommendation:*** Set aside \$1million but disburse funds on an incremental basis; \$250,000 for design and analysis of the effectiveness Oloid units at reducing bacterial levels as measured per AB411 standards. Release balance of funds based on an evaluation of this assessment by the CBTF. If the effectiveness of the Oloid units cannot be demonstrated, funding of the project would cease.

**Poche Beach Ultraviolet Light Bacteria Disinfection System PIN #6724 –**

*Project:* Relocate the present UV disinfection system to an above ground location and add media filtration. Treated effluent will be discharged to surf-zone (\$1,500,000 requested).

**Background:** The original system was installed with Proposition 13 funds. Additionally, the original proposed project was for a diversion facility, but a UV system treatment facility was constructed instead.

**Discussion:**

1. This is a high priority beach, and the water quality problem should be addressed.
2. Water Board staff should evaluate the location of the proposed facility and assess the likelihood of maintaining the total suspended solids level (TSS) level at less than 30.
3. Should monitor NTU and UV effectiveness. UV effectiveness should be maintained.
4. Need significant reduction in all three bacterial indicators.
5. Influent and effluent bacterial levels should be monitored.

***CBTF recommendation:*** Approve for \$1,500,000. A high level of effectiveness at bacterial reduction must be maintained. Problems meeting NTU limitations should be anticipated. Monitor influent and effluent bacterial levels (If funding is inadequate, monitor enterococcus only).

**Westside Park Septic to Sewer Project at Bodega Bay PIN #4916 –**

*Project:* Abandon existing on-site sewage system in Westside Park and connect facilities to public sewer (\$290,000 requested).

Discussion:

1. Any connection between bacterial contamination from the on-site sewage disposal system and water quality in the harbor or at Campbell Cove has not been demonstrated. Monitoring should be conducted to establish if a water quality problem exists.
2. How will applicant demonstrate that the conversion of the sewage disposal system will improve water quality?
3. This project cannot be justified on the basis of bacterial levels at Campbell Cove.

**CBTF recommendation:** *Approve the project for \$290,000 based on the principle that removing a source of ocean water contamination is desirable.*

**Colorado Lagoon Beaches PIN #4936 –**

Project: Clean and modify existing culvert hydraulically connecting Colorado Lagoon and Marine Stadium, install trash separators and low flow diversion structures into four storm drains, and create bioswales on the remaining five storm drains (\$3,823,868 requested).

Discussion:

1. Should trash separators and bioswales be part of this project? The trash separators are required for diversions by the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County.
2. The City of Long Beach should be required to have a “match” in funding this project.

**CBTF recommendations:** *Reduce request to \$2.5 million. City will be required to make a matching contribution of \$1.3 million for the trash separators.*

**City of Capitola: 3 Projects Drainage Improvement Plan PIN #5596 –**

Project: Construct a treatment wetland on ¼ acre of city-owned property adjacent to Soquel Lagoon, construct silt and grease traps, and dry weather diversions on two storm drains located between Stockton Avenue Bridge and the railroad trestle (\$973,000 requested).

Discussion:

1. The funding of the silt and grease traps is not shown to reduce bacteria.
2. The two diversions proposed are very small (couple hundred gallons/day)
3. Road oil and debris gets into the storm drains.

**CBTF recommendations:** *Approve \$600,000 for proposed project. Require the City to match \$375,000 for the silt and grease traps for the storm drains.*

**Prop 40 Phase 2 New Proposal Review:**

**City of Calabasas: Infiltration/Bioremediation of Urban Runoff to Las Virgenes Creek PIN #8743 -**

Project: Diversion of dry-weather flow from the storm drain located in the watershed into a two-stage filtration and infiltration system (\$172,700 requested).

Discussion:

1. No evidence that project will improve ocean water quality at Surfrider Beach.
2. No apparent link to AB411 exceedances at Surfrider Beach.
3. Accumulated flows of water in Malibu Creek cause breaches of the Malibu Lagoon but no evidence that breaches of the lagoon will be reduced if project is approved and constructed.

**CBTF recommendations:** *Require applicant to submit additional information including an estimate of how much project will reduce flow to Malibu Creek due to infiltration into*

groundwater. Obtain information regarding setback of infiltration field, how will it affect AB411 exceedances. Applicant should submit recent monitoring data.

**Malibu Civic Center Stormwater Treatment Facility PIN #8720 –**

Project: Diversion and treatment (filtration and ozonation) of dry-weather urban runoff flows from three existing stormwater drains to the Civic Center Treatment Facility (\$2,000,000 requested).

Discussion:

1. Original engineering firm selected for the project went bankrupt. Delay in implementing project has significantly increased project costs.
2. The improvement of water quality at Surfrider Beach is a high priority CBI goal.
3. In order to have an impact on Surfrider Beach flows to Malibu Creek must be reduced. Treated storm water flow must be diverted for reuse. Facilities to store and distribute treated effluent for reuse must be built and sites for reuse must be found.
4. As described, this project will not have the desired results.
5. Project is out to bid within two weeks.
6. This project as designed returns treated effluent to Malibu Creek. Effluent will be “clean” but project does not impact flow in the creek and reduce breaches of the lagoon.
7. This proposal doesn’t address the “reuse” portion of the project. Need for additional storage, distribution lines and reuse sites.
8. Discharge to the creek or lagoon with project effluent should not be permitted.

CBTF recommendation: Approve for \$2,000,000 with the request that all treated effluent must be reused and pending commitment to reuse in the area - no discharges to lagoon.

**Inner Cabrillio Beach Water Quality Improvement Project PIN# 6568 -**

Project: Rebuilding the beach with sand replacement (\$5,000,000 requested).

Discussion:

1. Available evidence indicates bacteria source and problem are sediments, poor water circulation and eelgrass. There is no evidence suggesting an offshore source.
2. Funding, if approved, should not be used for eelgrass removal.

CBTF recommendations: No recommendation is made pending a meeting between Mark Gold, Laura Peters, Kari Holmes, and the project representatives to thoroughly review the proposal. It was suggested that the project representatives be invited to next CBTF meeting to provide them an opportunity to explain and justify the project to the entire CBTF.

**Oceanside Beach at Loma Alta Creek PIN #8728 -**

Project: Installation of a UV system to treat dry weather flows before they reach the beach, and the construction of a wetland on city-owned property to aid in treatment (\$4,316,000 requested).

Discussion:

1. City does not own all the necessary land needed for the wetland, and is in the process of obtaining additional parcels.
2. The applicant has not identified matching funds for the projects implementation.
3. A design configuration has not been submitted with the proposal.
4. No details on the treatment process in the wetlands.
5. Why isn’t applicant upgrading their sewer infrastructure in the near future?

CBTF recommendation: Require more details onsite features, size, residence time, types of plants, configuration, and intake issues. A CBTF subcommittee will draft questions and Water

Board staff will meet with applicants and obtain clarification. CBTF may invite applicant to a meeting to answer questions or via teleconference and will also request site photos.

**Santa Monica Montana Watershed Dry-Wet Urban Runoff BMP Project PIN #8526 -**

Project: Removal of pollutants and other solids from urban runoff flowing to Montana Avenue Watershed (\$600,000 requested).

Discussion:

1. Diversion couldn't be constructed at the original location. A suitable location has been selected and additional funding is required to complete this project.
2. Prop. 13 funds plus a matching contribution are also being used to fund the project.

CBTF recommendation: Conditionally approved \$600,000 for the proposed project. Require additional information for what the cost is for constructing the project, see bid documents and cost estimates. Award only the shortfall between Prop. 13/match funds and the low bid.

**City of Redondo Beach: Alta Vista Park Diversion and Reuse Project Pin #8738 -**

Project: Diversion, treatment and reuse of dry and wet weather runoff from a watershed south of the Redondo Beach pier (\$788,400 requested).

Discussion:

1. What is the project's direct impact on ocean water quality at the Redondo Beach Pier?
2. The SMB-62 storm drain has been identified as causing a water quality problem at the identified site.
3. TMDL data was submitted in the proposal and is the first time we are seeing this type of data. Is this a TMDL project?
4. Parkland into multi-use project is good.

CBTF recommendation: Approve project funding for \$788,400 conditioned on receiving a further evaluation on what percentage of water quality problem is caused by the Redondo Pier or the SMB-62 drain, anticipated flow after this project is implemented? What is the proposed treatment process? What type of equipment will be utilized? What is the volume of the cistern for the water reuse project? Submit budget details.

**Additional Business:**

Amend the current CBI Priority List or Competitive Locations Listing to include beaches affected by the following criteria:

- High frequency (>4 percent) of bacterial standard exceedences during weekly monitoring of coastal waters (as specified in Health and Safety Code, Section 115880 (AB 411, Statutes of 1997, Chapter 765);
- A known public health threat or source of human sewage discharge to ocean waters adjacent to a beach;
- The beach received a grade of "C", "D", or "F" on Heal the Bay's report card at least once during the previous three AB 411 time periods (April 1 to October 31);
- Demonstrated bacterial contamination problems.

The Water Board will be changing the existing CBI listing so more projects are eligible for funding. The proposed amendment should be presented to the Water Board in January 2006 for approval. Additional proposals could be submitted in January and the CBTF could begin considering projects as early as February 2006.

CBTF members suggested:

1. Requested that facilities to project FAAST material at the next meeting be provided so proposal and attachments may be better presented at the meeting.
2. Have a Water Board staff person make a brief introduction about the proposals to the CBTF.
3. Have a Water Board staff person work with a specific CBTF member on getting questions and send e-mails to applicants on what is needed to avoid "conditional approvals".

Laura Peters says that she will make airline reservations for the CBTF members so they don't have to and bear the expense and inconvenience of getting reimbursed.

**Next Meeting: Tuesday, December 13, 2005 at 9:30AM at SCCWRP.**