

Safe, Clean Water Program

South Santa Monica Bay

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)



Meeting Minutes:

Wednesday, May 19, 2021

1:00pm - 3:00pm

WebEx Meeting

Attendees

Committee Members Present:

Cung Nguyen (LACFCD)

E.J. Caldwell (West Basin)

Lyndsey Bloxom* (Water Replenishment District)

Kristen Ruffell (LAC Sanitation District)

Darryl Ford* (Los Angeles Rec & Park)

Craig Cadwallader (Surfrider Foundation)

Guang Yu Wang (SMB Restoration Commission)

Hany Fangary (Fangary Law Group)

Wendy Butts (LA Conservation Corps)

Julio Gonzalez (Carson)

Susie Santilena (Los Angeles)

Thuan Nguyen* (LA County Public Works)

John Dettle (Torrance)

Geraldine Traveti* (EWMP: Beach Cities)

Heecheol Kwon (EWMP: Dominguez)

Ken Rukavina (EWMP: Peninsula)

Committee Members Not Present:

*Committee Member Alternate

See attached sign-in sheet for full list of attendees

1. Welcome and Introductions

Kristen Ruffell, Chair of the South Santa Monica Bay WASC, welcomed Committee Members and called the meeting to order.

The District conducted a brief tutorial on WebEx and facilitated the roll call of Committee Members. All Committee Members made self-introductions and a quorum was established.

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes from April 7, 2021

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes from April 21, 2021

The District provided copies of the meeting minutes from the previous meetings. Kristen Ruffell asked the WASC for comments or revisions.

Craig Cadwallader requested a correction to the April 21, 2021 minutes noting he was present and made a motion to approve the April 7, 2021 and April 21, 2021 meeting minutes. Cung Nguyen seconded the motion to approve both minutes with correction.

The WASC voted to approve the meeting minutes. (Approved, see Vote Tracker sheet).

4. Committee Member and District Updates

Kirk Allen (District) provided the District update, noting:

Safe, Clean Water Program

South Santa Monica Bay

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)



- Round 3 Call for Projects deadline is July 31, 2021. Project applicants were advised that to ensure adequate review time, to please contact the respective Watershed Manager no later than May 31, 2021 to initiate the project review and conceptual approval letter process.
- The District will host two informational sessions scheduled May 27, 2021 and June 3, 2021. The times and links for the meetings will be available on the SCW website.
- Interim programming guidelines for Nature-based Solutions and Implementing DAC policies are now available on the SCW website. The guidelines provide a shared vocabulary and clarity for WASCs and project developers.
- Municipal Program FY 21-22 Annual Plans were due on April 1, 2021 with 50 out of 86 Annual Plans having been submitted. Cities that have not submitted were requested to do so as soon as possible.
- Regarding the Watershed Coordinator (WC) selection process, 7 contracts have been fully executed. Heal the Bay is the WC for the SSMB WASC.

5. Watershed Coordinator Updates

Nancy Shrodes, Associate Director of Policy and Outreach at Heal the Bay provided an update on the opportunity to leverage funding with the LAC Regional Parks and Open Space District (RPOSD) grant. She updated the WASC on the status of Statewide Bills SB343 and AB1276.

Craig Cadwallader commented that the Skip the Stuff Ordinance by the City of Pasadena should sync with the County regarding self-service stations.

Guang Yu Wang asked for details regarding the leverage funding opportunity. Nancy Shrodes indicated that it is a part of their role to educate applicants on funding opportunities. Jon Abelson commented that Heal the Bay is currently developing a Strategic Outreach and Engagement Plan.

Susie Santilena asked about the limitations of the RPOSD grant. Nancy Shrodes responded that there is minimum of \$50,000 and a maximum funding limit of \$1M.

6. Public Comment Period

No public comment

7. Discussion Items:

a) Ex Parte Communication Disclosures

Kristen Ruffell noted to have had general discussions with John Dettle about his Projects.

Cung Nguyen noted to have had communication with Thuan Nguyen regarding coordination on two projects between the County and LAC Flood Control District.

b) Summary of Scientific Studies from the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project (SCCWRP)

i) Regional Pathogen Reduction Study

Susie Santilena asked about the background of the reviewers from SCCWRP. The District responded that 8 out of 9 interviewers were from Universities across the Country.

Safe, Clean Water Program

South Santa Monica Bay

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)



Richard Watson responded to feedback from the SCCWRP summary noting that their proposal intentionally lacked details to allow for future stakeholder feedback.

c) SCW Project Funding by Municipality Map

The District provided an overview of the GIS heat map features and expressed that there will be future versions.

d) South Santa Monica Bay (SSMB) Project Prioritization and Selection Discussion for populating the Fiscal Year 2021-22 Stormwater Investment Plan (SCW Portal & SSMB Scoring Rubric)

i) Infrastructure Program (IP)

- (1) Carson Stormwater and Runoff Capture Project at Carriage Crest Park – City of Carson
- (2) Portuguese Bend Landslide Complex Mitigation Project – City of Rancho Palos Verdes
- (3) South Santa Monica Bay Water Quality Enhancement: 28th Street Storm Drain Infiltration Project – City of Manhattan Beach
- (4) Stormwater Basin Expansion Project – City of Torrance
- (5) Torrance Airport Storm Water Basin Project, Phase 2 Construction – City of Torrance
- (6) Wilmington Neighborhood Greening Project – City of Los Angeles

ii) Technical Resources Program (TRP)

- (1) Palos Verdes Peninsula Multi-Benefit Flow Diversion Project – City of Rolling Hills Estates
- (2) Prioritization of Parkway BMPs for Dominguez Channel/Harbors Toxics TMDL – City of Torrance
- (3) Watershed Coordinator

iii) Scientific Studies Program (SSP)

- (1) Regional Pathogen Reduction Study – Gateway Water Management Authority

John Dettle commented in favor of the Stormwater Basin Expansion Project.

Craig Cadwallader inquired about issues with projects claiming DAC benefits that are outside of a DAC. Kristen Ruffell mentioned that there was an issue with the Torrance Airport Stormwater Basin Project claiming DAC benefits, but they have withdrawn their application.

The District confirmed that the Portuguese Bend Landslide Project is still in the running for funding.

8. Public Comment Period

Doug Krauss (City of Hermosa Beach) commented in favor of the Stormwater Basin Expansion Project.

Fernando Navarrete (City County District 15 Staff) commented in favor of the Wilmington Neighborhood Greening Project.

9. Voting Items

a) Approve the final Fiscal Year 2021-22 Stormwater Investment Plan funding recommendations

Safe, Clean Water Program

South Santa Monica Bay

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)



for the SSMB Watershed Area and approve submission to the Regional Oversight Committee for review

Susie Santilena proposed a motion to include the top 4 ranking Infrastructure Program projects in the Stormwater Investment Plan (SIP). John Dettle seconded the motion. The WASC voted to approve the top 4 IP projects. (Approved, see Vote Tracker sheet).

Guang Yu Wang made a motion to vote on each TRP and SS individually. Geraldine Traveti seconded the motion. The WASC voted to approve each TRP and SS individually. (Approved, see Vote Tracker sheet).

Cung Nguyen made a motion to vote the Palos Verdes Peninsula Multi-Benefit Flow Diversion Project into the SIP. E.J. Caldwell seconded the motion. The WASC voted to approve the Palos Verdes Peninsula Multi-Benefit Flow Diversion Project for the SIP (Approved, see Vote Tracker sheet).

Craig Cadwallader made a motion to approve the Prioritization of Parkway BMPs for Dominguez Channel/Harbors Toxics TMDL TRPs for the SIP. John Dettle seconded the motion. The WASC voted to approve the Prioritization of Parkway BMPs for Dominguez Channel/Harbors Toxics TMDL for the SIP (Approved, see Vote Tracker sheet).

Julio Gonzalez made a motion to approve the Regional Pathogen Reduction Study for the SIP. John Dettle seconded the motion. The WASC voted to approve the Regional Pathogen Reduction Study for the SIP (Approved, see Vote Tracker sheet).

Cung Nguyen made a motion to approve the Final SSMB SIP and submit it to the Regional Oversight Committee (ROC). Susie Santilena seconded the motion. The WASC voted to approve and submit the SIP with 4 IP, 2 TRP, and 1 SS to the ROC (Approved, see Vote Tracker sheet).

10. Meeting Schedule

a) 1st Wednesday, 2PM to 4PM (if needed): June 2nd

b) 3rd Wednesday, 1PM to 3PM (on going): June 16th

The June 2nd meeting will be cancelled, and the June 16th meeting may also be cancelled if there are no agenda items.

Craig Cadwallader asked if the 3rd Wednesday 1PM start time will be adjusted. The WASC consensus was to keep the time 1PM to 3PM.

11. Items for Next Agenda

TBD

12. Adjournment

Kristen Ruffell thanked WASC members and the public for their attendance and participation and adjourned the meeting.

SOUTH SANTA MONICA BAY WASC MEETING - MAY 19, 2021

Member Type	Organization	Quorum Present				Voting Items						
		Member	Voting?	Alternate	Voting?	Approval of 04/07 & 04/21 Meeting Minutes	Motion: Top 4 IP Projects	2nd Motion: Vote 2 TRPs & SS Individually	3rd Motion: Vote Palos Verdes Peninsula TRP into SIP	4th Motion: Vote Parkway BMP TRP Into SIP	5th Motion: Vote Regional Pathogen SS into SIP	6th Motion: Vote to Approve Final SIP and Submit to ROC
Agency	LACFCD	Cung Nguyen	x	Ramy Gindi		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Agency	West Basin MWD	E.J. Caldwell	x	Alex Heide		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Agency	Water Replenishment District	Diane Gatza		Lyndsey Bloxom	x	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Agency	LAC Sanitation District	<u>Kristen Ruffell</u>	x	Mike Sullivan		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Agency	LA Recreation & Parks	Cathie Santo Domingo		Darryl Ford	x	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Community Stakeholder	VACANT											
Community Stakeholder	Surfrider Foundation South Bay Chapter	Craig Cadwallader	x	Mary Simun		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Community Stakeholder	Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission	Guang Yu Wang	x			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Community Stakeholder	Fangary Law Group	Hany Fangary	x	Justin Massey		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Community Stakeholder	Los Angeles Conservation Corps	Wendy Butts	x	Bo Savage		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Municipal Members	Carson	Julio Gonzalez	x	Eliza Jane Whitman		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Municipal Members	Los Angeles	Susie Santilena	x	Ilene Ramirez		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Municipal Members	LAC Public Works	TJ Moon		Thuan Nguyen	x	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Municipal Members	Torrance	John Dettle	x	Wilson Mendoza		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Municipal Members	EWMP: Beach Cities	Geraldine Trivedi	x	Doug Krauss		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Municipal Members	EWMP: Dominguez	Heecheol Kwon	x	Mitchell Wagner		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Municipal Members	EWMP: Peninsula	Ken Rukavina	x	David Wahba		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Total Non-Vacant Seats		16			Yay (Y)	14	16	16	16	16	10	16
Total Voting Members Present		16			Nay (N)	0	0	0	0	0	6	0
Agency		5			Abstain (A)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Community Stakeholder		4			Total	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
Municipal Members		7				Approved	Approved	Approved	Approved	Approved	Approved	Approved

Other Attendees	
Alfredo Magallanes	Mercedes Passanisi
Brett Perry	Michelle Staffield
Caitlin Gray	Mikaela Randolph
Carmen Andrade	Mo Estepa
Christine McLeod	Prem
Doug Krauss	Richard Watson
Fernando Navarrete	Sarai Bhaga
Gregor Patsch	Seth Carr
Hans Tremmel	Shahram Kharaghani
Ilene Ramirez	Sheila Brice
Jacqueline Mak	Tammy Takigawa
Jessica Quach	Wilson Mendoza
Kathleen McGowan	
Katie Harrel	
Katie M	
Lauren Amimoto	
Lena Nguyen	

WASC Watershed Coordinator Update

—
Funding + State and Local Policy

L.A. County Regional Parks & Open Space District (RPOSD)

Leverage Funding

- Competitive Grant Open as of April 2021
- Virtual Workshops
 - May 12, 2021 - 2:00pm
 - June 9, 2021 - 10am
- To learn more, visit <https://rposd.lacounty.gov/competitive-grant-programs/>

Competitive Grant Programs
apply online at Grantfunding.RPOSD.LACounty.gov

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
REGIONAL PARK AND
OPEN SPACE DISTRICT

2021

virtual workshops
May 12th
June 9th

application opens
April 30th
application deadline
October 28th
10:00 AM

learn more at RPOSD.LACounty.gov

Statewide Bills

These bills could potentially help municipalities meet Trash TMDLs

Bills and their status:

- SB 343
 - On Assembly floor
 - AB 1276
 - In Appropriations
-

Data from Coastal Cleanup Month in 2020

LA COUNTY'S TOP 10



#1 Cigarette Butts



#2 Food Wrappers



#3 Bottle Caps



#4 Disposable
Foodware Accessories



#5 Takeout
Containers



#6 Plastic Bottles



#7 Plastic
Grocery Bags



#8 Plastic
Cups & Plates



#9 Beverage Cans



#10 PPE

SB 343: Truth in Labeling for Recyclable Materials

Authored by Senator Ben Allen

- This would ensure that only materials that are **actually recyclable in CA** have the chasing arrows symbol
 - as of now, all plastic resin numbers have that symbol
 - Currently, less than 15% of single use plastic in CA is recycled
 - due to drop in market for recycled material and cheap price of virgin plastic
 - result = contamination + consumers don't know what's actually recyclable!
-

AB 1276: Skip the Stuff- Reduce Unnecessary Food Serviceware

Authored by Assemblymember
Wendy Carrillo

- Expands statewide plastic straw upon request law to include other single-use food accessories, other food facilities, and third party deliver platforms (opt-in system)
 - Save business \$, and relieves recyclers, composters, and local govt's from complications and costs associated
-

Local Legislation to
combat trash:
#SkipTheStuff

#SkipTheStuff - Los Angeles



ACTION ALERT!

#SKIPTHESTUFF

REUSABLE | LA

Foodware Accessories Upon Request



#SkipTheStuff Ordinances In the Works

LOCAL

City of Los Angeles - passed

County of Los Angeles - motion passed to agendaize the ordinance 5/18/21 in order to vote on a future agenda (BOS)

City of Pasadena - passed motion to draft ordinance

City of Alhambra - passed

City of Beverly Hills - passed motion to draft ordinance

STATEWIDE

Assembly Bill 1276

Thanks!

Nancy Shrodes

nshrodes@healthebay.org

SAFE CLEAN WATER PROGRAM SCIENTIFIC STUDY PROPOSAL QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Proposal identification information and summary of the project goals.

Title: **Regional Pathogen Reduction Study**

Proposing Organization: **Gateway Water Management Authority**

Your summary of the Project Goals and Objectives:

The three reviewers are in agreement that the study's overall goal is to help the SCWP focus its resources on eliminating fecal contamination sources that pose the greatest risks to human health. Specifically, the study's goals are to conduct monitoring across the County to assess health risks from exposure, determine where hotspots are, and identify effective control measures for addressing these hotspots.

2. Are the objectives clearly stated? What portion of the objectives need more clarification?

The reviewers do not agree on how clear the study objectives are. One reviewer found the objectives to be clear and succinct, while another reviewer felt there was a disconnect between the study objectives presented in the objectives section and the tasks section, and furthermore, that the scientific terminology used was imprecise. The third reviewer felt the study objectives were generally clear, with the exception of one task (Task 4) that the reviewer found was vague.

3. How do the project goals directly support a nexus to increasing stormwater or urban runoff capture and/or reducing stormwater or urban runoff pollution?

The reviewers agree that the project goals directly support the SCWP's goals of more effectively reducing stormwater or urban runoff pollution. One reviewer noted that this work addresses bacterial TMDLs in the region by helping managers prioritize remediating fecal sources that pose the greatest human health risks.

4. What is (are) the overarching technical approach element(s) of the proposed project as you understand them (not necessarily the same as the elements described in the proposal)?

The reviewers agree that the study consists of a large-scale monitoring effort paired with multiple state-of-the-art methods for identifying and measuring human fecal contamination, with a goal to synthesize actionable insights that can inform management decision-making.

5. Has the proposal provided sufficient information to describe the technical approach for each element? If not, what information is missing?

The reviewers agree that the proposal does NOT contain sufficient information to understand how all of the technical elements would be implemented. One reviewer suggested that many details don't appear to have been decided yet by the proposing organization. Specifically, the reviewers noted that one of the proposal's biggest weaknesses is a lack of clarity about how the proposing organization plans to develop a risk management framework/model from the study's findings to guide management actions. One reviewer suggested that some steps that

the proposal refers to as “risk management” don’t involve risk management at all, but rather are “water quality management steps.” Among the missing details pointed out by the reviewers: Number of study locations, specific pathogens and environmental parameters to be measured, time of year for sampling, data analysis methods, and methods for reliably attributing a detected signal to an upstream source.

6. Is the technical approach sound? If not, what do you recommend should be done to improve the technical approach of the proposed project?

The reviewers did not provide a simple “yes” or “no” response to whether the technical approach is sound. Two reviewers said there was too little information provided to properly assess technical soundness. The other reviewer was more encouraging, calling the study’s approach “logical” and “laudable,” although they also noted that the proposal is lacking in details. The third reviewer, meanwhile, suggested that the study could be improved by examining some non-human fecal sources, including birds and possibly ruminant animals.

7. How achievable are the study’s stated technical objectives, especially within the proposed timeframe and budget?

The reviewers expressed a lack of confidence in the proposing organization’s ability to achieve all of the study’s objectives in the stated timeframe. One reviewer stated that there is not enough information to make such a determination at all. The other two reviewers each pointed to specific areas (especially Task 3 and 4) that they aren’t confident the proposing organization will achieve as proposed.

8. What are the greatest technical risks that you foresee the proposing agency facing when implementing the project?

The reviewers agreed this project faces multiple major technical risks. The areas that reviewers highlighted include: parsing out the relative contributions of different sources of risk (the technology to do this is still being developed), determining which management strategies are most effective at reducing human risks (the study design is not suited to make this determination), ongoing monitoring once managers address specific sources (the study design is unclear how this will be done), measuring only norovirus (this pathogen is insufficient as the basis for cumulative risk assessments), and developing recommended stormwater BMPs from the study’s findings (the study may not be able to identify BMPs that are effective at reducing human pathogens).

9. Are there clear linkages between the project’s technical objectives and the types of decisions that stormwater managers will make based on the project’s outcomes? Will the technical achievements provide stormwater managers useful linkages that extend beyond this study?

The reviewers agreed that the project has at least some linkages to management and that the findings have the potential to be applicable beyond the project. But they disagreed in the amount of confidence they put behind these assertions. One reviewer said that the project fails to establish clear, specific connections to management decision-making. The other reviewers were more optimistic, saying they hoped the study could prove particularly insightful and valuable to managers.

10. Please provide any additional technical perspectives you would like to share.

Two of the reviewers said they had no additional perspectives to share. The third reviewer said the proposal, as a whole, “missed the mark” because it reads more like a pre-proposal than a proposal.

11. Please answer each of the following questions by selecting one of the following five answer choices: Excellent, Very good, Adequate, Inadequate or Not applicable because of insufficient information. Feel free to add an explanation to accompany your answer choice:

- a. How well do the proposal objectives address the SCWP’s goals of increasing stormwater or urban runoff capture and/or reducing stormwater or urban runoff pollution?

Two of the reviewers rated the proposal’s objectives as being “excellent” at addressing SCWP goals. The third reviewer provided no response.

- b. How well do you think the technical approaches will achieve the study objectives and stated outcomes?

The reviewers disagreed in their rating of how well the study will achieve its objectives. Two reviewers provided an “adequate” rating. The third reviewer specified a range of “very good to inadequate,” explaining that “many” of the tasks are “very good” (albeit not “excellent” because no technical team has been assembled) and that the remainder of the tasks are “inadequate.”

- c. Technical experience and qualifications of the study team?

The reviewers disagreed in their assessment of the qualifications of the study team. One reviewer rated the study team as “adequate,” although they pointed out that insufficient information was provided about who specifically would be part of the study team. The other two reviewers rated the study team as “inadequate” – not only calling out the lack of specific information on the study team, but also expressing reservations about the proposing organization’s ability to pull together a team with the necessary expertise.