

**Meeting Notes - DRAFT**  
 Trash Amendments Ad Hoc Committee  
 Chairperson Malik Tamimi

1  
2  
3  
4

Date / Time	Agenda Summary
03/22/2018 Start time: 1:00 PM End time: 3:56 PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action Items Update</li> <li>Bulk Purchase</li> <li>Track 2 Implementation Plan Framework</li> </ul>
Location	
County of San Diego 5510 Overland Avenue, Room B-451 San Diego, CA 92123	

5  
6

Attendees:		
City of Lemon Grove <b>Malik Tamimi</b>	City of La Mesa <b>Joe Kuhn</b>	City of Poway <b>Tracy Beach</b>
County of San Diego <b>Sheri McPherson, Charles Morlock</b>	City of Encinitas <b>Nick Grossberg</b>	City of Vista <b>Brian Nemerow (via phone)</b>
Cities of Del Mar & Solana Beach <b>Erica Keyser (via phone)</b>	City of Escondido <b>Juan Magdaraog (via phone)</b>	City of Chula Vista <b>Marisa Soriano</b>
City of Carlsbad <b>Vivi Stevens</b>	City of San Diego	Port of San Diego
County of Los Angeles, DPW	Caltrans	Amec Foster-Wheeler
Dudek	D-Max Engineering	LWA
Secretary <b>Yvette Noir (Michael Baker International)</b>		

7

ACTION ITEMS FROM THIS MEETING:	Responsible Person(s)
1. Thuan to share sample design specifications with the group.	Thuan Nguyen
2. Tad to scan slides from the OVTA training and send to Sheri. Malik to post slides on Project Clean Water for the Committee.	Tad Nakatani, Malik Tamimi
3. Tad to email Malik the full PDFs of OVTA protocols and the spreadsheet calculator. Malik to upload the files to Project Clean Water.	Tad Nakatani, Malik Tamimi
4. Sheri to post the design specifications for Los Angeles Trash Capture screens at the Project Clean Water (Resources) website.	Sheri McPerson
5. Erica to find out how Orange County feels about the Master Purchase agreement they have.	Erica Keyser
6. Erica to ask Orange County if under the Master Agreement scenario, would the jurisdiction, as the Master Agreement holder, have to approve opt in or would they have to initiate the opt in on their own.	Erica Keyser
7. How long would be needed for the approval process (council/management review)? Would it need to go through the approval process for those jurisdictions that are opting in?	Malik Tamimi

<b>ACTION ITEMS FROM THIS MEETING:</b>	Responsible Person(s)
8. Joe to get contract examples for Malik and Erica to review.	Joe Kuhn
9. Erica to inquire via email to gage interest in participating in a small workgroup.	Erica Keyser
10. Sheri will post the Trash Load Reduction Tracking Method study (EOA) to the Project Clean Water webpage	Sheri McPherson
11. Malik to email the Committee with a direct hyperlink to the resources section for this committee on Project Clean Water.	Malik Tamimi
12. Jurisdictions and consultants with existing information on control measures and credits are to send the information to Malik before the next meeting.	All Copermittees

1     **1. Call to Order**

2             Malik Tamimi (City of Lemon Grove) called the meeting to order.

3     **2. Introduction**

4             Everyone in attendance, in person and via the conference line, introduced themselves.

5     **3. Time for public to speak on items not on the agenda**

6             No members of the public requested time to speak.

7     **4. Meeting Notes 03/08/18**

8             Voting on the meeting summary notes are deferred until the next meeting. Any comments on the  
9             meeting notes should be emailed to Malik.

10    **5. Action Item Updates**

11            Malik stated that D-max is out sampling and he has not heard from Tad as far as the OVTA training  
12            and the slides. Malik has not provided a hyperlink to the Project Clean Water website. He will  
13            post the slides with the next meeting invite.

14            Sherri posted slide presentations from last meeting to Project Clean Water site. Sherri explained  
15            that the presentations are located at the main group page → Meetings → Date for the Meeting.

16            Additionally, GIS shapefiles for the vector control are also available and Sherri can email it. The  
17            layer is updated annually and is available directly through them or SanGIS.

18            Sherri said Malik sent the design specifications for Los Angeles Trash Capture screens and she will  
19            post that in “Resources” location at the Project Clean Water site. She will send out a message  
20            once it’s ready for viewing.

21    **6. Bulk Purchase**

22            Malik said the City of Del Mar will look into providing the vehicle for a master services agreement  
23            or something similar that would provide the opportunity for a bulk purchase for the trash capture  
24            devices to ultimately benefit the jurisdictions that want to opt in. Erica has taken the lead on this  
25            and provided an update.

1 Erica has been in contact with all the municipalities that have had master agreements. She has  
2 contacted the Cities of Bellflower and Lakewood is also trying to get in touch with Orange County.  
3 Erica wants to see what kind of warrantees can be expected before diving into this effort. Also,  
4 she needs more feedback on how many jurisdictions are interested in maintenance service  
5 agreements and how many are not. Further, Erica stated that she wants to be sensitive to the  
6 fact that a lot of municipalities are currently phasing implementation so the numbers may not be  
7 known right now. As a result, it's important for the agreement to be flexible or have an opt in  
8 component so each jurisdiction can opt in at a year that is appropriate for them.

9 There is a possibility that Track 1 wants to switch to Track 2. Erica stated it's important to factor  
10 all of this in when developing the RFP so that there is flexibility.

11 Erica then discussed contract type. In review and looking at what Del Mar has done, Erica has  
12 come up with 2 types of contracts:

- 13 • Option 1 - Master Agreement – This type of contract is used by Orange County and the  
14 Cities of Bellflower and Lakewood. This type of contract would be between a jurisdiction  
15 and a panel of contractors. This would be an open contract so other jurisdictions can opt  
16 in and take advantage of the fixed unit prices.
- 17 • Option 2 - [Name of Contract type?] – an alternative contract type follows the contract  
18 in place for WQIP contract where the service agreement is funneled through a particular  
19 jurisdiction which would provide the sole or primary contact with the contractor(s).  
20 Under this type of umbrella, a jurisdictional agreement would determine how to pass  
21 funding along. This type of contract would follow the WQIP model since it has been done  
22 before. Erica feels that this contract type may not be the perfect fit for this project  
23 because it might be a little bit more complex than Option 1.

24 Erica is open on other contract ideas or contract types.

25 Sherri stated that the WQIP Cost Sharing is one way cost sharing can be done under the co-  
26 perimtee MOU. The MOU gives authority to cost share without having to go to respective boards  
27 to get the authority to do it.

28 Malik asked whether we can find out if Orange County had problems with their master purchase  
29 agreement and cities opting in and if those cities had any issues with the vendor as well. Erica  
30 will contact Orange County and inquire.

31 Marisa asked if for the second option, would a separate MOU have to be in place or could the  
32 existing MOU be used? Sheri said that the MOU has a dollar cap per year and the costs would  
33 have to be factored in in addition to the cap. Malik said that maybe we could do a simple MOU  
34 tied to a cost share agreement with the opt in option. And depending on the amount being  
35 purchased, it may or may not require council approval. Sheri and Malik agreed that the opt in  
36 option would be easier.

37 Sherri asked if, under the Master Agreement scenario, would Del Mar as the Master Agreement  
38 holder have to approve opt in or would they have to initiate the opt in on their own? Erica will  
39 ask Orange County for more details.

1 Sherri said opt in seems more flexible and unilateral rather than multilateral. Malik added that as  
2 a benefit to the opt in scenario, jurisdictions you don't have to go through the process of a  
3 jurisdiction developing their own RFP and not having to go through with the selection process  
4 would benefit jurisdictions like Lemon Grove. Using Orange County's agreement as an example,  
5 the language in the agreement is vague and general and that its extended to the jurisdiction  
6 within the County. Joe added that the pricing would be about half as much per unit. Malik agreed  
7 and stated that the two main benefits include staff time for not having to go through the process  
8 of developing an RFP and the pricing per unit. The opt in feature also allows flexibility in when  
9 jurisdictions want to start participating and at what level.

10 Sherri added that installation should be included in what the RFP would deliver. Erica agreed and  
11 also mentioned adding warranty and unit prices for maintenance serves.

12 Malik said that there are specific requirements for insurance which may vary for the level of  
13 coverage. Would this information be in the RFP or in the individual agreements? Joe mentioned  
14 that it may not be beneficial to make the restrictions in the RFP overly onerous which may result  
15 in bad bids. Malik clarified that the RFP may want to include details regarding things like liability  
16 insurance and coverage because certain jurisdictions may have some higher thresholds and if  
17 there's an opt in option, it includes the most conservative requirements so that each jurisdiction  
18 can opt in. Malik stated for insurance coverage of the vendor for installation in the RFP needs to  
19 have a level of consistency.

20 Erica also mentioned terms of contracts and what people are generally comfortable with (3  
21 years? 5 years?). She will check to see what Del Mar is using for their contract terms. Sherri said  
22 the County does not go beyond 5 years. Erica asked regarding timeline is there any commitment  
23 where jurisdictions have publicized a time for when they are going to start implementation and  
24 if there are any specific or special considerations for implementation? Malik stated that the  
25 anticipated timeframe to have something in place is by early 2019. Sherri stated that the timeline  
26 to have the new permit is Fall of 2018, which triggers the implementation timeline.

27 Erica asked how long would be needed for the approval process (council/management review)?  
28 Malik will look into how long it will take for approval, RFP, etc. A follow up question is would it  
29 need to go through the approval process for those jurisdictions that are opting in? Joe mentioned  
30 that for La Mesa, if he ordered devices that are \$50K and over, he would have to take it to City  
31 Council. Malik agreed that each individual jurisdiction's agreement would need City Council  
32 approval.

33 Sherri asked Erica if the contracting mechanism would be an as-needed type of contract where a  
34 task order is issued. If so, then each year you can task out annual amount and then each  
35 subsequent year, the annual amount gets tasked out. Or is it more like you opt in for four years  
36 of implementation.

37 Erica envisioned Task Orders created individually for each jurisdiction. Erica will get more  
38 information on how jurisdictions currently participating have it set up. Joe stated that most  
39 jurisdictions have agreements similar to this, such as for traffic signal maintenance etc. Malik  
40 asked Joe if he could provide a contract example for him and Erica to review.

41 Vivi asked if there is an option to opt in later on. Malik said that based on Orange County's

1 agreement, there is no time stipulation, and anyone can join. However, it's possible that the  
2 vendors want some kind of commitment to the numbers to realize the bulk. The City of San Diego  
3 is interested in participating. Majority of jurisdictions are interested in at least obtaining more  
4 information and learning about the process. The challenge could likely be a commitment to  
5 numbers and the period of time.

6 Erica asked if anyone is interested in participating in small workgroups so as she finds more  
7 information out, she can share the information with the small workgroups, hash out the details,  
8 and then relay it to the rest of the group? She will send out an email to gauge interest.

9 Sherri said the County will have the outcome of the Life Cycle Cost Analysis, which looks at  
10 distributed versus regional BMPs. Joe added that the capital cost is expensive but the long-term  
11 maintenance cost and staffing to provide servicing can be costly as well.

## 12 7. Track 2 Implementation Plan

13 Malik said the feedback he's been getting is looking more at sharing what everyone is doing as  
14 opposed to trying to standardize something or establish a specific framework. Initially, a more  
15 high-level approach to how the implementation plans look would be a better approach.

16 Malik remarked that the trash study comments are due tomorrow. The trash study looks at the  
17 trash generation rates and compares our region to LA and San Francisco. Our region is on the  
18 lower end with the exception of transportation, which was on the high end. Malik asked how this  
19 study will be integrated into each implementation plan and if there are any concerns.

20 Brian (on the phone) reviewed report and said that, for example, the transportation pollutant  
21 loading data, only has one site and it seems like it was an outlier so the trash loading was high.  
22 He doesn't think that we could necessarily use this for baseline data.

23 Erica said for a small coastal, homogenous city like Del Mar, these mean values are inflated or  
24 maybe not so representative of the City. Erica asked whether anyone is considering using another  
25 value, such the median or the 25-percentile, instead of using the mean? Nick does not have a  
26 concrete answer but wants to look into it because the same logic, in terms of values not  
27 representing the City, can be applied to Encinitas as for Del Mar. Nick agrees and doesn't want to  
28 take the mean of SF and LA and apply to Encinitas.

29 Sherri wanted to remind everyone that this is a Countywide study which included trash capture  
30 devices and other jurisdictions. The County had a separate study done for unincorporated areas  
31 and the final results are pending.

32 Vivi stated that there isn't a decision made on how Carlsbad will use the information, but will  
33 probably use it as a starting point in conjunction with the on land visual assessment for baseline  
34 trash generation rates.

35 Sherri stated that the visual assessment was drive by method and not pedestrian like in the Bay  
36 Area. As such, it would make sense to defer to the Bay Area studies where the comparisons were  
37 actually made. However, the scoring is pretty similar for both Bay Area and locally.

38 Malik asked if any thought has been given to whether using volume or weight would be taken for

1 establishing what the load is? Malik stated that one of the challenges with weight, is where does  
2 everything get dried out? Vivi said Carlsbad is using volume (cubic yards).

3 Marissa shared what she has found regarding credits for structural versus nonstructural BMPs:

- 4 • EOA, a consultant from the Bay Area, did a study called Trash Load Reduction Tracking  
5 Method, which included a fact sheets about credits being assigned to certain activities. The  
6 study includes fact sheets which are broken down into 2 different categories: loads reduced  
7 via credit (percentage) and loads reduced via quantification. Malik referred the group to page  
8 10 of the study (Table 3.1) which gives examples of credits given for certain actions (i.e.,  
9 Public Education and Outreach; Polystyrene Foam Food Service Ordinance, Single Use Carry  
10 Bag Ordinance, etc.). This study helps to figure out how much credit to give for certain actions  
11 and provides a good starting point.
- 12 • Sherri mentioned that there is a waste diversion program and asked if there is some way to  
13 be taking credit for that too and has anyone thought of having a waste diversion program as  
14 part of Track 2? Also, how do you establish a baseline for certain legislations (i.e., single-use  
15 plastic bags) that are already in effect?
- 16 • Additional discussion included how do institutional controls that are already implemented  
17 get applied as credits going forward? And also with regards to establishing a baseline: can  
18 you go back before certain things were implemented to establish a baseline?
- 19 • Marissa pointed out page 16 (Public Education Outreach Programs) of the study which  
20 discusses how many outreach events should be done based on population size. Tables CR-3.1  
21 and CR-3.2 and CR-3.3 will then help to determine how much load reduction credits you get  
22 for certain public outreach events. This is helpful for non-structural BMPs.

23 Malik inquired about the December submittal for Track 2: is there any clarification for the map  
24 being proposed/inlets? This question is a follow up to Brian's comment that a map of the proposed  
25 PLUs and inlets is missing from Track 2 Implementation submittal. Sherri stated that Track 2 isn't as  
26 explicit as Track 1. If a baseline load or volume is assigned, then a map is good to have.

27 Malik brought up another question regarding private property and land use swaps. For PLU inlets  
28 on private property, what are the methods used to determine which properties can have  
29 downstream public inlets fitted with FCD and the level of detail that goes into the implementation  
30 plan? Sheri said the amendments don't explicitly say that you have to account for private property  
31 connections into the MS4s; only the public inlets.

32 Malik asked regarding transportation: is everyone going to use literature value and not look at that  
33 high value? Because for transportation, the values were exceptionally high. Malik stated he would  
34 prefer to use literature value.

35 Vivi asked how people are addressing mixed use. Are they doing averages of all the other ones? Or  
36 changing PLUs so they're not mixed use? Or if over 50% commercial – reclassify? If it's over 50% of  
37 land use, it makes sense to reclassify it.

38 The next topic Malik brought up for discussion included monitoring aspect and the reissuance of  
39 the permit. If an implementation plan is being developed with prescriptive language relevant to

1 monitoring, how would that affect permit reissuance? A number of jurisdictions in San Diego bay  
2 are working on trash, including City of Chula Vista. What are some strategies to attain those goals?

- 3 • Marissa stated that the City of Chula Vista came up with a monitoring plan in the WQIP  
4 and as a result, they have something in place to assess whether or not they're achieving  
5 their goals for trash already accepted by the Regional Board.

6 **8. Future Meetings**

7 Malik asked whether the group meet on a monthly basis again? Also, a suggestion to go over the  
8 goals set back in September and see if they have been met.

9 Sheri mentioned that Caltrans has a statewide education outreach program on stormwater and  
10 trash. Can Caltrans put their advertising in some of the jurisdictions for credits?  
11 Protecteverydrop.com

12 Next meeting is tentatively scheduled for May 10<sup>th</sup> 1pm-3pm.