

2nd Trash PAG Meeting
August 30, 2011
Cal/EPA Building

Meeting Notes

Attendees:

<u>Name/ORG</u>	<u>Phone</u>	<u>Email</u>
Sean Bothwell/CCKA	949-291-3401	sbothwell@cacoastkeeper.org
Kirsten James/ Heal the Bay	310-451-1500	kjames@healthebay.org
Lindsay Stovall/ACC	916-448-2581	Lindsay_stovall@americanchemistry.com
Gary Hildebrand/LACDPW	626-485-4300	ghildeb@dpw.lacounty.gov
Miriam Gordon/CWA	415-902-5196	Mgordon@cleanwater.org
Leslie Tamminen/SGA	310-780-3344	leslie.tamminen@gmail.com
Charles Moore /AMRF	562-439-4545	Cmoore@calgolita.org
Dominic Gregorio/SWRCB	916-341-5488	dgregorio@waterboards.ca.gov
Emily Siegel/SWRCB	916-341-7338	esiegel@waterboards.ca.gov

After introductions, the website was discussed. Staff was requested to change spelling on webpage for Miriam Gordon and Kirsten James.

Next there were two presentations by members. The first was by Gary on the LA Trash TMDL. Waste load allocations for all point and nonpoint sources of in the TMDL are zero. The compliance period for the LA River and Malibu Creek was 8 years. Full capture devices must have capacity for peak one year/one hour storm, and must capture all trash greater than 5 mm. Simple drop inlet Certified full capture devices cost about \$300 to install and about \$330 per year of O&M. Vortex (CDS) units are certified; these are designed for more capacity but are much more expensive. ARS and FBI devices are not full capture but are less expensive in terms of maintenance costs. Institutional measures include education, street sweeping, source control ordinances, etc. The compliance period for Ballona Creek is ten years. There was some discussion of the design storm as used in the TMDL. Some discussion also included the need to define "catch basin."

The next presentation was by Miriam on the San Francisco Bay area trash survey. The study resulted in the collection of 11,395 pieces of trash. The most abundant items collected were cigarette butts, followed by napkins and snack food plastic wrappers. 67% of all items were food and beverage packaging. In terms of point of sale, the largest category was fast food (49%) and grocery stores (11%). Miriam also described some solutions regarding source reduction, including "big chain" practices as well as ordinances.

There was some discussion on monitoring, as well as beneficial uses. The trash definition was discussed. A question was asked about whether sediment was included in the definition of trash, and this was tabled until Bethany Pane (SWRCB attorney) attends next time.

A short presentation was made by Emily Siegel on the GIS exercise performed by staff to determine the linear miles of roadway in MS4s that are in the high density residential, commercial and industrial categories. The SWRCB intends to focus on these areas for implementation of the trash policy and full capture devices.

The group then discussed the draft SED (staff report) in support of the policy. Staff had provided copies of the rough draft but was continuing to work on the "issues" section. Staff stated that another draft of the issues section would be sent out to the group. The group suggested that staff coordinate with EPA before making SED public.

Miriam stressed the importance of institutional controls, including source control especially by ordinance. Kirsten discussed translating "strawman" comments into SED, and suggests a numeric vs. narrative objective approach. Dominic argued against a numeric objective, as it is impossible to meet during 303d assessments, but agreed that the overall goal of the policy/plan amendment would be the elimination of trash in waterbodies/ocean.

Dominic discussed his leaning toward in high density areas that the preferred alternative is the installation of full capture devices. An alternative may be combination of structural and institutional measures, but monitoring would be required. In lower density areas there could be more flexibility in terms of alternatives.

Charlie stressed that litter/trash are actually resources, materials with value to be recycled.

The group discussed the legal and practical implications of numeric and narrative objectives, and use of “zero” in numeric definition. Monitoring was also discussed. Monitoring should not be an impediment to permittee compliance. Monitoring of effectiveness of the policy allows for adaptive management. The group agreed to discuss monitoring again at the next meeting

Miriam suggested reorganizing the implementation section and institutional sources control sections. On Page 51 consider source control credits for going towards compliance. Education outreach to businesses was discussed as an institutional measure.

For the SED the group was in agreement that staff should be sure references are current and valid. Primary sources are preferred.

The group also discussed the potential econ study. Dominic stated that SWRCB does not do cost benefit analysis, but provides only costs (i.e. economic impact study).

For the next meeting, two day to discuss SED again and to have field trip; staff will send email information on where/when. Gary and Charlie will help organize the field trip.

Before adjourning the group discussed the previous (first) meeting notes very briefly and did not object to posting.

Meeting notes by Shuka Rastegarpour (volunteer), edited by Dominic Gregorio.