

**MEETING NOTES OF THE
LAKE ELSINORE/CANYON LAKE TMDL
TASK FORCE MEETING**

June 28, 2010

PARTICIPANTS

Debbie Johnson
Lisa Cotterman
Cathy Jochai
James Grimm
Linda Nixon
Kent Wegelin
Kevin Street
Jon Crawford
Jason Jimenez
Doug Edwards
Ron Young
Remi Candale
Tim Moore
Steve Pastor
Claudio Padres
Ray Stinnett
Clint Boschen
Bruce Scott
Pat Boldt (SJRWC)
Mark Norton
Rick Whetsel
Sara Villa

REPRESENTATIVE

AIS
AIS
Caltrans
City of Canyon Lake
City of Hemet
City of Moreno Valley
City of Riverside
City of Wildomar
Cleveland National Forest
Eastern Municipal Water District
Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District
RBF
Risk Sciences
Riverside County Farm Bureau
Riverside County Flood Control & WCD
Stinnett Enterprise
Tetra Tech
WRCAC
WRCAC
Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority
Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority
Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority

Call to Order & Introductions

The Lake Elsinore/Canyon Lake TMDL Task Force meeting was called to order at 1:38 p.m. by the Chair, Ron Young at Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District, Lake Elsinore, California.

Public Comments

Members of the public were invited to address the Task Force on matters within its jurisdiction. There were no comments.

Approval of the Meeting Notes

The Task Force meeting notes of April 12, 2010, were approved as submitted.

Presentation: Tetra Tech Model Update (Clint Boschen)

Mr. Clint Boschen from Tetra Tech provided a power point presentation on the San Jacinto Watershed Model Update. He discussed the Modeling Task, Key Model Updates, Calibration Review, Jurisdictional Areas & Preliminary Loads, and using the current model conditions versus pre-development. A question was raised regarding the overflow from Mystic Lake. Mr. Moore stated that he should make a note to calculate the capacity of the Basin in 2003 and in 2010. It was asked if overflows coordinated with storm events, and Mr. Scott noted that it's not necessarily tied to the size of a storm event but the chronological series of events. Mr. Boschen noted that he will put together a table to see the frequency of the overflow periods. It was asked if under the Land Use Summary if the Agriculture and Dairy could be kept separate from each other due to the permits. Another question was why the Low-Density and High-Density were separated from Urban, and Mr. Boschen noted he would look into it. It was asked if there could be a foot note that states

that the Urban or developed portion is based on the 2005 Land Use, because we don't have Land Use work Urban in 2010. It was asked if it was the Final Land Use coverage for the model, and he stated that it was.

It was asked if there was no water flow could there be any concentration of nutrient. Mr. Boschen said not if it's dry, and he noted that nutrient concentration data is the primary data. The total load coming from the Land Use is the total estimated nutrient load coming off of the land surface. It was asked what areas were included in the model as US Forest lands, and if historical forest fire data was included. It was noted that it was not included and Mr. Jimenez noted he could provide the data if necessary. There was some discussion in reference to the loading from the forest and how it compares with the previous model. Mr. Whetsel asked the Task Force what the next steps would be and if there were any adjustments. Mr. Moore noted the next steps are to get the natural background definition and any questions or adjustments the Task Force may have, should be addressed to Mr. Whetsel, so that we can get the Modeling Report done.

Discussion: Revisions of the Lake Monitoring Program

Mr. Young noted that there was a meeting with Cindy Li from the Regional Board to discuss a reduction in the nutrient monitoring for Lake Elsinore, and she was in agreement that the number of parameters and number of samples taken could be reduced. We are waiting on Dr. Anderson and Dr. Horne to provide a list so that she can give us the final okay of what it should look like before we provide the list to Ms. Sarah Garber. Ms. Garber will then take the list to San Bernardino to have them price it out. Mr. Young noted that we are looking at a 30 to 40% decrease in cost for the sampling. He noted that in the current contract with CA State San Bernardino their costs are less than what they had put in to estimate. He noted that they had asked to extend the contract from June through September in hopes to hear from the Regional Board to accept the new contract. Mr. Whetsel informed the Task Force that we are on schedule to get the Annual Modeling Report turned in by August 15, 2010.

Canyon Lake Management Activities (Rick Whetsel)

RFP Design of Aeration / Hypolimnetic Oxygenation System

Mr. Whetsel stated that the Request for Proposal (RFP) for Aeration Project deadline was Friday, June 25, 2010, and only one RFP was received from Pace Engineering. It was asked if anyone reviewed the proposal, and Mr. Whetsel stated that it was submitted to the members of the LESJWA TAC for review this included City of Canyon Lake, EVMWD, Riverside County, and City of Lake Elsinore. It was noted that the good thing is that Pace is familiar with the work. There was some discussion on Pace's bid being \$11,000 over. Mr. Young stated that it would be good if the Task Force had some input before submitting it to the LESJWA Board on August 17th. It was noted that the proposal will be reviewed in detail at the next Lake Elsinore and Canyon Lake TMDL Technical Advisory Committee meeting. Mr. Whetsel noted that if anyone wanted a copy of the proposal, he will provide it to them.

Task Force Budget (Rick Whetsel)

Dairy Contribution (Pat Boldt/Bruce Scott)

Mr. Bruce and Ms. Boldt provided a handout of the comparison of 2002 and 2009 RWQCB Dairy Annual Summary Data in the San Jacinto Watershed. Ms. Boldt noted that the TMDL Allocation model was based on the 2002 Data which at that time there were 39 Dairy's. The two years that need to be collected for is the FY 2009-10 and the FY 2010-11. The Dairy Budget Allocations for FY 2009-10 is \$51,740 and for FY 2010-11 it is \$52,735. She stated that they don't have that many facilities to spread it across and they do it by the number of cows they have in the San Jacinto Watershed. Ms. Boldt referenced to her handout and noted that in 2002 Data there were 72,061 cows and in 2010 Data there are 52,068 cows, which shows a 28% reduction of what was originally allocated. Mr. Young asked if this would create a \$30,000 shortfall over the two years that would have to be absorbed in Total Budget for the Task Force. Mr. Norton stated that yes it would and we would need to ask the other Task Force Agencies to cover the balance. It was asked to keep the rate per cow the same. After much discussion there was a motion to approve the 28% reduction in the FY 2009-10 and the FY 2010-11 Dairy Budget Allocations to reflect the current number of Dairy cows and facilities in the Watershed. It was seconded by Mr. Pastor, and City of Wildomar opposed.

LESJWA

Lake Elsinore Recharge Pipeline Project

Mr. Whetsel stated that Remetrix is waiting to get feedback from Dr. Anderson, and both Mr. Whetsel and Mr. Moore will schedule a meeting to follow up with him. He noted that the work with AquaTechnex is moving along.

Lake Elsinore Back Basin Wetlands BMP Implementation Project

Mr. Whetsel stated that we are still working with Mr. Kilroy to coordinate the project.

Task Force Amendment No. 1 (Rick Whetsel)

Mr. Whetsel stated that not everyone has signed the Amendment No. 1, and a reminder has been sent out to the ones who haven't submitted it.

WRCAC (Pat Boldt)

Ms. Boldt informed the Stakeholders that she has the final deliverable for the TMDL Grant for the collection process, and she has CD's in case anyone is interested. She also noted that they did get awarded the 319h and they just submitted for WRCAC a TDS offset grant, and they will know on July 30, 2010.

Schedule Next Meeting

The next TMDL Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting is scheduled for Monday, July 19 2010 at 1:30 p.m. at EVMWD. The next Task Force meeting is scheduled for Monday, August 23, 2010 at 1:30 p.m.

Adjourn

As there was no further business for review, the meeting adjourned at 4:41 p.m.