

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

May 31, 2011

PARTICIPANTS

Cathy Jochai
Nancy Horton
Pat Kilroy
Kent Wegelin
Ron Young
Tim Moore
Mike Shetler
Steve Pastor
Jason Uhley
Robert Vasquez
Bruce Scott
Pat Boldt
Ray Stinnett
Mark Norton
Rick Whetsel
Sara Villa

REPRESENTATIVE

Caltrans
City of Canyon Lake
City of Lake Elsinore
City of Moreno Valley
Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District
Risk Sciences
Riverside County
Riverside County Farm Bureau
Riverside County Flood Control & WCD
Riverside County Flood Control & WCD
WRCAC
WRCAC
Stinnett Enterprise
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 1:37 p.m. by the Chair, Ron Young at Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District, Lake Elsinore, California.

Public Comments

The public was 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 19, 2011, and TAC meeting notes of May 18, 2011; were approved as submitted.

Discussions: Next Steps – TMDL Implementation Strategy & Draft TMDL Allocation

A few handouts were provided to the TMDL Task Force; *TMDL Task Force/Riverside Co MS4 Permit Deliverables* and the *Draft Proposed Budget Allocation for the Lake Elsinore-Canyon Lake Nutrient TMDL Task Force*. Mr. Moore stated that Mr. Whetsel created a spreadsheet tool based on the Tetra Tech 2010 model update. The goal was to be able to use the tool and break down the data and determine how many pounds of Nitrogen and Phosphorus of load allocations in all the land use types in each jurisdiction. Mr. Moore referenced the handouts and gave a brief explanation of how the allocation is broken down. He stated that the spreadsheet tool was created to take to the Regional Board so that they can see the breakdown of acres in each land use. It was noted that it would be helpful to have a map showing zones 1-9.

Mr. Moore noted that we need a GIS layer mapping tool that can apply the septic systems and Ms. Boldt noted that they had one. Discussion ensued in regards to the septic systems. Mr. Moore stated that the Regional Board needs to see this breakdown of the proposed budget allocation and if they adopt a metric of compliance which is based on pounds, then you get a pounds base solution. He noted that the Regional Board needs to see that for less money, half of the stakeholders here could produce a project which might fix 80% to 90% of the problem, it would fix more of the problem than if they were to zero out their pounds load. Another item that the Board needs to see is how to take the charge on un-addressed sources (non-compliant Ag). Ms. Boldt noted that out of all the non complaints only three ACL's issued were collected.

Mr. Moore brought up a few key items that were mentioned in the meeting with the Regional Board. He noted that they wanted the Regional Boards full attention on the 30 or so non-compliant Ag Operations and to get them to join WRCAC. Also, they needed them to re-think how they had created the exemptions sub-categories and to think about holistic solutions, and whether they could find it in them to take the risk and stepping out for innovative strategies for compliance. It was noted that the Regional Board did guarantee them that they would go after the ACL's.

Mr. Moore stated that one of his main concerns is that if Tetra Tech retained the expectation that some of this land was active Ag when it wasn't, and when they went to collaborate the model the adjustments they made would have been wrong, because they were expecting to see a load that really wasn't there. Ms. Boldt mentioned that it would be so much easier on the next cycle to do it as a whole Watershed rather than pieces. It was asked how it will be determined how everyone will be treated from 2007, 2008, and 2009, if they are going to be treated as a wet weather load or will they just be taken out. Mr. Moore said that that is a decision on the Task Force. It was asked if the Regional Board has accepted the data and Mr. Moore stated that they accepted the idea, and they'll be hearing back from the Regional Board within two weeks. Mr. Uhley asked if he could get an agricultural land graphic. A brief discussion ensued in regards to getting the Regional Board on board. Mr. Moore also provided the Lake Elsinore nitrogen and phosphorus wasteload and local allocations. It was asked how it would get applied and when. There was discussion in regards to acreage that are zoned to Ag and are non-compliant. Mr. Moore stated that as soon as he gets the okay from the regional board, he will take out zones 7, 8, and 9 from being incorporated into the cost shares. He noted that it depends on which way the regional board is willing to go and how much they are willing to spend.

Action Items: Amendment to extend TMDL Task Force Agreement & FY 2011-12 Task Force Budget

Mr. Moore went over a handout that was provided *Stakeholder Contributions for FY 2006-07 to FY 2010-11*. Ms. Boldt noted that three checks came in from the Regional Board for the ACLs that added up to a total of \$7,285.33. Mr. Moore stated that he needs the Task Force to be in compliance to not hold WRCAC responsible for the amount from the acres that are outstanding. Mr. Moore stated that the best they can hope for is to receive \$65,000 through an ACL or a grant. Ms. Boldt gave a description of each of the potential Ag property's that is exempt. Discussion ensued. Mr. Norton stated that after discussing the model loads, we are looking into developing the Task Force Agreement based on the spreadsheet, though if people have an issue with it then they could spend the money to do a new coverage for the entire watershed using AIS and a new run using Tetra Tech because there really aren't any other alternatives.

Mr. Whetsel presented the original Agreement to the Task Force and asked how the Stakeholders wanted to proceed in extending the Agreement with an Amendment. Mr. Scott noted that it all depends on the direction of the Regional Board on whether they'd sign on to continue under the TMDL Task Force. It was suggested that a meeting be scheduled after we get direction from the Regional Board, Mr. Norton stated that it could be arranged. Mr. Norton asked the Task Force if they would consider approving the proposed budget with the allocation for the Lake Elsinore Canyon Lake Nutrient Task Force. Mr. Uhley noted that at the last meeting it was agreed to approve the budget based on how the regional board meeting went. He stated that there is concern about not having a former contract established, and that there won't be any money coming in until the Task Force Agreement goes into place. Mr. Whetsel stated that is the reason for asking the Regional Board to allow us not to do any monitoring for this fiscal year even though we said we were going to do monitoring through December, because if we had to do that it would be coming out of credits from other people. Mr. Uhley asked if we still need the 50 K for the Pollutant Trading Plan and the Watershed Monitoring. Mr. Moore noted that if we are planning on doing that he needs to know now since Ms. Rhonda Sandquist is already working on it. After much discussion, Mr. Uhley recommended that they approved the budget to \$183,140.71 to a one year agreement and it doesn't have to be based on a commitment to an allocation, and the Amendment could be worded differently. Mr. Norton stated that the only concern is if we were to extend the Agreement will Ag be obligated to pay the higher percentage of \$262, 141. It was noted that they can cut it in half and state it in the Amendment.

It was noted that a Draft Amendment could be sent out within a week with it containing the layout of the contributions for each of the stakeholders. It was noted that the revised budget needs to be incorporated and

an Amendment that states it will get them through another year. The cities should be consistent with numbers on the sheet and if Ag's budget needs to be 17.5% then it should show it. For this coming year we are deleting section 5 from the agreement and say see attachment A. The MS4 will be in for \$183,140.71; Elsinore valley at \$122,141; Lake Elsinore at \$140,000; Ag at \$17.5; and the other five Stakeholders will hold to their \$10,000 equaling them to a total of \$50,000.

Update: Prop 40 Grant (LESJWA) Lake Elsinore Back Basin Wetlands BMP Implementation Project

Mr. Whetsel informed the members of the Task Force that the State is going to pay them for the old money so he's just waiting on the check. Mr. Kilroy stated that he is trying to schedule a meeting with the resource agencies at the moment.

Other Business:

It was asked about the status for the Aeration System. It was noted that we haven't even received the design for it and we are waiting on Dr. Anderson.

Schedule Next Meeting

The next Technical Advisory Committee Meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, June 14, 2011 at 9:00 a.m.

Adjourn

As there was no further business for review, the meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.