

MINUTES OF THE  
BIG BEAR LAKE TMDL TASK FORCE MEETING

February 24, 2009

**Agency**

Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Big Bear Municipal Water District  
California Department of Transportation  
California Department of Transportation  
City of Big Bear Lake  
San Bernardino County SW Program  
Brown and Caldwell  
Risk Sciences  
San Bernardino National Forest  
San Bernardino County  
Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority  
Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority

**Participant**

Hope Smythe  
Heather Boyd  
Scott Heule  
Cathy Jochai  
Gian Villareal (RBF)  
David Lawrence  
Matt Yeager  
Nancy Gardiner  
Tim Moore  
Robert Taylor  
Dan Ilkay  
Rick Whetsel  
Regina Patterson

**Call to Order & Introductions**

Big Bear Lake TMDL Task Force meeting was called to order at 9:35 a.m. at San Bernardino County Public Works, 825 East Third Street, San Bernardino, California.

**Approval of January 9, 2009 Minutes**

The January 9, 2009, Big Bear Lake TMDL Task Force meeting minutes were presented for approval. Hearing no comments, the meeting minutes were received and filed.

Upon motion by David Lawrence, seconded by Scott Heule, the motion unanimously carried:

**BBLTMDL 09/02-01**

**MOVED**, Approve the January 9, 2009 Big Bear Lake TMDL Task Force Meeting Minutes as presented.

**Update: Task Force Administration - Agreement Approval, TMDL Schedule of Deliverables and Budget Review**

Agreement Signature Update – Rick Whetsel requested an updated signature be provided to SAWPA from each agency for the Task Force Agreement. Signature pages have been received from the Regional Board and San Bernardino National Forest. All others stated they would provide the signatures as soon as possible.

TMDL Schedule of Deliverables – Rick Whetsel presented a schedule of TMDL deliverables listing items from the Regional Board Basin Plan Amendment and items associated with the Lake Management Plan reporting the schedule is being provided for use in future planning. He invited additions or comments. Tim Moore said some of the items are complete. The report of waste discharge was turned in October 2006. The MS4 Permits have to be issued by the Regional Board and currently, all three counties are behind in getting the new MS4 Permits.

Budget Review – Rick Whetsel presented the Task Force budget for FY 2007-08 showing the stakeholder funding allocation and task descriptions. He stated that it is a projection of where the Task Force should be when the administration of the Task Force transitions to SAWPA. He noted there could possibly be a budget shortfall because Cal Trans cannot invoice until the Task Force agreement is in place. However, Mr. Whetsel does not have all of the details on previous spending by the Task Force

He noted SAWPA cannot invoice the stakeholders for the FY 2008-09 budget until all signatures for the Task Force are received. Matt Yeager said he will try to speed up their process to get the County's signatures. Mr. Whetsel said the total amount to be invoiced for stakeholder funded tasks for FY 2008-09 is \$332,661. He estimated at the end of FY 2008-09 there will be a carryover balance of approximately \$184,000, which will be applied to the FY 2009-10 budget. This included an estimate for the possible reimbursements to BBMWD for any shortfall. This carryover should help to address the allocation reduction requested by San Bernardino County stakeholders for FY 2009-10. This carryover balance will be used to cover the watershed –wide monitoring for next year. If approved by the Task Force, Brown and Caldwell has proposed the cost for watershed –wide monitoring for next year to be \$232,000 which will cover the full-blown watershed-wide monitoring as recommended by the Regional Board. Typically, SAWPA invoices are sent out after July 1<sup>st</sup> each year.

Mr. Moore said this now assumes, from the period 2008-10, that we are doing all the monitoring we agreed to do for the Regional Board. Mr. Whetsel said for FY 2008-09 Brown and Caldwell already has an agreement to do the training, QAPP update, forms/paperwork, and a season of dry weather monitoring, and these costs have already been included in the budget projection.

There was a question about the atmospheric deposition analyses. It was noted that this work is complete and will be removed from the 2008-09 worksheet.

#### **Status Update: Watershed Nutrient Monitoring Program**

Nancy Gardiner presented a cost estimate from Brown and Caldwell to complete their work for FY 2008-09 reporting they are developing a training program that would include classroom and field training with an opportunity for two months of sampling based on the monitoring plan provided by the Task Force.

The FY 2009-10 budget outlines what it would take for Brown and Caldwell to do one year of the full blown watershed-wide monitoring. She stated she is open to do all of the field monitoring or part, but expressed concern that anyone lacking experience in sampling a summer storm will have problems. This approach includes storm preparation, monthly baseline sampling, bi-monthly snow melt sampling between April and May, and the winter and summer storm events. She provided a detailed quote from E.S. Babcock & Sons, Inc. which includes everything except for chlorophyll-a. That is a very expensive analysis at \$250 per sample. There is a different sampling protocol for certain constituents and that drives up the sampling costs. No matter who does it, the lab cost is essentially fixed at over \$100,000. It does include a standard 10% quality assurance duplicate sample.

Mr. Yeager asked if the pH, turbidity, specific conductivity and DO tests could be conducted in the field. Ms. Gardiner said they would be done in the field. The costs are minimal when tests are done with a meter in the field that provide pH, conductivity, dissolved oxygen, temperature, and turbidity. Everyone agreed it is preferable to conduct the tests in the field and remove testing for turbidity, pH and dissolved oxygen reducing the cost by approximately \$4,000.

Mr. Moore asked that if the training goes well and personnel were provided, where would savings appear in the cost estimate provided Brown & Caldwell? Ms. Gardiner said in the main table she has broken out the staff costs to do each of the individual field tasks, Brown & Caldwell would be willing to do as much of the work or as little as the Task Force wanted. If the Task Force were able to do all of it, Task 2 would be deleted and save up to \$74,000. Two teams of two would be needed during an event to pull samples and get to the lab by 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Yeager asked if monitoring weather and coordination were included in the cost? Ms. Gardiner said it is embedded in the field preparation line item.

Ms. Gardiner said a revised draft sampling plan was submitted for comments. **Mr. Whetsel said he will provide the draft to everyone and expect comments back to Nancy by March 6<sup>th</sup>.**

Heather Boyd suggested referring to the old QAPP that was written and applied to the tributary monitoring. She recommended that the revision be specific to the TMDL. Discussion ensued and **Ms. Boyd stated she will provided Ms. Gardiner with the Word document and the appendices** for her review.

Mr. Whetsel said once the training is done in March, the budget and scope of work for monitoring and consultants will be reviewed. Training will not begin until the modified QAPP is complete. The QAPP and the monitoring plan should both be complete before the Regional Board's Workshop agenda is sent out on April 10<sup>th</sup>. The Regional Board will vote on it April 24<sup>th</sup>.

#### **Discussion: Mercury TMDL**

Hope Smythe reported a discussion has taken place with EPA about the Task Force relying on posting and restricting fishing. The EPA believes there needs to be a plan that reduces the levels of mercury. It was suggested by EPA that a restoration plan could take the place of a TMDL. Mr. Yeager asked where the load calculations would come from? Ms. Smythe said they are relying on the Tetra Tech report. There is some atmospheric and watershed data.

Ms. Smythe reported the goal is to put out a staff report by the end of March. She stated that Cindy Lin is available for discussion if it is requested.

Heather Boyd requested the complete data record of the vertical profile and the lake water quality for August to September 2006. Chlorophyll-a data and data collected for the beneficial use assessment to be used in a nutrient assessment of the three creeks has not been received. The data was to be used to identify a list of nutrients for the three creeks. The first annual report was due February 15, 2009. She requested a letter be submitted specifying what has been done.

#### **Future Scheduled Meeting**

The next Big Bear Lake TMDL Task Force meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 24, at 9:30 a.m. at San Bernardino County Public Works.

#### **Adjournment**

There being no further business for review, the meeting adjourned at 11:35 a.m.