

MINUTES OF THE  
BIG BEAR LAKE TMDL TASK FORCE MEETING

March 24, 2009

**Agency**

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

**Participant**

Michael Perez  
Heather Boyd  
Cathy Jochai  
Gian Villareal (RBF)  
David Lawrence  
Matt Yeager  
Nancy Gardiner  
Scott Tangenberg  
Karl Klouzer  
Mike Stephenson  
Darrell Smith  
Tim Moore  
Mark Norton  
Rick Whetsel  
Regina Patterson

**Call to Order & Introductions**

Big Bear Lake TMDL Task Force meeting was called to order at 9:33 a.m. at San Bernardino County Public Works, 825 East Third Street, San Bernardino, California.

Mark Norton reported the invoices have been sent for FY 2008-09.

**Approval of February 24, 2009 Minutes**

The February 24, 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 Matt Yeager, seconded by Cathy Jochai, the motion unanimously carried:

**BBLTMDL 09/03-01**

**MOVED,** Approve the February 24, 2009 Big Bear Lake TMDL Task Force Meeting Minutes as presented.

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

Agreement Signature Update – Matt Yeager stated their signature pages are being signed today. Rick Whetsel reported that once those are received the agreement process will be complete.

TMDL Schedule of Deliverables – Rick Whetsel presented the Plan/Schedule of TMDL deliverables welcoming comments, corrections or updates. Tim Moore reported he is preparing the Task 6 annual report that is due February 15<sup>th</sup>. The Regional Board requested the data be documented and summarized from the previous year. There was some atmospheric data collected in 2008. **Mr. Moore said compilation should be done within the next week and then it will be sent to Rick Whetsel to be finalized on SAWPA letterhead.**

Budget Review – Rick Whetsel referred to the Task Force Budget for FY 2007-08 stating that because this period was prior to SAWPA's administration of the Task Force, Big Bear MWD is preparing an accounting of expenses and contributions for that period. Invoices have recently been sent out for the current FY 2008-

09. Prior to FY 2009-10 invoicing, we will need to clarify how the carryover will be applied to the comprehensive monitoring program. The Task Force still needs to approve the FY 2009-10 budget to begin July 1, 2009. Mr. Moore said the budget does not include a line item for the Forest Service showing an equivalent for what they promise to do. Matt Yeager said the budget needs more detail on actual costs. Mark Norton asked if we are awaiting new numbers from Brown and Caldwell? Mr. Whetsel reported Nancy Gardiner has provided the costs pending the conclusion of the field sampling training that we anticipate being completed in April. After the training is completed the Task Force will need to make a decision about how much of the field monitoring work would go to Brown and Caldwell or to the stakeholder volunteers. **Rick Whetsel will prepare and present a revision for formal approval at the next Task Force meeting.**

### **Combined Watershed-Wide/Lake QAPP - Discussion**

Tim Moore provided background history stating that the Task Force has been working on the watershed monitoring plan for over a year and thought we were fairly close on have a finalized document. Following our last Task Force meeting the Regional Board provided our consultant, Brown and Caldwell with some rather substantial comments on the watershed monitoring plan. Brown and Caldwell in review of these comments became concerned that the requested revisions were well beyond the Scope of Work provided by Brown and Caldwell to the Task Force to complete the monitoring Plan and requested that the Task Force review the proposed revisions. Following communications between stakeholders and the Regional Board, Hope Smythe of the Regional Board acknowledged that many of these issues had been discussed at previous Task Force meetings and requested that SAWPA assemble a log of all of the discussions referring to the Watershed Monitoring Plan from the Task Force meeting notes. The following is a review of comments received from Heather Boyd of the Regional Board from a letter dated January 13, 2009 as discussed at the March 24<sup>th</sup> Task Force meeting:

#### *Comment 1 (Heather Boyd)*

Visual Monitoring – Does not object to that not being included in the Monitoring Plan because we now have more data. It was originally included to help determine what base flow and snowmelt looked like.

#### *Comment 2 (Heather Boyd)*

Snowmelt – The data is being biased when only collecting in April and May. Not concerned about frequency of sampling period. Mr. Moore said there were two reasons why April and May were chosen. The first was the general belief that we might or might not have melting by March. Second, we were heavily dependent on labor from the ski areas to collect the samples. He proposed not being specific about April or May. It can be determined after training is complete. If there are a lot of nutrients loaded up in the front end, it has to be caught or the models and analyses will not make sense.

Ms. Boyd said snowmelt is defined as greater than ½ inch in one storm or rainfall. Twice per month when representative flow is present. She said she would like to see February through May when there is snowmelt.

#### *Comment 3 (Heather Boyd)*

Storm Events – The Regional Board agreed to one summer and one winter event. The sampling plan was difficult to follow so she recommended the entire section be better described. Mr. Moore said it has been discussed. Ms. Gardiner stated she received comments from San Bernardino Flood Control who recommended using automated samplers except for the next year. Mr. Moore said automated samplers only made sense if doing for several years. If we are ever looking at an extended sampling period, we could look at it again.

Ms. Boyd said she would like to see the discussion with Tetra Tech in the minutes and in the Monitoring Plan describing which samples were required individual and which ones could be composited. Mr. Moore said it is reflected in the monitoring budget.

*Comment 4 (Heather Boyd)*

Flow Types - The flow types, when specified in the TMDL, said base flow was used, and we were not specific to dry weather conditions. The sampling plan says one of the types is baseline quality (dry weather) – more of a definition is needed of what representative flow for dry weather is or is it representative flow for baseline conditions. Mr. Moore said baseline flow was meant to be that flow that exists but is not either storm or snowmelt. Ms. Gardiner asked how to differentiate. Are there two samples or does one sample that constitutes both requirements during those months. Ms. Boyd said it depends on how it is qualified.

Mr. Moore said we expect to be out there once a month characterizing whether any of the monthly samples fits in one of these specialized categories that you have to have a sample for. The storm samples will be the ones that will have to be timed.

*Comment 5 (Heather Boyd)*

Table 4 – Chlorophyll-a will be removed from the table and not be sampled. She clarified that the reason there was suspended and bedload sampling is to calibrate the sediment portion of HSPF. When the attempt was made to collect suspended load and bedload during the grant, it became problematic. Mr. Moore said it was not important near term and was deferred. Ms. Boyd asked that the monitoring plan reflects that. Mr. Moore will work with Brown and Caldwell.

*Comment 6 (Heather Boyd)*

Sedimentation Processes Plan – That was for part of the calibration of the sediment portion of the HSPF model and to look at the nutrients in sediment to answer the natural background and calibrate the model. She said she would not be opposed to this if this is going to be looked at further.

Mr. Moore provide background stating 1) it was thought to be more closely tied to the sediment TMDL although we all acknowledge that there were nutrients in the sediment; 2) it was going to get folded into the natural background task and dealt with separately; and 3) at the time we were talking about the retention ponds, there was doubt about whether we would still have them or not. This will not be deferred but done differently. Ms. Boyd said it was a requirement of the Watershed-wide Monitoring Plan. She does not want to see questions in the TMDL.

Ms. Boyd asked that each of the 18 items listed in the January 13, 2009 letter be addressed prior to plan approval. She requested that she receive the QAPP in electronic format only, using the SWAMP format. She also requested a step by step analysis of the process.

Ms. Gardiner said she is standards and methods taken from the 2006 BBMWD Quality Assurance Project Plan. Ms. Boyd suggested going to the web site to view the updates for nutrients because some of the SWAMP comparable items have been updated. **Ms. Boyd will provide a copy of the Lake Monitoring Plan to Ms. Gardiner with the appendices. Ms. Gardiner is working on the Watershed Monitoring Plan and the Watershed QAPP.**

Mr. Moore noted a concern that there is nothing in writing that reflects the process the Task Forces take when going through these documents with the Regional Board and revisions are made. Mark Norton said from this point on SAWPA will provide this documentation.

Mr. Moore asked if the previous cost estimate provided by Brown and Caldwell for the preparation of the Watershed Monitoring Plan and QAPP would need to be revised to account for the revisions requested by the Regional Board. Ms. Gardiner said for collecting the data, yes, however the effort to prepare a full QAPP including all 24 elements that are required by EPA for all monitoring.

Ms. Gardiner then presented to the Task Force a cost estimate to revise the Watershed Monitoring Plan and prepare QAPP, noting that the additional work will increase the cost to a total of \$25,000. Rick Whetsel said

there are sufficient funds in the 2008-09 budget to cover the cost. The Task Force agreed to authorize Brown and Caldwell to proceed immediately. Mr. Moore stated he would be responsible for Brown and Caldwell's costs until the task order is finalized.

Mr. Moore said he does not need the QAPP to get the Watershed Nutrient Monitoring Plan to the Regional Board. He stressed getting the Watershed Nutrient Monitoring Plan done as quickly as possible. Ms. Gardiner said she could have it done by April 10<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Moore suggested changing the language in the Monitoring Plan from SAP to QAPP.

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

There was nothing to update regarding this task. Brown and Caldwell is in the process of coordinating with stakeholders for the Field sampling training.

#### **Big Bear Lake Management Plan - Discussion**

Mr. Moore recommended deferring this item to the April 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting because it is being rewritten.

#### **Mercury TMDL - Discussion**

Michael Perez reported he is working on the TMDL and addressing comments from the Mitsubishi Cement Plant, and getting additional support to why it is atmospheric deposition. Something may be being done from a local source and not necessarily from a global source. These issues have slowed the TMDL process. **A staff report will be provided by the second week of April.**

#### **Future Scheduled Meeting**

The next Big Bear Lake TMDL Task Force meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 22, at 9:30 a.m. at San Bernardino County Public Works.

#### **Adjournment**

There being no further business for review, the meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.