

NOTES OF THE  
BIG BEAR LAKE TMDL TASK FORCE MEETING

May 18, 2010

Agency

CA Regional Water Quality Control Board  
San Bernardino County SW Program  
Big Bear Municipal Water District  
CA Department of Transportation  
City of Big Bear Lake  
US Forest Service  
US Forest Service  
Big Bear Mountain Resorts  
Brown and Caldwell  
Brown and Caldwell  
RBF Consultants  
Risk Sciences  
Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority  
Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority

Participant

Hope Smythe  
Matt Yeager  
Scott Heule  
Cathy Jochai  
David Lawrence  
Mikaila Rimbenieks  
Robert Taylor  
Karl Klouzer  
Nancy Gardiner  
Khalil Abusaba  
Gian Villarreal  
Tim Moore  
Rick Whetsel  
Regina Patterson

Call to Order & Introductions

The Big Bear Lake TMDL Task Force meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. at San Bernardino County Public Works, 825 East Third Street, San Bernardino, California.

Approval of April 13, 2010 Meeting Notes

The April 13, 2010 Big Bear Lake TMDL Task Force meeting notes were presented for approval. Khalil Abusaba asked that the title referenced in the first sentence on page 3 be revised to “*Wet Weather Strategies for Controlling Nutrient Inputs to Big Bear Lake*”. Hearing no additional comments, the meeting notes were deemed acceptable as amended.

Status Update: Watershed-wide Nutrient Monitoring Program

Regional Board Comments on 2009 Annual Report

Nancy Gardiner presented a letter from the Regional Board discussing “*Review of Big Bear Lake Nutrient TMDL Annual Water Quality Report*” dated March 16, 2010. Ms. Gardiner led discussion on the recommendations outlined by the Regional Board for the report format and contents. Hope Smythe requested having annual average for total phosphorous targets.

In response to the request for summarizing the vertical profile measurement and secchi depth, Dr. Abusaba said fulfilling this would be a significant effort. The spreadsheets can be put on CD and the data have been summarized in the Sediment Nutrient Reduction Plan to the extent necessary. The DOC, hardness, TOC and TDS are not at hand, but the vertical profile measurements are. Tim Moore suggested waiting until the data is available and then decide if it is appropriate. There was a consensus to wait to see the data. Scott Heule will provide graphs at the end of this year.

Ms. Smythe said they are not necessarily asking that the February submission be revised, but to use this as a guide going forward in preparing future reports. Ms. Gardiner said they have developed a comment response matrix. Ms. Smythe asked that the data be provided to be uploaded to 303(d) integrated report database. Shape files would be useful. Mr. Whetsel said data SAWPA receives will be uploaded to SAWDMS database.

Dr. Abusaba said Brown and Caldwell will review the draft scope and note the assumptions. Ms. Smythe also requested that the next annual report include vegetation and model reporting. Sediment reduction data should be attached as an appendix with an explanation summarizing what was accomplished. Ms. Gardiner will develop an outline for the report and budget estimate to expand the annual report for FY 2010-11.

#### Status Update: Sediment Nutrient Reduction Plan

Ms. Smythe reported the submission draft of the plan and schedule for the “*In-Lake Sediment Nutrient Reduction Plan*” has been accepted by Heather Boyd. She will provide a letter stating that the plan is acceptable, and when it will be presented to the Regional Board. Mr. Whetsel stated next steps will be to present at the Regional Board Workshop on June 24<sup>th</sup>, Regional Board meeting on July 23<sup>rd</sup> and then to Big Bear MWD Board on July 25<sup>th</sup>.

Matt Yeager said his concern was that the largest BMP was contingent upon funding. Management on the margins, sharing responsibilities and costs are also concerns.

Future work and benefits of the ‘managing on the margin’ strategy were discussed by Dr. Abusaba. Mr. Yeager stated he is supportive of Brown and Caldwell’s work. Scott Heule stated the district was to retain the services of MWH to look after the interests of the district and to avoid perception of mixed loyalties. This needs to be a collaborative process with what Brown and Caldwell and Risk Sciences are proposing is good for the lake. There will be a meeting tomorrow to go over these plans to develop a strategy for the June 24<sup>th</sup> meeting and a way to present all the issues. Dr. Abusaba proposed meeting with Scott Heule on behalf of the Task Force.

Ms. Smythe said the numeric targets will need to be met in 2015. Adoption of this plan by the Water District provides the assurance to the Regional Board that the Task Force is moving toward the desired goal.

#### Status Update: Aquatic Plant Management Plan

Mr. Moore reported the “*Aquatic Plant Management Plan*” was sent in and a significant rewrite is required. The original was done as part of a grant by Erica and Dr. Givens. As a Task Force, we took that grant deliverable, reframed it and rewrote it in proper context and submitted it. It came back with more comments than expected. The rewrite has to be done by June 14<sup>th</sup> and then presented to the Board on July 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Ms. Smythe suggested the Task Force think more globally about what it wants to achieve with the aquatic plan. The ideas expressed when developing the TMDL were to go toward bio-criteria, and if bio-criteria included some measure of plant diversity, plant community, optimal levels, some of that information may be needed. These are things to think about and see if those would be appropriate to apply. If the APNI does not seem appropriate, then this is something that could be considered.

Mr. Yeager requested the Regional Board allow more time to prepare and to review consultant services. He said he would provide a proposed schedule to the Regional Board. Mr. Whetsel said budget is available. Dr. Abusaba said between now and June 15<sup>th</sup> he can put all the comments into a matrix. Ms. Gardiner said there is some carryover that may cover this part of the process. Brown and Caldwell will provide an estimate to prepare comments to address the June 15<sup>th</sup> deadline.

#### Status Update: Watershed Model

Mr. Moore stated that more so than the Aquatic Management Plan, there is a fundamental philosophical difference between his recommended approach to the model update and Heather’s expectations. The comments suggest much more work on the model than expected. There is no longer a lot of value to the models. They served their purpose when they were needed to develop TMDLs. We are moving to more direct measures of compliance, both biological and chemical. The model rapidly becomes obsolete. Minor

changes will be made to the model and then we'll move into the management strategies, which do not depend on the model.

Dr. Abusaba asked what percentage of the legacy of in-lake nutrients belong to background and what percentage belongs to anthropogenic? The same question can be asked about the current load. Most of it belongs to background with a small amount belonging to anthropogenic measured as mass. Is there one thing that you would like to see changed in the model? Ms. Smythe said she is not convinced a model is needed in this watershed. The existing model or other methods can be used to answer that question. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Yeager said if water quality monitoring data and related modeling analyses indicate that the urban wasteload allocation is being exceeded, we would do other things. Whatever we do has to be consistent. Mr. Moore said we're not abandoning the old model because it will show a large natural background load. We don't know what the compliance looks like for the legacy responsibility to the in-lake sediments.

Ms. Smythe emphasized her concern about the June 15<sup>th</sup> schedule. Mr. Yeager suggested preparing a document that integrates the plans to link them together. Ms. Smythe agreed and further stated the only other concern she has is that the Task Force have something in place to move the Task Force forward. If an extension were required, the document would need to be submitted by August 23<sup>rd</sup> for presentation to the Board at their September 16<sup>th</sup> meeting.

David Lawrence proposed writing a letter to the Regional Board staff requesting to resubmit addressing the Regional Board's comments and plan to provide the Aquatic Plant Management Plan and the Modeling Plan as an integrated document.

Nancy Gardiner said that Brown and Caldwell could use the carryover budget from 2009-10 to prepare comments to address the Regional Board deadline for the modeling update. In addition, she will prepare a scope of work and budget based upon the FY 2010-11 budget to integrate the three TMDL Action Plans ("*In-Lake Sediment Nutrient Reduction Plan*", "*Aquatic Plant Management Plan*", and "*Watershed Model Update Plan*") into a single comprehensive plan ready for the September 16<sup>th</sup> Regional Board meeting.

Status Update: Watershed-wide Nutrient Monitoring Program

Scope of Work 2010-11 Monitoring

Nancy Gardiner reported she will review the scope of work based upon these discussions. Mr. Whetsel inquired about whether the Task Force would agree with Brown and Caldwell continuing work. The task begins in July so a task order should be in place by July 1<sup>st</sup>. He invited comments and reported a memo will be prepared to the SAWPA Commission.

Status Update: Task Force Administration

Draft FY 2010-11 Budget

Mr. Whetsel presented the Budget reporting the carryover for FY 2009-10 is \$60,676. He reviewed the stakeholder funding allocation, Task Force funded tasks and stakeholder funded tasks for the 2010-11 budget year. Total funding required for FY 2010-11 is estimated at \$345,300. Mr. Whetsel invited comments and reported invoices will be sent in July. Reduce Tasks 4 and 5 to \$40,000 each reducing the county's contribution to \$210,000 and reducing the total budget to \$305,000. Department of Transportation requested a reduction down to \$12,000. Cathy Jochai will provide the actual numbers.

Mr. Whetsel will prepare a final FY 2010-11 budget based upon the available stakeholder funding for stakeholder review and approval at the June 29<sup>th</sup> Task Force meeting.

Discussion: OWOW and Prop 84 Grant Opportunity

Rick Whetsel reported there is an opportunity to receive Prop 84 DWR grant funds. SAWPA has posted a project application form on its website at [www.sawpa.org](http://www.sawpa.org). Submittals should be in by June 30<sup>th</sup>. They are looking for multi-beneficial and multi-jurisdictional projects.

Status Update: 303(d) Listing for Mercury

Ms. Smythe said there is nothing to report on the 303(d) listing for Mercury.

Other Business

Dr. Abusaba reported Brown and Caldwell will submit an abstract to the California Association of Stormwater Quality Agencies about the Big Bear Lake Sediment Nutrient Management Plan and the bigger picture. The abstracts are due on Friday.

Future Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, June 29<sup>th</sup> at 9:00 a.m. at San Bernardino County Public Works, 825 E. Third Street, San Bernardino.

Adjournment

There being no further business for review, the meeting adjourned at 12:19 p.m.

Handout(s) available at [www.sawpa.org](http://www.sawpa.org)

1. Regional Board letter "Review of Big Bear lake Nutrient TMDL Annual Water Quality Report 3/16/10
2. Regional Board letter "Comments on the Plan and Schedule for Updating the BBL Watershed Model and the In-Lake Nutrient Model 4/27/10
3. Brown and Caldwell 2010-11 Scope of Work w/worksheets
4. Task Force Budget