

NOTES OF THE  
BIG BEAR LAKE TMDL TASK FORCE MEETING

October 20, 2010

Agency

San Bernardino County SW Program  
Big Bear Municipal Water District  
CA Department of Transportation  
Big Bear Mountain Resorts  
CA Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Brown and Caldwell  
Brown and Caldwell  
RBF Consulting  
U.S. Forest Service  
City of Big Bear Lake  
Larry Walker Associates  
Larry Walker Associates  
Risk Sciences  
Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority  
Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority  
Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority

Participant

Matt Yeager  
Scott Heule  
Cathy Jochai  
Karl Klouzer  
Hope Smythe  
Nancy Gardiner (via telecon)  
Khalil Abusaba  
Gian Villarreal  
Robert Taylor  
Joe Cyzwik  
Diana Engle  
Karen Cowan  
Tim Moore  
Rick Whetsel  
Mark Norton  
Regina Patterson

Call to Order & Introductions

The Big Bear Lake TMDL Task Force meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. at San Bernardino County Public Works, 825 East Third Street, San Bernardino, California.

Approval of June 29, 2010 Meeting Notes

The June 29, 2010 Big Bear Lake TMDL Task Force meeting notes were presented for approval. Hearing no comments, the meeting notes were deemed acceptable.

Nancy Gardiner joined the meeting by teleconference at 2:03 p.m.

Discussion: TMDL Action Plan and Schedule of Upcoming TMDL/Permit Deliverables

Rick Whetsel provided the Brown and Caldwell draft Action Plan as presented in August and it was determined that the Regional Board has currently not commented on the document. He reported that there has been discussion about how to proceed.

Tim Moore said the TMDL Action Plan is simultaneously a Task Force TMDL deliverable, and separately, an independent obligation to the MS4 permittees, as defined by the new permit adopted by the Regional Board in January 2010. There is no material distinction between what is described in the TMDL than what is described by the new permit. The permit makes the TMDL deliverable obligatory to the permittees. The MS4 permittees transmitted the document along with a letter (dated August 27, 2010) stating the elements of the plan that they are committed to doing. It specifically makes the point that some of the elements of the TMDL Action Plan are already being done, mainly the weed control abatement plan the district is currently doing.

Mr. Moore discussed responsibility for demonstrating compliance strategy to the Regional Board. He recommended the Task Force establish an informal forum for seeking opportunities to coordinate and share costs, but to not formally convene to do submissions for the planning or compliance documents that are required by permit.

Karen Cowan offered an example of what other watersheds are doing regarding payment being proportional to discharge. There could be case made that the point of compliance for a permit isn't achieving the wasteload allocations, it's in the actual implementation actions. Hope Smythe said that's the way it was intended. There could still be a benefit from working together as a task force if there is an understanding of compliance; more performance based than numeric based.

Hope Smythe asked what San Bernardino County is committing to. Matt Yeager said they are committing to doing what is within their jurisdiction. The County has no authority to do activities within the lake without permission. The MS4 Permit requires BMP implementation be done. Land development and public education are being done. In-lake monitoring is not in County jurisdiction.

Following discussion of targets not being met in the lake, Ms. Smythe said ideally, the TMDL could be revised and everyone could be given their own allocation number.

Mr. Moore shared what is being recommended for the Lake Elsinore/Canyon Lake TMDL stating it is a different way of monitoring the lake at a fraction of the cost. It is money that would be better spent working on controlling the loads than measuring the loads. The recommendation is conversion from a binary style compliance to a four dimensional metric of compliance (three dimensions in space and one in time). Use our satellite data to quantify the normal range and variability of the algae under differing meteorological conditions over a long period of time. The argument is that while we may not be able to get to full compliance and full attainment 100 percent of the time, but we can shift the curve and measure that expressing that as recovered acre-foot years of volumetric water habitat. This shifts away from causal targets and towards response targets and measures success and failure there.

Lake Elsinore has satellite imagery data, 15,000 separate data points at five points per acre quantifying algae levels. We have four sampling locations in Big Bear that are used to characterize the entire lake.

There is a new satellite going up at the end of this year and there are private satellites where images with more clarity can be purchased. Mr. Yeager said he would like to see an example of the data.

Mr. Whetsel asked how to proceed with the draft plan. Ms. Smythe said following the discussions today, she is not sure what to ask her board to approve. Mr. Yeager said the County cannot commit to doing anything until they have funding.

Mr. Whetsel asked for direction of what items the Task Force will work together on. Joe Cyzwik suggested occasionally collaborating on grant opportunities, BMPs and educational purposes. Mr. Moore suggested telling the Regional Board that the Task Force as presently constituted as an instrument for compliance, will not continue. Therefore, those entities whose participation in the Task Force has been their basis for compliance will have to find a new basis for compliance.

Mark Norton said it is important to realize the impacts of disbanding. You would lose the cohesiveness of a unified message, Tim Moore, and consultant contracts. SAWPA is here to continue any support that the group requests. It will change dramatically when everyone goes their separate way. You can contract on your own with any of the consultants. Ms. Smythe suggested each entity submit a separate letter to the Regional Board. Mr. Moore said everything will be conducted through the Task Force through June 2011.

Status Update: Task Force Administration  
FY 2010-11 Draft Budget

Mr. Whetsel presented the draft FY 2010-11 Budget stating quarterly meetings could be supported with \$25,000. Watershed monitoring has \$120,000 budgeted for the year. A BMP implementation strategy is on hold with a \$60,000 budget. Items from the MS4 permit due November 15<sup>th</sup> include Big Bear permittees shall submit a report describing BMPs to reduce sources of phosphorous. The annual report and submittal of

results of the first model update for February 15<sup>th</sup>. There is a two-year carryover of \$191,000 for the coming 2010-11 budget year. If the reduced budget is used, which does not include modeling work or BMP report, the budget balance would be about \$28,366. He asked for direction.

Mr. Yeager agreed to do the monitoring program and the annual monitoring report.

Upon motion by Matt Yeager, seconded by Cathy Jochai, the motion unanimously carried:

**BBL TMDL 10-10-01**

**MOVED**, approve the FY 2010-11 budget as presented.

Discussion: U.S. 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court Ruling on NPDES Permits for USFS Roads – Tim Moore

Mr. Moore reported the court's decision implies it may be necessary for Forest Service to get a permit or something equivalent. Robert Taylor said the Forest Service was not a party to the court case. There are issues about the ruling that are not clear. Ms. Smythe asked what Forest Service thinks about establishing a waste discharge requirement and if anything has been heard about what EPA plans to direct the states to do. Mr. Taylor said they are working actively with the State Board on their non-point source conditional waiver. They want the draft plan by mid-November and the decision in January 2011.

Status Update: Weed Abatement Program – Scott Heule

Mr. Heule provided the “*Big Bear Lake Management Operations*” and reported they are sampling the lake each summer for temperature throughout the lake looking at lake clarity and dissolved oxygen (Appendix A). The measurements go to the bottom of the lake. He reviewed the report. One of the two programs for treating weeds is herbicides. He reported progress is being made with the milfoil infestation. Carp removal was about 50,000 pounds over the course of the year at a cost of \$14,500.

Status Update: Watershed-wide Nutrient Monitoring Program – Nancy Gardiner

Nancy Gardiner will provide a presentation of data at a future meeting. She reported success with the first storm event. In Big Bear there were cloud bursts in different parts of the watershed and the response was uneven. Four of the sites had enough flow to collect samples. Grout Creek and Boulder Creek did not flow enough to sample. Today, a total of six samples were taken that are currently being transported to the lab. Those samples should provide a good data point for one storm event. She expressed appreciation to Mountain Resorts for their staff mobilization, set up and storage.

Mr. Cyzwik said under typical conditions samples will not be available from Grout Creek and Boulder Creek until April 2011, and then it will be a mixture of storm event and snowmelt.

Tim Moore will meet with Matt Yeager and Scott Heule to discuss Big Bear Lake sampling separate from the Task Force.

Status Update: HG TMDL / Latest 303(d) Listings

Due to time constraints, this item was not discussed.

Other Business

There was no other business.

Future Meeting

A future meeting will be scheduled via E-mail.

Adjournment

There being no further business for review, the meeting adjourned at 4:26 p.m.

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

1. Brown and Caldwell draft Action Plan
2. San Bernardino County Stormwater Program Letter to Regional Board – August 27, 2010
3. Comment and Response Summary - BBL Nutrient TMDL Annual Report – Brown and Caldwell
4. Schedule of Deliverables – Brown and Caldwell
5. Task Force Plan and Schedule
6. Task Force Budget