

**FINAL  
Webinar Meeting Summary**

**Santa Margarita River  
Watershed Nutrient Initiative Group Meeting  
Wednesday February 20, 2013  
9:30 am – 11:30 am**

**Location:**

Webinar (Conference Call Number - 800-509-6344; Access Code - 0212938 #)  
Webinar Registration - <https://www1.gotomeeting.com/register/112527776>

**Webinar Attendee List:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>E-mail</b>
Jason Uhley	Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District	juhley@rcflood.org
Denise Landstedt	RCWD	landstedtd@ranchowater.com
Jo Ann Weber	County of San Diego	joann.weber@sdcounty.ca.gov
Sheri McPherson	County of San Diego	sheri.mcpherson@sdcounty.ca.gov
Chuck Katz	US Navy (SPAWAR)	chuck.katz@navy.mil
Kyle Cook	USMC Camp Pendleton	kyle.r.cook@usmc.mil
Rachel Davenport	AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.	rachel.davenport@amec.com
Ashli Desai	Larry Walker & Associates	ashlid@lwa.com
Dave Ceppos	Center for Collaborative Policy, California State University Sacramento	dceppos@ccp.csus.edu
Barry Pulver	Regional Water Quality Control Board	bpulver@waterboards.ca.gov
Karla Standridge	Mission RCD	karla@missionrkd.org
Clint Boschen	Tetra Tech	clint.boschen@tetrattech.com
Alison Witheridge	Tetra Tech	alison.witheridge@tetrattech.com
Scott Thomas	Stetson Engineers	scottt@stetsonengineers.com
Brittany Struck	National Marine Fisheries Service	brittany.struck@noaa.gov
Greg Kryz	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation	gkrzys@usbr.gov
Art Diaz	Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District	aadiaz@rcflood.org
Robert Vasquez	Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District	revasquez@rcflood.org

**Meeting Materials:**

1. Meeting Agenda
2. Draft Revised Project Process Plan

**Meeting Goals:**

1. Discuss and potentially complete the Draft Final Project Process Plan.
2. Receive informational updates.
3. Track status of action items.
4. Understand status of the watershed model.

### **February 20, 2013 Action Items:**

1. Barry Pulver will write up the results of his meeting with the Regional Board regarding their practical vision and will send it in a letter to Jason (as the chair of the group).
2. Barry and Jason Uhley will work offline to schedule a meeting with the stakeholder group and Dave Gibson to discuss the MOU and the Draft Final Process Plan. The general target for this meeting is mid to late March.
3. Dave Ceppos will contact Barry on Wednesday, February 27, 2013 to pin down a general target date for when the board staff will be able to complete review of the Draft Final Process Plan.
4. Martha Sutula will meet with Regional Board staff on Monday February 25, 2013, to provide an update and current status overview of regional and state-wide NNE February 25, 2013. Staff from SPAWAR and TetraTech are also expected to attend.
5. Dave will contact Martha regarding: the goal of the Monday meeting and whether it is appropriate to send technical staff from Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District (RCFC & WCD) and Camp Pendleton to the meeting.
6. Barry will speak with Cindy Lin (EPA) on Friday, February 22, 2013 regarding the project and EPA funding for Phase 2.
7. Ashli Desai will make the description of estuary modeling consistent between the Draft Final Process Plan and the Schedule (provided in excel format) when the Schedule is finalized.
8. Ashli will revise Section 7.2.6 of the Draft Final Process Plan Schedule to reflect a clear decision point for estuary impairment.
9. Jo Ann and Jason will have an offline conversation with Martha and Ashli by March 6, 2013 to clarify funding allocations for components of the project.
10. Ashli and Martha will work further with the SMR Group to identify opportunities to condense the Schedule to accommodate the Regional Board's schedule of mid-2014 for either a TMDL or any suggested alternatives.
11. Barry will bring the Stakeholder's schedule to his management to support the Regional Board's discussions with the EPA regarding the 2014 date.
12. Dave will provide the group action items by February 26, 2013
13. Dave will provide the final meeting summaries from November and January to Sheri McPherson so that Sheri may post them on the website.

### **Introduction**

Dave Ceppos (Facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy) reviewed the meeting goals and agenda and inquired whether anyone had changes. No changes or comments were noted.

### **Review and Approval of the November 28, 2012 Meeting Summary**

Dave inquired whether anyone had changes in addition to those provided during the January 10, 2013 meeting. No additional changes or comments were noted and the November 28, 2012 meeting summary was adopted. The November 28, 2012 meeting summary will be submitted to Sheri as final based on the proposed changes from the January 10, 2013 meeting.

***Action item: Dave will provide Sheri the November 28, 2012 meeting summary to be posted on the Project Cleanwater Website.***

### **Review and Approval of the January 10, 2013 Meeting Summary**

Dave inquired whether anyone had changes for the January 10, 2013 meeting summary. No changes or comments were noted and the January 10, 2013 meeting summary was adopted.

***Action item: Dave will provide Sheri the January 10, 2013 meeting summary to be posted on the Project Cleanwater Website.***

### **Review of January 10, 2013 Action Items**

The action items from the January 10, 2013 meeting were reviewed:

- Action Item #1 – Meeting summaries have been reviewed and are complete.
- Action Items #2 and 3– The fisheries presentation will be no earlier than early summer if at all, based on the results of the conjunctive use project.
- Action Item #4 – Denise will get a copy of signed grant agreement for use as a template. This has not been completed yet.
- Action Item #5 – Martha is still waiting for comments on the Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP).
- Action Item #6 – The Regional Board determined that it was premature to release the draft sections of their Practical Vision document. Barry will continue to update the SMR group.
- Action Item #7 – The internal Regional Board staff meeting with Dave Gibson (Regional Board Executive Officer (EO)) did not happen on January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2013 but occurred on Tuesday, February 19, 2013.
- Action Item #8 - Barry is writing up the results of his meeting with Dave Gibson. A letter summary will be sent from Barry to Jason as the chair of the stakeholder group.
- Action Item #9 – The Project Process Plan tables were updated and are to be discussed during today's meeting.
- Action Item #10 – Camp Pendleton has discussed the Process Plan with Martha and the Regional Board but has not provided specific comments on the process plan yet.
- Action Item #11 - A meeting to review the Process Plan and schedule was completed in February. The original meeting was scheduled for January 28<sup>th</sup>.
- Action Item #12 – Comments have been provided to Martha, Dave, and Ashli on the Process Plan and are up for discussion during today's meeting.

### **SMR Group Decisions:**

1. Coordination Decision - Approval of the November 28, 2012 meeting summary.
2. Coordination Decision - Approval of the January 10, 2013 meeting summary.

3. Resource Decision (Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), excluding consultants) – Adoption of “Draft Final” Process Plan, with the caveat of suggestions provided during today’s meeting.

### **General Updates:**

#### **IRWM:**

The San Diego Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) group is in the process of compiling proposal(s) for Phase 2 funding, including funding for the SMR Nutrient Initiative process. The proposal(s) will be submitted in March 2013. The San Diego IRWM group is working with their consultant team to conduct a cost/benefit analysis and anticipate a public draft of the IRWM plan update by June 2013. Sheri McPherson will keep the stakeholder group posted.

The Riverside IRWM group met last week and focused on the IRWM plan update. The group worked on the final draft of objectives. They have started their draft management strategy. The group is also working on Round 2 of the implementation grant. Their next meeting is May 8, 2013.

#### **Regional Board:**

Dave Gibson has requested an additional meeting with the SMR Group leadership to discuss a proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and how to move forward with the process. Barry discussed the draft estuary Numeric Nutrient Endpoint (NNE) process with Dave Gibson, who believes that there is sufficient scientific background to move forward with the project without waiting for the State Board decision. The timing is appropriate to discuss both an MOU and the Draft Final Process Plan. Dave Gibson is supportive of the local approach to the NNE. Barry will coordinate a meeting within the next month. Martha is going to provide an overview and status of the current NNE-type activities both on a regional and state-wide level to Regional Board Staff on Monday, February 22, 2013 from 11-1.

#### **RCFC & WCD:**

The Counties of Southern California (San Diego, Riverside, and Orange) conducted legislative outreach at both the state and congressional level regarding the need to promote basin planning efforts. Basin planning efforts need to be evaluated as to the TMDL process. The Counties met with John Bishop at the State Water Resources Control Board and the Governor’s office. RCFC & WCD has two new staff members assisting with the project: Art Diaz and Robert Vasquez.

#### ***Action Items:***

***Barry and Jason will work offline to schedule a meeting with Dave Gibson to discuss the MOU and the Draft Final Process Plan.***

***Martha will meet with Regional Board staff to provide an overview of NNE activities. Barry and Martha will provide a summary of the meeting at the next SMR Nutrient Initiative stakeholder meeting.***

#### **Review and discussion of the SMR Watershed Loading Model**

Tetra Tech, Inc. (Tetra Tech) previously provided a presentation to the SMR Group that focused on updating the current watershed loading model. Caltrans has provided comments on the

current SMR Watershed Loading Model, requesting clarifications of modeling assumptions and how the model works. The next phase includes sediment and nutrient modeling. RCWD had a conference call with Tetra Tech to discuss land use and any local data they might have. The call included an irrigation specialist and a GIS analyst from RCWD, who provided information to Tetra Tech based on Riverside County's parcel layer.

Tetra Tech conducted an analysis from the model based on the Riverside County layer and they feel confident in moving forward with the Hydrologic Simulation Program-Fortran (HSPF) watershed model. There was some concern that the land use parcel data would impact the vegetation coverage data representing the land processes for pollutant flow and transport modeling. However, Tetra Tech feels confident that the data is appropriate.

The County of San Diego also provided land use data to Tetra Tech. The County of San Diego selected 10 areas to compare Tetra Tech's model layer to the County Agriculture, Weights & Measures layer which is based on parcel information. The County of San Diego provided Tetra Tech their 2009 land use data and a summary of their comparison as support for Tetra Tech's use of their 2009 land use GIS layer.

The Regional Board also provided comments on the presentation and Tetra Tech's modeling technical memorandum and has suggested that some adjustments be made to that document. Barry is speaking with Cindy Lyn on Friday, February 22, for a status update and to discuss the Regional Board practical vision, which is not ready to be released to the group. EPA funding will be used to support Phase 2 of the model for development of sediment and nutrient parameters.

Barry, SCCWRP, and SPAWAR will meet on Monday to discuss the critical conditions and issues in the estuary. While the model is in good shape; clarifications are needed for wet and dry weather loading. The wet weather portion of the model is performing well, but dry weather is always a challenge. Ultimately, it depends on how well the model needs to perform for each of these situations (wet v. dry). The group will walk through the critical conditions to make sure the model is working as well as it can under those conditions prior to calibration for sediment and nutrients so it is useful for the estuary later on in the process. RCFC & WCD requested to send technical staff to the meeting on Monday to help them catch up to speed. Barry agreed. Camp Pendleton would like to attend as well.

***Action Items:***

***Dave will contact Martha regarding: the goal of the Monday meeting and whether it is appropriate to send technical staff from RCFC & WCD and Camp Pendleton to the meeting***

***Martha and Barry will provide an update during the next stakeholder meeting.***

**Project Process Plan Review**

**Comments on the Process Plan**

No additional comments have been received since the January 10, 2013 meeting. Most comments were editorial except the following:

- Section 6 (p. 40) –The tables added to section 6 need clarification regarding the purpose of the tables: to provide a link between beneficial use impacts and the impacts that could occur from eutrophication and /or algal growth. Tables 11 and 12 were intended as

general assessments. Table 13 is specifically for assessment within the Santa Margarita watershed. Any additional comments should be provided to Ashli.

- Section 9 (p.60) – The language needs additional clarification about the purpose of the schedule and the preamble that was requested clarifying the scheduling. There are two schedules. The first schedule separates out everything that has been funded or needs to be funded to get through the estuary Site Specific Objectives (SSOs) under Phase 1. Future phases are in the second schedule because funding and timing is more tentative, so the schedule for future phases is also tentative at this point.

Dave asked for additional comments or questions. No additional questions or comments were provided and the schedule was deemed responsive to feedback provided during the January 10, 2013 meeting.

### Comments on the Process Plan Schedules

Ashli walked the group through the schedules, which contained similar dates to the schedule presented by Martha during the January 10, 2013 meeting. The purpose of providing the current schedule was to clearly link the tasks in the previous schedule to the appropriate Process Plan sections and to clarify which work products are deliverables to the SMR Group. Oral presentations are set by a certain date, listed in the schedule. Columns were added to clarify:

- The lead consultant on each of the technical work products;
- The funding source for each line item
- Where SMR Group or committee decision points are anticipated; and
- When it will be necessary for the Regional Board to weigh in on decisions and how the Regional Board may utilize the information for their internal regulatory requirements. The last column of the schedule is provided for the SMR Group to think about what information needs to be provided to the Regional Board.

The schedule is a tool to assist and clarify what will be done and when. A summary of the discussion highlights is below:

- 7.2.1 – Only bathymetry data will be collected. The special study to develop a protocol to monitor sub-tidal microalgae has not been funded and will not be conducted under this project.
- 7.2.2 – Is complete, but has been kept in the table for clarity.
- 7.2.3 – Contains two tasks to develop and present the estuary model, including validation and calibration, and a report. The report may help support the Regional Board if a TMDL is developed. In addition, two presentations will be provided by SPAWAR by Fall 2013.
- The estuary model is inconsistent between the Process Plan and the schedule. Ashli will revise the Process Plan when the schedule is finalized.
- The draft report is anticipated for December 2013, and the final is anticipated for March, 2014. The report has been scaled down to a technical memorandum for the Regional Board to provide information on the dissolved oxygen and algal biomass endpoints. Based on the Regional Board schedule, analysis of the estuary data may need to occur sooner to see if there is still an impairment in the estuary and whether a TMDL needs to be implemented. This will need to occur around June 2013. In addition, one of the dates for the estuarine work extends into 2014, which will require some contract extensions by Camp Pendleton. Camp Pendleton believes they will be able to accomplish the contract extensions, potentially with a “no cost” extension.

- 7.2.4 - Some dates are set for the river model. They expect to have a report in September, which is a little ahead of the estuary model.
- 7.2.5 and 7.2.6 – Ashli stated that Martha Sutula feels comfortable that the SMR Group will have enough data and information by May to determine whether a TMDL is necessary based on the Nutrient Numeric Endpoints (NNEs). This will be discussed in June, with loads and allocations moving forward prior to the group discussion. Data from the model will be predictive of a more long term data set versus short term. The model will provide the targets and whether they are being met. Reviewing existing data and comparing to the numbers coming out of the estuary NNE are inter-independent actions. Current metrics and protocols will be used versus creating new ones. This is defined as a funding issue; Martha has some funding to do some of the protocol development with grant money, but there is no funding from this group to apply it to the estuary at this time. Barry would like a clear decision point on the schedule, as seconded by Scott Thompson. 7.2.6 is intended to be that decision point, which will be clarified by Ashli through a footnote on the task. 7.2.6 is covered under Prop 84 funding.
- 7.2.7 – The team will review algal response indicator targets and look at what N and P concentrations are needed to achieve those targets in the estuary. This includes determining the maximum daily allowable load, a modeling exercise, a recommendation to the Regional Board, and a presentation. This portion of the project is funded through the Prop 84 grant.
- 7.2.8 – Includes a report from the stakeholders to the Regional Board providing recommendations for site-specific objectives (SSOs), which is not currently funded (Prop 84 would only cover writing a report on the numbers). This is a decision point for the Regional Board, as the SMR Group needs to know what the Regional Board would like to receive from them. Afterwards, there may be sufficient support for the Regional Board to develop a TMDL, dependent on the best course of action to address the impairment.
  - Jo Ann will have an offline conversation with Ashli, Martha, and Jason so they understand better why the report may be important. They may shift to funding the development of the recommended numbers, but that may add significant costs. If the SSO route moves forward then they would bring resources forward to fund it, but it is not funded at this point (including all of the analyses).
- 7.5 – The model results will be used as a technical decision-making tool for the TMDL and for discussions with the stakeholder group regarding how to move forward. It is possible that the group may want to provide additional technical documents to the Regional Board such as an implementation plan and/or schedule, which are not included in the schedule because they are not currently funded.
- 7.3.2 - River monitoring will be conducted during Phase 1. SCCWRP will not be monitoring until the Fall of 2013.
- 7.4 – Includes additional analyses needed to support the decision-making process. A technical options paper to the Regional Board was added for December 2013.
- 7.4.1 - Evaluation of seasonal applicability of the Objectives is funded under the Prop 84 grant.
- 7.4.2 - Evaluation of Endangered Species for the estuary, if needed for SSOs, has not been funded at this time, as this issue recently materialized. Additional support may be needed.
- Global Comment (Barry) – The Regional Board is encouraged by the EPA to produce TMDLs or alternatives for 303(d)-listed water bodies. This needs to get to the Regional Board by mid-2014. The SMR Group needs to look for opportunities for condensing the current timeline. It may not be possible at this point, but the schedule can be provided to the EPA for what the SMR Group sees as realistic. Ashli will look for opportunities to shrink the schedule moving forward. Barry will take the schedule to his management to support the Regional Board's discussions with the EPA regarding the 2014 date.

## The Future Phases Schedule

The dates have not changed. They have been reorganized and clarified. The schedule is based on assumptions for proposition funding and phasing of work (assuming funding for Phases 2 and 3). The mainstem of the River will be analyzed first and then the tributaries. The schedule currently runs through 2022. The stakeholder group has recognized that this is not the ideal schedule from the Regional Board's standpoint, but this can't be currently adjusted due to the lack of funding. The schedule may or may not reflect reality for future funding and phases. Excluding consultants on the TAC, with caveat for suggestions made today,

Dave Ceppos opened the floor for anyone opposed to the modifications discussed earlier, the immediate modifications for the schedule, or making the document a draft final. No opposition was noted and the Process Plan was adopted as a Draft Final document.

The document will be provided to the Regional Board, including Dave Gibson, for discussion along with the MOU.

### **Action items –**

***Barry will provide the Draft Final Process Plan to Regional Board staff to review.***

***Dave Ceppos will contact Barry next week to pin down a general target date for when the Regional Board staff will be able to complete review of the Process Plan. Dave will contact Barry on Wednesday and Barry will email his schedule to Dave.***

### **Parking Lot:**

1. SMR Fisheries presentation will be scheduled for the summer, after completion of the conjunctive use project and associated public outreach.
2. The SMR Group needs to be aware of upcoming opportunities to make a decision as to whether the estuary is impaired (re: Schedule section 7.2.6).
3. Suggested approaches for TMDLs and/or alternatives must be provided to the Regional Board by mid-2014.

### **Next Meeting:**

March 20, 2013  
Rancho California Water District  
Times TBD