

**Santa Margarita River and Estuary  
Nutrient Water Quality Objectives Project  
Watershed Stakeholder Meeting Summary  
July 26, 2011, 10:30-3 pm  
City of Murrieta Training Room,  
1 Town Square, 24601 Jefferson Ave., Murrieta CA 92562**

**Meeting Goal(s):**

- 1) Provide feedback on 2<sup>nd</sup> draft of the river nutrient monitoring plan
- 2) Provide feedback and prioritize special studies

**Attendee List**

| <b>Name</b>        | <b>Organization</b>                        | <b>Email</b>                   |
|--------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| Con Kontaxis       | CALTRANS                                   | Constatine_kontaxis@dot.ca.gov |
| Denise Landstedt   | RCWD                                       | landstedt@ranchowater.com      |
| Fakhri Manghi      | WMWD                                       | fmanghi@wmwd.com               |
| Arlene Chun        | RCFC & WCD                                 | abchun@rcflood.org             |
| Danielle Wood      | Upper Sta. Margarita Irrigated Lands Group | dwood@usmil.org                |
| Mark Bonsavage     | Camp Pendleton                             | Mark.Bonsavage.usmc.mil        |
| Richard Williamson | RCWD                                       | williamsonr@ranchowater.com    |
| Jeff Marchand      | FPUD                                       | jeff@FPUD.com                  |
| Scott Thomas       | Stetson Engineers                          | Scottt@stetsonengineers.com    |
| Martha Sutula      | SCCWRP                                     | Marthas@sccwrp.org             |
| Pam Nelson         | Sierra Club                                | pamela05n@yahoo.com            |
| Todd Snyder        | San Diego County                           | Todd.snyder@sdcounty.ca.gov    |
| Chuck Katz         | SSC Pacific                                | Chuck.katz@navy.mil            |
| Cynthia Gorham     | SDRWQCB                                    | cgorham@waterboards.ca.gov     |
| Jayne Joy          | EMWD                                       | joyj@emd.w.org                 |
| Jason Uhley        | RCFC & WCD                                 | juhley@rcflood.org             |

**Meeting Materials:**

- SMR stakeholder meeting summary 5-17-2011
- Draft river monitoring workplan 7-20-2011
- Existing special study workplans or study prospectuses: 1) quantifying rates of denitrification and nutrient assimilation in SMR streams, and 2) stream nutrients, bacteria and metals reference study

**Major Decisions/Action Items**

- Stakeholders decided that, in lieu of the technical memo on project scope, they would work to put together a MOU among participating parties and a workplan that would cover the entire scope of the project (and not just the river monitoring per se).
- County of San Diego will pay for the support of a facilitator to help establish the MOU and workplan for the project. The group agreed that they would work on the MOU and project workplan this fall.

- Cynthia Gorham will send the TMDL schedule out to the group and to discuss with her management whether the Regional Board could be party to an MOU.
- Danielle Wood will give the group an update on whether the Upper SM Irrigated Lands group will participate in the SMR nutrient monitoring workplan at the next meeting.
- The group decided to add wet weather management questions to the river monitoring plan as a placeholder and to reorganize the table of monitoring questions so that the denitrification study and the study of assimilation of treated wastewater come under one heading of “assimilative capacity.”
- The stakeholders would like to see the winter dry weather sampling added as an option to the workplan and QAPP, in case funding becomes available. They also agreed that Scott, Arlene and Martha should work together finalize the level of effort table and include their final recommendation in the next version of the workplan.
- The stakeholders agreed that all special studies, with the exception of the stream reference study (because of timing), be considered for Phase II prop 84 funding. SCCWRP and Stetson agreed to have revised special study prospectuses and budgets ready in time for fall discussions on the workplan, if not sooner.
- Next steps include: 1) Select sites, finalize work plan, budget, and prepare QAPP for core monitoring—Complete draft by September 15, 2011, 2) SCCWRP will schedule a conference call for interested parties to provide comments to SCCWRP on the QAPP at end of September, 3) SCCWRP and Stetson will prepare detailed work plan and budgets for selected special studies, 4) the County of San Diego will work on MOU and prepare a set of fall meetings to develop the workplan

### Detailed Meeting Notes

#### Correction on May 17 Meeting Note

Scott Thomas noted that his update about the pending agreement between Liberty Quarry and Camp Pendleton, which would result in long-term monitoring on Stone Creek, was missing from the notes. He noted that he would update the group when more details are available about what would be monitored, if the agreement comes to pass.

#### Updates:

Todd Snyder gave an update on Prop 84 funding. The RFP for Phase II funding will likely be delayed and is anticipated that it will come out in late fall 2012. This will impact the second year of river monitoring, modeling for river WQOs, and facilitation support. The group talked about what impact this would have on the TMDL schedule. **Cynthia said she would send the schedule out so that they group could see it.**

With respect to on technical memo regarding project scope, Todd Snyder reported that several stakeholders involved in the Tri-County FAC met to discuss Phase II funding. **They thought it was better to hold off on the memo in lieu of developing a work plan, in conjunction with the Regional Board that would cover the entire scope of the project (and not just the river monitoring per se). The group agreed this was a good idea.**

Mark Bonsavage suggested that the stakeholders resurrect the MOU, which basically laid out the funding arrangements among stakeholders for this project. The group agreed it was a good idea, and suggested that the Regional Board be a party to the MOU, so that it was more vested in the workplan

and some of the early directions in technical approach and policy could be agreed upon and monies spent with confidence that they would be accepted by the Regional Board. **Cynthia Gorham said that she would check with her management about this idea. Todd Snyder offered that the County of San Diego would pay for the support of a facilitator to help establish the MOU and workplan for the project. The group agreed that they would work on the MOU and project workplan this fall.**

Danielle Wood reported that their Board would be meeting in 2 weeks to decide whether to create an independent monitoring plan to satisfy the requirements of the Ag waiver, or to throw in with the SMR river nutrient monitoring. **Danielle will give the group an update at the next meeting.**

#### Revisiting Monitoring and Special Study Questions

Martha offered that the group revisits the monitoring or management questions again, to confirm that the group felt that these were the appropriate questions. Todd Snyder asked that to add the following questions:

- Is wet weather discharge impacting river and estuarine beneficial uses OR
- What are the loads of wet weather nutrients that will be protective of SMR and estuary beneficial uses

**The group agreed to add these wet weather questions. Todd also asked to reorganize the table of questions so that the denitrification study and the study of assimilation of treated wastewater come under one heading of “assimilative capacity.”**

#### Discussion and Feedback on Second Draft of River Monitoring Plan

Martha went over changes to the workplan, based on discussion and feedback from stakeholders at the last meeting. Two major changes were discussed:

- 1) Sandia Creek (unlisted) currently will not be sampled until Year 2. Scott Thomas noted that it had high nutrient loading and he would recommend that it be included in Year 1 sampling. Arlene Chun said that it may be possible to reduce sampling effort associated with Upper and Lower Murrieta. **The stakeholder group agreed that Scott, Arlene and Martha should work together finalize the level of effort table and include their final recommendation in the next version of the workplan.**
- 2) Scott discussed the fact that it was somewhat short-sighted to only monitor during the summertime, because the stakeholders may want a “seasonal TMDL” in which higher nutrient targets would be possible during the wet season because more frequent scouring events, lower water temperatures, and shorter period of insolation. **The group agreed that it would be a good idea, but after much discussion, reached consensus that the workplan should stay as is and that SCCWRP should add in an option in the workplan for additional monitoring during the winter in case additional monies are found.**

Additional changes needed to workplan—note empty footnote.

#### Discussion, Feedback and Prioritization of Special Studies

The group discussed and provided feedback on the following special studies:

- Stream Reference stream study

Martha noted that site selection for this study was about to begin, so SMR stakeholders can choose to add sites if they choose, based on the results of that site selection. Additional dry weather sites cost approx. \$70K, while wet weather sites cost \$187K. Todd noted that the field work for this study would be largely completed by the time Prop 84 Phase II proposals came out, so it doesn't need to be considered for the Phase II funding

- Denitrification and Nutrient assimilation Study

Scott Thomas asked if this would be done at every site. Martha responded that it would be much more expensive, and that the plan was to do this at selective sites that represent a nutrient gradient as well as rocky and sandy substrates.

- Relationship of benthic algal biomass to aquatic life use

Martha presented the two options for this (statistical analysis of SMC data and a field experiment to selectively remove algae) and the group discussed this study at length. Scott Thomas said that this was very high on Camp Pendleton's (water resources) priority list, because of the need to get the thresholds right. Todd said that the field experiment was lower on SD County's list of priorities.

- Capacity of the river to assimilate treated effluent during winter

Scott Thomas presented the concept for this study. Denise Landstedt asked if the study would consider treated effluent upstream. The answer was yes, but only as a scenario of a point source. If Rancho is interested in discharge of effluent to the River, a similar study should be done for the area in which they would like to consider discharging.

**The group overall suggested that all studies, with the exception of the stream reference study, be considered for Phase II prop 84 funding. Prioritization of studies would likely occur if Martha proposed that SCCWRP work with Stetson to incorporate feedback and produce another version of the special study prospectuses with improved budgets. They agreed to have these ready in time for fall discussions on the workplan, if not sooner.**

#### Next Steps

- **Select sites, finalize work plan, budget, and prepare QAPP for core monitoring—Complete draft by September 15, 2011**
- **Schedule a conference call for interested parties to provide comments to SCCWRP on the QAPP at end of September**
- **Prepare detailed work plan and budgets for selected special studies**
- **County of San Diego will work on MOU and prepare a set of fall meetings to develop the workplan**