

**LAKE ELSINORE/CANYON LAKE TMDL TASK FORCE
MEETING NOTES**

January 25, 2021

PARTICIPANTS

VIA-CONFERENCE CALL

Kris Hanson
Dan Cortese
Carlos Norvani
Cynthia Gabaldon
Cynthia Gabaldon
Maria Arreguin
Mike Roberts
Stormy Osifeso
Johnathan Skinner
Nicole Dailey
Lynn Merrill
Rae Beimer
Lauren Sotelo
Rachael Johnson
Pat Boldt
Lauma Willis
Barbara Barry
Yiping Cao
SueAnn Neal
Richard Boon
Rebekah Guill
Abigail Suter
Amy McNeil
Andrea Macias
Dorothy Torres
Sudhir Mohleji
Mike Ali
Ankita Vyas
Scott Sewell
Richard Kim
Stefan Awender
Alberto Acevedo
Steven Wolosoff
Paula Kulis
Richard Meyerhoff
Tess Dunham
Chris Stransky
John Rudolph
Garth Engelhorn
Greg Kahlen
Michael A Anderson
Mark Norton
Rick Whetsel
Kelly Rowe
T. Milford Harrison

REPRESENTATIVE

City of Canyon Lake/Wildomar
City of Hemet
City of Lake Elsinore
City of Menifee
City of Perris
City of Perris
City of Riverside
City of Riverside
City of Lake Elsinore
City of Lake Elsinore
City of San Jacinto
City of Moreno Valley
March JPA
Riverside County Farm Bureau
WRCAC
Regional Water Quality Control Board
Riverside County Flood Control & WCD
Eastern Municipal Water District
Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District
Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District
Michael Baker/Caltrans
CA Department of Fish & Wildlife
CA Department of Fish & Wildlife
CA Department of Fish & Wildlife
CDM Smith
CDM Smith
CDM Smith
GEI Consultants
Kahn, Soares & Conway, LLP
Wood Environmental
Wood Environmental
Alta Environmental
The Kahlen Group
UC Riverside
Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority
Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority
Orange County Water District
Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority

Call to Order & Introductions

The Lake Elsinore/Canyon Lake TMDL Task Force meeting was called to order at 1:31 p.m. by Mark Norton with all participants participating remotely, due to COVID-19 related social distancing restrictions.

Meeting Notes

Mark Norton /SAWPA asked for any comments on the December 7, 2020 LE&CL TMDL meeting notes. There were no comments, and the meeting notes were deemed acceptable.

Status: TMDL Update (Regional Board)

a. Timing of Response to Comments

Barbara Barry /Regional Board informed the Task Force that Regional Board staff has been working with the consultant team on the scope of work for the additional modeling requested to address comments by Peer Reviewers and questions by Regional Board staff.

Barbara stated that until this modeling is completed, the Regional Board will not be able to provide an update on the timing of when the Response to Comments or revisions to the TMDLs will be completed. The Regional Board staff intends to incorporate the results of this modeling into the Response to Peer review comments and to amend the TMDL Technical Report.

b. Nutrient Offset Credit Language

Tess Dunham /Kahn, Soares & Conway, LLP informed Regional Board staff and the Task Force that she is still working on a response to the revised Regional Board nutrient offset credit language. She plans to get a draft out to the stakeholders for comment after the scope of work for the additional modeling is finalized.

c. Revisions Recommended by Regional Board Staff

Revisions to the TMDL Technical Report are tied to the completion of additional modeling as stated above.

d. Schedule Update on Adoption Hearing Date

No update at this time.

Action Item: Modeling Proposal (Dr. Michael Anderson & Steve Wolosoff/CDM Smith)

Steve Wolosoff /CDM Smith provided to the Task Force an outline of the proposed modeling and introduced Dr. Michael Anderson to discuss the various models and modeling scenarios. This included discussion of the following:

- Lake model migration updates
 - GLM
 - AEM3D
- Supplemental lake water quality model scenarios
 - Alternative reference scenario
 - Sensitivity analysis

Following the presentation, a question was raised as to the implications to the process to update the TMDLs if this modeling was not authorized to be completed by the Task Force.

Barbara Barry stated that given the comments from the Peer Reviewers several issues were raised that Regional Board staff wanted to see addressed. Additionally, as staff went through those comments, they began to develop their own questions on some of the assumptions that went into the modeling. Regional Board staff believes these additional scenarios to be necessary to enable staff to provide an appropriate response to the Peer Reviewer comments and to amend the TMDL Technical report. As far as what would happen if the Task Force would not conduct this additional modeling, that question would need to be discussed with upper management.

Tess Dunham posed the question to Regional Board staff, as this modeling is essential to Regional Board it is possible it could create a scenario where Regional staff could proceed do the modeling themselves, which probably would create even a longer delay in moving the TMDLs forward. Barbara noted that is a likely scenario and another option is to put the adoption of the revised TMDLs on hold.

Tess then added that a lot of effort has been put in by Regional Board staff in working with the consultant team to really focus in on the key issues of concern and narrow the scope of the proposed modeling.

Nicole Dailey /City of Lake Elsinore raised the question as to why the time frame for the modeling ends in 2016, as this was a very bad year for Lake Elsinore and produced water quality not representative of the typical

condition. Steve Wolosoff responded that the time frame used for the original modeling conducted to develop the TMDL Technical Document. He added that the modeling team can examine this issue further.

A copy of the CDM Smith Modeling presentation is available on the SAWPA website under Agendas and Meeting Materials: <https://sawpa.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/January-2021-TF-meeting.pdf>

Update: 2020 TMDL Compliance Report (Tess Dunham/KSC)

Tess Dunham /Kahn, Soares & Conway, LLP informed the Task Force the 2020 Compliance Assessment Report was submitted to the Regional Board and Task Force stakeholders on Wednesday, December 23rd.

As several comments were submitted late, Tess noted that there is an understanding between Regional Board staff and the consultant team that all outstanding comments will be addressed in the updated version of the Report to be submitted in March. This update will include the analysis of water quality data collected from October through December 2020, along with a matrix of all comments and responses (prepared by SAWPA Staff).

Discussion: Spring 2021 Canyon Lake Alum Application (LESJWA Staff)

Steve Wolosoff /CDM Smith provided to the Task Force an updated guidance document for the application of alum to Canyon Lake. This new simplified decision tree sets a threshold of total phosphorus (TP) concentration of 0.1 mg/L as a trigger, apply alum if the average TP concentration > 0.1mg/L and do not apply if the average TP concentration < 0.1mg/L.

Rick Whetsel /SAWPA followed to discuss a possible spring 2021 alum application, noting that a spring alum application has typically been targeted for late February, weather permitting.

Following discussion, it was the consensus of the Task Force to tentatively schedule an alum application for mid-late April. This period was selected based upon the assumption of this being a “La Nina” year with a relatively dry winter to date. Additionally, the pattern for rain over the past few years has shifted to where the rains have begun and continued through the end of March.

By scheduling in mid-April, it is the expectation of the Task Force that the alum would be applied after the storm season, which would result into the maximum amount of phosphorus neutralized. Additionally, if the “La Nina” conditions hold and this winter and spring continue to be exceptionally dry, then the thought is that following a review of water quality monitoring data collected in early April it may be determined that no alum application is necessary.

A copy of the CDM Smith presentation is available on the SAWPA website under Agendas and Meeting Materials: <https://sawpa.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/January-2021-TF-meeting.pdf>

Task Force Administration (LESJWA Staff)

Draft FY 2021 – 22 Budget

Rick Whetsel /SAWPA and Tess Dunham/ Kahn, Soares & Conway, LLP presented a series of items related to and leading to the presentation of a draft FY 2021-22 budget to the Task Force for discussion.

Rick presented to the Task Force tables summarizing the Task Force Reserve Account and status of the FY 2020-21 Budget:

Task Force Reserve Account Review and balance available:

- FY 2019-20 Task Force expended approximately \$160,000 of the Task Force Reserve account on alum, and consultant change orders to address peer review comments, TMDL compliance analysis and additional monitoring.
- Current balance of the Task Force reserve \$31,552 (part A, Comp Monitoring, Fish Mgt and Alum combined)

Status of the FY 2020-21 Budget

- To date \$667,654 of the total budget allocation of \$705,818 collected
- Outstanding stakeholder contributions \$38,164 from WRCAC

Next, Tess informed the Task Force of a credit request from WRCAC. The basis of which is that WRCAC represents only a fraction of the irrigated agriculture acreage in the San Jacinto Watershed; however, WRCAC members have been taking on the responsibility of paying the full TMDL budget allocation for all irrigated agriculture in the San Jacinto Watershed. The member of WRCAC have reached a point, due to limited budget resources to where they can no longer continue to pay for non-compliant agricultural operators. It was suggested that WRCAC should only be given a budget allocation for Part A budget activities equal to the percent of the irrigated agricultural acreage represented by WRCAC.

For FY 2020-21 this credit would reflect 72.8% percent of irrigated agriculture, which is represented by WRCAC. This would result in a reduction of WRCAC's FY 2020-21 budget allocation of \$38,164 and reduce it down to \$27,767.

Following discussion, a motion was put forward by Lynn Merrill representing the City of San Jacinto to approve the credits to WRCAC for FY 2020-21 reducing their budget allocation from \$38,164 down to \$27,767, and that the Task Force remaining cash reserve and projected 2020-21 budget surplus be applied to cover the costs for the proposed additional in-lake modeling for \$37,160 by CDM Smith. Lynn also included in the motion, that no cost overruns by any consultant will be considered for the balance of FY 2020-21. This motion was seconded by Richard Boon representing RCFC&WCD. This motion was unanimously approved by the Task Force.

Lastly, the Task Force initiated discussion regarding the Draft FY 2021-22 budget. This included a breakdown of the proposed FY 2021-22 budget by Rick Whetsel and discussion of a credit for WRCAC for FY 2019-20.

Additionally, a revision to the Task Force budget model to address the long-term issue of the unfunded allocation to irrigated agriculture created by the credit WRCAC was proposed to the Task Force. Following the same rationale as the credit provided to WRCAC, this revision proposed to parse the Part A budget allocation for irrigated agriculture to WRCAC within each annual budget based upon the percentage of irrigated agricultural acreage participating in WRCAC, with the remaining un-funded balance allocated to non-participating irrigated agriculture. To address the budget shortfall created by this allocated to non-participating irrigated agriculture, it was suggested this un-funded allocation be equally redistributed among all Task Force members.

Due to constraints on time, it was recommended that this draft budget be shared with the Task Force and brought back for further discussion at the next Task Force meeting.

Other Business

No other business was discussed.

Schedule Next Meeting

The next LE/CL TMDL Task Force meeting is scheduled for February 22, 2021 at 1:30 pm. as a virtual conference call meeting.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.