

UNRBA Committee Meeting

Subcommittee: Path Forward Committee

Date: 2/17/14

Attendees: Lindsay Mize, Kenny Waldroup, Michelle Woolfolk, Forrest Westall, Haywood Phthisic, Maverick Raber, Dan McLawhorn, Carolyn Bachl, Melissa Hodges, Nancy Wood, Reginald Hicks, Harold Kelly, Donald O'Toole, Tom Davis, Barry Baker, Gerrard Seibert, Matthew Van deBogert, Lauren Elmore, Sandra Wilbur, Jessica Gladwin, Danielle Mir, Jim Wrenn, Henrietta Locklear, Aaron Holland, Melinda Clark, James Bryan, and Alix Matos.

Co-Chair Lindsay Mize called the meeting to order and noted the purpose of the meeting was to update the PFC on the following current topics: HB 74; draft 303(d) list; the Nutrient Credit Development Project, and to review and discuss the Monitoring Development Project Modeling Framework, Model Sensitivity, and Flow Estimation Methods.

Forrest reviewed the current status of HB 74 and noted there are discrepancies in the date comments are due to DWR. The PFC should review and consider recommending proposed revisions to the full Board on the Falls Lake Rules that are not workable or achievable since the adoption of these rules.

Forrest discussed the draft 303(d) list that is out for comment noting that all comments are due by March 14th. He also noted that, to perform a thorough analysis of the revisions to the list, you will need to review the work sheets used by DWR to produce the draft list. Forrest noted he had that information and would forward.

The Nutrient Credit Development Project contracts have been executed and work will begin officially on March 1st. Forrest noted that the storm water group is no longer in DWR and a clear path to approve any proposed credits doesn't exist at the present time.

Lauren Elmore, with Cardno-ENTRIX, made a presentation on the draft Modeling Framework, Model Sensitivity, and Flow Estimation Technical Memorandums (TM).

Modeling Framework TM: Lauren reviewed the Falls Lake Rule language, discussed the previous meetings with DWR on the modeling framework, and summarized the TM content. She noted that DWR expected to see the modeling framework for the monitoring program and if there were any future revisions to the rules that they would need be based on the EFDC or the Falls Lake Response Model. Forrest noted that this process would make the EFDC model a better tool and cause less friction with the DWR staff moving forward. Following member discussions Forrest asked that each member follow up by email with their comments on this TM so this document can be revised and sent to DWR in the first two weeks of March. Forrest noted it is important to submit this document and receive DWR's reaction/response to this proposed framework. Their approval is necessary in order for sampling to start by June 1st.

Model Sensitivity TM: Lauren reviewed the use of the USGS LOADEST program to estimate daily loads, discussed the sensitivity of the existing Falls Lake nutrient model, discussed the sensitivity of BATHTUB model to changes in nutrient inputs, and the present implications for the monitoring program design and future model

updates. Lauren provided several illustrations of responses to increase/decrease inputs of nutrient concentration and the results at given points in the lake. Lauren noted the overall goal of the model is to determine which tributaries are the most sensitive to nutrients in the lake and perform the monitoring at those points.

Flow Estimation Methods TM – Lauren reviewed the Basin Proration and USGS Streamflow Regionalization Methods, described different performance evaluation metrics and compared WARMF, Basin Proration, and USGS Streamflow Regionalization Methods, discussed implications for the Monitoring Program design, and presented recommendations to the committee. Following discussion Forrest noted there is time to review these two documents, Model Sensitivity and Flow Estimation TMs, and would be discussed at the March 4th meeting.

The next PFC meeting is scheduled for March 4th .