

## **LOMA ALTA SLOUGH-CEQA SCOPING MEETING NOTES**

**Time:** Monday, October 25, 2010, 1:00-3:00 pm

**Location:** San Diego Water Board

**Purpose:** Gain public input on scope and content of functionally equivalent documents to the CEQA requirements for environmental documentation. Public input should promote discussion of environmental impacts and mitigation measures associated with alternatives for achieving compliance with the TMDL (i.e. reducing nutrient and bacteria levels)

**Attendees:** See attached sign in sheet

**Meeting notes prepared by:** Cathryn Henning, San Diego Water Board

### **Key Discussion Items:**

#### **1. Comments regarding CEQA Initial Study Checklist**

- A. Mo. Lahsaiezadehzadeh-coordinator of clean water program for the City of Oceanside
  - 1. The San Diego Water Board must address economic factors in assessment.
  - 2. The process must include all stakeholders in watershed, including Phase II MS4s such as school districts, NCTD (hydrologic impact), Evergreen Nursery.
  - 3. All sources shall be considered including groundwater contributions (high nutrients) and aerial deposition.
- B. Alyssa Muto-NCTD representative
  - 1. The most updated checklist format should be used. The updated checklist includes a section on greenhouse gases.
  - 2. Non-point sources need to be identified and appropriately addressed. Non-point sources contribute a substantial load to the Slough.
  - 3. Who will be responsible for testing, both financially and physically?
  - 4. i.e.NCTD transit plans for the Sprinter Line, including future improvements (double tracking) need to be considered in checklist section Transportation/Traffic, item f. NCTD can provide necessary documentation, upon request. (Different from this TMDL project.)
- C. Paul Hartman-City of Vista
  - 1. The Rainbow Creek CEQA checklist should be referenced for potential BMPs.
  - 2. The 10:1 nitrogen to phosphorus ratio in the Basin Plan shall be used only in absence of other data. The Numeric Nutrient Endpoint approach is more appropriate.

3. Bacteria RSAA would require finding an appropriate reference estuary.
- D. Group Discussion of Specific Sections of Checklist
1. *Aesthetics*-Impacts from potential treatment plant structure or other treatment system (i.e. wetland) near beach.
  2. *Agriculture Resources*-Potential impacts if nurseries are considered agriculture.
  3. *Air Quality*-Potential temporary impacts from construction.
  4. *Biological Resources*-Impacts from potential management of creek flows or reduction in algal biomass. Any management of the slough may impact any endangered species.
  5. *Cultural Resources*-Potential impact to Eternal Hills Cemetery.
  6. *Geology or Soils*-Potential impact from alteration of creek by NCTD. Erosion impacts from potential project sites. Oceanside has existing landslide issues; any project increasing infiltration will have impacts. Any additional structures pose risk to life or property. Potential projects may impact septic system setback requirements.
  7. *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*-i.e.NCTD transit plans offset vehicle miles. (Different from this TMDL project.)
  8. *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*-no impacts identified.
  9. *Hydrology and Water Quality*-b) Pump and treat would impact groundwater table, c) ,d), and e) will have impacts. Any construction will be mitigated through compliance with San Diego Water Board construction stormwater permits. Some structures may be placed within the 100-year floodplain. Management of slough may impact adjacent mobile home park and upstream commercial buildings.
  10. *Land use and planning*-Potential impacts to infill projects with requirements for BMPs.
  11. *Mineral Resources*-no impacts identified.
  12. *Noise*-Potential impacts from any treatment system. Temporary construction noise impacts.
  13. *Population and Housing*-b) Installation of retention basins may displace existing housing.
  14. *Public Services/Recreation*-Garison Elementary school is nearby. Improvement of slough may increase use of park. Economic burden on local governments to implement TMDL. Police protection increases with increased public space.
  15. *Transportation/Traffic*-ei.g)NCTD plans to expand to double track. Any restrictions to further develop the track may impact transportation/traffic. (Different from this TMDL project.)
  16. *Utilities*-Impacts arise from: a) Expansion or upgrading of WWTPs b) Installation of new wastewater treatment facilities c) Treatment control BMPs (new drainage facilities) d) Low-flow diversion systems, and e) Dredging operations.
  17. *Mandatory Findings of Significance*-td

## **2. Comments Regarding Draft Problem Statement**

- A. Page 3, third paragraph. Periodic opening and closing of the slough mouth. The City does not typically close the mouth, closing of the mouth is a naturally occurring event. The City opens the mouth when 0.25 inches or more of rain is expected to avoid flooding of the upstream community.
- B. Must consider groundwater contribution.
- C. Problem Statement lays out water quality objectives and beneficial uses. The section on water quality management does not belong in the problem statement.
- D. Economic impact needs to be discussed. The City of Oceanside is currently operating a UV treatment plant at the mouth of the slough.
- E. Discussion of the water quality objectives only covers the current Basin Plan objectives and not the Numeric Nutrient Endpoint and reference system approaches.
- F. Sediment is not a part of the TMDL, but it is a significant problem in the slough. Bacteria tend to attach to sediment. The implementation plan must address sediment loading.
- G. Primary beneficial use is non-contact recreation (REC-2) versus contact recreational use (REC-1).
- H. Seasonal variations should be considered.
- I. Mo. Lahsaiezadeh has historic aerial photo of the slough. Significant alteration of the slough affects the hydrogeology. Geology and type of creek (losing or gaining) is very important.

## **3. General Discussion-Questions and Comments**

- A. What are the deadlines for submitting comments on the CEQA study? Stakeholders will have opportunity for input on draft sections 45-days prior to adoption.
- B. The draft checklist will be revisited at a later time. The draft checklist will be provided to stakeholders for additional comments in the future.
- C. A compliance timeline of 20 years is possible because of multiple constituents. Beneficial use prioritization may affect implementation.
- D. References to Loma Alta Estuary shall be changed to Loma Alta Slough.
- E. November 5, 2010, requested deadline for comments on Problem Statement, but actual deadline is during the public adoption hearing.
- F. The meeting with SCCWRP will be in November.