



Ventura River Watershed Council

Meeting Summary

Wednesday, August 8, 2012

Our mission is to facilitate and support efforts by individuals, agencies, and organizations to maintain and improve the health and sustainability of the Ventura River watershed.

Thirty-two people attended the August 8, 2012 meeting. Acronyms are defined at the bottom of the summary.

1. Announcements

No announcements.

2. Ventura River Watershed Management Plan structure and outcomes; October 8 evening public scoping meeting

Lorraine Walter, Ventura River Watershed Coordinator, provided a presentation about watershed management plans in general and requested guidance from the Council on what they specifically want from their plan.

Lorraine explained that planning by watersheds is practiced and advocated throughout the world, and at the national, state and local levels. Watershed management plans are cross-jurisdictional—defined by watershed boundaries rather than political boundaries, they represent and involve many different stakeholders, and they are non-regulatory.

Lorraine reviewed the benefits of watershed planning, some of the drawbacks, and typical contents of watershed management plans. She noted that recently more emphasis is being placed on better integration of social and economic considerations, and offered as examples plans from three agricultural areas that explicitly attempt to integrate economic issues with ecologic ones. (See Lorraine's Powerpoint presentation for more details on the above overview.)

She then asked the group to consider what they want out of the plan, suggesting that we should craft a plan that is as useful as possible, that takes into consideration our limited staff and resources, that acknowledges the current economic climate, and that addresses our unique situation. She reminded the group that her grant-funded position ends in a little over two years, and we may not come up with continued staff funding. This should be kept in mind when considering the purpose and utility of a watershed management plan.

Given the resource and staff constraints, Lorraine recommended that the Council focus on three things:

1. Developing a basic, but user-friendly, "starter" plan, and one that integrates the social and economic context.
2. Positioning ourselves for actual, upcoming grants for projects/programs. Jump to implementation as soon as possible to secure successes. Do create goals, objectives and a projects list, but don't spend a lot of time setting up measures of success or developing the details of theoretical projects yet. That kind of nuanced planning is out of proportion to our resources and organizational capacity. Instead, identify actual upcoming grants, and then develop project details as dictated by the funding source. This "ground truths" our plan sooner and gives us real world feedback on what implementation constraints are like for us. And, if we are successful with the grants, it can help us build the organizational capacity appropriate to that bigger-picture, long-term planning.

3. Pursuing funding to continue staffing for the Council.

Council members provided the following feedback. (This is a detailed summary, as it provides important documentation of the desires and concerns of Council members with regard to our watershed management plan.)

Karen Waln, city of Ventura: We don't want another plan that doesn't do anything for us. I like the idea of leaving the goals and projects a bit more open. Maybe if we don't drill down so deep now we can get a decent plan that will lead us to grants where we can dig deep into projects. The most important thing is to keep the staff position going. That has been a big help to everybody.

Lynn Rodriguez, Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County: The user-friendly component is important. We need to be able to put the plan in the hands of a 12th grader, a retired engineer or a city council member, and have them all get the same basic foundational understanding. The more succinctly the plan communicates the vision to people, the more likely they will see how they can jump in and be part of this.

Karen: If you make the plan more internet accessible, then others can pick up on it and help with implementation, like the UCSB Bren students, the Boy Scouts, etc.

Jeff Palmer, Ojai Valley Sanitary District (OVSD): As part of OVSD's budget process this year, they adopted a five-year capital improvement program, but it could be boiled down to one page. This document is a good piece to have for talking with the Board about issues and goals. It is also good for helping us all stay focused. I support development of something simpler that we can grab hold of, rather than a 600-page report.

Greg Gamble, Ojai Valley Land Conservancy: Clearly we need goals and objectives and they need to be measurable. We have to be able to measure something; that is the essence of the plan. One of the things we can avoid is getting too big and developing too many goals. A shorter list is going to serve us better. Focus on the goals and projects of the entities in the room that are going to work aggressively on achieving success. For the sake of not leaving any stone unturned, we should not include a bunch of goals that aren't meaningful for the people putting in their time developing the plan. I support choosing a streamlined list of goals to serve the people participating in the Council.

Jurgen Gramckow, grower: I look at this process as the beginning of regulatory constraints on agricultural water use. I, and probably other growers, see this as a threat. There is only so much water to go around. I expect that regulations are going to be imposed at the expense of those who have historically used the river.

Lorraine: I'd be interested in your ideas for making the Council less threatening. Indeed, regulations that could restrict water use may be coming, but not from the Council. The Council exists to collectively negotiate things like regulations.

Jurgen: Unclear about the Council's formation and the balance of stakeholders. Oftentimes there are people in groups like this who have the time to give, while those who have businesses to run can't come to all the meetings. So policy directions get taken that we have problems with.

Lorraine explained the Council's charter and agricultural representation, and confirmed that it has been difficult for our grower representative to attend. However our Farm Bureau representative does attend regularly.

Zia Hosseinipour, Ventura County Watershed Protection District: Not clear about going after grants before creating detailed project ideas. In order to go after a grant, you have to say why you want the funding and that needs to be in the plan.

Lorraine: We would still go through the task of creating goals, objectives and a suite of projects, so the plan will provide the "why" and a list of potential projects. Grants are very specific about what they will fund, so when we find a potential grant we can turn to our suite of projects and start ranking them and putting an appropriate project together. Since we have limited resources, rather than develop nuanced project details for all of our

proposed projects, maybe we only do this for projects that fit with actual funding opportunities. And then we will have the detail, whether we get the grant or not, and that can be integrated into our plan. If you want really detailed descriptions of potential projects included in the plan, then I will likely need help from the group with that. Otherwise, the projects can just be concepts for now and we can use the grant process to flesh them out.

Lynn: Cautioned the group that this is how we've operated in the past. From the beginning this group has wanted the foundational piece that really tells the story, describes the future vision. That is why we wanted a watershed management plan, because we didn't have that. We had a list of ideas. It is a balance between having your projects in general, regardless of where the money comes from, and targeting the money that comes along.

Karen: Would like to see the projects organized and presented in a way that makes more sense than they have been before. Projects should be listed under and associated with goals, so when grant opportunities do come up, you can go to the list and find appropriate projects. I would like to see estimated costs associated to them. This helps to identify which projects might line up best with mitigation funding that might become available.

Lorraine: This is a lot of work. These plans are typically developed by teams of people with GIS staff, writers, editors and graphic designers. We need to bear in mind that we just have me, volunteers and you.

Greg: It was never envisioned that the watershed coordinator would write a large plan alone. I conceived the position as a coordinator and facilitator. You shouldn't feel burdened. You are just supposed to lead us and we will bear the burden collectively of producing the plan, because not only do you not have the time, if we want buy in from this group, we want people to be engaged.

Ron Sheets, OVSD: It is up to the stakeholders to provide you with the content because they have the expertise.

Zia: Completing a watershed management plan requires a focused person that is going to manage it. I can see the watershed coordinator's function as going after grant funding so we can hire somebody to write a watershed management plan. It is going to be really hard for this group to do it because everybody is busy. It will take a very focused effort.

Shirley Birosik, Regional Water Quality Control Board: I think it is going to be really important to tell the story of the watershed up front in a really concise way. I tell people about the watersheds in the region I cover, and the nuances of what makes each watershed special is lost on the average person. When I tell someone in LA about the Ventura River watershed, I say it is this green place, and there is lots of open space; it is a self-contained watershed. And that is a big point to make, that this is a green place and we don't want it to turn into a concrete place. It might seem obvious to us, but it is not obvious to others.

Henry Graumlich, Calleguas Creek watershed: I am visiting from the Calleguas Creek watershed. The Calleguas watershed is facing a lot of the same problems. We have more to do than we have resources for. We produced, with considerable funding, a massive watershed characterization, and a lot of that sits on the shelf and no one uses it. What did come out of the process was that we ended up with a story. We ended up understanding what is different about our watershed. The east county is the opposite of this watershed: we are very developed; we have imported water and lots of problems. We have big human-generated impacts and we need engineered solutions. For us, it is too late to let nature restore itself. We're beyond that. You could go through an extensive watershed analysis, but you probably already know what your issues are for this watershed and what you need to spend money on to fix. If you adopt those as your goals, there is a greater chance they will get implemented. You don't want to set up an evaluation process that produces a result that does not match what you already know in your gut.

Paul Jenkin, Surfrider Foundation: The power, potential and benefit of this group is in coordination and integration between the groups; being able to leverage the funding and human resources from the different sectors. I hate to go back to the project-first mode of thinking, but maybe demonstration projects are good to

provide an example of what can be done. It does help to have projects that we're specifically looking at. Projects that can help integrate flood control and water quality solutions are really good examples of the types of projects that we could be looking at.

Ben Pitterle, Santa Barbara Channelkeeper: I understand that it is more pragmatic to focus on projects and upcoming grants, but we should also recognize that the goals and objectives should be broadly outlined. The Technical Advisory Committees may not be able to identify every project in the next few months. And it might not be solely projects that get us where we want to be; we may also need to address policies and other approaches. I recommend that we keep the foundation broad to allow for new information, flexibility and the ability to respond to opportunities.

Lorraine: When I use of the term "projects" I mean it to include all types of strategies, including policy, education, etc.

Lynn: Recommended making the definition of "project" explicit. She uses "projects and programs" so people know she is not just referring to infrastructure projects.

Leslie Purcell, Sierra Club and Friends of the River: The word "pragmatic" describes well what we should focus on. Just having a big plan is not enough. I like the idea of having more down to earth goals and leaving the process open.

Lynn: In terms of telling the story, an important thing to consider is what has already been done in the watershed. People tend to be so focused on what we need to do next, that they don't look back at what we've already accomplished.

Jeff: The story needs to go back farther than 2006. We should document the significant improvements that have made over the decades, such as in water quality.

Leslie: Have you had any input from tribal people?

Lorraine: No. Feel free to work on that.

Lorraine: Based on the discussion, I will do the following: 1) work on producing a concise, user-friendly story of the watershed, with lots of graphics and maps and charts; 2) launch our Technical Advisory Committees and see what they can do with regard developing project lists and measurable objectives; and 3) look into what grants are out there that we might be gearing up for and crafting projects around.

Diana Engle, Larry Walker Associates: It would be useful to have a one-page brochure that summarizes what this Council is, why it originally formed, what it has done, who is part of the governance, and what the web links are. The Council is kind of a mystery to a lot of people. It can sound authoritative and weighty. What it isn't is just as important as what it is. People may not get involved if they think it is only agency representatives.

Our second evening meeting of the year is coming up on October 3. The group agreed to use this meeting as an official public scoping meeting for the watershed management plan. We will share our draft goals, objectives and projects and then turn the floor over to the audience to see what ideas and concerns they have.

3. Water quality monitoring in the Ventura River watershed

Ann Rosecrance, assistant watershed planner, provided an overview of the water quality monitoring programs in the watershed and a history of our water quality impairments. Water quality monitoring in the watershed is performed by 10 local agencies and organizations. Sampling of representative groundwater and surface water is conducted at varying frequencies with laboratory testing for a variety of parameters which includes *in situ* tests, anions, cations, nutrients, metals, organic chemicals, bacteria, biological and radiological parameters. A summary of current monitoring was shown in tables and figures with additional details available in an Excel

table. Water quality impairments in the watershed and dates for anticipated TMDLs have been listed in the Clean Water Act 303(d) list, LA consent decree and draft TMDL regulation for algae, eutrophic conditions and nutrients released on July 20, 2012. There currently are 13 different impairments affecting one or more of 10 water bodies in the watershed. A summary of the total impairments was presented in a table and the impairments listed in the draft TMDL was shown in a figure. Numeric targets for receiving water monitoring in the draft TMDL were presented as well as a summary of current monitoring for dissolved oxygen and nitrogen. See Ann's PowerPoint presentation for more details.

4. Recently released draft TMDL for algae, eutrophic conditions and nutrients

Ewelina Mutkowska, Ventura County Stormwater Program Manager, provided a summary of the draft TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) regulation for algae, eutrophic conditions, and nutrients that was released by the LA Regional Water Quality Control Board on July 20, 2012. See her Powerpoint presentation for the details. The summary below covers discussion not included in the slides.

One of the mechanisms to address impairments in the watershed is to establish a TMDL. The Regional Board staff established numeric targets intended to address the impairments for algae, eutrophic conditions and nutrients in the river. Different indicators are used for different types of numeric targets. There are different indicators and targets for the Ventura River, tributaries and the estuary. Ewelina reviewed the different indicators and targets for the different water bodies. (See the Powerpoint presentation.)

TMDL's typically have a section that lists responsible parties. In this TMDL, there is no such section, but the allocations in the TMDL indicate the responsible parties. A specific amount of pollutant needs to be reduced in order to reach the TMDL targets, and the allocations assign a certain amount of that load to different parties. Those allocations are assigned in the draft TMDL to these parties:

- MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems; includes the city of Ojai, city of Ventura, County of Ventura, and Ventura County Watershed Protection District)
- Caltrans
- Ojai Valley Sanitary District (Wastewater Treatment Plant)
- Agricultural Dischargers
- Horse/Intensive Livestock
- General Industrial/Construction Stormwater Permits
- Septic Systems
- Other NPDES Permits

Question: Who is responsible for septic systems?

Answer: The city of Ojai is responsible for the septic systems in the Ojai, the city of Ventura is responsible for those in Ventura, and the County of Ventura is responsible for those in the county.

There are wet weather allocations and dry weather allocations. Dry weather allocations are more critical because algae grow mostly in the dry season between May 1 and September 30. Ewelina reviewed the different allocations by responsible party. She mentioned that grazing is the one category of discharger for which the TMDL does not have good data on the existing load.

Ewelina said the Countywide Stormwater Program has been in place for many, many years, and water quality in the river has generally been improving. For the MS4s, this TMDL represents more stringent limits that will require additional funding in order to meet the lower targets.

Question: Does "wet weather" have a definition?

Answer: The TMDL does not have a detailed definition, but we understand this to mean it is raining. The definition does not specify where it is raining. A dry day is a day when rain is not falling out of the sky; weather it precedes or follows a raining day is not specified.

The staff report that accompanies the TMDL has very detailed information and analysis on how the source analysis was done, how the reductions were determined, etc. This is available on the Regional Board's website.

Question: Do you think the allocations are reasonable? How were they determined?

Answer/Discussion: Extensive modeling was done based on existing information. A certain amount of estimating was performed. If you are representing a certain group, you may want to dive into the details and look at the assumptions that were made. It is a pretty complex analysis. The Regional Board makes the final decision as to what is reasonable, after considering the staff recommendation and comments and testimony from the public.

EPA has already established standards for water quality throughout the United States. The reductions are meant to bring existing water quality up to those established standards.

The TMDL is a legal document, but what actually happens and whether or not it is practical comes in the implementation plan.

Question: The consent decree from the 1999 lawsuit requires that this regulation get adopted by a certain date, but does the judge care about what gets adopted, or just that something gets adopted by a certain date?

Answer: Just that it happen by the required date.

If the Regional Boards don't adopt the TMDLs by the due dates, then EPA has to do the TMDL in time. So, either way, by March of 2013 there will be a TMDL.

Ewelina reviewed the water quality monitoring required by the draft TMDL.

Ewelina explained that the TMDL outlines five optional special studies, which, if conducted within three years after the TMDL becomes effective, then the Regional Board will provide an opportunity to "reopen" the TMDL and consider the results of the special studies and make certain changes. Responsible parties must facilitate these special studies. A work plan must be written in advance and agreed upon by the Regional Board.

Question: Is this the only option for a reopener?

Answer: Yes.

Ewelina reviewed the implementation plan milestones. Milestone dates are different for the different responsible parties.

Dates: The draft TMDL public comment period for Regional Board is July 20 to Sept 4, 2012. The Regional Board Hearing is on Oct 4, 2012. If you wish to speak at the hearing, you must notify the Board by Sept 27, 2012. If adopted by the Regional Board in October 2012, the State Office of Administrative Law and US EPA must adopt and approve it, and this must be done by March 24, 2013.

Discussion:

Paul: There are a lot of things that could be done to deal with these prescribed reductions. The RCD and NRCS have programs to address these issues on agricultural lands and livestock properties. Grant funding is available. These are practices that could and perhaps should be being done voluntarily. In a voluntary, nonbinding watershed plan, these types of projects might become priorities because of the urgent need and pressing nature.

Jurgen: Regarding reducing agriculture's contribution by 50 percent, everybody is using drip irrigation and mini-sprinklers. There is no agricultural runoff now. To suggest that agriculture is contributing to these dry monitoring periods just doesn't comport with reality. As a person in agriculture, I don't even discharge, so what am I supposed to do?

Diana: If you don't discharge, you are automatically in compliance. Fifty percent of zero is zero. It will be under the auspices of VCAILG that irrigated agriculture will comply with this TMDL; it is not a farm-by-farm approach.

Jurgen: But how do they come up with these TMDLs when this is today's reality? Agricultural by and large today is very water efficient, simply because it is expensive.

Ben Pitterle: A point that is really critical, and not well reflected in the draft TMDL, is that the contribution from agriculture is likely not as significantly related to tail water, or surface water discharge, as it is to groundwater. And groundwater controls and implementation requirements that would actually affect groundwater loading (for example, application ratios), aren't in the TMDL. This may be a significant gap and may make it hard to reach the TMDL targets.

Dale Zurawski, Ventura County Agricultural Irrigated Lands Group: Confident that agriculture can meet these allocations.

Joe Chrisman: But the farm community is being asked to monitor, at considerable expense, something they aren't doing. The data doesn't support that there is a contribution being made, so let's stop before we allocate responsibility to these users. People want to jump over this because we're all going to share, but the sharing is not reasonable and the monitoring costs aren't reasonable.

Lisa Brenneis, grower: It appears that the whole enforcement of this is based on monitoring of water in the Ventura River. It seems like it would be impossible to detect which nitrogen came from which exact source, so every responsible party's ability to comply depends on everybody else's ability to comply. And the further downstream you are, the more you are responsible, in a way. Am I mistaken in that?

Diana: Compliance will not be determined by the river concentrations of nitrogen and phosphorus. Compliance will be determined by the concentrations coming out of discharges, like storm drains, runoff from agriculture, monitoring locations selected by the horse community. It is the monitoring of those discharges that gets incorporated into the various entity's permits. And that is the mechanism for determining compliance.

It was suggested that we invite Regional Board staff to the next meeting to address concerns. Questions about the TMDL should be directed to the Regional Board. People with questions about the agricultural parts of the TMDL are welcome to contact Dale Zurawski at 805/289-0155.

5. Upcoming regulation for the pumping/diversion impairment on the Ventura River

Shirley Birosik provided an update on the pumping/diversion impairment on Reaches 3 and 4 on the Ventura River.

Shirley: Lack of water for the endangered steelhead trout was the impetus for the listing of these reaches as impaired by the Regional Board. This impairment is also subject to the consent decree and the March 2013 deadline. The Regional Board is hoping that in this case the end result is not a TMDL. There is a part of the Clean Water Act that says you don't have to do a TMDL if you can show that an alternative program is in place to address the issue. Next Wednesday, on August 15, 2012, the Regional Board and US EPA will meet with water districts and pumpers about the impairment. We hope that the end result is a series of alternate programs that address the impairment in such a way that EPA can move the impairment from the part of the 303(d) list that requires a TMDL to the part of the list that says you are doing an alternate program. We envision that

various entities would have different responsibilities for addressing the impairment, and that all these entities would sign a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to say what those responsibilities would be and what the timeline should be. She envisions that state and federal agencies would be part of the MOU with local entities. Developing a groundwater management plan to better manage the water among all the uses would likely be included in the alternate strategy.

If we don't come up with an alternate strategy, then EPA will have to put together a TMDL by March 24, 2013. They would probably base it on something like dissolved oxygen (DO). The TMDL could dictate, for example, that in order for DO to be maintained in certain over-summering pools, water needs to be maintained at a certain depth. The problem with this is that the Regional Board has no authority to implement such a TMDL, because they have no regulatory authority to tell people what to do with their water; in terms of groundwater, no one has that authority.

Question: Since TMDLs are not self-implementing, they require that they be written into a discharge permit, is the problem that the diversion and water pumping doesn't fall under any NPDES permit?

Shirley: Not really. The Regional Board has no authority over groundwater, so we could only address the problem from the surface water diverter side of things, which would totally ignoring the groundwater pumping side. And we would still be stuck with the need to distinguish between groundwater and subterranean surface streams that we call groundwater.

A short video, produced by Santa Barbara Channelkeeper was shown. The video was taken over about a month's time in summer at the swimming hole on OVLC's Ventura River Preserve. Ben Pitterle introduced the video by saying they think it is important for people to see these visuals so they understand what is happening on the river. The video showed dramatic increases and decreases in the level of water in the swimming hole over short periods of time. A sped up, time-lapsed view showed the levels going up and down repeatedly over many days and nights. Channelkeeper deployed a water level logger that took a water level reading every five minutes. They put the logger upstream of the swimming hole where the water was still flowing. The logger data showed the water level immediately dropping from 18 inches to zero. A day and a half later it jumped back up in a matter of minutes.

Shirley: I got the latitude and longitude of that pool and plotted it in GIS, and also got the locations of the nearest groundwater wells. Unfortunately I didn't find any wells close to that pool. I am not clear what is causing the levels to change in that pool. Maybe there is pumping going on we don't know about.

Jurgen: When you have a hot, dry, windy day, vegetation in the river sucks up lots of water and river flows will decline as the vegetation uses the water. Then, when we return to a marine layer condition, the vegetation uses less water and the flows will increase. So if you take your data and relate it with evapotranspiration data from CIMIS, I think you'll find a correlation. There aren't a lot of pumpers up there, and the extent to which we pump is not enough to pull that much out of the river.

Paul: The interesting thing about the time-lapse video is that the pool completely refilled between noon and 2 pm on a hot day in June. From bone dry to almost completely full. That kind of counters the evapotranspiration argument. There could be a time lag going on, but you need to look at what is going on in the whole basin. What you are seeing is just the very top of the groundwater elevation within the alluvium in the river.

Ben: I don't believe it is evapotranspiration. You do see those effects, but they are generally diurnal types of fluctuations.

Shirley: At the Regional Board, we do not have authority in this matter, other than that we designated the original impairment. The solution to this is not in our purview. The historical ecology study showed that, well before there was much human impact in the area, the river dried up at times. I think EPA would understand that

keeping water in these pools even in the driest of drought years is not reasonable. We're hoping for considerably more input from NMFS on this; we'd like them to give us a gauge, to tell us what we are shooting for in terms of amount of water in the pools and when. So far, NMFS has not provided information. In other areas, Fish and Game has gotten involved and issued cease and desist orders where there was a noted direct connection between pumping and pool water level dropping.

If pumping is shown to affect pool levels, then an agency has to be willing to do enforcement. Potentially Fish and Game can do that. NMFS can do that too; at any point they can step up and enforce the Endangered Species Act. We're hoping to get them to agree to a set of alternate programs that meets their requirements.

Question: If pumpers are not in Reaches 3 & 4, do they need to be concerned about the situation?

Answer: Probably not. The focus of this is the reaches that overly the Upper Ventura River groundwater basin. This is mainly Reach 4.

The meeting to begin work on an alternate programs strategy will be held August 15, Wednesday, 1:00 – 3:30 pm. Ventura City Hall, Santa Cruz Room. There will be additional meetings in the future.

6. Ventura River Parkway project

Paul Jenkin, Surfrider Foundation, reported that there was an information forum on the Ventura River Parkway project presented on July 18 in the Board of Supervisors hearing room. The forum was very well attended. There were presentations by various organizations such as the California Coastal Conservancy and the Trust for Public Lands. As a follow-up to that Supervisor Steve Bennett asked the Board of Supervisors to agree to support, in concept, a Ventura River Parkway, which they did. The idea of a parkway is to transform a lot of the liabilities on the river into assets. The hope is that incrementally, working with the land conservancies and others, we can see some positive changes on the ground.

7. Special September Leadership Committee meeting

Although a Watershed Council meeting had not been planned in September, there are several issues that need to be addressed soon, so a meeting of the Council was scheduled for September 6. At this meeting, we will need to select projects from the watershed to go forward in the county's Proposition 84 Round II grant application, and we also need to continue work on the watershed's climate change vulnerability assessment.

Next Watershed Council meeting:

September 6, 2012, 8:30 am – 12:00 pm

Multipurpose Room, Ventura County Government Center, 800 S. Victoria Avenue, Ventura

Acronyms

CIMIS California Irrigation Management Information System

IRWMP.... Integrated Regional Watershed Management Program

MOWD.... Meiners Oaks Water District

NPDES..... National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

NMFS National Marine Fisheries Service

NRCS Natural Resource Conservation Service

OVSD..... Ojai Valley Sanitary District

RCD..... Resource Conservation District

RWQCB... Regional Water Quality Control Board

TMDL Total Maximum Daily Load

VCAILG Ventura County Agricultural Irrigated Lands Group

VRCWD ... Ventura River County Water District

VRWC..... Ventura River Watershed Council

WPD..... Watershed Protection District

WCVC..... Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County