

## Basin Monitoring Program Task Force

July 15, 2009

**ATTENDEES:**

Jack Nelson, YVWD  
Tom Field, City of Riverside  
Chandra Johannesson, City of Riverside  
Val Housel, San Bernardino MWD  
Gerard Thibeault, CRWQCB  
Hope Smythe, CRWQCB  
Linda Garcia, WMWD  
LeAnne Hamilton, IEUA  
Bonita Fan, IEUA  
Max Rasouli, City of Riverside  
Craig Justice, City of Riverside  
Tim Moore, Risk Sciences  
Al Javier, EMWD

Julie Carver, City of Rialto  
Norris Brandt, EVMWD  
Lyndy Lewis, City of Corona  
Cindy Li, CRWQCB  
Bobby Gustafson, City of SBMWD  
Jayne Joy, EMWD  
Greg Woodside, OCWD  
Marsha Westropp, OCWD  
Joe LeClaire, WE Inc.  
Andy Malone, WE Inc.  
Mark Norton, SAWPA  
Rick Whetsel, SAWPA  
Regina Patterson, SAWPA

**Call to Order**

The Basin Monitoring Program Task Force meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m. at the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority office located at 11615 Sterling Avenue, Riverside, California. Introductions were made.

**Meeting Summary Approval – June 16, 2009**

Mark Norton presented the June 16, 2009 Meeting Summary for approval. On page 3 in the third full paragraph, delete the statement made by Mr. Thibeault; page 4 first paragraph, replace “preclude” with “conclude”; and in the last paragraph replace “members” with “numbers”. Hearing no further comments or revisions, the Meeting Summary was received and filed as amended.

**Final Annual SAR Water Quality Report – SAWPA**

Rick Whetsel presented the Final Annual Santa Ana River Water Quality Report reporting the report has been distributed by email and general comments received on table format have been incorporated. He said Pavlova Vitale of the Regional Board recommended removing the value of 1700 mg/L COD because the mistake could not be found at the lab. It was also reported that trending will be watched for during follow-up monitoring.

Mr. Whetsel reported there was discussion between the Regional Board and Chino Basin Watermaster that they would be renewing their permit which could mean they may change their monitoring program for the HCMP. This may or may not impact how this report is done in the future. The majority of the in-stream sampling comes from the HCMP. Joe LeClaire reported the data for some of the tributaries are not helpful in the HCMP, so they are requesting that during the Basin Plan Amendment process it be reduced to quarterly. Gerry Thibeault

---

asked when could that kind of Basin Plan Amendment be done? Hope Smythe said it could be done along the same timeline as the wasteload allocations.

#### RWQCB Reclamation Guidance Document (RGD) Policy – Risk Sciences

Mr. Moore said he has found a way to turn the RGD into an MOU, or alternatively, a regional policy document that the Regional Board would adopt. It wouldn't be a Basin Plan Amendment, but it would memorialize some of the critical elements from the RGD that we think are important. Years after the completion of the TIN-TDS Basin Plan Amendment, the State Board adopted the recycled water policy using what was done in the Santa Ana watershed as a template for how antidegradation should be looked at and how compliance demonstrations are to be made. There were many negotiated agreements in the RGD that were used to guide the Regional Board staff's recommendations when the Basin Plan Amendment was done but these agreements were not approved at the same time. It was put on hold awaiting what the State's Recycled Water Policy would be. He explained the requirements and specifications of the Recycled Water Policy that the State Board has issued. The plan is to produce a document where the Regional Board declares that this Salt Management Plan (adopted in 2004), conforms with this Recycled Water Policy. He distributed the Recycled Water Policy.

Mark Norton asked in regards to nutrient management planning, is there a need to mention our TMDL efforts that are covering the majority of the watershed? Potentially, Mr. Moore said, phosphorous is key one. Currently, with a couple of lake exceptions, we do not have flowing water bodies listed as impaired for nutrients. We have impairments for nitrogen, but not for phosphorous because it is unlikely that our flowing waters will have excessive algae.

He referred to page 10, item 8a which states “. . . all recycled groundwater recharge projects must be reviewed and permitted on a site-specific basis, and so such projects will require project-by-project review.” In 2006 we were trying to do a general WDR for groundwater recharge - State Project water. The idea was to simplify and streamline permitting for that kind of recharge. Item 8a will make it difficult to do what we attempted to do in 2006; every recharge project which is thought to have reclaimed water in it will have to be individually evaluated and permitted. Discussion of CDPH regulations and recommendations ensued.

Page 11, item 9c states “Groundwater recharge with recycled water for later extraction and use, is beneficial to the people of the State of California”, Mr. Moore said unless they are shown to not be protecting beneficial uses or otherwise not in compliance with the law, these things should be permitted expeditiously. He discussed the Regional Board calculating the impacts of the project(s) over at least a ten year time frame.

Following discussion, Mr. Thibeault said we may have to do the background ambient work to identify whether or not a project will cause objectives to be violated. In this basin, the analysis has been done to identify assimilative capacity, and ambient water recalculations are done every three years.

Mr. Moore said the RGD would be useful to acknowledge that not only does this inform one about the TIN-TDS regulatory process; it will also inform other task forces that are working on emerging constituents. **Mr. Moore said he will produce a draft MOU.**

---

## Basin Plan Amendment for SAR Wasteload Allocation – WE Inc. and Risk Sciences

Mr. Moore said he has provided an outline of the argument supporting changes to the Basin Plan Amendment, specifically to Chino South. The feedback received indicates that it would not be controversial. Mr. Moore discussed the following:

Argument No. 1 - The current objective is 4.2 mg/L nitrate-nitrogen, the proposal is to raise the objective to 5 mg/L nitrate-nitrogen and the existing nitrogen loss coefficient would be applied unchanged. By going from 4.2 mg/L to 5 mg/L you don't legalize the status quo suddenly making the basin become compliant. The purpose was to ensure that the existing dischargers could continue to discharge where they are discharging, because those dischargers at 5 mg/L nitrate-nitrogen (worse than the objective) are better than the existing ambient water quality and thought to be useful to improving ambient water quality. This assumes that in the absence of changing the objective to 5 mg/L nitrate-nitrogen, the water could go somewhere else and that you need it to be 5 mg/L nitrate-nitrogen to keep the water there. That may not be true.

Argument No. 2 - What appears to be beneficial for some may not be beneficial for others. Adding nitrogen that somebody else would have to take out through an RO process further downstream, adds to their costs. What should be considered is that those who propose to increase the nitrogen should be asked to bear some of the costs of removing it from those wells downstream in that groundwater basin.

Mr. Thibeault said those causing that water from the SAR to be drawn in to Chino South more than it would under unmodified conditions, are getting a huge benefit from lowering Chino South nitrogen. Some might consider that Watermaster may need to pay the upstream dischargers for this benefit. There may be a water rights argument, not a water quality argument. The improvement in water quality in Chino South, along with the very small increase in nitrogen, is enormous, and should be considered a positive rather than a negative.

Andy Malone asked why the maximum benefit argument did not have to be made? Mr. Moore said the water quality is improved, not degraded.

Discussion ensued regarding objectives and which wasteload allocation was being adopted. Mr. Moore said currently, there is no wasteload allocation that protects Chino South.

### **Andy Malone will email a draft of the first scenario of the Basin Plan Amendment for the SAR Wasteload Allocation.**

### **Well Attrition Analysis for Watershed - Interpretive Tools and Calculations for Future Ambient Water Quality Updates – WE Inc.**

Andy Malone reported the contract has been executed, and that if some wells that could be sampled are identified, it will be presented to the Task Force before the end of the year. Mr. Norton recommended they proceed.

### **Future Meetings**

Monday, August 24, 2009 at 1:30 p.m.

Wednesday, September 23, 2009 at 1:30 p.m.

---

### Adjournment

The Basin Monitoring Program Task Force meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

### Handout(s)

1. Recycled Water Policy – Risk Sciences