

Salinity Management and Imported Water Recharge Plenary Workgroup

September 16, 2008

SIGNATORIES:

Jayne Joy, EMWD
Edward Filadelfia, EMWD
Greg Woodside, OCWD
Marsha Westropp, OCWD
Sam Fuller, SBVMWD
Jeff Davis, SGPWA
Jack Safely, WMWD
Linda Garcia, WMWD
Rod Cruze, City of Riverside
Max Rasouli, City of Riverside
Stacey Alstadt, City of SBMWD
Robin Ohama, City of SBMWD

OTHER ATTENDEES:

Jim Hyde, Irvine Ranch WD
Gerry Thibeault, CRWQCB
Cindy Li, CRWQCB
Jack Nelson, YVWD
Tim Moore, Risk Sciences
David Aladjem, SBVMWD/WMWD
Dennis Williams, Geoscience
Ben Pak, CBWM
Mark Wildermuth, WEI/STWMA
Mark Norton, SAWPA
Regina Patterson, SAWPA

Call to Order / Introductions

The Salinity Management and Imported Water Recharge Workgroup meeting was called to order at 2:07 p.m. at the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority located at 11615 Sterling Avenue, Riverside, California. Introductions were made.

Approval of July 31, 2008 Meeting Summary

Mark Norton asked if there were comments or revisions to the July 31, 2008 Meeting Summary. David Aladjem requested that a typo be corrected on Page 2 in the last sentence of the third paragraph to read "SAIC" in place of "SCIC". Hearing no additional comments, the meeting summary was received and filed as amended.

Upon motion by Jack Safely, seconded by Jayne Joy, the motion unanimously carried:

IWR 08/09-01

MOVED, approve the July 31, 2008 Meeting Summary as amended.

Draft Version of Methodology – WE Inc.

Mark Wildermuth presented the TDS and Nitrate Projection Methodology First Draft Report dated September 16, 2008 reporting he was specifically tasked to develop a uniform methodology. Based on the discussion from the outline presented in July, in part what is doable in the timeframe, and more importantly the limitations in the Cooperative Agreement, a concept of a uniform methodology will not make sense. There are some things we can try to make similar in the different models. Models with different times of spatial or temporal

dispensation will not be consistent but we can make some similar assumptions. It is more of an implementation guideline.

He discussed Exhibit A: Excerpt from the Cooperative Agreement which addresses preparation of the Triennial Water Quality Report and the CEQA review of the proposed projects, and the list of modeling tools you assume can be used to do imported water recharge without question. The experts know how to use these tools and have concepts of how they think the hydrology works and how TDS and nitrates are occurring, and what the sources are. We can begin to get some standardization or specification by paying attention to hydrologic components or fluxes into the control volume that we are interested in. All fluxes on the recharge side and discharge side need to be carefully specified.

Mr. Wildermuth presented Table 2, "Work Breakdown Structure and Cost Estimate" Task 3. He stated the work would start at the top of the watershed and work down because some of the management zones will feed in to others. He presented a map explaining how the groundwater moves through the management zones. He said it is necessary to arrange how calculations are done with separate tools and separate basins, in a cascading manor, both for surface water and groundwater. He suggested doing Beaumont, propagate its impacts down the stream system, specify an additional recharge flux in time. Two or three projections can be done in the management zones concurrently and then use the wasteload allocation to translate it downstream. At the end, Orange County can be given a time series of flow in the river.

What we would use for a planning period hydrology? In the old basin planning model we used an expected value hydrology, the average recharge was calculated from every component and that was used every year. It doesn't really happen but it represents the essence of recharge. That is the basis of the wasteload allocation model. Another alternative is to look at a 20-year period that has the average rainfall or generates the average recharge. Average rainfall can generate an average runoff if the watershed is fully paved.

Mr. Norton asked if Corona or Temescal Basin are required to be a part of this effort? Mr. Wildermuth said they can be added if they are not included. If you want to do a good salt projection you need to identify all of the salt fluxes. It would not be hard to do, we would just need more detail.

Gerard Thibeault asked if everyone has models that cover all of the basins they plan to recharge to? Mr. Wildermuth said no. There are two models in Beaumont and there are high developed models built for the Bunker Hill, Rialto and Lytle Basins. Orange County and Elsinore have models and Riverside is building a model.

Mr. Wildermuth said he will include maps in the final version and will email spatial domains of the models, the Beaumont management zone boundary, and what the real boundary is.

David Aladjem suggested asking each signatory if the Tasks listed in Figure 3 are doable.

SGPWA - Jeff Davis said they will have to determine what their options are. Mr. Wildermuth said SGPWA effluent impacts are important. There may be bridge if SGPWA wants to accept some impact on the wastewater discharge and agree to it by stipulation.

SBVMWD - Dennis Williams suggested sliding some of the tasks on the schedule to the left so they can all start at the same time. Once this reaches Orange County, we have to have a check and balance system.

WMWD - Jack Safely reported they are working jointly with the City of Riverside and will have something that is adequate for these purposes.

EMWD - Jayne Joy said they would be able to accomplish this. She questioned the timing and said she would verify it with Behrooz Mortazavi. Mr. Wildermuth said EMWD is not on the critical path.

OCWD - Greg Woodside said yes.

Mr. Wildermuth said with everything starting October 1st it will give everyone a month to get all of their assumptions together. For those that have obligations to meet, he suggested meeting as frequently as required to get things done, approximately three meetings until April or May 2009. The technical group should meet separately.

Mr. Norton said the assumption is that everyone will have to rerun their model based on specific criteria and that a consensus is reached about the planning period and the hydrology. Mr. Wildermuth said Orange County does not have to care too deeply about the details of the hydrology in the Bunker Hill Basin. Mr. Norton expressed concern regarding the issue of some not having parameters like a subsurface flux, and they didn't account for that in their modeling effort? Are you now asking them to go back and modify their model to include that? Mr. Wildermuth said the models for Chino and Beaumont and by Geoscience have all addressed that. If the models have been rigorously calibrated, that has all been identified. They will only need to assign concentrations to these fluxes or have a computational process that can be calculated.

Mr. Norton asked what happens if the deadline is not met? Mr. Thibeault said we will have to review the agreement.

Mr. Wildermuth asked that the workgroup review the TDS and Nitrate Projection Methodology and provide comments to Mark Norton by September 26th.

Mr. Norton reviewed Table 2, the cost estimate. Until final numbers are in from consultants the approximate cost is \$50,000 if divided among the four SAWPA member agencies. **Mr. Norton will provide a draft breakdown of the cost estimate for each signatory to take back to their agency.**

Future Meeting

- October 22, 2008 at 9:30 a.m.

Recycled Water Policy

Mr. Moore reported that the Recycled Water Policy is out for review. Having attended the meetings on behalf of water and wastewater agencies, David Aladjem said that the final draft policy submitted to the SWRCB is a compromise. Neither the environmental community nor the water/wastewater community got what they really wanted from the draft policy but both sides thought the draft policy was an improvement over the present situation. The one issue where a compromise could not be reached was over how to treat incidental runoff. The stakeholders' group had reached a tentative agreement on the question of incidental runoff but neither the environmental community nor the water/wastewater community thought that the proposed compromise was a good idea. The SWRCB staff will now review and revise the proposed policy, circulate the revised policy for public comment, and bring the policy to the SWRCB for approval.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:02 p.m.