

Salinity Management and Imported Water Recharge

Plenary Workgroup

October 22, 2008

SIGNATORIES:

Jayne Joy, EMWD
Greg Woodside, OCWD
Marsha Westropp, OCWD
Sam Fuller, SBVMWD
Jeff Davis, SGPWA
Tom Harder, SGPWA
Linda Garcia, WMWD
Rod Cruze, City of Riverside
Val Housel, City of SBMWD
Robin Ohama, City of SBMWD
Rudy Fandel, City of Corona

OTHER ATTENDEES:

Gerry Thibeault, CRWQCB
Hope Smythe, CRWQCB
Cindy Li, CRWQCB
Joseph Zoba, YVWD
LeAnne Hamilton, IEUA
Tim Moore, Risk Sciences
David Aladjem, SBVMWD/WMWD
Dennis Williams, Geoscience/SBVMWD
Andy Schlange, STWMA/BBWM
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 9:35 a.m. at the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority located at 11615 Sterling Avenue, Riverside, California. Introductions were made. Signatories

Approval of September 16, 2008 Meeting Summary

Mark Norton asked if there were comments or revisions to the September 16, 2008 Meeting Summary. Greg Woodside requested more detail regarding David Aladjem's comment on page 4 in the second sentence. David Aladjem said he would provide language to the secretary. Hearing that, approval of the meeting summary was deferred to the next meeting.

Draft Version of Nitrogen and TDS Projection Methodology

Mark Norton stated Mark Wildermuth has provided the "Response to Comments, First Draft - TDS and Nitrate Projection Methodology" dated October 21, 2008. He recommended the workgroup take time and review the document.

After reviewing, Mark Wildermuth stated that he had some confusion as to what his role should be. He said it is arguable that tools were allowed that may have nothing to do with the consistency. Those that have the responsibility to provide the projections must sit down and figure them out. There are models that don't yet exist.

Mr. Norton asked Tim Moore that as the workgroup's facilitator and regulatory advisor, if he had any suggestions to resolve the impasse? Mr. Moore said it is nice when you can integrate and it is great to share expenses, but he is more concerned that in the effort to develop a finished product we may be held up in submitting a final report by the deadline due to a single

agency's model. This is something we will be doing for a long time, so he recommended getting the first one out and then upgrading it. It is necessary to assure some transparency. Each agency should make the declaration they have done the technical tasks and briefly explain how it was done and say where they can find the details. It needs to be scientifically and intellectually defensible. Each agency, in the first round, should assume that upstream subsurface flows are either at the objective or the current ambient water quality, whichever is higher. Everybody will do round 1 based on that assumption. In round 2, we begin to use the output from upstream models as input for the upstream subsurface flows into each downstream model. We will need the initial condition, baseline, and the results of the upstream model run. Then all you need is a simple informal meeting of their technical advisors of how they are approaching it. Either they agree where the understandable differences are or provide an explanation for how an input was considered and then adaptively manage it in subsequent years. For this first round, each agency will produce their own report for this coming year by either using the upstream groundwater management zone objective or current ambient water quality, whichever is higher. Later it will become staggered, one year offset from the year above it with the first one due when it is due.

Mr. Moore proposed, as a working assumption, using it in lieu of actual data – projections with real data. We will have to live with that even if we don't like it and be good about documenting what happens in the first cycle.

Gerry Thibeault said there is a need to show good hydrology in a scientifically valid manner. We should not ignore that. He is concerned that we may not have a consistent planning period hydrology with this approach. Mr. Moore said hydrology will be addressed by all the modelers, but we can't solve the consistency issue in one year. It is appropriate to call out the inefficiencies and work on them.

David Aladjem said there are some problems with the model and we need to understand that. Mr. Norton asked if there are any concerns of the approach as laid out by Tim Moore or using the objective or current ambient water quality for the upstream subsurface flow? Detailed methodology will be provided by Mark Wildermuth. He suggested Tim and Mark work together to incorporate this new approach into the draft report.

Dennis Williams expressed concern about letting each group come up with whatever? There are some standard hydrological principles that should be followed. Mr. Moore suggested working, not in a task force environment, but with a technical committee. It would put everyone on notice to what objections to expect and ultimately what the CEQA and model output requirements will be.

Mr. Norton asked that if we have the technical committee review it, will the workgroup prefer to have SAWPA serve as the responsible party submitting the final report, or will each party submit on their own? Do you want us to continue administering this effort with the workgroup or with just the technical modelers? Is that what you want to do in the future as well? Mr. Moore suggested SAWPA take responsibility for setting up the technical meetings which will eventually slow down at the end of the first cycle.

Mr. Norton said for this first cycle, model results from each recharging agency don't have to be submitted in order. When you are ready for document review, we will look at it. He asked if there is any need for this workgroup to meet again? Linda Garcia asked if we need a schedule? Mr. Norton said everyone has to meet the deadline of July 18, 2009. Mr. Aladjem said it might be useful to plan on having all reports done several months in advance so all can see the results, and SAWPA could prepare a summary document with the parameters and hydrologic periods. Mr. Norton said the first step is to get the methodology laid out and finalized so that everyone can proceed. Mr. Aladjem said this group needs to approve that methodology prior to implementation.

Mr. Norton stated the methodology will be revised to reflect a 2-cycle approach addressing the items discussed today. The desire is to have that prior to the next meeting. Mr. Moore will work with WE Inc. to document what we are agreeing to.

Greg Woodside suggested seeing the draft written report due to the RWQCB by April or May 2009. Mr. Moore recommended each agency provide a 90% draft by April 1, 2009 and then the final deliverable on July 18, 2009 using the specific outline and meeting a common set of expectations. The technical group will develop a template outline. He suggested starting with examples of previous work that has been accepted by the Regional Board in the past and refining it. Each agency will do a 20-year projection starting July 2009.

Mr. Norton said the goal for the next meeting will be to make sure everyone approves the methodology and outline.

Future Meeting

- November 12, 2008 at 1:00 p.m.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m.