

Salinity Management and Imported Water Recharge Plenary Workgroup

November 12, 2008

SIGNATORIES:

Jayne Joy, EMWD
Ed Filadelfia, EMWD
Marsha Westropp, OCWD
Sam Fuller, SBVMWD
Jeff Davis, SGPWA
Max Rasouli, City of Riverside
Phil Miller, EVMWD
Val Housel, City of SBMWD
Rudy Fandel, City of Corona

OTHER ATTENDEES:

Gerry Thibeault, CRWQCB
Hope Smythe, CRWQCB
Cindy Li, CRWQCB
Tom Harder, Thomas Harder GW Cons.
Ben Pak, CBWM
Tim Moore, Risk Sciences (T)
David Aladjem, SBVMWD/WMWD (T)
Dennis Williams, Geoscience/SBVMWD
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 1:10 p.m. at the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority located at 11615 Sterling Avenue, Riverside, California. Introductions were made.

Approval of September 16, and October 22, 2008 Meeting Summaries

Due to a request for clarification, Mark Norton stated approval of the September 16, 2008 Meeting Summary was deferred at the last meeting to include a more detailed statement regarding the Recycled Water Policy. He asked if there were additional comments or revisions. There were none. The October 22, 2008 Meeting Summary was also presented for approval. Hearing no comments or revisions, the meeting summary was approved as presented.

Upon motion by Phil Miller, seconded by Sam Fuller, the motion unanimously carried:

IWR 08/11-01

MOVED,

1. approve the September 16, 2008 Meeting Summary as amended; and
2. approve the October 22, 2008 Meeting Summary as presented.

Revised Nitrogen and TDS Projection Methodology

Mark Wildermuth presented the Second Draft - TDS and Nitrate Projection Methodology dated November 10, 2008 stating he took the existing methodology with his notes to prepare the draft, tracking the changes. It is now up to the recharging parties to get their part done on time. Parties that are not part of the Cooperative Agreement were included because the maximum benefit parties were given the same tasks when their recharge permits are renewed.

Tim Moore said we would like to use either the water quality objective or the ambient water quality, whichever was higher, to represent the subsurface water quality above the groundwater basin you are projecting. If you don't have the data for what is coming into or above you, you would use conservative assumptions. The understanding was that although the technique that any given model might use to do these calculations would likely vary, it was important to demonstrate that regardless of the model itself, the model had taken into account certain inputs (fluxes) and that those had to be documented. In the methodology they are also called inbound fluxes and outbound fluxes or discharge fluxes and recharge fluxes. In round one we were going to briefly specify how each model accounted for them, and then there would be a reference to where a more detailed technical explanation could be found in model documentation or in the parties' archives. The report would be a checklist for what is accounted for and that checklist would accompany each report. Mark Wildermuth's letter calls out the importance of what one assumes about the initial conditions of the groundwater basin and the saturated zone. The initial conditions for the groundwater basin should be equivalent to the Basin Monitoring Task Force's estimate of groundwater quality. That estimate is for an entire groundwater management zone. The group needs to agree on how the initial conditions will be done for a model and whether it will still replicate, on a courser scale, on what the Task Force estimate is.

Mr. Wildermuth said he disagrees. The ambient water quality estimates from the Task Force are statistical. The models need to start with actual conditions. Mr. Moore agreed and said that we want to make sure they are using the same finalized data so that we don't have six different models all coming to different conclusions about what the ambient groundwater quality is. Mr. Wildermuth said there is university data that is available to everyone. Our goal is to use the most recent and best data.

Jeff Davis asked that the technical group be defined so that everyone knows what it is going in.

Mr. Wildermuth apologized for inadvertently not listing EMWD on the schedule for the end round of the projections.

Sam Fuller provided a letter detailing their belief of what Mark Wildermuth's proposal should have included for the Cooperative Agreement Methodology presented today. There are items in Wildermuth's proposal shown on pages 1 through most of 5 that are not presently required and are not in the agreement. This has to be complete by July 2009. Getting it done between now and July will be a difficult task. The concept developed by Mark Wildermuth includes coordination of all the models and coordination of the hydrologic period and coordination of the methods to make everything consistent. Those things have to be done, but it will be difficult getting it done between now and July. We are trying to get a proposal for the required work to July 2009. Mr. Moore said his understanding of what Mr. Fuller is stating is that the integration and coordination will be more complex than imagined. Let everybody do it their own way first and document that method so that it will provide a starting point to where the inconsistencies are that may create confusion or disagreement among the parties. That is something to be worked on in the next cycle. This cycle is about documenting the here and now.

Mr. Norton asked if everyone agreed that we need to develop a boiler template of some type and include a checklist of items that each model must account for. Mr. Moore said these are

factors the Regional Board considers relevant, in general. This would apply to both projections. When you do your projections, you would need to account for stormwater recharge, imported water recharge, recycled water recharge, septic tank recharge, deep percolation of precipitation and irrigation and subsurface applied water.

Mr. Fuller said the specific issues that Mark Wildermuth thinks we need to have in our checklist can be added as a list or included by appendix. Mr. Moore suggested that he rewrite it as what we agreed on how to approach this. It can then be circulated and debated by email to save on meeting time. A bullet list documenting the expectation we have of one another and what the Regional Board has. It would document the approach we are intending to take.

Mr. Norton asked if anyone were opposed. Hearing none Mr. Moore said he can create it and email it by Friday, November 14th with the deadline for comments on November 19, 2008. He suggested the Technical Committee be tasked to develop a template and meet in January 2009 to review.

Mr. Norton asked that each agency provide a modeler contact to him as soon as possible.

Future Meeting

- January 14, 2009 at 1:30 p.m.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Signatories to the Cooperative Agreement:

EMWD	City of Riverside	City of San Bernardino Water Dept
OCWD	SGPWA	EVMWD
SBVMWD	WMWD	City of Corona