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Call to Order / Introductions
The Imported Water Recharge Technical Committee meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. at the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority at 11615 Sterling Avenue, Riverside, CA. Brief introductions were made.

Review Meeting Summary
The June 25, 2013 meeting summary was deemed acceptable.

Riverside Basins Groundwater Model Input Concerns and Options
Mark Norton briefed the technical committee that we are all a part of a cooperative Imported Water Recharge Agreement. In this agreement there are a number of requirements, including comparing a 20-year projection of the ambient water quality in the watershed. Instead of doing a watershed wide model or a number of groundwater modeling efforts, the signatories agreed to a cascading modeling and reporting approach starting with the upper basin. Geoscience completed one for San Timoteo Management Zone and Yucaipa, and Wildermuth Environmental for Beaumont which was submitted in 2012. Mark Norton said that we are now at a stage where the process of asking the parties that discharge to Riverside Basins A-F, Arlington, Temescal and Elsinore to do their model projections which are due July 18, 2014.

Cindy Li said that Geoscience finished the model for the Bunker Hill basins. The report was done in June 2013 but it stated that the runoff quality model component was not calibrated. It was noted that the runoff quality assumptions could affect the City of Riverside’s permit. David Garcia expressed some concern with the nitrogen levels and in looking at the input assumptions for their model, how would they handle the current situation as far as the very conservative assumptions assumed? Are there any other options available for the City of Riverside other than using the numbers that are provided for the upstream model? It was requested that more time be given so that the model could be calibrated and this over estimation could be taken care of. It would mean delaying the deadline of July 2014 to another year. David Garcia states that the best approach is to wait for the results from the upstream model to input it to their model.
There was a brief discussion in regards to receiving comments from Wildermuth Environmental in March of 2009, and how they were incorporated in the Final Report of July 2009 without bringing the comments back to the committee.

Mark Norton questioned the comments received, and Samantha Adams stated that the overriding comment was: If you apply the ambient water quality to every upstream input value to the basin, your basin output is going to be the ambient quality over a 20-year period. Mark asked what it was based on and Samantha said that it was based on studies done for SAWPA, and some of the original basin planning models.

Mark Norton asked Cindy Li what time frame for model reporting she recommends and Cindy said that this isn’t the RWQCB’s decision. It’s really up to the Agreement parties. Her suggestion is that every agency use the appropriate data for them at the time instead of waiting for Geoscience’s more in depth analysis to be conducted later so that way everyone can meet the deadline. Greg Woodside said that he agrees with Cindy Li to use what we have and continue with our current schedule with the modeling inputs. It was noted that it’s a judgment call for everyone as far as what model they use.

David Garcia asked if there is any value of the work that is being done here and if it can be combined with the Basin Monitoring Program Task Force Triennial Ambient Water Quality Update and the Wasteload Allocation Model Update. Samantha Adams said that it’s a cooperative effort.

It was asked if they could have a deliverable by July 2014, and Sam Fuller said yes. There was a consensus among the Technical Committee to keep the time frame the way it is and to have each agency use their best judgment on the upstream input quality for their respective modeling efforts.

**Review Status of Modeling and Study Updates by Basin**

As the modeling presentation was the main discussion focus of the meeting, Mark Norton asked if anyone had any comments or updates for their specific basins.

**San Jacinto Area Management Zone (EMWD)**

No change, the modeling is going out to bid. It’s an on-going process.

**Other Business**

The general waiver R8-2013-0015, was approved by the Regional Board on March 22, 2013. Greg Woodside asked if the waiver includes the category for recharge of imported water by signatory agencies of the cooperative agreement since this was covered through the data collected from EC Task Force agreement. Both Cindy Li and Mark Norton said yes.

**Future Meeting**

The group decided it would be best to meet quarterly. The next IWR Technical Committee Meeting is scheduled for February 4, 2014 at 1:30p.m.

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.