

SJR DO TMDL Executive Committee Agenda - Draft 1

August 28, 2002 9:00 - noon

RWQCB Watershed Annex, [8950 Cal Center Drive](#), Sacramento

Attending: Russ Brown (JSA), Chris Foe (RWQCB), Dan Hinrichs (DJH), Lisa Hunt (URS - by phone), Jay Jahangiri (TRE), Fred Lee (GFLA), Barbara Marcotte (CALFED), Lowell Ploss (SJRGA), Jennifer Spaletta (SEWD), Kevin Wolf (facilitation and notes)

Meeting Notes:

A. Determine next steps for filling the peer review data gaps.

1. On September 10 there will be a Technical Committee meeting. Tom Quasebarth will organize the meeting. The meeting objectives include:

a. Review the Peer Reviewer's comments on data gaps downstream of Lander Avenue, Mud and Salt Slough and Grasslands.

b. Develop a process by which studies and monitoring for 2003 can be advanced this fall. CALFED will want to do a mini-peer review on proposed Directed Action or RFP guidelines. In order to have studies underway in the field in 2003, progress needs to be made this fall

c. Provide feedback to URS proposal for advancing a pilot aeration project and associated monitoring for 2003.

d. Review any TAC or Steering Committee member's comments on Fred's response to the Peer Reviewers' Overall Comments on the 2001 and other studies. (See http://www.sjrmdl.org/technical/2001_studies/process/prcomresponses.pdf). Comments on Fred's response should be sent to the listserv before the Sept. 10 meeting.

2. An Eastside Upstream Technical Committee is scheduled for October 3. The location will be announced. The agenda will mirror the agenda set for September 19 Westside Technical Committee meeting. In addition, the Eastside meeting may include a tour over lunch.

3. The Westside Upstream Technical Committee Meeting is set for September 19. The agenda is on line at http://www.sjrmdl.org/committee/2002/west_tech/wtech_agenda_sept19.pdf. Issues and discussion involving the meeting included:

a. Mark Gowdy and Russ Brown will take over the different assignments that Chris Foe will not be able to do because he will not be able to attend the meeting.

b. If possible, a list of monitoring projects and efforts being done on the Westside should be made available at the meeting. No one was selected to do this work so it may not happen. Kevin will communicate with Nigel Quinn and Joe McGahan to see what might be done

c. At the Sept. 19 meeting, it would be good to ask the area leaders if and how they would like to pursue integrating the DO monitoring and studies into any other programs they are or might be involved in. If they are supportive, this can be added to the agenda for the follow up Westside Technical Committee meeting.

d. We would also like to hear the Westside leaders' advice on how this upstream monitoring/studies can be organized and administered, especially so that they trust the results.

For example, funding might be made available for the Westside Drainage Association to hire a consultant like Joe McGahan to participate in the technical process.

4. How will funds from Prop. 13 and CALFED be made available to help with the data gap work in 2003? Are the upstream stakeholders willing to take on the studies? This means getting organized, helping outline the study objectives, and agreeing to be the contracting nexus with CALFED. The choices for administering funding include:

a. A local agency (e.g. Westside Drainage Association) administers funds (replacing an NFWF administrator). This local agency would be compensated for their efforts.

b. After RFP guidelines are approved through the CALFED Peer Review, a local agency coordinates the RFP process with CALFED involvement in decision making process. This could be combined with 'a' above.

c. The DO Steering committee and the Westside Technical Committee develop a directed action grant. The directed action proposal would be evaluated through the CALFED process. There are a variety of ways it could be funded. For example, it could run through the existing CALFED selected "IQID" master contractor (i.e. Jones and Stokes or CH2Mhill) or an NFWF type administrative organization. (Note: An organization needs to be found to administer funding for eastside and downstream studies as well as Westside studies.)

d. A wide open CALFED organized RFP could be pursued where different local districts could partner with or solicit qualified professionals to put together grant proposals. These would then be evaluated through the RFP process. Projects with local district and landowner support have a significant advantage in the funding process and would likely be selected.

5. Carl Chen's City of Stockton/CALFED funded computer model may not receive funding to do the runs that the Peer Reviewer's suggested were needed to better understand the data gaps. This led to the following discussion and decisions:

a. The Hydroqual modeling proposal which CALFED chose to replace the Chen model will not likely be useful to the stakeholders for a year, if it even receives a final contract.

b. Carl's model should be run with 2001 and 2002 data to see how well it would have predicted the DO levels in the DWSC. If it correlated well, everyone's confidence in it would be increased and it could be used for analyzing the data gaps as well as be helpful in the development of different assurance package scenarios.

c. The Executive Committee would like to have DWR or the Regional Board staff make these 2001 and 2002 data runs with Carl's model (Note: Carl's model is in the public domain because it was developed with public funds.) It will be easier to get funding for this work if it goes through one of these state agencies. Barbara will see if the DWR modeling group can do this work in a timely manner. Chris will see if the RB modeler can help and how the funding can move to the RB from CALFED. Hopefully a decision can be made on this by the Sept. 11 Steering Committee meeting.

B. Aeration Pilot Project and Monitoring in 2003.

1. URS is hard at work trying to find a way that all the permits and other steps can be accomplished so that a pilot aeration project can be installed in the DWSC in 2003. They will

report on their progress at the Sept. 10 Technical Committee meeting and at the Sept. 11 Steering Committee meeting. At the present time, they think it will be difficult to be able to develop a realistic timeline that will allow this to occur in 2003.

2. One option that should be considered is to improve the monitoring in 2003 and use the existing jet aerator to conduct some aeration studies. The jet aerator will need to be improved so that it is more effective. The Army Corps which owns the aerator will need to cooperate. Studies on this would lead to a pilot aeration project in 2004 and a demonstration project in 2005 or 2006.

3. URS will circulate a list of unresolved issues (both technical and managerial) that must be addressed as part of the planning process. These issues will be discussed at the Sept. 11 Steering Committee meeting.

C. Assurance Package

1. Lowell Ploss and the San Joaquin River Group have been making slow progress on gaining commitments for funding the Assurance Package. At the present time, stakeholder organizations are committing to a percentage of the total cost. The exact percentage each group commits to would not be public though the supporting groups would be listed with commitment letters/contracts gained from each.

2. The assurance package is progressing with a worst case scenario of \$500,000 per year. The funding commitments would come to play if maintenance and operation costs for the aeration project and its associated monitoring were not funded through another program such as Prop. 13. The funds could cover a worst case scenario of a significant number of dry and critically dry years in a row by having the funds be assessed every year whether the DWSC oxygen demand levels need it or not. Thus if a severe set of dry years occur, extra money will be available, or if this worst case scenario happens at the beginning, a loan could be obtained to pay for the additional costs with the excess funds in good water years paying back the loan.

3. The \$500,000 per year would meet the Interim Performance Goal proposed by Regional Board staff. If the Regional Board required that the DO level not go below 4.0, the costs would be higher and may exceed the \$500,000 level. Fred is concerned that the National Marine Fishery Society may object to the 3.0 minimum in the Interim Performance Goal. Chris will talk with NMFS to find out their concerns and report back to the Steering Committee on whether the 3.0 minimum will face a strong challenge.

D. September 11 Steering Committee Agenda .

1. Kevin will draft a new agenda for circulation by Sept. 4. In addition to the above items , if time permits, discussion will also occur on:

- a. Update on Congressional funding in the WRDA bill.
- b. Preparing for CALFED management meeting in October. .
- c. Developing the scope of work for the Long-term Planning Coordinators.