

**San Joaquin River Dissolved Oxygen TMDL  
Planning Committee Meeting – Draft 1 Notes**

June 5, 2002 1 - 4 pm

**Attending:** Chris Foe (RWQCB), Mark Gowdy (RWQCB), John Herrick (SDWA), Dan Hinrichs (DJH & City of Modesto), Lisa Hunt (URS), Jay Jahangiri (TRE), Bill Johnston (Modesto Irrigation District), G. Fred Lee (GFL and Assoc.), Chris Leininger (SJRG), Barbara Marcotte (CALFED), Bill Paris (OID), Lowell Ploss (SJRG), Tom Quasebarth (CDM, City of Modesto), Steve Ritchie (URS), Rene Roa (TRE), Kevin Wolf (facilitator and notes 530-758-4211, [kjwolf@dcn.davis.ca.us](mailto:kjwolf@dcn.davis.ca.us)), (Note: I forgot to circulate a sign in list for the afternoon. Let me know if this list is wrong. Thank you. KW)

**A. July RWQCB Meeting - What to provide Board members?**

**1. Interim Target levels**

- a. We should emphasize that the interim targets meet the USEPA's 1987 Gold Book criteria for dissolved oxygen. It would be good if Mark Gowdy explained the importance of this in his report as well.
- b. It would be good if we explained the improvement meeting the interim target would provide in terms of better DO conditions.

**2. Summary of Peer Review**

- a. Provide a list of everything that has been studied and provided to the Peer Review. Include Principal Investigators, dates, studies and data collected. Fred Lee will organize this information.
- b. Identify any major disagreements, especially if they are identified by the peer reviewers.
- c. Clarify what we know and don't know. Use Chris Foe's "What We Have Learned" document.
- d. Create a timeline from 1999 to date and place the studies in the time line. Mark Gowdy will use project management software to create this document.
- e. Explain process whereby we will evaluate and respond to PR comments. Since this material will be sent to the Board by July 5, the PIs are not expected to have completed their response to the peer reviewers' comments.

**3. Next Steps document**

- a. In general, we want to provide the Board with as much detail as we can on our plans. We won't have everything figured out by the Board meeting, but we will be able to provide the major tasks and deliverables.
- b. Mark and Chris's Next Steps document for the Peer Review should be modified to include more detail and the political and administrative milestones through the end of Phase I. I Mark will put this into Project Management software. He and Chris will work on clarifying what

occurs between the end of Phase I and the time when Phase II implementation plans are in place and benefiting D.O. When does the Phase I assurance plan and the financial commitments of the stakeholders end? When will the assurance package for Phase II be completed and will there be an overlap between the two processes? If so, who is responsible for covering aeration costs, which will likely go up with the end of the Interim Target?

c. The Next Steps document should clarify when we expect to meet the Interim Target. Chris believes that the stakeholders would create momentum for their overall plan in the 2004 Basin Plan Amendment process if the Interim Target could be met that summer. Accomplishing this may not be easy. Can a pilot project be installed in 2003 and enough data gathered so that enough aeration devices to meet the Interim Target can be installed and operated in 2004? Or is there a way that the pilot project step can be avoided and full aeration installed in 2004? This could be done if there was enough agreement on what equipment would work, not have significant secondary impacts, and be cost effective. Given the uniqueness of the DWSC, are there real examples of equipment working in similar conditions elsewhere in the world?

d. We should clarify why we believe that aeration is the Phase I solution to meet the Interim D.O. Target.

#### **B. Interim Planning Coordinator - Aeration and Monitoring Project**

1. The key issue is whether there is sufficient time to accomplish everything needed to install a pilot aeration project in the DWSC in 2003. Permits will be needed from the Coast Guard, USACE, and others. A bid process will need to be crafted, proposals accepted and reviewed, and a contract signed. One of the first things the Interim Coordinator needs to do is work out the details, options and timeline for this process.

2. The group labored over whether it was possible for the Interim Planning Coordinator, within their budget and timeline, to craft the details needed to let an RFP for the aeration and monitoring project by the end of September when their contract ends. There was general agreement that, based on what we know now, this should be doable, though it may not also be possible to craft the monitoring program into an RFQ at the same time. Lowell will take the lead on providing more of the detail in the Planning Coordinator's scope of work that Barbara Marcotte is requesting.

3. It may be prudent to allow proposal bids to be either for a pilot project in 2003 or a full aeration project in 2004. If a firm believes they have the aeration device that is so proven it doesn't need to go through a pilot project process, they can make this pitch and plan for full aeration in 2004. If proposal bidders believe that they can install a pilot project in 2003, they can explain how they will do this and provide a timeline, tasks and associated budget line items. We want the Interim Planning Coordinator to help us determine whether this option makes sense, or if only one of these choices should be part of the bid process.

3. It may be best to have the monitoring program linked to the aeration program with the same firm doing both. On the other hand, stationary, real time sensors may be independent of type and location of aerators. We may know enough now to determine the type of monitors needed and their locations. This could then set up an RFQ for this specific project. A problem may exist

in the lack of TAC members who have the time to participate in this. Anyone participating in the development of an RFQ may be restricted from bidding on the project. DWR may be good candidate to oversee the monitoring project. What are the pros and cons of them taking on this role, including the ease of getting a project in the water in 2003. The Interim Planning Coordinator needs to address these options and questions.

4. As part of the monitoring program, it may be important to have the ability to put a researcher in the water on short notice to do more intensive sampling than can be done by the stationary monitors. Gary Litton was mentioned as an excellent resource. Is there a way that he can be included in the project?

5. The planning group agreed that the monitoring and aeration program should include a set of experiments that improve our understanding of what is occurring in the DWSC and the importance of different factors. For example, it may be possible to have the Stockton RWCF not discharge effluent for a long enough period that we can better determine how the DWSC functions without their influence. During the pilot project phase, the Interim Target is not expected to be met and thus the aerators can be turned on and off in conjunction with these types of experiments.

6. A real time monitoring station should be installed between Mossdale and Channel Point to get accurate measurements of incoming loads. There was not an agreement on whether additional upstream monitoring needed to take place as part of the aeration pilot project. The more components that need to be included in the aeration project proposal, the more difficult it will be to get everything done so that a project has a chance of being installed in 2003.

#### **C. Long term Planning Coordinator -**

1. Barbara Marcotte needs our help to determine the scope of work for the long term Planning Coordinator. Chris's Next Steps document along with Mark's conversion of this into a project management format will help. Barbara needs a small team who are not potential long term Planning Coordinator candidates to help provide enough detail that an RFQ can be written for the first 1-3 years of this scope of work. Lowell, Chris and Mark will help. Anyone else interested in helping should contact Lowell.

2. The earliest the long-term coordinator is expected to be hired is October. We need to be careful not to include tasks that may have to be done in October or November because the contract could be delayed or the person/team may not be able to get up to speed soon enough.

#### **D. Assurance Package**

1. We want to use the term "Assurance Package" instead of "Cost Sharing" because the final agreement on how the maintenance and operation costs are covered through Phase I may not involved cost sharing.

2. Chris emphasized his belief that the stakeholders should assure the Regional Board that the costs of operating and maintaining the aeration and monitoring program will be met through Phase I. An assurance package that relies on hope of unsecured grant funding or Congressional funding will not be acceptable. The assurance package should include a backup plan in case

these other sources of funds are not secured by the end of the year. If CALFED agrees to include these costs in the RFP for the duration of Phase I, this will likely be sufficient to be considered assured. .

3. It was not determined who should draft a timeline and set of tasks for developing the assurance package. The Executive Committee can address this at their next meeting.