



Linda S. Adams
Secretary for
Environmental
Protection

California Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Valley Region

Katherine Hart, Chair

11020 Sun Center Drive #200, Rancho Cordova, California 95670-6114
Phone (916) 464-3291 • FAX (916) 464-4645
<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley>



Arnold
Schwarzenegger
Governor

IRRIGATED LANDS REGULATORY PROGRAM

EAST SAN JOAQUIN WATER QUALITY COALITION MANAGEMENT PLAN

DRAFT MEETING NOTES

14 September 2010– MEETING No. 8

(Revised on 22 May 2010)

ATTENDEES: Chris Jimmerson, Dania Huggins, Melissa Turner, Mike Johnson, Parry Klassen, and Susan Fregien.

SUMMARY: The last quarterly management plan meeting (qtrly MPlan mtg) occurred on May 4th (August qtrly MPlan mtg was postponed). The next qtrly MPlan mtg is schedule for November 2nd. Therefore, Staff facilitated this meeting, to obtain a status on some of the key MPlan components that the Coalition is currently working.

ITEMS DISCUSSED

- (1) May 4th qtrly MPlan mtg pending action items
- (2) implementation of the recommended management practices for the first three high priority site subwatersheds
- (3) PG 2 for the next four high priority site subwatersheds
- (4) SJR C & D Annual TMDL Report
- (5) Request letter to remove MRP Plan constituents
- (6) Other items
 - a. Draft summary of PGs and PMs for 3rd set of high priority site subwatersheds
 - b. Site Modification for 3rd set of high priority site subwatersheds
 - c. Request to discontinue management plan for specific constituents
 - d. Clarification of 2011 monitoring strategy (sites and type of monitoring)
 - e. Revised MRP Plan and QAPP
- (7) Next Steps – Action Items
- (8) Next Deliverable
- (9) Next qtrly MPlan mtg No 9

(1) MAY 4TH QRTL MPLAN MTG PENDING ACTION ITEMS

Purpose: To provide a status on pending items from the last qtrly Mtgm Plan Mtg and determine if follow up actions still are needed. The two pending action items were:

- a. Provide shape files of non members for Dry Creek, Duck Slough, and Prairie Flower that have direct drainage in the areas targeted for surveys (based on maps included on the Annual MPUR).
- b. Propose a strategy that allows for flexibility in PGs datelines.

Outcome: For the first item the Coalition explained that the maps created and included in the 2010 Annual MPUR were based on information from 2008. Therefore, the membership data

California Environmental Protection Agency



has been updated since. Recent membership information for these areas can be obtained from the annual membership information that was provided to the enforcement unit on 31 July 2010. The Coalition would like to coordinate efforts with the enforcement unit for the 3rd set of high priority site subwatersheds. Parry explained that his request is based on the success obtained with the 1st set of high priority site subwatersheds on the completion of individual surveys. At the time that the individual surveys were completed, the enforcement unit was coordinating enforcement efforts on the same area (e.g. postcards, 13267, and so forth). Staff agreed to communicate this request to the enforcement unit. Additionally, the Coalition will need to provide an approximate time of when the individual surveys are going to start. This information will allow the enforcement unit to plan their efforts better in terms of post cards, 13267, and so forth for that area.

For the second item, see Section 6.b

(2) STATUS ON FIRST THREE HIGH PRIORITY SITE SUBWATERSHEDS

Purpose: To provide a status on:

Performance Goals (PG) 3 and 4

PG 3. Encourage growers to implement additional management practices based on water quality results.

PG 4. Evaluate effectiveness of the new management practices implemented during 2009 and 2010.

Outcome: The Coalition had anticipated completion of all follow up surveys by 30 June 2010 (2010 Annual MPUR, Table 18, page 64). ~~At the time of this meeting, all follow up surveys were completed for the 1st priority subwatersheds. However, not all follow up surveys have been completed. Double check with Parry and Melissa???~~ Some of the recommended management practices cannot be implemented by growers given the type of agriculture practices and crops ~~and are therefore not recommended~~. An example of this is Prairie Flower Drain at which recirculating – tail water return systems were ~~not recommended during the initial individual surveys. However,~~ due to high salinity concentrations in the area. ~~Therefore,~~ growers cannot implement this particular ~~recommendation practice~~ because it could potentially kill their existing crops ~~due to salt buildup (soils already high salt). Thus, parts of the follow up surveys are no longer applicable and will need to be modified.~~

Formatted: Superscript

The evaluation of the effectiveness of any modification ~~to current practices and/or implementation of~~ new management practices will be done through the evaluation of water quality monitoring results. Thus, if water quality has improved (in terms of detections and exceedances), then no more follow up actions are needed until the next assessment monitoring is due. However, if water quality problems still continue, then the Coalition ~~will may~~ proceed with the appropriate follow up actions (e.g. contact the growers ~~again and perform~~ follow up visits) to verify that the recommended management practices were actually implemented.

(3) STATUS ON THE NEXT FOUR HIGH PRIORITY SITE SUBWATERSHEDS

Purpose: To provide a status on:

Performance Goals (PG) 1

Individually contact members on adjacent properties to waterways where discharges have been identified to fill out surveys

Outcome: All growers for the four priority site subwatersheds (~~2nd priority subwatersheds~~) have been contacted. Originally the number of growers scheduled to be contacted ~~ed~~ in the

Formatted: Superscript

Highline Canal @ Hwy 99 was 10. The new target is 9 growers, because one of the growers from Highline Canal @ Hwy 99 is no longer a member (he filed for bankruptcy). The Coalition will provide the contact information for this grower to Staff to follow up with the enforcement unit. Since the time of the meeting, this member has ~~payed~~ paid his dues and was reinstated in the Coalition. The Coalition has met with the grower and filled out a survey which makes the targeted number of members 10 as originally estimated.

Parry indicated that every site in each of the 2nd ~~set of~~ high priority site subwatersheds is very different. For example, a majority of Cottonwood Creek @ Hwy 145 is ~~an~~ elevated above the surrounding fields; therefore, in order for parcels to move irrigation drainage or storm water into Cottonwood Creek the water would have to be pumped into the creek there is no potential for growers draining into waters of the State. Thus, most of the exceedances found in this area are most likely due to spray drift or operational spills from canals that originate from the local irrigation district (one chlorpyrifos exceedance on 1/19/2010 = 0.21 µg/L). However, the Coalition has started to find ~~see~~ dissolved copper exceedances (for dissolved copper) in their monitoring results (4/20/2010 = 3.1 µg/L and 5/18/2010 = 3.6 µg/L, with a WQTL of 2.2 and 2.3 µg/L, respectively). The Coalition would like to do upstream sampling because there are ~~it is possible that~~ copper mines in the Sierra Nevadas that drain into Cottonwood Creek that could be ~~the a~~ contributing source of the exceedances however this is difficult to assess due to low or no flows upstream of Avenue 13. However, it is difficult to access these locations for sample collection.

Another example of this uniqueness a unique site subwatershed is Bear Creek @ Kibby Rd. This site subwatershed, which has a substantial numbers of parcels along the creek areas that are non-irrigated pasture. Owners of these parcels do not fence both sides of the creek (as a measure of containing the cows) because the cow grazing controls the growth rate of weeds and other vegetation (e.g. blackberries), which ultimately keeps the creeks clear and flowing, s for which the cows step right into the creek. These parcels are ~~not part of the program because they are not irrigated however they are most likely contributing to the E. coli problem in Bear Creek. Thus, E. coli exceedances are found; however, these growers are not part of the program. Additionally, growers do not want to place fences in their properties (as a measure of containing the cows) because the action of grazing from the cows controls the growth rate of weeds (e.g. blackberries), which ultimately keeps the creeks clear and flowing.~~ Additionally, the Coalition has no jurisdiction with these growers (since they are not part of the program); thus, *E. coli* in this area will continue to be a problem since there is no program in place that regulates non irrigated grazing lands that are not irrigated. Staff described, that there is a substantial amount of research done on how to manage cows and pastures including other alternatives as supposed to fencing their properties to keep cows out of the creek.

(4) STATUS ON SJR C & D ANNUAL TMDL REPORT

Purpose: To provide an outline regarding the components that will be included in the San Joaquin River Chlorpyrifos and Diazinon Annual TMDL report (SJR C & D Annual TMDL Report). The purpose of providing this outline was to obtain input from staff on the SJR C & D Annual TMDL Report, which is due on 30 October 2010.

Outcome: The Coalition provided the outline to Staff during the meeting. Staff agreed to reviewed and provide comments, if necessary, to the Coalition.

(5) CONSTITUENTS REMOVAL

Purpose: To provide a status on the request letter to remove constituents such as: organochlorines (Group A and DDTs), TKN, Orthophosphate as P, glyphosate, paraquat, lead, molybdenum, cadmium, and arsenic.

Outcome: The Coalition will be submitting a request letter in the near future to modify their MRP Plan and the monitoring strategy for all of the above constituents.

(6) OTHER ITEMS

a. Draft summary of PGs and PMs for 3rd set of high priority site subwatersheds

Purpose: To discuss the submittal of a DRAFT summary of PGs and PMs for 3rd set of high priority site subwatershed, which includes:

- Ash Slough @ Ave 21
- Berenda Slough along Ave 18 ½
- Dry Creek @ Rd 18
- Livingston Drain @ Yosemite Rd

Outcome: Staff suggested to the Coalition to submit a DRAFT of the PGs and PMs for the 3rd set of high priority site subwatersheds by November 2nd (qtrly MPlan mtg). The Coalition will propose a time frame (or specific date) for when these PGs and PMs are going to be completed.

b. Site Modification for 3rd set of high priority site subwatersheds

Purpose: To explain the rationale for a future Coalition ~~future~~-request to modified-modify the site selection for the 3rd set of high priority site subwatersheds.

Outcome: The Coalition explained ed that they would like to request an exchange of Ash Slough @ Ave 21 for Lateral 2 ½ near Keyes Rd. Ash Slough @ Ave 21 has been dry during the last couple of years of sampling, which is the reason why no samples have been collected. Additionally, the fact that the creek is dry most of the time makes it difficult for the Coalition to be effective with their outreach efforts. ~~Growers are no interested in area that is dry most of the time.~~ Additionally, three chlorpyrifos exceedances have been found at Lateral 2 ½ near Keyes Rd. since July 2009, which merit priority over Ash Slough @ Ave 21.

The Coalition also suggested submitting the final PGs and PMs for the 3rd set of high priority site subwatersheds in the request for site modification for 3rd set of high priority areas. ~~-Melissa could you please double check on this????~~

c. Request to discontinue management plan for specific constituents

Purpose: To provide clarification on the process that the Coalition needs to follow if they want to end the management plan for a particular constituent.

Outcome: Staff had some questions for the Coalition with regards to the process for requesting to stop a management plan for a particular constituent. The Coalition explained to Staff that in the approved management plan there is a process for the follow up actions during years 1 through 4. The process does not include a submittal of a formal request (to stop the management plan process for a particular constituent) after all management plan process has been applied and completed.

Staff was going to provide ed guidance to the Coalition on this item, based on the Coalition's current approved management plan process and management input.

d. Clarification of 2011 monitoring strategy (sites and type of monitoring)

Purpose: To provide clarification on the type of monitoring and sites to avoid future confusion.

Outcome: In the original monitoring strategy the Coalition described the 2 types of monitoring and sites (core and assessment).

Type of Monitoring

Core Monitoring will occur at sites that have undergone intensive monitoring in the past to assess general water quality trends over time. Assessment Monitoring will occur at sites that have not been well characterized by previous monitoring. This monitoring strategy allows for comprehensive monitoring in the short term and general trend monitoring over successive years.

Type of Site

The Coalition area has been divided into six zones based on hydrology, crop types, land use, soil types, and rain fall. Each zone contains one Core Monitoring location and one Assessment Monitoring location that will rotate every two years.

Core Monitoring sites have been selected from water bodies that have a history of monitoring and are suitable to track water and sediment quality trends over extended periods of time. A list of criteria used to select these sites is provided below. Core sites will undergo Assessment Monitoring every three years in order to evaluate the effects of changes in land use and management practices and provide information about long term trends and effectiveness of the management practices. Management plan monitoring may also occur at Core sites.

More details on the monitoring strategy in terms of monitoring sites and type of monitoring can be found in the ESJWQC MRP Plan Monitoring Strategy section, pages 35 and 36 (approved on 15 September 2008).

e. Revised MRP Plan and QAPP

Purpose: To discuss the Coalition's proposal of submitting a revised MRP Plan and QAPP.

Outcome: Since the Coalition's MRP Plan and QAPP were approved on 15 September 2008, a number of modifications to the MRP Plan have been completed through executive officer approval. Additionally, laboratories ~~recalibrate their instrument-update their standard operating procedures (SOPs) and review their minimum detection limits and reporting limits~~ every six to twelve months. ~~At this time new calibration curves, practical quantitation limits, and other revisions to their laboratory manuals needs to be updated.~~ Therefore, the above modifications will be included in a revised MRP Plan and QAPP.

(7) NEXT DELIVERABLES

Purpose: To provide a status on Coalition's next deliverable

Outcome: The Coalition will be submitting the first "SJR C & D Annual TMDL Report" on 30 October 2010.

(8) NEXT STEPS

The following is a summary of the action items identified as part of the meeting outcome.

Regional Board

- a. Coordinate efforts with the enforcement unit for the 3rd high priority site subwatersheds (Item 1, page 2). **Completed on 09/27/2010**
- b. Review and provide comments to the Coalition, if necessary, on the SJR C & D Annual TMDL Report outline (Item 4, page 3). ~~In progress~~ → **Susan Completed on 10/4/10**

- c. Provided guidance to the Coalition on the management plan process regarding the submittal of a formal request to end the management plan process for a specific constituent (Item 6.c., page 4). ~~In progress~~ → ~~Susan~~ Completed on 9/28/10

ESJWQC

- a. Provide an approximate date of when the individual surveys are going to start (Item 1, page 2). Completed on 09/23/2010
 - b. Provide to Staff the contact information for the grower in the Highline Canal @ Hwy 99; thus, Staff can follow up with the enforcement unit (Item 3, page 3). Pending ~~Not Applicable: grower reinstated as of 9/15/10~~
 - ~~b-c.~~ Submit a request letter to modify MRP Plan (constituent removal. Item 5, page 3) ~~Pending~~ Submitted draft on 9/21/10; received RB staff comments on 10/12/10; final submission pending
 - d. Submit PGs and PMs for the 3rd set of high priority site subwatersheds by November 2nd (Item 6, page 4). Completed on 9/28/10 ~~Pending~~
 - e. Submit a Revised MRP Plan and QAPP. Pending
- (9) NEXT ESJWQC QUARTERLY MEETING ==> **Tuesday, 2 November 2010**
(10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Rancho Cordova Office, Feather River Room)

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering