

ANTELOPE VALLEY SALT/NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT PLAN STAKEHOLDER MEETING MINUTES

July 17, 2013

Location: City of Lancaster – EOC Room

11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Attendees: Tom Barnes (AVEK), Tim Chen (LACWD), Wanda Deal (Edwards AFB), Brian Dietrick (RMC Water), Jamie DuBois (Rosamond CSD), Aracely Jaramillo (LACWD), Bob Large (Lake Town Council), Yvonne Malikowski (Lake LA Park Association), Gordon Phair (City of Palmdale), Brenda Ponton (RMC Water), Jose Saez (LACSD Consultant), Christopher Vidal (Palmdale Water District), Jamshed Yazdani (City of Lancaster), Jan Zimmerman (Lahontan RWQCB)

RWQCB/DWR Updates

No updates from the Regional Board.

Project List

No new projects were brought up for consideration to be incorporated into the SNMP. The current project list resulted from review of the projects currently listed on the [AV IRWMP website](#). As mentioned at the previous meeting, we will review and reconsider new projects from the AV IRWMP project list as soon as that list is updated.

Draft SNMP

The previous draft SNMP distributed to stakeholders for review was 60% complete. A completed Draft SNMP was distributed to stakeholders at the meeting and is available on-line at this [link](#).

The draft SNMP is still organized into sections following the Scope of Work approved by the Lahontan Regional Board, but with some changes for better flow in the report.

Comments on the draft SNMP are due by August 21. This due date will give staff time to address comments and incorporate changes into the report or prepare for further discussion. A Microsoft Word version of report will be sent out to allow for commenting and “track changes” using the Word file.

The draft SNMP was presented and discussed:

Section 1: Introduction, provides some general information.

Section 2: Basin characteristics. Much of the information is redundant. The IRWMP already provides much of the information in this section. Not all information in this section are required elements per the Scope of Work. Reviewers can comment to help determine which sections and information are appropriate to include in both plans.

Section 3: Salt & Nutrient Characterization. Some of the fluoride results from GAMA were questionably high. Jan Zimmerman (Lahontan Regional Board) made an inquiry regarding the questionable data and received a response for Los Angeles County data. The questionable data was off by a factor of 1000 (input in parts per billion instead of parts per million). She is still awaiting a response for the data set from San Bernardino and Kern Counties. The remaining data will be reviewed and additional questionable numbers/results will be flagged for further review. There were comments that the color coding icons on the constituent maps were too small and that the number of constituent maps should be limited as some of the maps are similar/redundant. These mapping concerns will be addressed after further review of the map and map comments. The table and map of the current and future projects (Table 3-4, Figure 3-17) do not match and will be fixed before the next meeting. A request was made for everyone to carefully review the water volume projections of their own projects for accuracy. If possible, everyone should review and comment on all information.

Section 4: Salt balance. A simplified mass balance flow chart (page 62) for salt and nutrient sources was used in the draft SNMP. The flow chart shows a conservative approach, assuming 100% of the salts/nutrients reach the groundwater table and assuming immediate mixing. Concerns were raised that the mass balance did not include additional sources that may contribute to future salt and nutrient concentrations such as private well use and septic systems. Attachment I was also distributed to stakeholders. This shows topics that have been discussed at previous stakeholder meeting and will be added to the mass balance if/when sufficient information is available to do so. Waterworks will work with the Sanitation District to address these concerns. Sources not incorporated in the mass balance chart will be addressed in the text.

The Regional Board envisions the SNMP as a “living plan” where current data is used for updates and to verify that the plan continues to serve its purpose. The report currently does not propose specific mitigation. A suggestion was made to analyze the salt and nutrient concentrations after a specific timeframe (i.e. 5 years) and compare to baseline conditions and “trigger points.” Feedback on the timeframe and “trigger points” was requested with the draft SNMP comments. The revised SNMP will address “trigger points” for reanalyzing water quality conditions and evaluating mitigation measures.

Adoption of the SNMP

Should the SNMP be a standalone report or part of the IRWMP, as an appendix? Relevant portions of SNMP may be adopted into the Lahontan Basin Plan as necessary. Water quality objectives (MCLs, beneficial uses, etc.) must be met.

A short write-up in the IRWMP will refer to the SNMP in the appendix. However, the SNMP will not be completed until after the IRWMP update completion deadline of December 31, 2013 due to the CEQA requirement. A draft SNMP will be included in the IRWMP appendix.

The SNMP will be presented to the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board for final approval/adoption by their May 14, 2014 deadline. Although, there is a 2 year extension with progress made, we want to finalize the SNMP as soon as possible to allow projects to move forward.

Upcoming Activities

The next SNMP stakeholder meeting is tentatively scheduled for September 18, 2013 at the City of Palmdale. Comments on the draft SNMP are due by August 21, 2013 to Tim Chen, tchen@dpw.lacounty.gov. A matrix of comments and responses will be prepared for tracking.

Attachment I

