SJR DO TMDL Technical Working Group Meeting
September 23, 2004
Meeting Notes

Attendance List:

Sal Batmanghilich	Department of Water Resources
Bill Beckon	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Russ Brown	Jones & Stokes
Mark Brunell	University of Pacific
Cealy Chang	US Geological Survey
David Cory	Exchange Contractors
Laura DiPalermo	University of California, Davis
Sergio Escobar	Department of Water Resources
Bill Fleenor	University of California, Davis
Mike Garello	HDR, Inc.
Steve Gittings	City of Stockton
Russ Grimes	Jones & Stokes
Les Grober	Regional Water Quality Control Board
John Headlee	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Jim Hench	Stanford University
Gene Lee	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Jamie Lee	Regional Water Quality Control Board
Gary Litton	University of Pacific
Barbara Marcotte	California Bay-Delta Authority
Paul Marshall	Department of Water Resources
Lee Mao	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
JB Neethling	HDR, Inc.
Bob Pedlar	Department of Water Resources
Lowell Ploss	San Joaquin River G Agency
Hari Rajbhandari	Department of Water Resources
Mark Roberson	California Bay-Delta Authority
Megan Robinson	Jones & Stokes
Tara Smith	Department of Water Resources
Craig Stevens	Jones & Stokes
Will Stringfellow	Lawrence Berkeley National Lab
Jeff Stuart	NOAA Fisheries
J.D. Wikert	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services
Jim Wilde	Department of Water Resources

Introductions and Agenda Review

D. Wilson opened the meeting at 9:10 a.m. with the welcome and self-introductions. D. Wilson stated that the purpose of the meeting was first to review and discuss a series of presentations on the Aeration of the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel, followed by a discussion on the status of and comments related to the draft Aeration Feasibility Study.

Aeration of the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel

Several presentations were made on efforts related to aeration of the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel. Those in attendance were asked to consider the following three questions while viewing the presentations, for purposes of discussion:

1. How much oxygen should be delivered during the demonstration project?
2. How many devices do we test?
3. Where should the device(s) be located?

The following presentations were made:

- Explanation of Port's Planned Aeration – Tom Trexler
- Draft Aeration Feasibility Study – Russ Grimes/Mike Garello
- Assessment of U.S. Corps Aerators in the San Joaquin River for the Port of Stockton – Russ Brown
- Port of Stockton Aeration Dye Study – Gary Litton

Copies of these presentations will be made available on the DOTMDL website as part of the results of the September 23 TWG meeting.

Aeration Feasibility Study

Copies of the draft Aeration Feasibility Study were made available at the meeting on CD Rom. D. Wilson indicated that to date, not many comments on the draft Study had been received and that Friday, September 24 was the final day to provide comments. D. Wilson further stated that if anyone still wished to submit comments on the Study after today's DOTMDL TWG meeting, to please send comments via e-mail to Russ Grimes at rgrimes@jsanet.com. Comments received at today's TWG meeting were recorded and are provided Attachment A to these minutes. Once all the comments have been received and reviewed, recommendations on next steps will be circulated to the TWG either by e-mail or at the next TWG meeting.

Data Collection and Monitoring

P. Marshall gave an update on the DWR stations. The following discussions were postponed:

- Discussion re: *Sources of Oxygen Demand in the Lower San Joaquin River, California*
- Update on *Linking the San Joaquin River to the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel*
- Update on *Hydrodynamics and Oxygen Modeling of the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel*

Identify Next Steps

The next DOTMDL TWG meeting was schedule for Thursday, November 18, 2004 beginning at 9:00 a.m.

# # #

DOTMDL Comments and Questions

Below is a list of questions and comments received during the Technical Working Group meeting of September 23, 2004. Many of the comments were addressed at the meeting, and will be included as part of the revisions to the feasibility study. The final feasibility study is due to be released mid-October.

- DWR is committed to generating 10,000 lbs per day.
- What can be achieved through aeration?
- Develop monitoring program to study secondary impacts.
- Examine the economics of development of aeration device that can accommodate 2,500 versus 5,000 versus 10,000 lbs of flow.
- A recommendation was made to build a test site that can handle at least 7,500 lbs or perhaps two that can handle 5,000 lbs each.
- Concern regarding impact on species if more than 2,500 lbs are generated.
- Concern if more than 2,500 lbs are generated and the possible increase in turbidities. Will photosynthesis be restricted to the top surface? Is there a possibility that you will pull in an increased amount of sediment when aerators are used? Will filters be used?
- Suggested approach is to construct a modular system that can be phased in over time as availability of funding allows.
- Strong desire to see monitoring devices installed up front.
- Request to know what basic construction costs are for both the 5,000 and 10,000 lb device. If cost is minimal to construct what is necessary for additional 5,000 lbs, then why not proceed in this direction?
- How efficient is the device? What are the impacts?
- Is it useful to see the oxygen levels?
- What are the gross effects on entire channel, not the plume itself?
- Supportive of a pilot project, not a demonstration project.
- What would the long-term operational and maintenance costs be?
- Build a substantial size – 7,500 lbs or two 5,000 lbs with one operation.

- If it does not work, we don't want to spend public money.
- Don't loose focus – this is a demonstration project. Don't set ourselves up to expect that we are creating a 100% solution.
- Will the feasibility study be redrafted?