

CV-SALTS Executive Committee
Wednesday, April 21, 2010 1:30pm to 3:30pm

Attendees: See [Committee Roster](#) for attendance.

Executive Committee Chair Mona Schulman called the meeting to order at 1:40 followed by introductions of all present in-house and on teleconference.

1. Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review, Approve Consent Calendar

- a. Review/Approve [February 2010 Executive Committee Notes](#)

Page 2, middle of the page “Mona Lake” should be Mono Lake.

Motion to approve as drafted with changes noted; Karl – seconded; approved

- b. BUOS Phase 1 Contract Award Recommendation (Daniel)

In late 2009, the Technical Committee sent a scope of work to the Executive Committee for the Beneficial Use Objectives Study Phase 1, which was heavily GIS based. This would assemble information on beneficial uses and existing objectives from both the existing basin plans as well as inferring some information from indicator permits. The third task involved a literature of water quality criteria. An RFP was issued and 11 companies/agencies attended a pre-proposal call. Four (4) proposals were submitted and reviewed. Two were selected to come back for an interview.

The selection committee had Mona, Nigel, Lisa, Rudy, Dennis, Mike, and Perry. After the interview, Kennedy Jenks was unanimously decided to recommend as the consultant. Normally, the committee would have briefed the Executive Committee before making a decision, but the timeline meant that the recommendation needed to be made to the coalition board and to the Drainage Authority, because the Drainage Authority is the contracting entity. Clean up and Abatement funds from the State Board were provided to CV-SALTS and coalition to be used for the Beneficial Use and Objectives Study, \$1.2 million contracted to the Drainage Authority to take the funds and issue the contracts to support this work.

The Drainage Authority entered into negotiations with Kennedy Jenks and during the meeting this morning the Technical Committee received confirmation from their council that the negotiations are complete. Their first day of work was today. We have a contract with them for \$50,000 to do those three tasks and that work will be completed in July, and the final deliverables in August.

Mona mentioned that The Selection Committee has agreed to continue on and to monitor the progress of the contract and received volunteers from the technical committee.

- c. Technical Committee Co-Chair approval

List Holm volunteered to serve as Co-Chair of the Technical Committee and was heartily endorsed by the Committee members.

The Technical Committee took an action to approve nomination to take a co-chair. The Executive Committee would also need to take an action to approve the co-chair position because it is a position that takes a lot of work, but also becomes a member of the executive committee upon acceptance.

Motion to approve by Joe DiGiorgio; Seconded: Karl Longley - approved

- d. Circulate the Committee [Membership Roster](#) for sign-in

2. Issue #2 of the [Policy Issues List](#) and discuss [Overall Approach](#)

Mona presented to the committee an approach to moving forward with issues for the committee's consideration on how to deal with legal issues, land and water use issues, and land claims issues. Mona's proposed approach would re-order the issues previously laid out.

On page 13 on identifying targets for mitigations for salinity of regions of evaporation basins as technology changes. Someone commented that number 9 is what we're here for. Mona agreed that it was the ultimate goal.

Nigel commented that #4 (to calculate salinity capacity of the basins), the technology used to make those calculations did tend to look at the capacity within each basis. Nigel asked if that would be the salt capacity of the river or would that be attempting to look at negative assimilative capacity within further sub-basins. Mona replied that the Tulare Basin would be one issue versus San Joaquin. Nigel asked if this was going to be a basin-by-basin plan. Mona commented that that concept had been discussed at several meetings. Nigel commented that it would make more sense to look at the entire San Joaquin Basin as a whole. Mona clarified that basin in this context means the larger basins to start, and then the sub-basins.

Committee members agreed to review Mona's approach and discuss in next meeting.

Karl asked for clarification on #2 under general principles – irrigation should have priority over direct dischargers of salt. Mona defined a direct discharger as someone who actually puts salt in the water.

Daniel commented that it would be good to revisit the order of the policy items to be addressed to generate interest and motivation in working on them and including Regional and State Water Boards' actions.

- a. Policy Issue 2 of [Anti-Degradation Whitepaper](#) (Bobby and Daniel)

In February, the committee suggested some changes to the whitepaper.

The changes include a quick summary of the main points. A statement was added to clarify that the State Board would take a look at the implementation of the policy regarding ground water.

Question was raised about what the State Board is doing on ground water. The State Board really hasn't come out with a proposal yet on what they would recommend, but consideration has been given to groundwater under the interpretation of anti-degradation instead of surface water, the usual.

b. CV-SALTS issues raised by recent State Board remands – Ken Landeau

The water quality objectives to protect beneficial uses come in two forms: numerical objectives (predominantly in the Delta) and narrative objectives. The drinking water standards apply to all surface and ground waters, but are actually a variety of numbers.

There are several things that are looked at when considering what needs to be protected including: water quality standards (either numeric or an interpretation of the narrative), and surface water discharge under the NPDS program, and reasonable potential for discharge to violate water quality standards (dilutions, seasonality). This is more flexible than NPDS, but still ensures that water use is not violating water quality.

A smaller subgroup looks at salt limits for effluent discharges, predominantly in the Tulare Lake Basin Plan. There are numbers in the Basin Plan that refers to effluent limits, not water quality.

There are four main groups of State Board orders: The Delta, numeric standards, Woodland Davis orders that deal with narratives, and then groundwater. Part of Tracy's water comes from the Delta, part of the State Board's work involved investigation into where the standards actually applied. The State Board has imposed final effluent limits on the City of Tracy. The city has to maximize efforts to reduce salinity with a new water supply that will be phased in over the next few months.

Based on State Board's findings, the State board issued a decision on the City of Stockton similar to Tracy, and is being taken to court by the City of Stockton.

Davis Woodland and UC David situation is quite different. Numeric standards are outside the Delta, so water quality is more interpretation of a narrative. They all discharge directly or fairly close into the Yolo Bypass, which acts as the flood channel for the Sacramento metropolitan area. There is a low area with levies that is agricultural, there also a lot of wetland development, which isn't a salt issue. But this low area is known for having 10 feet of water on it for long periods at a time. The CVSC needed to look at how this affected the build up of salt. This started in Woodland, where the groundwater is predominantly marine which naturally has a lot of salt, boron, and selenium in it, and where there are obvious waste water issues.

State Board imposed a limit for the City of Woodland to protect agriculture and was increased to a higher limit to protect municipal water supply, as well. The Regional Board was told to look at what an appropriate number would be to protect agriculture. Part way through the process, the State Board started working with Hoffman. Ken's group decided to wait for the outcome from the State Board. The State Board will be starting back up with the committees in regards to the technical issues and impact assessments.

Groundwater – CVSC has been working with Lodi to see what impact they are having on the groundwater. Someone asked why knowing the background of groundwater was important. Ken replied that it affected the expectations on salinity contributors to comply with groundwater quality objectives. Bruce asked, what determines natural background? Ken replied that for groundwater there isn't a specific date that can be used as a natural background to compare everything to. Pamela clarified that having a date and having a natural background were two totally different things.

The current Basin Plan addresses all waters – first encountered everything. That's what must be implemented right now.

Ken continued explaining that, in the case of Lodi, they continued to look at what the quality of the water is in their background, whether or not their current regulations have had an impact or not. To date there were no conclusions drawn about either the background or the current regulations.

One of the things that came out of the Lodi decision was that the State Board recommended that the group pick not just the highest salinity numbers to work on and calculate with, but also the smaller numbers to protect municipal water as well.

The challenge is to ensure that the policies in place protect actual beneficial uses.

It was suggested that Ken and Pamela make similar presentations to the board in the future so that the executive committee can ask questions rather than just receiving a memo. Ken responded that there really aren't that many announcements that directly affect salinity.

3. [Progress Criteria Milestones](#) for 2010 from Regional Board (Daniel)

Daniel presented to the committee a list of items that the regional board will use in 2010 to determine whether CV-SALTS has made adequate progress on the committee's process for developing CV-SALTS. Daniel suggested that each grouping of items on the list be assigned to a sub-committee. Daniel invited committee members to comment and feedback on the content of the items.

After the respective committees have had a chance to review and discuss their items, the committees need to provide a report to Daniel for the benefit of the executive committee and a conference call scheduled to address any questions or concerns – which is a slight deviation from normal protocol.

4. Funding and Fundraising for CV-SALTS workplan (Daniel)

Daniel updated the committee on the informational briefing that the State Board is having on May 18. It would be useful to have CV-SALTS participants at that meeting to talk about what we've done and prepare them for the request of \$2 million from the Clean Up and Abatement Fund.

Another issue that has been resolved is how the coalition is going to raise money from its members and recruit new members. One misunderstanding is that process will be able to provide all the funding required for the CV-SALTS program. Daniel presented the committee with a document that outlined potential sources for funding. Daniel asked for help from people to identify fund sources and real targets to go after funding opportunities.

Nigel suggested that CV-SALTS and other agencies might want to team up on research proposals to work together instead of everyone going after the same money. One committee member suggested that it would be better to have a completely separate person working on just getting money for CV-SALTS, where there are no conflicts of interest.

Suggestion to get a group together and go after the AWEP and to contact the NRCS people in Sacramento. This may be fruitful. Need to work with them to understand the opportunities.

Karl suggested that a subcommittee flesh out this issue and report back to the Executive Committee with ideas and concrete suggestions. Daniel emphasized that the committee was looking for what other salt provided management efforts would benefit - can they be worked into the implementation plan and get people who want to involved. There is not a lot of money for the planning and research efforts. These efforts, contacts, and ideas need to be in a strategy and framework so the committee knows ahead of time when opportunities to apply for.

Requested volunteers for a subcommittee – Rudy Schnagl, Karl Longley

5. [Projects List & Grant Funding](#)/Appoint subcommittee A funding and financing group was appointed to assist with the development of funding.

6. Coordination of Programs with Committees for approval/policy

- a. From the Technical Committee [BMP Review Template](#)
- b. Recycled Water Policy Salt & Nutrient Management Plan compliance
- c. Salt and Nitrate Pilot Study Lessons Learned / Next Steps

Issues from Items 6 and 7 were discussed and overlapped the discussion due to committee interaction in these issues. Comments and discussion are captured in the item below.

7. Receive Reports and Recommended Actions from Economic and Social Cost, Technical, and Public Education and Outreach Committees (Chairs)

- a) Report from Nigel Quinn Technical Committee:

The formation of new funding committee. There are some resources that could be potentially available. Wine Institute Study included some regional board staff. Rudy will make available some of the 2008 documents that were compiled. The goal of the committee is to build off previous work as much as possible.

Then there's the Technical Committee workplan sub-group that needs to flesh out the work plan and need more detail and development activities. Also decide on areas where a consultant might be helpful – this can only be done when those work items are better fleshed out.

b) There was also a work group connects with the Salt and Nitrate Pilot Study. That work group is the evaluation committee that was formed to review and select the group that we wanted to work on that study.

The other subgroup was the Beneficial Use and Objectives Subgroup which is connected with the \$50,000 GIS study.

Information sharing regarding to the upstream TMDL study. We were planning to consolidate comments. The regional board wants comments not only on the study itself, but any other comments associated with that study.

c) Joe DiGiorgio reported that there are upcoming workshops in Woodland on Apr 26 and one in Tulare on Apr 27. About 50 are signed up for the Woodland workshop and 67 for the Tulare Workshop.

d) Other issues: Daniel reported to the committee about the presentation of the Upstream Objectives by Jay Simi and Amanda Montgomery that occurred at the last Technical Committee meeting. The Executive Committee will be asked next month whether or not to take on these Upstream Objectives through a more permanent committee that would continue to monitor things in the San Joaquin. Need to have a decision made in May to inform the Regional Board by July.

Daniel will report back to the Executive Committee on the proposed process at the next meeting. Daniel invited feedback and concerns.

8. Next Meeting May 13, 2010 – Final [2010 Calendar](#)

9. Adjourned