

**Joint Economic and Social Impact and  
Technical Advisory Committees  
Wednesday, April 21, 2010 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM**

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

**Technical Committee Chair Nigel Quinn called the meeting shortly after 9:00 am followed by introductions of all present in-house and on teleconference.**

- 1. Welcome, Introductions, Circulate roster**
- 2. Review/Approve [March 11 Technical Committee Meeting Notes](#)**

**Motion to approve Karl Longley; Seconded Joe DiGiorgio; approved**

- 3. Technical Committee Co-Chair offer from Lisa Holm**

**Lisa Holm offered to be co-chair of the committee. Endorsed by Nigel Quinn. Nigel Quinn nominated Lisa Holm for co-chair. Seconded Dennis Westcot. Motion passed.**

- 4. Best Management Practice Review [Template](#) Discussion**

Since the last meeting, an underlined section was added that resulted from discussion with the board about the expectations of the document. It began as one of the early implementation items. Best management practices are efforts that would be done by industry to help control salts and nitrate and that would be fed into the process of determining the implementation of the Basin Plan. We decided to proceed with some things instead of waiting until other studies are done based on the Wine Institute Study.

Daniel Cozad asked for discussion regarding how CV-SALTS would evaluate the technology and best management practices. Pamela Creedon commented the best management practices may not be the best management practice under every circumstance or environment. Once the methodology tool is set up to regulate for salt, dischargers won't be confused with the inconsistency between CV-SALTS and other agencies. The Wine Institute is going to implement some things and it will give CV-SALTS a chance to see how those things work. There has to be a process by which the CV-SALTS group to evaluate a best management practice before implementing or endorsing it.

Discussion ensued about how such measures will be viewed in a regulatory sense. A suggestion was made to minimize the potential resistance to something that appears regulatory but isn't by moving "BMP review by CV-SALTS as voluntary and not CV-SALTS or Regional Board regulatory requirement" into the background paragraph.

A suggestion was made that the evaluation should be scalable based on what is done within some defined boundaries/variables/conditions. The methods should be the same to maintain consistency in the accounting of salts and nitrates in all industries.

A suggestion was made that there be a variety of tools that will address different regional situations that will still allow salinity control options that meet the Basin Plan requirements.

**Daniel Cozad summarized the discussion by concluding that a decision needs to be made on what the minimum requirements need to be, and how can we be sure that the minimum standards are adequate for CV-SALTS. A BMP Work group was formed to meet and discuss the issue for the May or June Agenda.**

5. [Lessons Learned Salt/Nitrate Source Pilot Implementation Study](#) (15:00)
  - a. Discussion and Subcommittee assignments

The purpose of the pilot was to develop and test a methodology or model approach. Daniel Cozad suggested that the next step was to put together a smaller committee to evaluate what went well, what should be repeated in other regions, what would be suggested for other regions if they want to do it themselves. Also, how the salt balance snapshot can be described in general terms and then how to integrate all that together.

One of the suggestions from the last meeting was a lessons learned report and a TAC vision for its future development/application. Daniel Cozad has started a document with help from others and has taken some lessons learned from the comments that were provided and some of his own conclusions. The decisions on each item need to be documented for future reference. For example, in retrospect, perhaps three areas were a little too much to accomplish. One or two areas would have been a better approach and may be a caution in future efforts.

Another issue is local coordination and how to ask for data from people. Would it be better to have a regional request from the Regional Board, State Board and CV-SALTS? One suggestion was that data requests from the coalition would empower the coalition/CVSALTS.

Daniel Cozad asked for TAC volunteers to read through the report in its entirety and provide some feedback, such as identifying what a salt/nitrate mass balance could look like, how to define it, what should be in it. This subcommittee would provide technical feedback to the technical advisory committee.

Lisa Holm commented that this is a very good opportunity because CV-SALTS can take some of the thought process of the smaller group and implement it right away. There is a question about format and what the critical information CV-SALTS needs for the broader Basin Plan amendment. What is it CV-SALTS trying to get out of it. Lisa Holm stated the concern about CV-SALTS doing detailed information versus the local agencies that would have more ownership of it. There are also some overarching technical processes that come out of this work. The committee needs to find out now the most effective ways of gathering information.

Daniel Cozad commented that it was up to CV-SALTS to finish the evaluation of the pilot work.

**Subcommittee to be Daniel Cozad, Lisa Holm, Nigel Quinn, Rudy (volunteered by others), Michael Huot?, Mona Schulman (second list)**

Pamela Creedon commented that the CV-SALTS initiative is the development of a new regulatory program for the Water Board which will result in two major Basin Plan amendments for the Tulare Lake basin and for the San Joaquin/Sacramento Watershed Basin. In that will be a new salinity and nitrate management plan and through that, CV-SALTS will do an evaluation and establish, revise or confirm beneficial uses of our water bodies for surface and ground water, set the objectives, set the thresholds which the salt needs to meet to achieve those uses depending on the water bodies and their use. And then in the case of the water code, we will also have to develop an implementation plan that will lay out a plan of what the board intends to do to comply with the chief beneficial uses CV-SALTS has identified. It includes both surface and ground water. It's for the entire Central Valley region including the Delta and it will result in an impact to those who use the water either for irrigation, municipal drinking water, or those who use the water to dispose into. How do you deal with salts in terms of controlling the concentrations as they're discharged or how do you get rid of them once they're in place. This program is going to have to talk about areas that where we've determined there's an impact already and how are we going to bring those water bodies back into the acceptable threshold so it can be used. These are all the issues that need to be discussed through this.

The pilot study is one very small component to see if we can do those beneficial use designations. It was a model to see if we could make those determinations based on source identification. What are the sources of salt in the Valley and that will help us find better control implementing and who needs to be involved in that.

## **6. Review and Discuss Technical Committee Work Plan and RWQCB**

Daniel Cozad asked for feedback in creating an effective 1-page document, should the current document not be ideal. Some of the items on the work plan have been reordered based on suggestions and recommendations from the committee.

Nigel Quinn suggested that intermediate sub-tasks be added. That the work plan needs to identify tasks, develop a method for completing that task and then show that the work has been completed.

Daniel Cozad asked for comments regarding data management approach and how we're going to approach the management of data, what it looks like and where it goes. Daniel Cozad agreed to add a description paragraph under each of the items telling what each item means and what is it going to do.

Daniel Cozad asked if the committee members agreed that the items are things they can do, or whether some of the items should be contracted out.

David Cory suggested that it is imperative that the committee decide to continue with the work toward completion of some of the items even as the work plan approval process continues. The Committee needs to resolve to work on a couple of items now, instead of waiting for the whole work plan to be approved.

Lisa Holm agreed that a small group should go through it and identify the tasks and come back with proposals to the main committee.

**Daniel Cozad agreed to add a little more detail and schedule a conference call for a small group of people who want to be involved and suggested that the process should start with a needs analysis. A couple of conference calls will be arranged in May with a report as to the committee's recommendations ready for the May meeting. Travis volunteered for the subcommittee.**

Nigel Quinn suggested that each subgroup needs to have a mission statement and clear guidelines as to what's expected of them, and define terms of engagement.

a. Data and database planning contact recommendations

There was a question about the status of California environmental data that was mentioned in an email from Adam Ballard. Nigel Quinn replied that he was going to try to get Stephen or Karl Jacobs in to update the committee on where they are. Daniel Cozad has been in touch with them via email to discuss who would be good resources about what's in the database, and how it can be used. Daniel Cozad asked which of the people on the list would the committee like to hear from first and when would the committee like to hear from them?

Bruce asked about overall budget from 2010 to 2013 as it applies to the three phases. Daniel Cozad reminded the committee that the work plan outline had a very broad scale of what the items would cost between \$22 and \$42 million. In the workplan, Daniel Cozad took the items in the first year and broke it up into stages. There has been no additional work done to establish what those tasks are, should be done, and what has been accomplished. It does fit reasonably with the funding development and the State Board and Coalition funding. It makes CV-SALTS very reliant on State Board Clean Up and Abatement Funds, but they shouldn't be relied upon to build a program.

**David Cory suggested that the technical committee find a way to approve this work plan without delaying the decision of the executive committee. He suggested that it be slated for TAC and Executive Committee approval at their May meetings, and that the work group revise the document and send it out for final review before the TAC meeting. Daniel Cozad agreed. Nigel Quinn agreed.**

7. [Scoping BUOS Phase 2](#) and [Coordinated Data Collection Buff sheet](#)

Daniel Cozad suggested this discussion be left until the end of the meeting so facilitate progress on the other items on the agenda.

## 8. Coordination Programs – San Joaquin River Upstream Salt & Boron BPA/TMDL (2:04:12)

### a. RWQCB Transition, Discussion from Regional Board (Daniel/Rudy)

The deadline for comments to the Regional Board on this draft report is May 19. . The Regional Board's Upstream Standards Program is being reorganized and will go from a TMDL to a Basin Plan Amendment process. The Regional Board is proposing that this study and development work become a CV-SALTS activity. That CV-SALTS take over the work necessary and recommend the objectives for the upstream portion of the San Joaquin River. The Regional Board will present their proposal to the Executive Committee for their feedback and decision as to whether or not it is reasonable/acceptable. As part of their request, the Regional Board will make a funding commitment toward completing the technical workplan. Daniel Cozad suggested that for the study and technical committee review offers the opportunity as the SJR is a microcosm of the Central Valley and could be an example of how the rest of the process may go. He also suggested the forming of a San Joaquin salinity objectives committee, the committee should consider timing and if the SJR work is its own independent, parallel track, with a faster timeline than 2014.

Karna Harrigfeld asked what will happen to the report that was presented at the last meeting. Daniel Cozad replied that comments about the actual document need to be provided on that report to the Regional Board by May 19. Those suggestions will be incorporated into the second draft of the report by July. Comments that go into the technical methodology of the study will be incorporated into future work.

Rudy commented that the work on crop salt sensitivity (Hoffman Report adjusted for the upstream SJR) will be finished this spring. There is a huge body of work that has been done over the last few years at the Regional Board and there has been a lot of work on the TMDL for the salinity objective in Vernalis and there has been additional work since then. The Regional Board will just build on that and settle on the objective and development of the implementation plan through group efforts with CV-SALTS to develop the best possible plan for the San Joaquin.

Karna Harrigfeld asked about the timeline for presenting a staff report and Basin Plan Amendment to the Regional Board for adoption of upstream objectives. Rudy replied that it's going to depend on the discussion with the CV-SALTS Executive Committee. They have to accept this project and take on this task and set up a group to set up the timetables. **Karna Harrigfeld expressed her desire to be included in that work group.**

### b. Committee Consolidated Questions and Comments

A suggestion was made that comment letters include comments on technical issues in the report as well as broader policy issues that should be discussed as part of CV-SALTS. Nigel Quinn agreed. The Regional Board stretched their deadline to allow for comments from CV-SALTS. Daniel Cozad asked the committee members to consider whether this was an appropriate action for CV-SALTS to have uniform comments and/or should they combine all the comments that are being

presented by others and present that? Daniel Cozad agreed with Lisa Holm's comment about things that needed cleaning up in the report and address larger policy issues. Dennis Westcot indicated they would be providing comments Nigel Quinn confirmed that the Wetland Entities would also provide comments.

Daniel Cozad asked to confirm that these separate bodies were going to present comments directly to the Regional Board and not through CV-SALTS.

Jay stated that they would be happy to receive all comments. At the end of the comment period all the comments will be posted on the website. Nigel Quinn asked of those comments could be included in the next package for the next Technical Committee meeting? Daniel Cozad replied that those comments would not be available before the next committee and suggested that if they would send comments to Daniel Cozad he could consolidate them.

**Action: Comments that are submitted to the Regional Board can be CC'd to Daniel Cozad so they can be included for the next Technical Committee meeting discussion. Daniel Cozad will review with those who said they would be submitted comments if prepared in time for the meeting.**

#### 9. Outreach Workshops April 26 in Woodland and April 27 in Tulare 9:00 A.M. – Noon

- a. Assistance Request and [Workshop Questions](#)

Joe thanked the committee for all the volunteers and asked for a few more volunteers for the Tulare workshop. To date, pre-registration is 50 for Woodland and 60 for Tulare. In Woodland, 30+ of those are people who know about CV-SALTS and about 20 people don't know much about it. In Tulare, there are large farm interests, water irrigation, and a very broad group of people.

Volunteers will need to show up around 8:30. The facilitators will have a presentation that will last about an hour and then will break up into smaller groups that will be recorded and those comments will be compiled.

Bruce said he would circulate a reminder to his contacts.

#### 10. BUOS Phase 1 Award Update and Schedule

A selection committee was set up to review proposals for the Beneficial Use and Objectives Study Phase 1 project. They recommended a contractor to the Coalition Board and to the Drainage Authority, because the Drainage Authority is the contracting outlet for the money that came through the Clean Up and Abatement fund. The goal was to have the contract negotiated for today. Thanks to Joe and those at the Drainage Authority for their hard work.

The committee reviewed the four proposals that were received. The committee selection process narrowed the applications down to two and invited those two in for interviews and out of that the committee made a unanimous decision to recommend Kennedy Jenks.

Colleen Haraden presented a review of the Kennedy Jenks' proposal. The first task is to identify existing and potential beneficial uses in the Central Valley and develop a base map from readily available state and in-house data. The next step is to look at the basin plans and maps of the water bodies and develop a beneficial use attribute table associated with those water bodies. Kennedy Jenks will categorize those water bodies based on existing or potential beneficial uses and integrate them with the GIS layers.

As part of the project, KJ will be compiling a geodatabase. The end product would be a customized GIS web viewer and the geodatabase. The next step is for the group to define some of CV-SALTS needs and processes.

Task 2 is identifying water quality objectives that are present for surface water and ground water. KJ will be basically looking at the Basin Plan to identify existing water quality objectives. KJ will also be working with the board and CV-SALTS to pick 25 NPDES (WDRs) that apply water quality objectives to point sources. They will also look at special studies that have been done in the Delta and San Joaquin area to see what kind of additional permit-specific water quality objectives may have been established. This information will be compiled into a table to show total dissolved solids, electrical conductivity. They will also take selected ions, such as sodium, and chloride, which have direct impacts to agriculture and those levels will be included in the study. They will also be discussing boron at the kick-off meeting and other ions to be included in the table. The table will also identify where the data gaps are in terms of area. Nitrate is also included.

Task 3 is a literature search of water quality criteria at state, national, and international levels. They've picked locations that were representative or that had numbers or scientific basis for the type of work that was done. In California, they're going to look at the Hoffman Report. They will also look at the State recycled water policy. Even though there are no numerical values, the recycled water policy is going to have a lot of salt and nutrient management plans produced by the cities and municipalities. KJ will create a GIS layer and attach those to the plans as they're produced by the various agencies, as an extra layer of data for CV-SALTS.

At the national level, the EPA produced a series of papers on salinity and nitrate levels protective of beneficial uses. Colorado has been selected as the national example since they are similar to the Delta and have some scientific papers available for salinity and nitrate.

At the international level, KJ selected Australia and some countries in the Middle East for example salinity and nitrate criteria setting. If numerical values are available, KJ will publish those in the report. If not, KJ will provide a brief narrative of what was done. Those areas were chosen because they already have a scientific base for what they're doing. KJ will also look at the United Nations Food and Agricultural organization reports for agricultural numbers.

Australia has done a lot of beneficial use mapping and similar guidelines.

There will be a peer review process through internal senior executives. There will also be status review meetings. The first one is May 28<sup>th</sup>. Daniel Cozad commented that the selection committee recommended that they stay on as a project review committee. Daniel Cozad offered the opportunity

to serve on this committee to anyone else who was interested. That committee would monitor the project from day one to the final report and provide technical and other assessment as the process continues. In the end the report will be submitted to the Technical Committee for comments.

Question: Is it the group's objective and the Regional Board's objective to evaluate beneficial use and ground water, redesignate specific locations and if it is, will that require WDR to accomplish this?

Answer Pamela Creedon: Yes.

**Daniel Cozad asked if there were any others who wanted to be involved in this review committee: The BUOS Project committee will be:**

1. Michael Huot
2. Nigel Quinn
3. Mona Shulman
4. Parry Klassen
5. Lisa Holm
6. Dennis Westcot
7. Travis Peterson
8. David Cory
9. Michael Nordstrom
10. Eric Berntsen
11. Papantzin Cid
12. Rudy Schnagl
13. Daniel Cozad
14. Joseph McGahan
15. Colleen Haraden

**11. Actions/Recommendations/Report to the Executive Committee**

- a. The Committee will not be preparing a coordinated comment letter on the upstream objectives, each group will submit their own
- b. Update on upcoming workshops
- c. Best Management Practices work group
- d. Pilot Sources Project review work group
- e. 2010 Technical Work plan work group
- f. BUOS Phase 1 oversight/advisory work group

**12. State Water Plan [Salinity Section approved/released](#)**

Daniel Cozad recommended that committee members read the salinity section in the State Water Plan because there hasn't been a salinity section before.

**13. Salt Management Alternatives Development select May dates**

The idea was to take some of the implementation plan management alternatives and concepts to identify which are worthy of additional discussion and evaluation and conduct a brainstorming session. A suggestion that the best management practices subgroup is a better place for this effort Daniel Cozad suggested that the salt management alternatives development be moved to June. Nigel Quinn requested that the Regional Board study on management alternatives completed in the 80s be provided in electronic format for review because it could be a useful starting point.

**14. Next meeting date, May 13, [2010 Calendar](#) with locations**

**15. Adjourned at 12:00**