

CV-SALTS Executive Committee Meeting

November 17, 2011 9:00 AM to 2:30 PM

Sacramento Regional Sanitation District Offices – Sunset Maple Room

Attendees are listed on the Membership Roster

AGENDA

1) Welcome and Introductions Chair

- The meeting was brought to order by Chair Parry Klassen, and roll call was completed.
- Jeanne Chilcott requested the 10/20 notes be clarified to indicate there are a total of 2 regional board personnel assigned to the CV-SALTS effort, and 2 personnel specific for beneficial uses in AGR-dominated waterbodies.
- Rob Neenan moved to approve, and Jeff Willett seconded, and by general acclamation the October 20, 2011 meeting action notes were approved.

2) Review Expected Outcomes for November 17, 2011 Session

- Tim Moore reviewed expected outcomes for the session: Refine the strategic direction the committee wants to pursue with respect to salinity and how it relates to MUN and AGR. Top priority for the next session is to put together the conceptual outline for the strategic framework.

3) CV-SALTS Executive Committee Policy Discussions and Decisions

- Daniel Cozad presented the version of the Policy Discussions and Decisions document approved on the November 15th Executive Committee Admin call. Items 2 and 3 were revised per the 11/15 discussions.
- Daniel also presented an initial draft of the "Short-term Nitrate Action Plan for Disadvantaged Communities." Committee members were asked to email Daniel with feedback on the document. Pam Buford offered to help edit the document. It was agreed that the document be kept internal and identified as "FOR COMMITTEE USE ONLY – NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION."

4) Discussion of Nitrate Objectives

- Tim Moore recommended that, due to the ongoing development of the state's nutrient policy and the focus of that effort on AQUATIC LIFE impacts, it is premature to work on developing new nitrogen objectives through the CV-SALTS process at this time.
- Debbie Webster stressed the critical importance of asking *where* should a given point of compliance be, and *what* should be the *appropriate duration* or *measurement* of that number. Tim indicated those issues would be given a high priority for policy discussion by the Executive Committee in 2012.
- Dennis Westcot brought up the point that in some instances AGR is the most sensitive use, and not MUN. (Olives and grapes were noted as examples.) After a lengthy discussion Tim indicated this was a really important task and the Technical Project Manager should be asked to prepare a more detailed scope-of-work. Additionally Tim assured the group that selecting a few ag canals to serve as "archetypes" was not intended to preclude similar reviews from being performed on similar ag channels elsewhere. On the contrary, the use of archetypes is intended to expedite review and approval of standards revisions by establishing a cost-effective template for making such a demonstration.

5) Discussion of Salinity Objectives for MUN

- After discussion committee members introduced the option of developing a basin planning approach built on an advisory process vs. establishment of specified numerical objectives. Instead of replacing the narrative paradigm with specific numeric criteria, the Committee considered the option to continue using narrative objectives approach while increasing the number and specificity of factors used to translate and implement the objectives in the permitting process.

6) Discussion of Salinity Objectives for AGR

- Pamela Creedon emphasized the fact that input from the AGR community is an essential component in establishing the appropriate numerical objectives before the adoption of any process approach.
- Tess Dunham cautioned that if this process approach is adopted with a default and the ability to tailor to specific circumstances, it has to be considered to be part of the objective as adopted. This would ensure not having to go through a basin plan amendment every time an adaptation is needed to fit a specific situation.
- The concept of identifying zones with separate numbers for those zones was introduced. Committee members agreed that at least a couple of archetypes would be needed as proof of validity for the process. Debbie Webster reminded the committee that as part of the implementation process the plan would have to show how this is going to impact different groups.

CV-SALTS meetings are held in compliance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act set forth in Government Code sections 11120-11132 (§ 11121(d)). The public is entitled to have access to the records of the body which are posted at <http://www.cvsalinity.org>