

**DRAFT AGENDA  
 Public Education and Outreach Committee**

**Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District  
 Valley Oak Room, 10060 Goethe Rd, Sacramento 95827 [MAP](#)**

Teleconference available (218) 339-4600 Participant Code: 927571#

**Thursday, May 13, 2010 3:30 pm to 4:50 pm**

1. Welcome and Introductions 5 min
2. Review Agenda and Approve [April 21 Committee Meeting Notes](#) 5 min
3. [Outreach Meeting Response](#) feedback 40 min
  - a. Provide overall observations of the meetings
  - b. Discuss compiled feedback
  - c. Discuss next steps and follow-up efforts
4. Review [Committee Work Plan for 2010](#) 15 min
  - a. Develop project details and priorities for implementation of priority projects
  - b. Outreach Efforts discussion – Legislative Lunch? No EPA funding Identify priority for that could fit into the BUOS study or project partners
5. [State Water Plan Salinity Section](#) Outreach efforts discussion 10 min
6. Next meeting June 10, [2010 Calendar](#) and identify items Exec. Comm. 5 min  
 Review workshop lessons and feedback.
7. Adjourn 4:50 PM

**Mission of the CV Salinity Leadership Group:**

*The mission of the Central Valley Salinity Leadership Group is to work closely, in a collaborative manner to create a comprehensive Central Valley Salinity Management Plan.*

**Mission of the Public Education and Outreach Committee:**

*The mission of the Public Education and Outreach Committee is to obtain broad-based public participation in the creation and implementation of a comprehensive Central Valley Salinity Management Plan*

**Central Valley Salinity Leadership Group  
Public Education and Outreach Committee  
Thursday, March 11, 2010; 1:30PM to 3:00 PM**

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

**Committee Chair Joe DiGiorgio, called the meeting at 1:35 PM followed by introductions of all present. No phone participants were on teleconference.**

- 1. Welcome, Introductions, Circulate Roster**
- 2. Review/Approve [February 10 Committee Meeting Notes](#)**

**Motion / Seconded - Approved**

- 3. MSSC [Paper on CV-SALTS and SWQCB Recycled Water Policy](#) and [Presentation](#)**

Feedback has been generally positive and acknowledging that salinity is a serious issue.

Daniel asked if there were minor errors or things that should be added please provide them to him.

- 4. Salt and Nitrate [Project Summary Page for Outreach](#)**

This was a draft put together by Newfields Environmental.

Daniel asked for feedback.

It was pointed out that on page 2 the Salinity Coalition is non-profit. It was suggested that the document not be put on CV-SALTS letterhead and that the summary be attributed to the writers of the document, as well.

Daniel thought it would be helpful to include a statement about why this work was started, what happens next and how it relates to previous work.

Joe volunteered to work with the group to develop an executive summary of what we have learned from the pilot study. For example, how the pilot study identifies to land use decisions as the largest controllable salt “source”.

- 5. Review and Approve [Scoping and Outreach Notice and Questions](#)**
  - a. Notice for Release**

Meeting to be 2-3 hours. Focus is on receiving input. And engaging people, providing sufficient information so they can participate in the questions.

Suggestion that “overview of pilot source study for the local area” should be added. Workshop comments will have a deadline of May 30<sup>th</sup>.

**b. Questions for Responses**

Suggestion that to eventually achieve compliance with CEQA the questions need to assist the group describe existing conditions, frame the project in terms of what exactly do you want to do (what needs to be changed), timing of completion of the project, and location of the project. This is the type of information that needs to be in the project description before it goes out for scoping.

Recommendation that questions need to be worded to allow more than a yes and no answer. Need to be more open-ended.

Questions 1-5 are going to be addressed by everyone. Questions 6-13 are optional questions and may just come up. Questions 17 onward are not really necessary. Question suggestion: How does salt impact your community? Add, "If so, how?" on question 4.

**c. Facilitator/Staffing Training**

Daniel said that there would be general rules for breakouts. The main points will be listed on a flipchart for feedback. Daniel stated that he would like to find a way to record each of those sessions and have those discussions transcribed. The facilitator, though, should capture the basic concept of the questions being asked and the answers received.

Joe DiGiorgio committed to drafting an email be sent out to all the CV-SALTS members for 4-5 volunteers who could arrive 20 minutes early – one committee person at each table. Rose, Bruce, and Mark Larson were discussed as people to approach. Each group would be presented with the same discussion topics. No votes will be needed, but feedback should include the topics that seemed most important to the smaller groups.

Suggestion that presentations for the day include what is going on and what has been done so far in salt/nitrate management to help promote the outreach meetings. Study information should be provided to each region. Pilot Study should be worked into the program after Status Report on CV-SALTS to develop science and policy to examine the implementation of policy in the region.

Joe wondered how each of the sessions are going to be documented. Flip charts and consolidated documentation will be done by the facilitators. The summaries will be recorded and transcribed.

**d. Press Releases outreach in Tulare and Woodland areas**

Daniel has had it suggested that for \$500 press releases could be drafted and sent out to the appropriate news agencies and contacts.

**Consensus to hire PSA writer and to issue the notices regarding the upcoming workshops. Press releases and notice will be provided to committee members via email for feedback before issuing to the public.**

**6. Approve [Committee Work Plan for 2010](#)/budget w/chairs priorities – Develop project details and priorities for implementation of priority projects**

Daniel added a new table with all the items that were presented.

Joe DiGiorgio asked about the funding for the slidecards with a budget \$6000. Daniel replied that notice about funding wouldn't be decided on until June when the EPA Grant is known.

Discussion about when the brown bag lunch should be planned in relation to the workshops. Daniel replied that previous discussion had been over scheduling one in conjunction with the passing of certain legislation to draw in the legislators. Suggestion that one be arranged in November.

**Motion to approve / seconded – approved.**

**7. Other Outreach Efforts – Leadership Group and Forum? September**

Suggestion that the forum focus on policy instead of technical things. Need to develop a draft of what the forum would consist of.

The leadership group meeting is going to be about three hours and consist of high-level executives of the agencies.

**Action: Sufficient time be planned for a forum once the topic of the forum is decided and what is still needed according to the scope following the meeting in April. September is too soon.**

Joe DiGiorgio wanted to make sure that the legislative brown bag lunch is still being planned.

**8. Next meeting April 21 and April 26/27 Workshops [2010 Calendar](#)**

**9. Identify items to be taken to the April 21 Executive Committee**

1. Workshops – one of the co-chairs to attend; update on the volunteers available and still needed; press releases
2. Workplan approved

**10. Other items**

Gail described the updates to the Regional Board's Salt web pages, and asked for feedback on the different projects and products linked with salt. Each project needs to have a map. A performance-tracking chart is needed. Links and descriptions of the projects should also be included. As well as contact information. The material is needed to appeal to the EPA.

Gail announced that there are two PSPs out and guidelines are out. The Regional Board has invited CV-SALTS to comment on the pre-public draft.

**11. Adjourned**

# DRAFT Workshop Issues Feedback

## April 26, 2010 Woodland, April 27, 2010 Tulare

---

### Question 1. While all water use adds salt, how do salts and nitrates impact your community or industry today? How could salts and nitrates impact you in the future?

1. Agriculture
  - a. Limits what crops can be grown W-1, W-4, T-2
  - b. Fertilizer an issue but Nitrate is a benefit to Ag W-2, T-4
  - c. Special concern about boron in tree crops, sodium and chloride in other W-1, W-4
  - d. Salt accumulation in perched water- impacts crop production. Pre-existing history Tulare Lake "A" clay. Today and in future T-3
  - e. Regulatory burden Permit compliance issue W-1, W-2
  - f. Growers discharging tailwater in canals and streams T-2
  - g. Source Water Supply an issue W-2
  - h. Dairy has issues with CAFO regulations that have nitrate and phosphorus standards T-4
    - i. Existing conditions exceed standards T-4
    - ii. Availability of nutrients an issue especially phosphorus T-4
    - iii. Economic impact are issue T-4
    - iv. Technical analysis is needed T-4
  - i. Evaporation Basins should be recognized as BMPs T-4
  - j. Digging deeper wells equals higher EC values and requires blending to use for ag supply T-1
  - k. Difference between seasonal use vs 24 hour use T-1
2. Cities and communities
  - a. Utilities rate increased to meet targets W-1, W-3
  - b. Today elevated nitrate in wells GW: Foothills and various Areas T-3, T-2
  - c. Nitrates limiting the use of wells, Wells out of production \$1.5-\$3.0 million per well W-1 W-2, W-4
  - d. Nitrate- health problem and groundwater contamination in small communities T-2, W-3
  - e. Search for cleaner water sources W-3
  - f. Community water treatment need desalination and brine line W-4
  - g. Source water treatment for industries raise costs to remove salts W-3, W-1
  - h. Different interests are impacted very differently W-2
  - i. Conservation – higher TDS W-3
  - j. Inhibits water reclamation and recharge W-1, W-4
  - k. Political issues in the communities ability to pay W-2
  - l. Community concern about landfills and local salt impacts when salts are disposed of in landfills W-4
  - m. Automatic water softeners contribute to salt levels T-2

- n. Public misconception concerning treatment of nitrates in their water T-2
- o. Integration with IRWMP and Basin Management Plans T-1
- 3. Environment
  - a. Wildlife sites at the ends of watersheds collect salts T-2
  - b. Wetlands, nitrate starved wetlands/grasslands T-2
- 4. Wastewater treatment plants
  - a. Costly Capital improvements for small and questionable improvements in water W-1, W-2, W-4
  - b. Large financial burden to community W-1, W-4
  - c. Salt addition in water use creates issue, meeting current regulations Discharge limit problems T-3 W-4
  - d. Consideration for flexibility T-1
  - e. No one size fits all T-1
- 5. Industry
  - a. Costs of treating supply water for processes W-1
  - b. Costs of treating for salt and disposal of salt and wastewater W-1
  - c. Discharge limits are a problem W-4
  - d. Higher cost to remove salts W-3
  - e. Industrial wastewater and lye peeling equals EC T-1
  - f. Needs robust data set for BMP's T-1
- 6. Future impacts
  - a. Ability to recycle water T-3
  - b. Conflict between salt management and recycle T-3
  - c. If recycle then it can cause issues with STDS T-3
  - d. Beneficial uses? T-3
  - e. Impacts concerned with crop selection T-2
  - f. Higher treatment cost with higher concentrations T-2
  - g. Greater green house gases T-2
  - h. Higher costs to comply T-1
  - i. Population increases compounding salts issues and gains T-1
  - j. Individual citizen costs (new WWTPs etc.) T-1
  - k. Current surface salts (unusable land), becoming issue after water applied (future) T-1

**Question 2. Are the current regulations a problem for your community or industry? If so, how?**

- 1. YES W-1
- 2. Cities and Communities
  - a. 500 above source virtually impossible to meet T-3
  - b. Salt and nitrate objectives require more treatment W-3
  - c. Drinking water exceeds the wastewater discharge standard in communities W-1
  - d. Conservation strategies increase issues (i.e. reduced dilution) T-3

- e. Financial Challenge, cost to build and treat water exceeds communities ability to pay W-1, W-4
  - f. RO plan cost \$60M for small community population W-1
  - g. Regulations impact the Economic Environment and therefore the rest of the environment W-4, T-3
  - h. Existing regulations are not being enforced, how will new ones be enforced W-4
  - i. Current regulation limits: some aren't even measured (i.e.) surface water discharge chlorine T-3
  - j. Problem with anti-deg policy. One molecule rule. Doesn't look at big picture T-3
  - k. Different interests are impacted very differently W-2
  - l. Current regulation treats all areas same, prevents effective treatment and reuse, in appropriate application of E.C. limits T-3
  - m. Using recycled waters is hard because you have to convince farmers of benefits even though it would include additional monitoring (monitoring wells) and nutrient managing T-2
  - n. Source waters already not meeting objectives downstream users being held to those objectives, bearing the monitoring cost T-2
  - o. Is there any way to look at standards that may be weight averaged for different time scales? Ages of water (moving average) T-1
  - p. Political issues in the communities ability to pay W-2
3. Ag and Industry
- a. Conflicts among water regulations and water and air regulations W-1
  - b. Where should Salt Go, regulations say you have to take out, but it is not allowed anywhere W-1
  - c. Ties the hands with regulatory conflicts W-1
  - d. Dairy industry has issues T-4
    - i. Lots of monitoring and resulting high costs T-4
    - ii. Management plan is needed T-4
  - e. Farmers getting a lot of pressure – Irrigated Lands program-salts etc. T-1
  - f. Sampling/regulations are costly, don't want to see that happen to every farmer T-1
  - g. Need flexibility on regulations meeting beneficial uses, for the discharge area (ie. salt sensitive crops) and also ephemeral streams. T-2
  - h. Reduced water supply will lead to higher concentrations on tailwater T-2
  - i. Ag can change salt loads it is different for communities T-1
  - j. All practices add to water quality problems, issue with anti-deg T-1
4. All Users
- a. Lack of ocean discharge – a constraint W-3
    - i. Problem for water softener industry
    - ii. Ag chem. and food processors
    - iii. POTW
    - iv. Industry departing Ca
  - b. Regulatory conflicts with requirements W-1, W-4
    - i. State W-1, W-2

- ii. Federal W-1
- iii. Local W-1
- iv. Surface water sources and groundwater protection is a confusing scheme W-2
- v. Environmental impacts and solutions are competing W-4
- vi. Need Regulations that are Reasonable, practical and feasible W-4
- vii. No flexibility of standards-(ie. Local issues or economics feasibility) T-3
- c. Point sources heavily regulated but they are only a small part of the salt W-1
- d. Managing discharge from managed wetlands when source levels are exceeding T-2
- e. BMPs required by the Waterboards may not work W-1
- f. Considerations for amount of water (drought) T-1
- g. Difficult to get water data. Land owners sometimes don't agree with testing. T-1
- h. Companies pumping brine into groundwater. Water Board not regulating properly T-1
- i. State of Flux, Study takes time so you have guess at direction W-1

### **Question 3. How do you think salt should be managed? What factors should be considered?**

1. Cities/Communities
  - a. That's the most important question to try and answer T-2
  - b. Maximize overall beneficial uses and make tradeoffs for the maximum benefit W-1
  - c. Determine real impacts first, rather than modeled or assumed impacts W-1
  - d. Use a balanced approach to setting limits with consideration for local and regional factors and geology W-1, W-4
  - e. Apply resources where they provide the greatest benefit W-1
  - f. Consider salt trading or offsets to make it more economic W-2
2. Public
  - a. Focus on sustainability and long term benefits and impacts W-1, W-2
  - b. Consider limiting water rights to allow desired blending and reduce EC W-2
  - c. Consider the impacts of drought and other supply impacts W-2
  - d. Overall scheme should be consistent with local practices W-2
  - e. Goal should be REASONABLE protection of beneficial uses when economics are considered W-2, W-4
  - f. Short term and long term issues should be considered W-4
  - g. Must consider both upstream and downstream needs W-4
  - h. Depends on what type or form of salt you are looking at T-2
3. Industry
  - a. Outreach and education are critical W-1
  - b. BMP's developed by industry should be encouraged W-1, W-2
  - c. Regional BMPs and policies with local implementation W-1
4. Conservation
  - a. Drainage canals needed W-1
  - b. Salt transport out of the valley is needed W-1
  - c. What are the real impacts of discharge of brine? W-1



5. Agriculture
  - a. Sustainability focus for keeping land in production and farming in business W-1
  - b. Need lower salinity water, build more dams and facilities W-1
  - c. Salt Management
    - i. Evaporation Basins work T-4
      1. Combine with tile drains T-4
    - ii. Being successfully used should be BMP T-4
6. Management Recommendations
  - a. Unclear what the ultimate goal is? W-2, T-4, W-4
  - b. Need to define the problem before you look for solutions T-4
  - c. Different problems will have different solutions T-4
  - d. What are the appropriate Water Quality Objectives W-2, W-4
  - e. How could organizations reduce salinity without more regulation W-2
  - f. What could be done to encourage self regulation W-2
  - g. Allow for management by local conditions (sources, discharge point) T-3
  - h. Allow for local to manage local impacts (i.e. drainage districts, cities...) T-Find out the “right” water quality objectives with flexibility – seasonally, regional, quantification W-3
  - i. Refine and improve beneficial use definition and applications T-3
  - j. Improve data quantity, quality, accessibility studies T-3
  - k. Better defined and consider economics to achieve uses and objectives T-3
  - l. I.D. Specific areas of issues, i.e. impaired or perched water T-3
  - m. Better I.D. recharge i.e. rates hydrogeology T-3
  - n. Balance with economic and environmental impacts W-3
  - o. Mixing zones W-3
  - p. Compliance schedules W-3
  - q. Waste disposal of cross media transitions W-3
  - r. Advances in water softening W-3
  - s. Adaptive, dynamic, flexibility of managing salts (ie. having real time Vernalis of TMDL) assimilative capacity T-2
  - t. Besides salts look at the system as a whole with other nutrients, mineral and trace elements T-2
  - u. Factors to be considered TDS/EC relationship needs flexibility among discharges who have identified their own relationships T-2
  - v. Salt should be managed differently depending on source T-1

#### **Question 4. Should salt or nitrate management consider groundwater differently from surface waters? If so, how?**

1. YES Both are a concern W-1, treat differently manage different sources W-2, T-4, T-3, W-3
2. Yes/no W-3
3. First encountered Groundwater is a flawed approach and is unsustainable W-4
4. No, you have to address receiving waters ie. mixing zone, flexibilities T-3
5. Considerations for Surface and Groundwater differences in Assimilative Capacity

6. Discharge limits should not go below ground water quality (although site specific) T-3
7. Denitrification could be different surface vs ground water T-3
8. Averaging periods W-3
9. Aquatic life – surface only W-3
10. Depends on beneficial use and whether it's surface water or ground water T-2
11. Evaluating ground water basins/may have different water quality objectives
12. The San Joaquin Basin different water objectives than other basins, salt sources are different in the different areas T-2
13. Higher demands of groundwater pull more salts up T-2
14. Surface water typically better than groundwater, use surface water for good crops, salty groundwater on salt tolerant crops T-1
15. Sometimes deep groundwater greater than shallow. No way to control background. T-1
16. Concern over “one size fits all” limits T-1
17. Cities
  - a. Groundwater sources are different than surface water sources and are treated differently W-1, W-2
  - b. What does management mean, W-1 what will a management plan look like T-4
  - c. It depends on the Beneficial Use/what the water use is first W-1, T-4
18. Conservation
  - a. Groundwater has a longer term horizon in impacts and recovery W-1 W-2
  - b. Soil, geology, and sources are different in different areas W-2

## **Question 5. Should management efforts address nitrates and nutrients differently from salts? If so in what ways?**

1. Treat nutrients differently especially in surface waters W-2, T-4, T-1
  - a. Need to define Salts Be specific – which salts W-3 W-4
  - b. Some areas have only salt issues and some just nitrate T-4
  - c. Yes, different Nitrates- health problem T-3, W-3
  - d. Regional specific – reasonable limits W-3
  - e. Remediate by not contaminating water in the first place T-2
  - f. Good salts vs bad salts T-1
  - g. Drip irrigation concentrating salts. During drought salt layers builds up T-1
2. Agriculture
  - a. Yes, very different issues W-1, W-4
  - b. Land application should be treated differently , for salt and nitrates W-2
  - c. Nutrients are a benefit in Ag supplies T-4, W-4
  - d. Most soils can denitrify T-4
  - e. Not all Salt ions are a problem in all areas T-4
  - f. Standards need to be reevaluated T-4
  - g. Beneficial Uses need to be reevaluated T-4
  - h. It's not just form of salts or other constituent but also how its treated. (ie. drinking water or Ag use) ( i.e. groundwater vs. surface water) T-2

- i. Different soils use different irrigation practices T-1
  - j. Nitrate a salt, some instant nutrient, some not T-1
3. Industry
- a. Yes W-1
  - b. Salts are conserved and require treatment W-1, W-2, T-3
  - c. Care should be used in grouping W-1, T-3
  - d.
  - e. Yes, nitrates (one cat.) and nutrients because opportunity for uptake and denitrify Salts conservative T-3, T-3, W-1
  - f. Consider Nitrate and Nutrients differently W-1
  - g. Better treatment is needed for nitrates W-2
4. Cities
- a. Nitrate can be limiting in Recycling and recharge W-1
  - b. Salts should be isolated and reused W-1
  - c. Funding is needed for Nitrate and Salt treatment W-2

**Question 6. Should salt be managed in conjunction with water use? Should it be coordinated with surface water rights or groundwater adjudication? Why or why not?**

- 1. No T-4
- 2. Reappropriate water rights to manage salt W-3
- 3. Need flexibility to manage groundwater and surface water separately. T-1

**Question 7. What geographic scale should be addressed in the Salinity Management Plans?**

- 1. Consider Watershed for surface water T-4
- 2. Does need small scale (based on hydrologic and hydrogeologic) concerns Geo Scale T-3
- 3. Soil type and weather patterns W-3
- 4. IRWMP areas for GW T-4
  - a. Groundwater management plans T-4
  - b. SB-1938 plans
  - c. GW Basin Plans
  - d. AB-3030 Plans

**Question 8. What categories, if any, should be considered for grouping salt sources?**

- 1. Based on constituents W-3

**Question 9. Do you think economics and social/community cost should be considered in CV-SALTS management alternatives? Are there specific costs that should be considered?**

1. Most definitely consider money T-3

**Question 12. The California Water Code decrees recycled water and water conservation as a benefit to the people of the State, should recycled water projects be given special consideration? If so why and how?**

1. Consider further water storage. Not letting it go to the ocean. T-1

**Question 13. Are there any additional factors that should be considered in developing and implementing CV-SALTS projects further regulatory programs?**

1. Economic impact, how much industry would leave CA? Burden of cost to industry. T-1
2. More risk assessment T-1

**DRAFT**











































