

Questions for the Executive Committee from the Knowledge Gained Subcommittee, 11/09/10

Until it is clearer what the subcommittee is tasked to do, it will be difficult for the subcommittee to do its work effectively or to come up with something that is clear and focused and that we know is going to fulfill CVSALTS needs. Therefore, a few of us have prepared some directed questions to help the Executive Committee give us the needed direction. The memorandum attached to the November 18 agenda should also highlight possible discussion points per the direction of the Subcommittee's work.

Essentially: What is the ultimate product desired from the subcommittee?

1. CVSALTS funded a pilot salinity and nitrate sources study that was narrowly focused. The Knowledge Gained subcommittee has discussed the need to expand the scope in order to develop more broadly useful data. Does the Executive Committee prefer to limit the subcommittee's work to a review of the sources study as is, or to expand the subcommittee's work to a broader context of review of up to three pilot salinity/nitrate studies?
2. Should the subcommittee limit its technical review to questions that the sources study answered, or should it review the study in a broader informational context (to inform planning and water supply/quality management in addition to mass loading).
3. Should the subcommittee review the three known studies to inform future direction of salinity and nitrate data gathering?
4. Should the subcommittee review the three known studies to inform a methodology for prioritizing areas to (regulate/plan/manage)?
5. Should the subcommittee review the three known studies to inform identification of management strategies or identification of problem types (in addition to source types)?
6. The subcommittee believes that the analysis of sources should be done in the context of the beneficial uses being protected (an analysis of river water quality should be done in the context of the desired water quality outcome). Does the executive committee agree? And if so, would the executive committee advise the subcommittee on whether/how it should evaluate for existing/future antidegradation, beneficial uses, water quality objectives and control practices? Should some of this work be phased? Or can it be flexible enough to adapt to changes in these endpoints?
7. Should salinity and nitrate studies determine assimilative capacity in groundwater or surface water? Is there some guidance the subcommittee should employ in assessing whether the studies have done this?