

**CV-SALTS Joint Economic and Social Cost and
Technical Advisory Committees Meeting
Wednesday, December 16, 2009; 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 November 19th [Technical Committee Meeting Notes](#)

Upon motion by Member Cory and second by Member Longley the notes were approved with no noted changes

The notes for the December 7 Salt and Nitrate Source Pilot implementation were also approved by acclamation.

3. Salt/Nitrate [Source Pilot Draft Report](#) Stakeholder Discussion

Because limited time for comments was available on December 7, after the presentation time was allotted for discussion of the First Draft Report. The project team members were available by telephone. Joel and Bob answered questions for the group.

Comments and Questions with responses

Comment

Consider a chart or other graphic or table that illustrates the relative importance and magnitude of salt sources in the pilot areas.

Questions on Atmospheric Deposition of TIC

What are the variables of the deposition and is it in equilibrium is there withdrawal or off take of TIC

Joel: Deposition is sensitive to the location in the airshed and the air quality of the airshed. The deposition numbers are net, the both deposition and withdrawal are taken into account in the model.

Comment that we need to learn more about the deposition and dissolution of inorganic carbon and the contribution and meaning of it to regulatory limits as EC and TDS for waterbodies.

Response – It also matters how it is tested and counted, not just EC but TDS and TDFS, or what is left after ashing.

Question, How much differentiation is there between crop types or how much aggregation can be done and still model the basin

Response, it is based on the uncertainty of the data and the use of the analysis, there may not be one answer. The aggregation can be done various levels, we will see how the system that Newfields devised work for the pilot areas.

Comment: There will be a difference between the level of aggregation or differentiation needed for source work and what may be needed for management at the field or basin level.

Comment: Post Modeling has been done, in this effort what types of management practices changes have been tracked in the model.

Response, the model is look in at the long range. Many changes have been implemented and the groundwater system takes a long time to change. Surface waters change quickly but the implementation of the changes for these systems may still take time. Long term averages are the focus of the study.

4. Coordination Programs Items

a. Regional Board Beneficial Use Projects (Emily)

The handout lists some of the projects where beneficial use has been re-evaluated by the regional board. CV-SALTS is particular interested in re-evaluating the aquatic life uses for the Sacramento/San Joaquin Basin. Staff in the pesticide TMDL unit are in the process of developing a basin plan amendment for various pesticides and valley floor water bodies for the San Joaquin Watershed, Sacramento River Watershed and Delta. Staff is requesting that the amendment include pesticide water quality objectives that would applied to specified valley floor water bodies. A final report including water bodies is anticipated in January 2010. Stakeholders will have another chance to review the document during the development and potential adoption of the basin plan amendment, which is anticipated to go before the board in 2010.

Discussion regarding previous designation of water bodies and aquatic life beneficial uses and how these new numbers and designations apply to salinity and water quality objectives.

5. Best Management Practice Documents and Evaluations (Daniel)

Many industries are working at producing a best management practice document for their particular group and work. Wetlands has done one and the Wine Institute has done one. Daniel suggested that some of these findings be worked into the basin plan as it would speed up the process if some of the research needed for the basin plan has already been done elsewhere. The Wine Institute has allowed us to take a look at theirs to see how they've done it. So the Technical Committee can use this as a test case and see what it does and doesn't do, does it cover the things we need. Daniel suggested that the consultants present to the committee on the report and how the Wine Institute looks at implementing them.

6. Technical Committee Work Goals 2010 and Committee Efforts (Daniel)

Daniel took the things that the committee had previously discussed that they wanted to see started or accomplished for 2010 and compiled them into a smaller prioritized list, along with a couple of easily-achievable goals. This list is a draft – not a commitment to do it. Daniel asked if the committee had items that they wanted to accomplish that weren't included, should something be removed.

Technical outline work plan tasks are what the committee is going to spend most of the year on. These things are the easiest things to get done. After we get the pilot report back the committee needs to address data quality, which data and how much data we can use and we need early in the year.

7. Review/Discuss [Draft Beneficial Use/Objectives SOW](#) (Daniel)

Phase 1 was approved at the last meeting and the executive committee will approve that later today and that will go to contracting. Phase 2 is the next step. Daniel produced a chart that shows what we've done, where we're going and what comes out of that. We need a list of draft objectives, including anti-degradation. Daniel asked the committee members for their feedback as to any changes they wanted made, do we need more conference calls to tighten Phase 2.

Discussion about how to show multiple beneficial uses and deliverables used in the GIS. Daniel explained that it would be difficult to list all the uses in a single document. Suggestion that the data be color coded according to the tributary rule.

Committee chair, suggested that when the RFP is developed that whoever places a bid gives an example of their deliverables in terms of how they will use GIS to convey some of that information.

Daniel asked for guidance on how to proceed in to Phase 2. Several members agreed that conference calls would still be good. Daniel said he would work on finding out about the technical issues of having too many people on the conference call. First call will be scheduled in January when all the comments are in to the consultant on the pilot implementation study to give people a chance to review the study.

The RFP for phase 1 will go out as soon as there is confirmation from the State, which should be soon, then the contract requirements will need to be evaluated to see if we need to do anything different than last time and then discuss with the Drainage Authority how to go about the work. The draft RFP should be ready by January 20. Proposals will be taken for three to four weeks.

8. [Salt Management Alternatives List/Development Process](#)

Daniel commented that the list includes suggestions and feedback that he received on the document since the last meeting and suggested that it be brought up again at the January meeting when Denis can look at it. There should probably be an extra single discussion in February where everyone can bring their news together about what they've heard about what other groups are doing. Daniel suggested that some of the things that the alternatives list should include are: what kind of salt do these alternatives address, would it lower the salt in the river, in the ground water. Quantities may not be possible, but it would be a start. Not all the management alternatives will work in all areas.

Comment regarding #18 – that reducing water used for land maybe changing what's being used will change things as far as plants are concerned. Discussion about whether or not changing in-house water use efficiency changes the salt disposal problem in Sacramento. There has been a steady rise of salt concentration in municipal waste water and that is usually connected to the new developments, which are much higher efficiency.

Daniel suggested that the items on the list be left there even if the issues aren't going to be addressed right away.

Suggestion that reflux elimination be included on the list because of leaching requirement needs.

Short term and long term issues should be considered because local pumping may cause increase in salts in some regions

9. Actions/Recommendations/Report to the Executive Committee

Presentation of the work plan and where the salt and nitrate pilot study. Phase 1 is on the agenda for approval.

Suggestion that the concept of excess salt to mirror the source study and beneficial use and bring those together to assess management items be presented in January or February. Daniel suggested that Joe DiGiorgio present the material presented at a recent meeting in Modesto at an upcoming meeting in February.

Nancy King, from DWR asked to be provided with a small article for their conservation bulletin. Vice Chair Dorn suggested that she would work with Public Education committee.

10. Next Meeting January 21 and [2010 Calendar](#) issues

Problem with June 16 – Ground Water Resources Group runs for 4 days.

Public Hearing on the Triennial Review of the Tulare Basin report will be out on the 2nd of February and meeting in March.

11. Meeting Adjourned 12:00