

**Joint Economic and Social Impact and
Technical Advisory Committees
Thursday, May 13, 2010 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM**

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

Technical Committee Co-Chair Lisa Holm 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 [April 21 Technical Committee Meeting Notes](#)**

Motion to approve by Nigel Quinn; Seconded by David Cory; approved with changes.

- 3. Coordination Programs – San Joaquin River Upstream Salt & Boron BPA**
 - a. RWQCB Transition, Discussion from Regional Board
 - b. [Subcommittee Recommendation](#)

An ad-hoc committee was formed at the last meeting to develop a recommendation for the executive committee. That recommendation was presented to the Technical Committee for conditional acceptance. The effort and process for the development of this BPA would move to CV-SALTS and the listed conditions would apply. In effect, this could be a sub-set of the entire CV-SALTS planning/BPA effort, with this particular region addressed by a committee appointed by the Executive Committee.

Karna raised the issue of whether or not the transition of the responsibility to CV-SALTS would slow down the process and if the intent was to keep up with the schedule laid out by the Regional/State Board? Amanda responded that the effort is currently aligned with State Board efforts to update the WQCP by the first quarter of 2012 and that they had planned to share the modeling effort. Rudy added that this should still be the case, but that the Work Plan and schedule should be reviewed by the new committee as soon as possible, using the Regional/State Board's plan as a guideline. One big advantage is that CV-SALTS can now frame the implementation strategy. David Cory agreed with Amanda that it will be key to keep the effort aligned with the SWRCB effort (and coordinated). Technical issues from the new Committee will still come back to the TAC.

Rudy Schnagl offered to coordinate with State Board on timing and related to the Salt Boron TMDL and San Joaquin flow efforts and to provide a detailed report back to the TAC.

4. Review discuss [Progress Demonstration List](#)

a. Technical Committee [Work Plan](#) approval

The subcommittee met on Monday and updated the list with a little more detail under each item. There were a few items where detailed would be best added once the BUOS Phase 1 study is completed and the SNPS Review is finished, and so those items will be updated at that time (probably July/August).

Item 1 a, b, c, d, e were not completed last year. Item 1 b (contracting work plan elements) is next and has been started with the BUOS Phase 1.

Management team development and implementation: Building out the capacity and infrastructure of the coalition so CV-SALTS can accomplish all this work. The coalition is currently working with the newly passed budget to determine what they can do.

Daniel reviewed the items that the subcommittee changed.

Item 4 (task descriptions) – adding more detail to the work plan.

Items 6 a and b - setting and pursuing funding goals. The executive committee appointed a subcommittee to work on this. The membership funding has been done on behalf of the coalition, but the next step is to go after grants.

Item 7 – looking at management options and alternatives to be evaluated – this task was broken up into identifying the management options and alternatives and then identifying a screening or analytical evaluation tool. The subcommittee identified the BMP subcommittee as an appropriate venue for this task.

Item 10 – preparing a semi-annual status report. We expect to expand the accomplishments report.

Item 11 – developing a process for coordinating with regional water management groups, planning and implementation projects. One element is to identify the information would we want those groups to give us.

The committee laid out a few steps to identify administrative and technical program needs that can be met through in-kind services rather than financial contributions. In order to enable offers of in-kind service, tasks will have to be scoped out, so this task will be ongoing.

Item 13 – Developing a plan to solicit meaningful stakeholder input from groups with limited financial resources. This will be a our template for involving the people who are really important to the process, but don't have the financial ability or physical proximity to be involved. There is currently a quarterly conference call, but need to find a way to get them even more involved and engaged.

Item 14 - Assessing the value and applicability of the pilot salt sources study, and using the study to identify where we should go from here.

Item 16 - identifying near-term, medium-term, and long-term data storage and collection needs. This item needs more discussion and work to identify the data that is really needed and assess the state programs to understand what we can use and what changes are needed.

Item 20 is one of the tasks that will be scoped in the next few months, but will likely go beyond 2010.

Item 9 - completing data management approach. This was moved down the list following the discussion in the last meeting.

Item 21 - Identifying beneficial use and objectives. Phase 1 has been done and we are currently working on Phase 2.

Progress Demonstration List items are ordered by their schedule/status date, not numerically by task. We propose that the work plan will be a living document and a way to monitor current projects and progress on those projects, including updating documents. This annual effort will be referred to as the "Progress Demonstration List" and serve as an annual snapshot of the larger work plan. A "key" will be developed to tie Progress Demonstration List item numbers to Work Plan task numbers.

A suggestion was made that the existing ad-hoc subcommittees also be listed on the work plan, along with the committee's mission statement/agendas. **Daniel agreed and said that lists would be available before the next meeting.** A suggestion was made that the subcommittee meetings be included in the meeting calendar, with links to members, agendas, and call in numbers. **Daniel agreed to follow up on these suggestions before the next TAC meeting.**

A suggestion was made that updates to the plan be recorded each month in the document for tracking by the TAC. Major changes and schedule issues should be brought to the Executive Committee for approval and status reports.

Motion to approve Progress Demonstration List and recommend executive committee approval. Moved by Debbie Webster. Seconded by David Cory, motion passed.

5. [Lessons Learned Salt/Nitrate Source Pilot Implementation Study](#)

This is item 14 on the Progress Demonstration List. The subcommittee met on Tuesday. They discussed the report background and what the group was looking for from the pilot implementation study. It wasn't intended to be a definitive study and to reach regulatory conclusions. The subcommittee will develop a "Lessons Learned" report; an initial outline starts on page 22 of the agenda package, with some of Lisa Holm and Daniel Cozad's thoughts and questions embedded as preliminary thoughts.

The subcommittee decided that the salt sources study was only one piece of information needed for salt and nitrate management planning. The subcommittee discussed that they would also need to information like water budgets, fate and transport of salts, as examples. As a starting point, the subcommittee discussed the concept of triage: developing a methodology to prioritize or categorize regions for salt/nitrate management plans. As an initial discussion, for example, the subcommittee discussed what the minimal level of information would be needed to participate in the plan, say for regions with minimal salt/nutrient issues or regions who believe this is the case and want to minimize their participation. The list developed in the call is on page 30 of the agenda package. The subcommittee was given a homework assignment of thinking about what information the most impacted regions would need – perhaps even think of this as levels of information: for participation in this planning effort, or beyond that, the information needs to develop a regional implementation strategy. The subcommittee also discussed the use of the BUOS Phase 1 Study in the “trriage” concept. Pamela commented that no area of the region would be able to “opt out” of the basin plan process and basin plan amendment and the subcommittee relayed that they had discussed the need for environmental and land use monitoring, periodic reporting, and the potential use of monitoring-related “triggers” which could bump regions into a higher triage category.

There was a question about what kind of feedback the committee received from the public. Daniel replied that much of the feedback are those that are already participating in salt management or those looking to get involved in salt management. We heard that the local regions know how they want to manage salt and requested that CV-SALTS tell the communities the options protect beneficial uses.

Next meeting is May 26 at 9:00 am in the Rancho Cordova offices of Kennedy Jenks. There will be a call-in number as well.

A participant asked what the deadline was for the report. Lisa replied that the preliminary goal was to have something for July.

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

Not much progress has been made to this point on scoping Phase 2. Much of the effort that has been put into examining lessons learned from the Sources Study and the work outlined in the Phase 1 BUOS is going to put the committee in a better position to proceed with Phase 2 scoping. Daniel suggested that the committee tackle Phase 2 in two portions. First compile a list of beneficial uses that committee members view as problematic, misapplied, wrong, or causing conflicts. For example, calling every water source a municipal water source, the definition of agriculture use and designation of Ag irrigation as streams etc. Second identify the beneficial uses or physical areas that need special attention.

Daniel asked for people to send him suggestions as to beneficial use issues that need to be addressed or reviewed, and may be integrated into use attainability studies or more extensive studies.

Parry suggested that his group has a list of waterways that, except for extremely wet years, never reach the San Joaquin River - either due to agriculture usage or because of percolation and evaporation. Their beneficial uses were applied through the tributary rule, but they are only occasionally true tributaries that provide those beneficial uses.

Rudy suggested that the regional board has a list of issues that the board has identified as needing attention through their Triennial Review Process, and a couple of those issues include beneficial uses – Ag drains and water bodies including groundwater are the topics. Rudy will summarize and provide this information for the committee.

Pamela Creedon commented that most of the issues the group is dealing with are identifying uses and therefore objectives that are not appropriate or accurate. One issue is identification that is a blanket application for all water bodies – surface and ground water and those that supply them. Even if they keep or don't keep the definition defined by that policy because of salt concentrations, they still apply regardless and need to be specifically designated in the basin plan (i.e. remember that beneficial uses apply to a broad spectrum of water quality constituents). The other thing with the ground water is the general application that all ground waters are used for drinking water. The designation of the beneficial use is valuable but some applications are problematic for surface and ground water. There the problem is not so much the use but the numeric objective Nigel suggested that perhaps a little refinement is needed. Pamela agreed that redesignation or revision may be needed.

Bob Smith commented that for discharges to ground water there is the issue of first encountered groundwater as the compliance point.

A suggestion was made that CV-SALTS should verify that the beneficial use is there and not just rely on what's in the Basin Plan.

A comment was made that from a water supply management basis, one of the problems is the issue is running up against cost, solution space and regulations. The economical route may be to go de-designate or redesignate, and CV-SALTS could be involved in the redesignation process as part of its implementation strategy.

Daniel set a deadline of June 1st for suggested target issues and beneficial use areas that are known problems.

A suggestion was made that a group of interested/involved parties get together to put the list together. Daniel responded that the idea was to start with a few ideas and then go to a larger audience.

Question about whether these items will be included in the Phase 2 scope of work. Daniel responded, yes.

7. Westside Salt/Nitrate Study Status - Reclamation

Reclamation is examining the subareas that receive water from the DMC and how DMC-delivered salts move through the Valley and when and if they end up in the San Joaquin River. Reclamation's intent is to look for additional implementation strategies to mitigate, offset and control salts and also to complement and expand upon CV-SALTS salt sources work.

Reclamation has been working on refining and updating WARMF and WESTSIM models. Instead of traditional WARMF hydrologic watershed boundaries, we are using irrigation district and wetland boundaries. Water movement is dictated by irrigation district infrastructure in the Valley floor. Developing monthly 2000-2007 water budgets first, then salt and nitrate budgets, as well as looking at residence time and fate of water, salt, and nitrates. They are hoping to post the technical approach and results on the web in the near future. Initial results should be available in a couple of weeks. Also trying to incorporate lessons learned from the salt sources study and to identify what information may still be needed.

Lisa Holm will send an update to Daniel when the website is available.

8. Actions/Recommendations/Report to the Executive Committee

- 1) Progress Demonstration List
- 2) Subcommittee lists and meetings on calendar
- 3) Request submittal of Beneficial Use Issues (for BUOS Phase 2 scoping)

9. Subcommittee Meetings and Reports

- a. **BUOS Phase 1 Subcommittee meeting 5/26/10 10:30 AM**
- b. **Best Management Practice Subcommittee next call 5/25/10 3:00 PM**
- c. **Pilot Lessons Learned and Phase 2 BUOS Meet 5/26/10 9:00 AM**

Daniel asked if the entire TAC committee would like to receive information and notices of the subcommittee meetings. Consensus is no.

10. Next meeting date, June 10, [2010 Calendar](#) with locations