

**MEETING NOTES**  
**Joint Technical/Economic and Social Impact Committee Meeting**

**February 18, 2008**

Attendees:

See attached Sign-in sheet/Telephone participants list.

**1. Welcome and introductions/Review of Agenda**

Technical Advisory Committee Co-Chair Nigel Quinn called the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m. He welcomed everyone to the meeting and attendees introduced themselves.

**2. Approval of Meeting Notes from January 13, 2009 Meeting**

Mr. Quinn noted that the meeting notes had been posted on the website. The Committee approved the meeting notes as posted.

**3. Salt Source Pilot Study Selection and Procurement Update**

Daniel Cozad indicated that the subcommittee had convened by conference call two weeks ago to finalize the scope of work. The subcommittee has begun compiling a list of firms interested in proposing to undertake the work, and the subcommittee is developing a list of qualifications and selection criteria. They are also recruiting interested persons to participate on the selection committee. The RFP is expected to be issued in early March.

**4. Website Demo**

Daniel Cozad conducted a brief demonstration of the Central Valley Salinity Coalition (CVSC) Website: [www.cvsalinity.org](http://www.cvsalinity.org). He explained that users can create a login and password for accessing the site. He thanked Joe DeGiorgio from ECO:Logic for converting the "Salt of the Earth" videos to web format. All three versions (8 minute, 20 minute and hour long) will soon be available for download on the website. Older materials will be archived.

**5. Technical Scope Methodology Used in Santa Ana Region**

Andy Malone of Wildermuth Environmental presented an overview of the Region 8 Basin Plan amendment process from a technical perspective. To provide a scale for comparison, he noted that the Santa Ana Region is much smaller geographically (2,800 square miles versus 60,000 square miles in the Central Valley) but the populations are similar (about 6 million people.) He suggested

that the Santa Ana process is transferable. He gave an overview of the elements of the 2004 Basin Plan Amendment, which included:

- Establishment of sub-basins
- Establishment of water quality objectives
- Establishment of current ambient water quality
- Computation of assimilative capacity
- Development of wasteload allocations for POTWs.

In response to a question, Mr. Malone indicated that the effort focused on point sources and that there is limited agriculture in the region.

Mr. Malone explained that all participants, including the Regional Water Board, agreed up front on the methodology and agreed to live with the result. Data collection was the most labor intensive and expensive part of the technical effort. In basins with no assimilative capacity available, the potential impact was costly mitigation for recycled water and recharge projects. To address this, the BPA employed the concept of “maximum benefit” under Resolution 68-16: the water quality objectives can be changed if consistent with the maximum benefit of the people of the State and if the change will not unreasonably affect beneficial uses.

The Committee was very interested in the presentation, and requested that a longer session be planned to explore the process in greater detail. Lisa Holm agreed to work with Daniel Cozad to pull together a special workshop on the Santa Ana model and the drinking water policy methodology.

The presentation will be posted on the CVSC website.

## **6. Work Plan Outline Review and Recommendations**

Daniel Cozad reported that the subcommittee continues its work and is not on Version 8 of the work plan outline. The next step is to develop detailed scopes and get some of the work started. In addition, the subcommittee will develop duration, cost estimates and “predecessors/constraints.” Chair Linda Dorn will schedule the next meeting, and the Technical/Economic and Social Impact Committees will have an opportunity to review the final draft before it is transmitted to the Executive Committee.

Paula Hanson suggested it might make sense to compare the 3 Central Valley basins with the Santa Ana basin to identify key differences. Lisa Holm noted that the work plan was not modeled solely on the Santa Ana work but was also informed by other processes such as the development of drinking water standards for the Central Valley. The Committee did identify several key differences, including the number and diversity of stakeholders, the greater amount of surface water involved and the sheer scale of the project geographically.

## **7. Review of Final “Things You Can Do” from PEO Committee**

Daniel Cozad indicated that he will convene a small committee by conference call to address point number 4 (water softeners) because there are some concerns with the most recent draft of the language. The group also agreed to strike point number 6 (energy conservation) because it lacked sufficient specificity to be very useful.

## **8. Grant Opportunity**

Gail Cismowski reported that grants are available to address nitrates in fertilizer from the California Department of Food and Agriculture. Proposals are due within two weeks, and last year’s projects ranged from \$50,000 to several hundred thousand dollars. The Committee agreed to invite a CDFA representative to attend the next meeting.

## **9. Actions/Recommendations to Executive Committee**

- Notify the Executive Committee of the CDFA grant opportunity
- Report out on technical presentation on Santa Ana Basin Plan process.

## **10. Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled for March 18, 2009 at a location to be determined.

## **11. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.