

MEETING NOTES
Joint Technical/Economic and Social Impact Committee Meeting

April 14, 2009
10545 Armstrong Road, Room 162, Mather CA 95656

Attendees:

See attached sign-in sheet. Telephone participants included: Erika De Hollan, Jim Atherstone, Laurel Firestone, Joel Miller, and Tom Harder.

1. Welcome and Introductions/Review of Agenda

Technical Advisory Committee Chair Nigel Quinn called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. He welcomed everyone to the meeting and attendees introduced themselves.

2. Approval of Meeting Notes from March 18, 2009 Meeting

Nigel Quinn noted the meeting notes had been posted on the agenda. After review, and upon motion by David Corey, seconded by Dennis Westcott, the meeting notes were unanimously approved.

3. Salt Source Pilot Study Procurement Update

Daniel Cozad reported that the RFP has been sent out, as approved by the Coalition Board. The responses are due the 20th of April. Daniel noted that there were a dozen or so questions at the pre-proposal conference. Answers were distributed on the 9th of April. Approximately 20 prospective bidders participated on the call. There was one request to extend the deadline for the bidding, but that request was denied, the rationale was provided in the question responses. Mr. Cozad expects to have an approved scope of work and negotiated terms by the end of the month, if not a final contract. Mr. Cozad noted that funding for this project is in process. There will be a special meeting of the subcommittee designated to oversee this pilot study to review the bids, and determine the scope and negotiate the terms of the contract.

4. Technical Workshop from Santa Ana Region

Daniel Cozad reported that the Santa Ana Region Workshop is set for May 14, 2009, with a second meeting to be held May 28, 2009. The plan is for the first meeting to be a presentation by the participants in the Santa Ana Region project to discuss what went well, and what did not, and how that might apply to the Central Valley Salinity project. The second workshop is a planning session to apply concepts from the first workshop on a working level to the CVSalts concept. The workshops will be held in the ACWA conference room. The Santa Ana project was ten years into the process, from its first analysis, and has just completed its first three year review. Karl Longley was designated to lead the workshop on the 28th of May.

5. Work Plan Outline review Costs and Schedule

Daniel Cozad passed out the Work Plan outline review. Mr. Cozad noted that he had some data from DWR, and some from the Resources agency, but that inputs into time and cost were of

limited value due to the uncertain nature of the process at this time. However, given what could be gathered, it was estimated that \$14 to \$36 million in direct costs would be expended, plus \$7 to 8 Million in agency costs to put the work together proposed by the Work Plan. In addition, the public outreach portion has not been finalized, pending a determination by that committee on items desired to be completed. Discussion ensued regarding particular items and data within those items, and how that would impact the overall costs. Preliminary work needs to be accomplished to determine, for instance, what data sets will be placed into the database. The committee was requested to review the Work Plan and note any changes. Karl Longley expressed the need to include the Tulare Basin in the Work Plan, which will add costs. Daniel noted that the timelines were overlapping, not consecutive and still came up with a five to seven year schedule. Nigel Quinn noted the "predecessor" line indicates what must be accomplished in the Work Plan before another item may be initiated.

6. Grassland Bypass Basin Plan Amendment (time extension)

Gail Cismowski from the Regional Board reviewed the attached PowerPoint presentation regarding the Grasslands Bypass permit project. A discussion was held regarding the Regional Board's request for a "vote" on four items: Does the committee favor/oppose the drainage management program approach that forms the basis of the Region's selenium control program? Does the committee support/oppose the proposed basin plan amendment? Should the basin plan amendment be prepared by Board staff or the CVSalts effort? Does the committee favor/oppose the salt (drainage) management plan strategy outlined in the Westside Regional Drainage Plan?

Questions arose regarding individuals on the committee who also had a vested interest in the project/permit. Questions arose regarding Regional Board members and staff being present while information is being presented outside of a Regional Board hearing. Discussion ensued regarding the role of CVSalts, and whether the standing rules allowed for the committee to take a position.

It was decided by consensus that the presentation go forward as a pilot, as the Regional Board has several other presentations to make over the course of the CVSalts project. The Executive and Leadership Committees will be requested to take up the issue and make a determination of process. Refer to the [posted Power Point](#) file for the details of the Presentation.

Mr. Corey noted after the presentation that while they were participating in the Project, the ultimate determination would have to be made about what to do with salt that is diverted to protect an area, would the salt be maintained in the basin, evaporated and disposed of, or would it be part of a brine line that ultimately discharged into the ocean. These are the broader questions that face the CVSalts effort.

Rudy Schnagl of the Regional Board noted that there are areas where response from the Technical/Advisory Committee would be useful to the Regional Board in planning and implementing these projects. Monitoring and discharge data exists and will continue to be amassed from these and other projects. In addition, consideration has to be given to pre-existing saline groundwater, and how best management to manage the overall system. Discussion was held that the appropriate role of the Technical committee would be to comment/analyze and identify gaps in data, while policy questions would be most appropriately directed to the Executive or Leadership Committee. The goal is for CVSalts to be part of the

process, not a dissenter. Timing is an issue as the Basin Plan is targeted for the end of 2009.

7. Nitrate Influence on Chromium Mobilization

Robert Busby from the USGS reported on a USGS project analyzing a dairy near Palmdale, where elevated chromium was detected in the groundwater. The USGS evaluated whether nitrate pollution from a nearby dairy facility was mobilizing the chromium(6) contaminant. The issue is whether naturally occurring chromium is mobilized by dairy nitrate. Chromium 6 in the environment was not readily reduced to Chromium 3 as would be expected. The hypothesis is that the microorganisms in the soil that would otherwise break down the chromium, acted on the nitrates instead. Mr. Busby noted that there are a great number of variables, including an alluvial fan of high chromium content, arid conditions with a subsequent high "dosage" of water, and various soil microbes that can affect the situation. A conclusion was that nitrate concentration is one of the variables that may have some effect on chromium mobilization.

8. Update on State Board South Delta Program

Mark Gowdy reported on the 2008 contract with Dr. Glenn Hoffman and a salinity literature review. There were iterations of the contract, including public comment, an issuance of a draft – all of which caused the process to take longer than expected. The San Joaquin River Authority offered to fund the subsequent contract, and the State Board agreed to direct the project, similar to how CEQA reviews are handled by agencies. A draft report is expected in July or August with a final report completed by October. In consideration is also a dynamic modeling analysis. A workshop may be convened as a group effort perhaps under the banner of CVSalts. It was noted that UC Riverside is also undertaking an effort to compare various salt models, and perhaps this initiative could be coordinated as well, including the kinds of issues that the modeling should address. At this time, the model focuses on the crop root zone, and crop yield effects. Leaching to groundwater is also being included. By consensus, it was agreed that a joint modeling project would be beneficial for all.

9. Technical Committee Agenda for Projects and Integration

Daniel Cozad reported that there are several "floating" items. More time is needed with planning and agendas and a determination of technical items needed.

10. Actions/Recommendations to report to the Executive Committee

Four items were determined for report to the Executive Committee: a process for coordination with the various agencies engaged in salinity issues; potential revision to the mission statement for the technical committee; notice of the joint modeling effort with the State and Regional Boards; and coordination of meeting calendars.

11. Next Meeting Date

The next meeting date is May 13, 2009 and will take place at the ACWA Offices in Downtown Sacramento.

The meeting adjourned at 12:27 p.m.



SALTS

Salinity Alternatives for Long-term Sustainability

Central Valley

Meeting Sign-in

Meeting Technical Economic Comms. Date 4/14/09

Name	Organization	Email (if new or changed)
Joel Miller	Consultant SIV WDRS	joelmiller@fradition.net
MARK KETON	CULLIGAN WATER / PUBA	
Lynette	USBR	
Gary Leathers	K/S Consultant	
Don Demelle	CWRPCB	
Yunhong Long	"	
Nigel Abidin		
Jo DiGiorgio	ECOLOGIC	
Charlie Kraker	USGS	
David Cory	STUDA	
Karin Havigfield	SEWIND	
Jon Schurz	Sumach, Simmons and Quinn/CASA	
Rob Burby	RMQCB	
Ben Hall	Hess Family Div. Co.	
Daniel Gozard	CVSC	