

**CV-SALTS Joint Economic and Social Cost and  
Technical Advisory Committees Meeting  
Wednesday, May 13, 2009; 9:30 AM**

1. Attendees introduced themselves. Sign-in sheets are attached.
2. Notes from preceding meeting were reviewed and approved.
  - a. Item number five (5) was clarified.
3. Consultant selection for the salt and nitrate pilot study – Daniel.
  - a. Interviews have been scheduled for the five returning interviewees. A selection to be taken to the board should be made by the end of May. It took longer than planned, but the team wanted to be thorough as this was the first time through for the coalition. This should not push out the deadline of the project.
  - b. The proposals ranged from just under \$200,000 to almost \$300,000.
  - c. The committees need to be prepared for a lot of work being due quickly once the consultant is chosen.
4. Technical workshop from the Santa Ana region taking place May 14 at 9:00am – Daniel.
  - a. Daniel made a copy of the agenda available, which included the goals, purpose, and questions to be addressed. The second workshop, to take place on the 28<sup>th</sup>, will be outlined.
  - b. This is probably the only time this particular show will be in Sacramento.
  - c. There are only 16 slots available in GoToMeeting this time around.
  - d. Daniel suggested that non-technical people come for at least the morning portions.
5. Work plan outline and cost duration ranges.
  - a. A good amount of time was spent on this last time.
  - b. Tulare Lake Basin is included.
  - c. Daniel talked about package page 11 and the updates he made to some of the numbers (they went up). Cost ranges between \$22 million and \$42 million, depending on the level of detail and the wide variety of implementation methods.
  - d. Daniel discussed the cost-per-quarter projections.
  - e. Daniel included schedules for people to look at; and, no, they haven't really improved.
  - f. As there were no other questions, Daniel will not work on this items any more until questions/changes come up in the future.
6. Project review and draft Grasslands basin plan amendment committee recommendations
  - a. Since people didn't like the idea of "endorsing" or "supporting," questions were passed around seeking recommendations and suggestions regarding the drainage management approach taken by the board.
  - b. The committee decided to review each question one by one.

- c. Nigel expressed that he feels that the stakeholders have been successful in meeting their objectives, so they should continue with the current approach.
  - d. Daniel expressed that the technical committee should stick to technical issues, identify policy issues, and send both to the board as their recommendations, noting dissension(s) as needed.
  - e. Suggestion: technical recommendations should be made via a clear “recommendations letter” and not just as a part of the meeting minutes.
  - f. Suggestion: salt load reduction should be included in WBRs as well as selenium load reductions.
  - g. Suggestion: to mitigate the loads coming into the San Joaquin River, the excess monies should be used to purchase water to dilute the salt and selenium entering the river.
  - h. It was agreed that the committee continue to keep an open mind and not preclude options as they move forward.
  - i. It was agreed that the deadline is, at the latest, the end of this year.
  - j. All documentation in the package is available for download on the [cvsalinity.org](http://cvsalinity.org) Web site.
  - k. Need to talk about process with the executive committee.
7. Potential watershed and operations modeling tool – Amanda
- a. The project is basin plan amendment for site-specific water quality objectives for salt and boron for the San Joaquin River.
  - b. The first step is to figure out what some potential objectives are. This will have to take place at a future meeting.
  - c. The next step is to use other modeling tools to figure out how achievable the objectives are in this particular basin. Amanda is seeking input from the committee on the modeling tools at which she is looking. She went over three specific questions for the committee to consider. She also expressed that they would like to move forward by the next meeting with selecting the tool.
  - d. Interest was expressed in having additional training sessions on modeling tools.
  - e. After much discussion, it was agreed that people should email their thoughts to Daniel and he will compile them. Then, the committee will have a conference call a week before the next meeting to review. Anyone outside the committee who should be included should be invited.
  - f. Need to talk about process with the executive committee.
8. Coordination committee project and program matrix – Daniel/Linda
- a. Two questions for the committee:
    - i. Is there something missing from the matrix?
    - ii. How do we get the details for the projects without a POC name attached to them (as well as a name)?
  - b. Projects broken into tiers:
    - i. Critical/Significant
    - ii. Close coordination/Mutual interest
    - iii. Ancillary/related
    - iv. Informational
  - c. Absent project: compilation of 303d list of impaired water bodies. The reason this is important is that TMDLs will need to be prepared down the road.

9. Updates on MDA
  - a. Soon be having public commentary on draft plan.
  - b. The larger points will be hashed out and brought before this committee at a later meeting.
  - c. Anyone who wants to join this endeavor just needs to let a member know.
  
10. Plan updates, planned use by Dr. Hoffman – Mark
  - a. Contract accepted and picked up.
  - b. Dr. Hoffman flying in the following week.
  - c. Looking at August 12 or 13 for presentation of Dr. Hoffman’s draft report. The report will be released a week or two early so people can review and come to the presentation with questions and comments.
  - d. Having preliminary discussions with UC-Riverside water resources center on coordinating similar plans for viewing transient soil selenium model.
  - e. Working on alternatives for water flow operations modeling based on April 22<sup>nd</sup> workshop input.
  - f. *There were a couple inaudible questions to which the subsequent answers did not make sense by themselves.*
  - g. Mark was not aware of a rescheduling of the cancelled May 18<sup>th</sup> state board meeting.
  
11. Scoping meeting planning for July discussing project options – Daniel
  - a. One of the requirements from the regional board was to have a scoping meeting this summer. July 15<sup>th</sup> was picked as the date. Daniel asked for a group of people to come up with the technical content.
  - b. “The project” was defined as a basin plan amendment that is five years out, the exact details of which are undetermined. It was, therefore, recommended that the scoping meeting be viewed as an exercise in defining the project, including the “alternatives.”
  - c. Postponing the July 15<sup>th</sup> deadline can be taken to the board if need be. A subgroup was formed to determine the feasibility of having the meeting on the 15<sup>th</sup>.
  
12. EC regulation vs TDS (total dissolved salts) – Daniel
  - a. This issue came from state board’s scoping meeting by waste water treatment plant attendees. It was added to the agenda because there were many emails about it.
  - b. TDS can’t be monitored continuously. EC-to-TDS relationship can vary quite a bit.
  - c. This issue is critical and built into the pilot study, and the committee will need to discuss it further and compare pros and cons of different approaches, beginning with the end impacts (“why” before “how”).
  - d. The committee decided to assemble a matrix of approach possibilities and then have consultants come in to educate them further to start. Daniel warned the group that these consultants will be very ready to move forward on decisions made.

13. Technical Advisory Committee Mission tabled. Email input to Daniel or Nigel.
14. Scope and planning for May 28<sup>th</sup> meeting – Nigel
  - a. The idea was to have a meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup> followed up by the meeting on the 28<sup>th</sup>.
  - b. The agenda for the 28<sup>th</sup> meeting is on page ten of the package.
  - c. Program funding: Not much work has been done on this, and detail will be needed soon. The money is there; the committee needs to make sure they fit under the program description.

**Next meeting: June 17<sup>th</sup>**  
**Send agenda items to Daniel.**



# Meeting Sign-in

Name	Organization	Email (if new or changed)
Lisa Rde	USRA	
Dennis Westcott	STRGA	
Lynnda Dorn	SRCLSP	
Karl Longley		
Ruddy Schmege	RWQCRB	