

**Joint Economic and Social Impact and
Technical Advisory Committees
Thursday, June 10, 2010 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM**

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

Technical Committee Co-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 [May 13 Technical Committee Meeting Notes](#)**

Motion to approve by Joe DiGiorgio; Seconded by Bob Smith; Motion was approved

3. **Upper San Joaquin River Committee Kickoff Update**
 - a. Dennis Westcot and David Cory Co-Chairs

The Upper San Joaquin River Committee will present for approval Dennis Westcot and David Cory as co-chairs to the Executive Committee. The Technical Committee seconded the recommendation.

- b. Participants, study area, scope and efforts discussions

Notes of the first meeting will be available once the co-chairs have had a chance to review them. Agendas will be made available to those who request them for review. There was a discussion of whether additional members/representation was needed, suggestions were made, and CVSC is contacting parties for their participation.

Nigel asked whether the name should be Lower San Joaquin instead of Upper. The name is lower but the actual area covers is still to be decided.

- c. Background meeting with RWQCB June 30, 2010 9:30-4:30 will be a full day meeting to review all existing work and scope the next steps and future work needed to complete the efforts. An agenda for this workshop will be developed and distributed ahead of time.
 - d. Next Committee meeting July 26, 2010 in Modesto

Nigel asked to be added to the List for the Committee

4. **Meetings and Update Reports from [Active Subcommittees](#)**
 - a. Subcommittee Agenda
Daniel presented TAC members with a list of all the subcommittees and what those subcommittees' roles were, as well as information on past and future meetings .

Meeting times will be updated on the website.

b. Pilot Lessons Learned

At the last meeting, the committee members worked on the sections near the end of the Lessons Learned to develop the minimum and maximum tiers.

At the next meeting, the committee will decide if the work on this section is complete or if more work and investigation is required on the definitions and explanatory text, and then start work on the rest of the report.

c. Best Management Practice Committee

No chair has been selected yet. The draft document based on the BMP work the Wine Institute provided is done. At the last few meetings, the Regional Board Executive Officer asked CV-SALTS to include some other areas – how would someone demonstrate a best management practice, how would we keep track of it, what would we do, etc. The committee discussed these issues at the very beginning stages.

BMP consideration began with the Wine Institute and aimed to determine what CV-SALTS might want to look at, and from that what would other organizations (eg: California League of Food Processors, Irrigated Lands, Wetlands) want to look at. CV-SALTS is focused on getting salt and nitrate management included in practices, and the net results of any implemented BMP.

The committee will hear from the State Board in July on what they're doing.

d. Phase 1 BUOS Subcommittee Update

Kennedy Jenks (K/J) provided an update on their ongoing efforts. The PowerPoint is posted under Documents/presentations on the website:

Task 1: Identify Existing and Potential Uses from the available information

Colleen introduced the team and their efforts. They have reviewed the basin plan and the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary Plan, and pulled out the beneficial uses and water quality objectives.

GIS data is now being linked with the key players: the California Water Data Set (Calw221) and the Bolton 119 for ground water and the National Hydro Dataset from USGS.

The committee has also assigned categories of existing, exempt, and potential and working through it.

The committee found a solution as to how to apply the tributary rule to segments that are not assigned a beneficial use. The committee is taking the Calw221 data and the Hydro Sub unit and capturing the tributaries with that and then assigning beneficial uses based on the tributary rule.

The committee met with the SWRCB staff doing beneficial use mapping for their storm water effort. The K/J effort parallels the SWRCB efforts.

SWRCB has integrated their 2010 report with additional impaired waters and beneficial uses. Cal EPA will not be approving it until October or November. CV-SALTS Efforts should be even more integrated into that report. There is some overlapping with the existing projects.

The skeleton of a GIS viewer has been developed. On the 18th it will be sent to the subcommittee for their review and on the 29th they will be meeting to discuss it.

The database will be developed throughout the project.

Task 2: Identification of Existing Water Quality (Leila)

Basin plans reviewed included: Sacramento River/San Joaquin Basin Plan, Tulare Lake Basin Plan, San Francisco Bay-Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta Estuary Plan. The control of Salt and Boron Discharges into the Lower San Joaquin River amendment of the Sac River/San Joaquin Basin Plan was also reviewed. Two more amendments are still in the reviewing/development stage and haven't been approved and so weren't considered.

The group presented committee members with a grid layout of the basin plan, including what river it's associated with, the description that was listed in the basin plan and then identified which beneficial uses were applied to those locations. A second grid continues that table with the water quality objectives associated with those locations. The individual constituents aren't always documented separately.

The group also presented a table of regulatory criteria (Safe Drinking Water Act) for Municipal water (specific conductivity: the secondary MCLs and the primary MCLs) that Calw122 has listed. These are included as a reference for what the requirements are for municipal delivered water.

Other beneficial use codes appeared, but were not included in master table including: COMM – Commercial and Sport Fishing; RARE – rare, threatened, or endangered species; NAV – Navigation; SHELL – Shellfish Harvesting; BIOL – Biological Habitats of Special Significance.

NPDES permits have been reviewed and a table provided to list various part of the NPDES permits. These permits should serve as an example for interpreting the basin plan and the historic regional implementation. Region 5 staff proposed a list of representative NPDES permits, the subcommittee reviewed the list and made comments. Those comments were incorporated and the subcommittee approved the final list.

This list will allow limits established in the permit both narrative and numerical limits will be included in the layer.

Suggestion that the items listed are representative.

The subcommittee will continue to discuss what is going to be included in the mapping regarding the permit information for each discharge location.

Task 3: Literature Search of Water Quality Criteria

The various reports mentioned in the proposal have been collected, as well as reports from the Rio Grande River Basin and Arkansas River Basin in Colorado.

Nigel suggested that State Board staff be brought in to present what they're doing so CV-SALTS is aware of where there is overlap when the Combined Impaired Waterbodies List is approved.

5. Technical Subcommittee Meetings Scheduled

- a. BUOS Phase 1 Subcommittee meeting 6/29/10 10:00AM
- b. Best Management Practice Subcommittee next call 6/29/10 3:00 PM
- c. Pilot Lessons Learned and Phase 2 BUOS Meet 6/29/10 1:00 PM

6. Review discuss [Progress Demonstration List](#) (1:13:54)

- a. Review Luce Environmental Science Fellowship Proposal

Committee members were presented with a draft RFP which would also be reviewed at the executive committee. This is a UC program that brings together multidisciplinary groups of post-docs to work for 18 months on a particular problem as a capstone to their work. They need something long-term. So the committee decided on the review of technologies and management alternatives for salinity management and their effectiveness.

The object we developed is to identify, understand and evaluate how salinity is being managed by communities and industry, identify critical salt areas, investigate the most effective means to manage those areas, and present their conclusions to CV-SALTS so they can be considered for integration into management alternatives.

Nigel asked what role CV-SALTS would play in the study. Daniel replied that CV-SALTS would provide data, with the hope that the LUCE Fellowship will be able to present associated costs. Nigel suggested that, if the proposal is one of the winning ones, the group should be invited to talk with the committee. **Suggestion that a subcommittee liaison be appointed to work with them and report back to the committee.**

Committee Recommends the Executive Committee Approve the Proposal

b. Brainstorm Technical Tasks likely to use in-kind contributions

The committee has a requirement to identify a list of technical tasks and develop a process to identify elements of the technical and administrative and project work that could be done as in-kind services, such as elements of the Beneficial Use and Objectives Study.

Joe DiGiorgio agreed to provide a bullet list of elements that could be done through an in-kind arrangement.

Bruce volunteered SAC Water Valley Coalition. Daniel suggested that Bruce provide a paragraph of what his group would do so the committee can decide on what things that may need to be done on the whole.

Suggestion that an in-kind relationship be investigated for data compilation, eg: the Yarum-Ruben (UC Berkeley) database. Daniel agreed to follow up with Hilmar to see if the group would be willing to share their information.

More ideas may come out when BUOS Phase 2 is about to get started.

c. Distributed data collection and management

On July 6, CV-SALTS will be asking SWRCB for funding for coordinated data collection and aggregation work. The committee will need to collect some of the data on water quality. Daniel asked whether or not this work can be done in-kind or with a small incentive. Daniel asked the committee for feedback on the areas that CV-SALTS should look to develop data needed for future efforts. (eg: IRWMs, watersheds).

Nigel suggested that someone sit down with some of these groups and help design a rough database that either their existing database or data collection activities would fit into that could be pulled into CV-SALTS' database.

Nigel indicated that in the past Karl Jacobs (BDAT, CEDEN) offered to assist stakeholder groups with database design if the data was to be eventually housed in CEDEN. This would end up being less work for the Resources Agency and data managers in the long term since the database would be designed to interface with the larger CEDEN geodatabase.

Melissa Turner suggested that someone talk to Department of Water Resources regarding the water elevation data they will be collecting and find out how they will be getting groups to submit that data.

Daniel asked if there were logical groups that CV-SALTS should approach to form a network group. Nigel suggested the Wetland Coalition wetland entities (State, federal and private wetlands).

Question about what data the committee is looking to collect. The Lessons Learned committee was looking to identify gaps in the data to replicate the process in other areas. Question about what would be done with the data and how will that data change at beneficial use and objectives and fits into the implementation plan.

Suggestion of development of a relational database that will accept the data from other groups and put it into CV-SALTS' database without requiring a lots of meetings. Nigel commented that not everyone's monitoring tools will be the same and parameters of everyone's particular databases may not be compatible.

Melissa suggested to work with CEDEN regarding what data sets/programs/groups have already spent money on such data compilation and build on their work – surface water, ground water, discharge. And to have someone present to the TAC perhaps in August and that a list of “need to knows” be provided to CEDEN rep prior to presentation.

Nigel suggested that the committee start with Joe's suggestion in terms of some of the things that CV-SALTS needs regarding salinity. It will provide a template for triaged areas and the detail that's required and then approach those who would have that data already.

Pamela agreed that the Lessons Learn subcommittee come out with a two-tiered template of what information is needed overall, and then break it down into the data needed for the basin plan amendment.

One group suggested was IRWMP. All the groups had ground water data. Another suggested the database for recycled water.

Action: The Lessons Learned committee will summarize the lessons learned through July and to guide the discussion and presentation for August.

d. Data and database planning contact recommendation (July)

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

In order to develop Phase 2, we need to see the Phase 1 work and the Lessons Learned work. Daniel suggested that it therefore be deferred until next month.

8. Actions/Recommendations/Report to the Executive Committee

- a. **Report on “Lower” San Joaquin River and approval of the co-chairs**
- b. **Updates from the subcommittees**
- c. **Luce Environmental Science Fellowship Proposal**

9. Next meeting date, July 15, [2010 Calendar](#) with locations

10. Adjourned