

**CV-SALTS Joint Economic and Social Cost and
Technical Advisory Committees Meeting
Thursday, May 28, 2009; 9:00 AM
Central Valley Water Quality Control Board Offices, Rancho Cordova, CA**

I. INTRODUCTIONS:

Attendees introduced themselves and a signup sheet was passed around. Additional parties were on the phone.

II. MEETING PURPOSE:

Chair Quinn described the meeting purpose stressing that we were to use the Santa Ana experience explained to us on 14 May 2009 to identify what needs to be done for the Central Valley situation. The initial focus would be on beneficial uses in each of the Basins. The committee needed to identify work needed to define beneficial uses and water quality objectives as well as follow this up with a better definition of existing programs and data sources.

III. PHASE I WORK PLAN:

Daniel Cozad gave a detailed explanation of the Phase I Work Plan efforts which were described to the SWRCB in the submittal for funding the initial efforts of the Salinity and Nitrate Objective and Beneficial Use Study Project. A salinity and nutrient management flow chart was used and is available as a handout. The two primary deliverables for year 1 of this project are: 1) a final report and data attachments supporting establishment of beneficial uses and preliminary objectives acceptable for protection of the beneficial uses and 2) a model to be used for establishment of uses and objectives throughout the region with limited or no data. Questioning focused on bringing in existing implementation efforts and *Daniel agreed to redo the arrows to reflect that this will happen.*

IV. EXISTING BENEFICIAL USES:

- a. Daniel Cozad gave an overview of the existing beneficial uses in the present basin plans by starting with several principles that lay the foundation for beneficial use protection and designation. These are described in the handout for the meeting. One important point discussed was that dilution or assimilation of salt or waste is not a beneficial use that is protected even though in some cases it may be desirable. Pamela Creedon stated that a water body cannot be utilized as a conveyance for waste and salt is a waste in the eyes of Porter-Cologne therefore any suggestion of such a beneficial use will never fly. Daniel also emphasized the connection between water quality and water quantity, *but this needs further clarification as the Regional Boards have no authority over water quantity or water rights.*
- b. Daniel Cozad gave an overview of the existing definitions used for designation of beneficial uses and the ones he considered most important for establishing water quality objectives and protection schemes for salinity. *A request was made to consider additional definitions for beneficial uses, if one was needed.*

- c. Although there was general understanding of the definitions and the need to review them, there was also a call for 1) inclusion of other designations such as WILD for wetlands as important for salinity control, 2) although all designations need to be in any plan, some will be more important than others in developing water quality objectives and a salinity management plan, and 3) *the need to possibly make two lists; one for salinity and one for nutrients as in many cases they are not the same.*
- d. A discussion took place on the need to differentiate effluent dominated streams, constructed water bodies and Ag dominated water bodies as these may have entirely different beneficial uses.
- e. Rudy Schnagl explained that there is a detailed listing of beneficial use designations found in the Basin Plan that apply to salinity control in the document entitled “Overview of Salinity in the Central Valley, May 2006” that can be found on the CV-SALTS website:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/salinity/initial_development/swrcb-02may06-ovrvw-rpt.pdf
- f. It was suggested that a matrix be prepared that everyone could put their assessment value in for the relative importance of the beneficial use for salinity and nutrient control. *No decision was made on the timing of when this matrix would be prepared.*
- g. A discussion ensued on the designation of beneficial uses via the tributary rule. It was explained that US EPA rejected the State’s attempt, thru the Central Valley Regional Board’s Basin Plan to modify how the tributary rule is applied. *Many asked to better understand the basis of the US EPA rejection of the revised language on the tributary rule. Many feel that US EPA needs to have a representative at the Technical and/or Executive Committee meetings.*
- h. A discussion also ensued on the link between groundwater pumping and discharges to surface water that contain all or a portion of that groundwater. The initial discussion involved municipal and industrial discharges but could also include agricultural pumping as well as pumping for wildlife or wetland use.
- i. A discussion also ensued on the SWRCB’s Sources of Drinking Water Policy and whether there is any flexibility in the policy for groundwater areas not intended for drinking water use or in effluent dominated water bodies. *It was agreed that a person from the SWRCB should be asked to make a presentation to the committee on the policy and its flexibility.*
- j. A request was made for a better understanding of how all the rules come together to make a designation. *As a possible future agenda item, have the group ask specialists to come in and take one or two water bodies to see how it is done.*

- V. CV-SALTS SALT AND NITRATE PILOT AREA STUDY PRESENTATION
- a. It was announced that Larry Walker and Associates would be selected as the consultant to prepare the CV-SALTS Salt and Nitrate Pilot Study. The consultant was introduced and introductions were made of the subcontractors that would be working with Larry Walker and Associates as they put together the study. The consultants gave a detailed presentation of the study concept, the project milestones and schedules along with the proposed pilot study areas. A detailed slide presentation on the salt sources study is found on the CV-SALTS Website.
 - b. It was stressed that this was a project kickoff meeting and the consultants wanted to confirm the study area selections. The critical milestones to follow are a Pilot Area Workplan due in June 2009 with a Pilot Study Implementation Report due in October 2009.
 - c. The consultant confirmed that they would be using the WARMF Model to conduct the study. There was concern among some committee members about whether the WARMF Model would deal with deep groundwater as the WARMF Model was developed as a surface water model. Additional concerns were that the data needed for the WARMTH Model were too detailed for this initial sensitivity analysis. The consultants explained that they planned to take a 20-year period and determine the sensitivity of the data.
 - d. The consultant defined three pilot areas; Yolo County, Merced Area and the Modesto (Stanislaus County) Area. A discussion ensued on the need for an area in the Tulare Lake Basin where groundwater was a primary water supply and little surface water existed. The consultants review the intensity of data in each of the suggested areas and a discussion ensued on the level of data needed and whether the approach they were suggesting would be useful in a data-poor area.
 - e. Because of time limitations, it was agreed that a more in-depth meeting on the suggested pilot areas was needed. *It was agreed that a meeting with the consultants and all interested committee members would be set up for the week of June 1st. An e-mail would be sent to notify every one of the meeting time and place (likely to be in Davis at Larry Walker and Associates).ED. [Agenda](#) and [Notes](#) of that meeting are posted.*
- VI. PRIORITIZATION FOR FUTURE MEETINGS
- Because of time limitation the discussion on prioritization was delayed until a future meeting of the Committee. A short discussion ensued on the various monitoring programs that are on-going and the need to integrate them into the Committee discussions. *To facilitate the discussion at future meetings however it was agreed that each Committee member would provide the chair with their listing of priorities for the Technical Committee to consider.*

- VII. TRIAGE CV-SALTS TECHNICAL ISSUES/SHORT AND LONG TERM NEEDS
Due to time limitations, the agenda item was delayed until a future committee meeting. *Linda Dorn will coordinate with Dennis Westcot to establish a listing or outline for a future Committee Meeting.*
- VIII. SCOPING MEETING OUTLINE/PRESENTATIONS
Daniel Cozad announced that the CEQA Scoping meeting that was planned for July 15th had been rescheduled for September with a date to be chosen. The intent is to hold the meeting immediately following or immediately before the Leadership Council Meeting tentatively planned for September 24th. He has received some input from Committee member on the scope of the meeting but needs more. *Daniel has a writeup on the scope of the meeting and will present his ideas at a future Committee meeting.*
- IX. NEXT JOINT ECONOMICS/TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING
The next Joint meeting of the Economics and Technical Committees is scheduled for June 17th at 9AM to 12 noon with a location to be determined