AGENDA of the Combined Meeting of the Economic and Social Impact and Technical Advisory Committees

July 14, 2009 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM

CV Regional Water Quality Control Board Room
11020 Sun Center Drive #200, Rancho Cordova, CA Map

Webcast  https://www2.gotomeeting.com/join/723404171 Meeting ID: 723-404-171
Teleconference Dial 712-338-7121 Access Code: 723-404-171

1. Welcome, Introductions, Approve June 17 Notes  5 min
2. Review and Approve Committee Rosters  5 min
3. Salt/Nitrate Source Pilot Draft Work Plan Presentation - LWA Team  40 min
4. Salt/Nitrate Source Pilot Draft Work Plan comments – All  40 min
5. Coordination Committee Process Program MATRIX  5 min
6. Review/Discuss Draft Beneficial Use/Objectives SOW (to be updated)  30 min
7. Coordination Programs
   a. Intro Developing a Groundwater Strategy for the CV – Pam Buford  10 min
   b. Intro Project Review Guideline from PEOC Committee  5 min
8. Discuss edits to the Technical Committee Mission (below)  15 min
9. Brainstorm Questions to ID basin plans improvement areas  15 min
10. Actions/Recommendations/Report to the Executive Committee
    Discuss next meeting date August 19 and create Agenda Calendar
    Committee meeting August 19th Basin Plan Training August 18th
    Leadership Group Meeting September 24 1:30 pm  5 min
11. EC vs TDS, Sodium etc. Matrix review/discussion - Tom  20 min
12. Scoping Meeting Planning NOP and Project information  45 min

Executive Committee begins at 1:30 PM

Mission of the CVSLG:
The mission of the Central Valley Salinity Leadership Group is to work closely, in a collaborative manner to create a comprehensive Central Valley Salinity Management Plan.

Mission of the CVSLG Technical Advisory Committee:
The mission of the Technical Advisory Committee is to provide guidance and direction for the ongoing compilation and management of data, studies and technical information needed to develop a comprehensive Central Valley Salinity Management Plan.
Attendees: See separate sign-in sheet and teleconference log.

1. Welcome, Introductions, Approve May Notes
After a motion and a second, the May notes were approved without dissension.

2. Complete Committees Membership Roster
Per Mona’s request, Daniel passed the roster around and asked the attendees to fill in their names and to select whether they want to be a “member” or a “participant.” No distinct difference was defined at this time.

After a few meetings, the team agreed on three study areas: Yolo County, the Modesto area, and the Tule River. Yolo had a great amount of well organized ground water data already available. Modesto and the Tule river have some detailed ground water modeling already going on (Harter in Tule). The presentation is available on the Web site.

The control volumes are as strictly set to the chosen study area boundaries as the data allows. The study area boundaries themselves were basically determined by the modeling work currently taking place. The point was made that the boundaries may need to be adjusted depending on the problem to be solved. The ground water quality would be determined by averaging available data.

Lisa reviewed the Drinking Water Policy Constituent Prioritization Process (available upon request) as it might pertain to the pilot study. WARMF TDS is calculated by adding up all the constituent ions; this enables digging down to specific elements. The Modesto area drainage wells’ impact on the study needs to be addressed. The land use categories will be expanded as part of this study.

Pamela expressed concern that the schedule is unrealistically aggressive (e.g., someone made the point that December might not be a good month for moving from draft to final.) The team decided that the draft deadline would remain November 30th, the comment deadline would be moved to January 15th, and the final would be due January 31st.
4. Coordination Committee Process/Program MATRIX
Daniel suggested that people download the excel file from the Web site to truly review it for themselves. Daniel briefly highlighted a couple additions, including the San Joaquin River recirculation and restoration efforts, item 4, and item 34. He made the point that the committee will need to decide a prioritization process for the data tracked in this matrix. Linda commented that the permit information needs to be reviewed more thoroughly. If anyone wants to make changes, they need to pull it down from the Web site when ready, make the change(s) right away, and then send to Daniel. This matrix will be used to coordinate with everyone who is doing significant work on salinity.

5. Discuss Project Review and Grasslands Bypass Amendment, Committee Recommendations Final Questions, Comments and Process
Gail said she got one comment back, from Dennis. His first comment was that the full process is a selenium control program, and this will only be beneficial if the salinity discharges can be controlled. Plus, the salt control program should be integrated into the CV SALTS program. His second comment was that the drainage plan basically stores salt in the basin, because there are still no long-term plans to mitigate the salt that is drained.

The committee after much discussion, a proper motion, a second, one abstention, and one recusal, the committee agreed to move forward to make these comments their final comments on the project and refer them to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee was encouraged to endorse the project based on the committee’s review.

6. Discussion of Potential Watershed and Operations Modeling Tools to Establish New Salinity and Boron Water Quality Objectives in the Lower San Joaquin River and TMDLs to Implement Salinity and Boron Water Quality Objectives Results of Questions and Modelers Conference Call Draft Comments
Amanda followed up on her presentation from last month on the modeling tools and the three questions she posed to the group. They received some comments and they have been combined and will be considered as they move forward. Daniel suggested that focusing on the consensus of feedback proves more fruitful.

Nigel commented that people can provide feedback more easily if they know exactly what the models are to be used for. CalSim would be utilized to model the full range of hydrology in the basin. The WARMF model would be used to determine water quality and also for the ground water component in the basin. Using both together would give a high-quality representation of the system and
look at the entire range of hydrology; capture worst case scenario; and, find out what impacts would arise from implementing the different objectives.

Dennis made the point that this entire project should be focused simply on hydrologic surface water data, and that land use, ground water, etc., are very minor issues.

Amanda made the point that they really wanted to make the decisions today. **Linda volunteered to put the recommendations and comments together into a comment letter format.** Daniel would work on the protocol for such reviews. **Per Daniel’s suggestion, the teleconference that took place to discuss this will be repeated on June 22 at 2:00pm, allowing for more attendees.** After this meeting, another letter will go out and respondents will have a week to respond. If there are no responses, this item will be considered closed, and the recommendations will be forwarded to the Executive Committee.

7. Bay-Delta Plan Update – State Board
There was a brief, informational run-through of upcoming public events Mark Gowdy.

- Reevaluating Flow in SJ River and Salinity objectives in the South Delta
- Friday 6/26, Follow-up meeting after the public workshop and the Cal-Sim modeling and summary of the comments that were received.
- July 7, Periodic Review of Bay Delta Plan, Division of Water Rights provided staff report evaluates issues the plan update should consider. Salt related changes could be the X2 objectives or the transition brackish/fresh locations.
- July 15th Dr. Hoffman will issue draft report on effects of salinity on south delta agriculture.
- August 13th Dr. Hoffman will present the report and take public comment
- Taking with UC Riverside and Salinity Lab, to study transient state soil water salinity models

8. Break

This was a top-level “awareness” briefing, so the committee knows this is going on. The presentation is available online; and, **if anyone is interested, they need to get involved now. Here is a Presentation LINK**
10. EC vs TDS, Sodium etc. Matrix Review/Discussion – Tom
Tom did a high-level overview and asked everyone to review this on their own and provide feedback to Daniel. Tom may, in the next iteration, remove all the non-salinity-related beneficial uses and reference them in footnotes.

11. Actions/Recommendations/Report to the Executive Committee
(1) Approval of Grasslands comments; (2) San Joaquin River Model (3) Meeting on the 22\textsuperscript{nd} and the 30\textsuperscript{th} and (4) Process for committees

12. Discuss Next Meeting Date and Create Agenda; Leadership Meeting
Support Draft Calendar and Future Agenda
a. Scoping Meeting Planning NOP and Project Information
b. Work Plan Technical Approach/Questions BU Matrix
c. Discuss Edits to the Technical Committee Mission
The next meeting date is July 14\textsuperscript{th}, NOT the 17\textsuperscript{th}. Daniel stressed that these sub-items need to be addresses as soon as possible, and that this effort will soon be behind schedule if they are not.

The committee agreed to have a “workshop” on June 30\textsuperscript{th} at 2:00 pm to address these items. If you cannot attend, you should review and provide feedback before the meeting. Nigel requested that people include their initials when giving comments/feedback.

13. Meeting Adjourned
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Stiger</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michael.stiger@cvac.org">michael.stiger@cvac.org</a></td>
<td>CVAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Minors</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anna.minors@cvac.org">anna.minors@cvac.org</a></td>
<td>CVAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john.doe@cvac.org">john.doe@cvac.org</a></td>
<td>CVAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Solution alternatives for long-term sustiability
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Carl Ciesielski  CURRICULM
Steve Phillips  USGS
Bill Luce  Friant Water Users Authority  wluce@friantwater.org
David Coy  STU D A
Joel Miller
Melissa Turner / Michael Johnson
Victor Chan  Solano County
Charles Tang
> Thomas Harper
> Pascal Benito
> Erika De Holban
## CV-SALTS Committee Roster

### Technical Advisory Committee Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nomination Category</th>
<th>Name and Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Co-chair</td>
<td>Nigel Quinn, Laurence Berkeley National Laboratories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Co-chair</td>
<td>Currently Vacant,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Steve Bailey, City of Tracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Linda Dorn, SRCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>David Cory, San Joaquin Valley Drainage Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dennis Westcott SJR GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lisa Holm, Bureau of Reclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mark Gowdy, SWRCB, Water Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Darren Polhemus, SWRCB, Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tom Reyes, City of Vacaville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Karna Harrigfeld, Stockton East Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>John Schutz, Sommach, Simmons and Dunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jeff Bold, Brown and Caldwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ron Crites, Brown and Caldwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Dan Burgard, Cascade Earth Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Joe Digiorgio, EcoLogic Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Lynne Baumgras, Amex Geomatrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Michael Steiger, Erler and Kalinowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Paula Hansen, CDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bob Smith, LWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants:
- Mark Larson, KDWCD
- Karl Longley, CVRWB
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### Economic and Social Cost Committee Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nomination Category</th>
<th>Name and Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Co-chair</td>
<td>Rob Neenan, California League of Food Processors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Co-chair</td>
<td>Dave Cory, San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Water Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Joe Digiorgio, EcoLogic Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Linda Dorn, SRCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tom Reyes, City of Vacaville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Mark Larson, KDWCD
- Dennis Westcott SJR GA
CV-SALTS

Work Plan for Salt and Nitrate Sources Pilot Implementation Study

*Draft*

Submitted by:

LARRRY WALKER ASSOCIATES
LUHDORFF & SCALMANINI CONSULTING ENGINEERS
Systec Water Resources, Inc.
Newfields Agriculture and Environmental Resources, LLC.
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2 Matrix of Projects and Programs

The committee is developing a Matrix of Projects and Programs that need to be coordinated with CV-SALTS. The matrix has input from committee members and significant data from the Waterboards. The most recent version of the matrix, Version 7 (July 2009) includes significant State Board additions, San Joaquin River project coordinated by Dennis Westcot, and NPDES lists by Linda Dorn and her staff.

2.1 Project/Program Tiers

These Tiers identify the criticality of coordination of the project with CV-SALTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Program Tier</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Coordination Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0. Integral:</td>
<td>CV-SALTS Stakeholder led and coordinated activity, highest priority</td>
<td>Must develop scope, funding, oversight and coordination with all other efforts for this tier. Must attend their meeting and have them attend ours and provide official feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Significant:</td>
<td>Directly effects the Basin Plan Amendments or implementation Indirectly affects Basin Plan Amendments, impacts CV-SALTS efforts or significantly limits/advances salinity management options</td>
<td>Clear interaction and official coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Close Coordination</td>
<td>Indirectly impacts CV-SALTS or potentially limits/advances salt management options</td>
<td>Ad-hoc coordination and awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Ancillary</td>
<td>Indicates the process of basin planning or salinity management plan implementation</td>
<td>Reports to the committee and information exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Informational:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Timeline and Schedule Coordination

The committee members are working, Regional board Staff to complete the areas of Schedule, Milestones and Decisions for the tasks and add detail to the Matrix.
2.3 Engagement Process and Decisions
The committee has spent significant time working to identify the process for coordinating and updating information, gaining input and providing decisions and comments in a timely manner. The Draft Process document is included below.

3 Coordination Process
The Ad-Hoc Committee has put significant time into the identification of programs that should be coordinated with CV-SALTS. While each Program and Project will be different and require specific coordination processes, the goal of this process is to identify and document the standard processes which will work for most or many of the programs and then further refine the process.

3.1 Project Integration by Schedule of Decision or Timeline
The preferred process of coordination is to engage projects as they ramp up to make decisions or approve contracts or enact regulations. An example process is diagramed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 months</td>
<td>Work with the staff to educate them on CV-SALTS and the general interests and needs for Salt Management.</td>
<td>Advance CV-SALTS efforts with the program staff as early as possible so the needs are reflected in initial efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier I. II. III. IV</td>
<td>Awareness briefing or general information on the program or project</td>
<td>Be a source of information for stakeholders and stay up to date on changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide direction that will benefit the basin planning tasks and process</td>
<td>Improve efforts of both programs and assist with integration of results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months before Decision Point</td>
<td>Request background information and make available to appropriate CV-SALTS Committees. Work with point of contact and to help them prepare materials for the committee to review.</td>
<td>Bring stakeholders up to speed, orient them to how the program related to CV-SALTS and what they need to understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier I. II. III. IV</td>
<td>Schedule the committee presentations for discussion and information and have them review potential implications of the decisions.</td>
<td>Prepare committee, have members perform analysis or review of the outcomes of various decisions being contemplated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 months before decision point</td>
<td>Based on the committee briefings coordinate comments, consolidated position and consensus recommendations and dissent.</td>
<td>Prepare or coordinate group opinions and comments to develop consensus. See Committee Protocol below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier I. II</td>
<td>Consensus recommendation and documentation of the feedback to be approved by the Executive Committee. See Committee Protocol.</td>
<td>Facilitate approval of consensus position and ensure staff of the organization is aware of the position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 month before the decision point</td>
<td>Member of the Coalition or CV-SALTS Executive Committee represents the position</td>
<td>Ensure communication of the position and enhance the likely changes are made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coordination elements would for Tier III. and IV. would include only the 6 and 4-6 month elements.
3.2 Project Integration by Geography
As CV-SALTS is developed there will likely be focused efforts in various regions, likely at least in the Sacramento, San Joaquin and Tulare Lake. Geographic integration would be possible by identifying the project locations and linkages and coordinating the projects effects by community as well as by water movement downstream and down gradient. This may be integrated with work plan elements as well. If all projects have GIS information for extents simple visual checks on GIS maps would be possible.

3.3 Project Integration by Work Plan Element
As the CV-SALTS Work program develops the major work elements can be used for integration. Particularly data acquisition and management efforts will need to be coordinated for review and comparison with existing and collected data. By using the work plan elements as integration similar functions and efforts can be identified. This integration can be classified and a schedule developed similar to calendar and geography.

4 Committee Protocol for Program Feedback and Recommendations
The protocol below more clearly identifies the review and comment and overall integration of projects and programs in the Matrix. The programs and projects will have various interactions with the committees because of the different committees and the broad nature of programs to be coordinated.

4.1 Schedule Coordination
Projects or Programs proponents or managers requesting specific feedback from CV-SALTS committees should identify the program according to the Schedule Timeline section above. Bringing the committee or committees up to speed and providing background and project information before the feedback or recommendations are needed. Participants or committee members may initiate a request for feedback or comments on an existing or newly identified program as well.

4.2 Committee Review and Comment Protocol
Many types of requests may be made of the CV-SALTS committees. The protocols for two types of reviews are outlined below to illustrate the steps and process expectations. The actual protocol may change slightly depending on the issue and its timing. The protocol as written should take no more than 2 months maximum and if pre information is provided and all deadlines are met may be able to be done in one month.

4.2.1 Request for review and feedback or comments
1. Background or information made available to committee, schedule with chairs for regular meeting (Notice and Info)
2. Briefing, discussion and specific or general requests from proponent (Presentation)
3. Committee members comment or provide draft feedback to chair within 2 weeks (Comments)
4. Chair or Co-Chair may schedule a conference call or meeting to review committees feedback (Review call)
5. Chair or Co-chair consolidates comments and summarizes into draft committee response for distribution to committee members (draft letter)
6. CVSC distributes the draft letter to the committee members (Committee distribution)
7. Committee members review 1 week to email Chair or Co-Chair or final (Wescot review)
8. Agendized for the next regular meeting simultaneously agendized on consent calendar of Executive Committee, unless controversial
9. Committee approves comment or feedback letter
10. Executive Committee approves letter or provides direction to committee chair (approval)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Protocol Element</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Notice and Information</td>
<td>2 weeks before a regular meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Presentation if needed</td>
<td>At regular meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Committee Comments</td>
<td>2 weeks after meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Review Call</td>
<td>2 weeks after meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Summary draft letter</td>
<td>2 weeks after meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Committee distribution</td>
<td>2 weeks after meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Westcot Review comments</td>
<td>3 weeks after meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Agendized for Committees</td>
<td>1 week before next Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Committee approval</td>
<td>At regular meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Executive Committee Review and approval</td>
<td>At same regular meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Requests for support, approval, or funding
1. Background or information made available to committee, schedule with chairs (Notice and Info)
2. Briefing, discussion and specific or general requests from proponent (Presentation)
3. Chair or Co-Chair may schedule a conference call or meeting to discuss members recommendations in accordance with the guideline (Comments and Review call)
4. Chair or Co-chair consolidates comments and summarizes into draft committee response for distribution to committee members (draft letter)
5. CVSC distributes the draft letter to the committee members (Committee distribution)
6. Committee members review 1 week to email Chair or Co-Chair or final (Wescot review)
7. Agendized for the next regular meeting simultaneously agendized on consent calendar of Executive Committee, unless controversial
8. Committee supports, approves or recommends funding
9. Executive Committee supports, approves or recommends funding to the CVSC Board
10. CVSC Board reviews funding request and budget or available funding and provides funding or other response to the Executive committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Protocol Element</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Notice and Information</td>
<td>2 weeks before a regular meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Presentation, if needed</td>
<td>At regular meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Committee Guideline Review Call</td>
<td>2 weeks after meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Summary draft letter</td>
<td>2 weeks after meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Committee distribution</td>
<td>2 weeks after meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Westcot Review comments</td>
<td>3 weeks after meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agendized for Committees</td>
<td>1 week before next Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Committee approval</td>
<td>At regular meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Executive Committee Review and approval</td>
<td>At same regular meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>CVSC Board Review and Disposition</td>
<td>At earliest regular meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Matrix Development and Updates

Critical to the process of coordination is identification of basic information for the programs. The Matrix is the first iteration of the coordination information. Development and updating of the Matrix is key to being able to correctly bring programs and projects into the CV-SALTS program. Important parts of the Matrix include the following:

Index No. - Index number is assigned, as programs are identified to assist in an unique shorthand identified for the program or project. Like a table of contents, it would be broken down further to represent different tasks in a project or program.

Program or Effort Name - Common name or identifier for the program

Tasks - Task or work elements under the Program or Project

Purpose or Objective - What the Task or Project will or is intended to accomplish

Requirement or Driver - Regulatory or agreement driver or required

Data or Deliverables – Describe the Data that is generated or deliverables that will be completed as part of this project or task.

Geographic Region – Identify the geographic region that the program or project may affect with as much specificity as possible but at a minimum the basin and water bodies.

CV-SALTS Task # - Referring to the CV-SALTS Work Plan outline, identify if possible which task may be closest related to the program. If the program generates data or reduces salt identify the areas of the work plan that this data or implementation would fit into.

Website – Program website that keeps updated information and data for the projects

Agency or Group – What agency or group is responsible or managing the program or had decision making authority over it.

Contact Name – Manager or project staff point of contact name

Title – Title for the point of contact

Agency – Agency or organization is responsible or funding the program with decision authority

Timeline Start and Completion – Project or timeline or schedule, initiation or start data and completion date. If ongoing use the date it began or the date it was identified. If the project is part of a program that will be ongoing for more than 5 years, list the last date for the planned activities.

Task Deadline – For each task, if there is a deadline for the documentation or action list it.

Milestones 2009 - List major milestones for the project or tasks, significant accomplishments or changes documents or other program milestones

Decision Points 2009 – Decision Points are critical to identify, these allow the program to be engaged prior to the decisions and to produce recommendations from CV-SALTS in a timely manner. The decision points may include draft and final approval of CEQA/NEPA documents, plan approval, project funding or other significant opportunities to provide coordination and input before a decision is made by the agency or organization.

*Data that is required cannot be left blank
Criticality to CV-SALTS – The tiers of coordination describe in more detail above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Program Tier</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Coordination Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0. <strong>Integral:</strong></td>
<td>CV-SALTS Stakeholder led and coordinated activity, highest priority</td>
<td>Must develop scope, funding, oversight and coordination with all other efforts for this tier. Must attend their meeting and have them attend ours and provide official feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. <strong>Significant:</strong></td>
<td>Directly effects the Basin Plan Amendments or implementation</td>
<td>Clear interaction and official coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. <strong>Close Coordination</strong></td>
<td>Indirectly affects Basin Plan Amendments, impacts CV-SALTS efforts or significantly limits/advances salinity management options</td>
<td>Ad-hoc coordination and awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. <strong>Ancillary</strong></td>
<td>Indirectly impacts CV-SALTS or potentially limits/advances salt management options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. <strong>Informational:</strong></td>
<td>Informs the process of basin planning or salinity management plan implementation</td>
<td>Reports to the committee and information exchange</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tiers are defined here and identify how closely the program or project is related to the CV-SALTS Initiative.

**Sources Addressed** – Sources of salt addressed by the project or task, agricultural, urban, process, dissolution, irrigation etc.

### 6 Coordination Level and Activities

There are significant efforts in coordination that can be accomplished at the staff to staff level other need to be escalated to the Executive to Executive level. Examples of both are shown below.

#### 6.1 Staff –Staff or Executive Level Coordination

Staff –Staff and Executive-Executive coordination may be appropriate in the following situations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Coordination</th>
<th>Executive Coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The program is known/understood</td>
<td>Program is new or unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program staff have been identified</td>
<td>Program point of contact is unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program staff participate in CV-SALTS</td>
<td>Program do not participate or respond to inquiries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program is on budget and schedule</td>
<td>Program involves funding needs or program changes or significant deviations from schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program or organization is controversial or defiant</td>
<td>Requires legislative, legal or other decisions by the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires legislative, legal or other decisions by the organization</td>
<td>Program or organization is uncooperative at the staff level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6.2 Executive-Executive Coordination

Executive level coordination may be initiated by anyone in CV-SALTS, Executive Committee Members, Central Valley Salinity Coalition Board Members or State or Regional Board Executives may be available to help with any of the situations identified. The request should be made to CVSC Staff and the Chair of the Executive Committee to initiate appropriate coordination.
Draft Scope Tasks for CVSALTS Beneficial Uses and Objectives Study

Organization Background
The Central Valley Salinity Coalition (CVSC) was formed in 2008 to integrate and augment the efforts of the Central Valley Salinity Alternatives for Long Term Sustainability (CV-SALTS) initiative. The purpose of the organization is the governance and organization of the efforts needed to plan, develop and implement the salinity and nitrate management plan for the Central Valley. This plan will incorporate, and become implemented through, basin plan amendments for the basins in the Central Valley.

Project Background
The overall purpose of the Beneficial Use and Objectives Study is to review the information and data to determine the appropriateness of the existing beneficial uses for water bodies on the Central Valley and determine their attainability. Additionally the Study should assemble and review existing data and information to develop preliminary objectives. This effort should build on the Salt and Nitrate Pilot Study and prepare procedures for the distributed implementation of data for all areas of the Central Valley.

This scope of work will evolve based on the Economic and Social Cost and Technical Advisory Committees. The scope of work was approved by the committees and the Executive Committee in February 2009. Significant salinity and nitrate work has been accomplished in the region; Attachment A provides a list of references and sources of information the consultant should be familiar with and which their scope of work should utilize or with which they should be compatible.

Major Scope of Work Areas for Beneficial Use and Preliminary Objectives Phases

Phase 1: Background and Workplan
- Compile beneficial use background and existing information
- Develop Work Plan for Data Assembly/Aggregation and validation in BUO Study

Phase 2: Identify Existing Water Quality
- Assemble data on salinity and nitrate impact levels in surface and groundwater
- Assemble available data on surface and groundwater quality current, trend, historic
- Assemble surface and groundwater data on salinity or nitrate sensitive uses in priority geographies
- Review and validate data assembled for review and summary

Phase 3: Preliminary Objectives and Attainability
- Determine use attainability based on surface and groundwater impact levels and quality
- Generate preliminary draft objectives needed to meet beneficial uses
- Document and report draft and final data including significant sources of nitrates and salt and dilution

Phase #: Develop work plan for other elements of the program
Phase 1 A

Task 1: Identification of Beneficial Uses in the Central Valley
The purpose of this task is to create GIS layers* of the beneficial use categories assigned to surface and ground waters within the Central Valley (the region covered by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board). Contractor will identify all surface and ground waters on two GIS layers (one for surface waters, one for ground water basins). Contractor will identify beneficial use categories assigned to identified surface and ground waters, limited to the categories of MUN, DOM, IND, PRO, AG, and WILD. Contractor will use information from, at a minimum, the Inland Surface Water Plans, existing Basin Plans, Department of Water Resources’ Bulletin 118, and through products of the coalitions operating under the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program. Where the plans do not cover the areas, the Contractor will work with the board to document the currently implemented process for beneficial uses, such as the tributary rule and etc.

Task 2: Identification of Water Quality Objectives
The purpose of this task is to develop GIS layers* of the existing water quality objectives ascribed to surface and ground waters within the Central Valley (both in general because of the defined beneficial use and in site-specific locations). Contractor will use existing Basin Plans to map water quality objectives for electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, all salinity ions, and nutrient species.

Task 3: Identification of Existing Water Quality Problems
The purpose of this task is to develop GIS layers of water bodies currently under a TMDL regulation or identified as impaired on the 2009 303(d) list. Contractor will use existing Basin Plans to map water quality exceedances enforcement action and active regulation for electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, all salinity ions, and nutrient species.

Task 4: Literature Search of Water Quality Criteria
The purpose of this task is to assemble existing water quality criteria assigned to the identified beneficial uses, and the status of current scientific study related to these criteria. Contractor will utilize the memoranda developed by the Drinking Water Policy and other sources, exploring the development and use of criteria within the state, the nation, and around the world, to identify the current state of regulation and science to protect the identified beneficial uses related to nutrients and salts.

Task 5: Prioritize Salinity and Nutrient Issues
The purpose of this task is to use information developed in Tasks 1 through 3 to prioritize areas requiring salt and/or nutrient management. Contractor will identify “tiers” of priorities based on the state of regulation.

Phase: 1 B

Task 6: Develop Data Collection and Validation Work Plan
Based on the Pilot and Task 5, develop a work plan to detail procedures and methods to assemble or aggregate data and information for the study. (*Italicized section below was modified from the Salt and Nitrate Sources Pilot Study, it may need further modification*)
The work plan shall build on the efforts of the Salt and Nitrate Source Pilot Study Workplan and expand to areas needed to determine the existing and historic water quality in the priority areas. The consultant will propose priority areas and actual priority areas will be determined by the Technical Advisory and Executive Committees. The work plan will document the methods, manner and technical veracity of the work needed to characterize all “salt and nutrient sources of significance” in the priority areas. Through the plan the consultant shall:

- define terms “salt and nutrient sources of significance” for the purposes of the plan and areas
- provide the methods and manner of collection and validation of the salt and nutrient source data for the pilot areas
- outline data that is currently available and the quality of the data
- identify additional data which will need to be developed
- indicate how the data collection shall account for
  - the total salt load salt balance and salt accumulation for each of the pilot areas
  - identify critical concentration discharges
- ensure the magnitude of each source is accurate when combined into the overall salt balance
- identify how historic, current and future salt and nutrient source quantities will be collected or can be estimated to provide trend information
- identify and quantify areas where nutrients, especially nitrates are impacting beneficial uses of the waters

It is critical for the consultant to propose methods that provide consistency in evaluation across sources and across all areas. The methods must avoid double counting salt and nutrients as sources and validate salt and nutrients related to sources of water. Because of the linkages with water supply each of the pilot areas should be reviewed for wet, dry and normal hydrologic years.

The constituents contributing to salinity impacts should be identified in the work plan and should be prioritized into tiers as indicated below in an evaluation process with the committee:

1. Salts as Total Dissolved Solids and/or EC, and separately, but with equal importance, Nitrates and water quality related nitrogen species
2. Other salt constituents, chloride, phosphate, sulfate, carbonate, and bi-carbonate or others of local interest as recommended by the consultant. Consultant should propose data collection methods for all constituents, methods or timing may vary as appropriate.

Other constituents may also be addressed if project scoping or information uncovered during Phase I indicates a data requirement. The plan should propose methods that are consistent with prior works indicated in References as shown in Attachment A and provide efficient collection and utilization. All collection efforts are intended to lead to the broader basin plan amendment work plan and tie to fate and transport studies in future work phases, not included in this study. The studies will proceed only upon approval of the work plan by the committees and upon adequate funding.
Most effort has gone into developing the scope of work for Phase 1a and 1b. Further work is needed to develop Phase 2 and beyond.

**Phase 2 Identification of Existing Water Quality**

**Task 7: Identification of Existing Water Quality**
Task 7 requires further development in the tasks, but preliminary areas of work include:

- Assemble data on salinity and nitrate impact levels in surface and groundwater
- Assemble available data on surface and groundwater quality current, trend, historic
- Assemble surface and groundwater data on salinity or nitrate sensitive uses in priority geographies
- Review and validate data assembled for summary reporting
- Create GIS layers and that connect the and summarize the data assembled

**Phase 3: Develop Preliminary Objectives and Attainability**

**Task 8: Determine interactions and connections between the waterbodies and impact areas**
**Task 9: Determine use attainability based on surface and groundwater quality**
**Task 10: Generate preliminary draft objectives needed to meet beneficial uses**
**Task 11: Document and report draft and final data including significant sources of nitrates and salt and dilution**

* Description of GIS requirements. GIS Layers/coverages to be developed with spatial, numeric and appropriately populated metadata to indicate sources and any assumptions in an ESRI shapefile format or compatible. Base mapping coverages provided must be royalty free or public domain.
SUBJECT: RESOLUTION R5-2008-0181 IN SUPPORT OF DEVELOPING A GROUNDWATER STRATEGY FOR THE CENTRAL VALLEY REGION

Affected Water Quality Control Plan(s):
Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Tulare Lake

Agency/organization: CVRWQCB

Staff contact: Pam Buford, 559-445-5576, pbuford@waterboards.ca.gov

Committee: Executive
Meeting Date 14 July 2009

Action needed: Input
Deadline for action: 31 August 2009

Project Summary:
On 4 December 2008, the Central Valley Water Board adopted Resolution R5-2008-0181 in support of Developing a Groundwater Strategy for the Central Valley Region. The resolution directs staff to work with stakeholders and interested person to develop a comprehensive, consistent, and coordinated strategy for the protection of the beneficial uses of groundwater throughout the Central Valley Region. Our goal is to develop a long-term strategy that will identify high priority activities, recognize the water boards core responsibilities and existing commitments; and build on existing processes.

It is important to note that developing this Strategy is not a regulatory program, and it is consistent with the State Water Boards Strategic Plan. We anticipate it being a part of the Central Valley Region’s Strategic Planning Efforts.

Prior to scheduling stakeholder workshops staff are gathering information on the various agencies with roles that directly, or indirectly, can affect the quality of groundwater. This information will be provided for the stakeholder workshops to aid in the identification of deficiencies, conflicts, or gaps in protection of groundwater quality. Stakeholder workshops are scheduled for the week of 24 August 2009, in Rancho Cordova, Redding, Fresno, and Delano. Workshop format is still under development.

Questions for the committee’s consideration:
• How should strategy development be coordinated with and informed by CV-SALTS?

Additional Information:
Resolution R5-2008-0181
CV-SALTS Project Review Guideline and Funding Recommendation Questions

Review the project for:
A. Primary benefits to CV-SALTS
B. Overall value to CV-SALTS
C. Appropriateness for CV-SALTS
D. Affordability/Timeliness

The following questions may guide the evaluation of the projects:
1. Is the project feasible can it be completed?
2. Does the budget seem reasonable is it understandable and detailed?
3. Evaluate project proponent's performance history in management, budget, schedule and technical areas?
4. Does the project fit the CV-SALTS timeline?
5. Is the project in the CV-SALTS Workplan outline?
6. How will the project serve the mission of CV-SALTS to develop a regional salinity and nitrate management plan in 5 years? What portion(s) of the basin plan amendments or overall work plan will it address?
7. Is the project critical, necessary, useful, or only generally favorable to the regional goals and Salinity Public Education?
8. Where does the project rank in the committees priorities?
9. Where does the project rank in the overall CV-SALTS priorities?
10. Are the main benefits statewide or local rather than regional?
11. Must CV-SALTS fund the project will it be done anyway with other funding?
12. Are there other funding sources the project proponent should be seeking instead or in addition to CV-SALTS?
13. Does the proponent provide a significant match to the funds requested?
14. How can the proposal be improved to better serve the needs of CV-SALTS?
15. If this project is recommended, will it increase or decrease the group's chances of getting additional funding out of this source?
16. What measurable benefits to CV-SALTS are promised by the project?
### Tentative Education and Economics Meeting Dates

- June 16: Tentative Hold Only
- July 13: Tentative Hold Only
- August 18: Tentative Hold Only
- September 15: Tentative Hold Only
- October 9: Tentative Hold Only
- November 15: Tentative Hold Only

### Tentative Technical and Executive Meeting Dates

- May 13: TAC-Econ, PEOC & Executive
- June 16: Tentative Hold Only
- July 14: TAC-Econ, PEOC & Executive
- August 18: Tentative Hold Only
- September 15: Tentative Hold Only
- October 27: Tentative Hold Only
- November 9: Tentative Hold Only
- December 15: Tentative Hold Only

### Holidays and Constraints

- May 28 & 29: Multi-State Salinity Conference
- September 15: Scoping Committee
- September 24th: Leadership Group
- September 28-29: Multi-State Salinity Conf.

### Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Year's Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Martin Luther King Jr. Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>President's Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Groundhog Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Valentine's Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Women's Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>St. Patrick's Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>April Fool's Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tax Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Memorial Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cinco de Mayo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Independence Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>World Environment Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>National ice cream Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>July 4th Independence Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>World Bicycle Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back to School Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Labor Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Columbus Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wordpress Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Veterans Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Columbus Day (Observed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thanksgiving Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Black Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Christmas Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>New Year's Eve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>