

**CV-SALTS Executive Committee**  
**Thursday, July 15, 2010 1:30pm to 3:30pm**

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

**Executive Committee Chair Mona Shulman called the meeting to order at 1:35 followed by introductions of all present in-house and on teleconference.**

**1. Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review, Approve Consent Calendar**

- a. Review/Approve [June 10, 2010 meeting notes](#) the meeting minutes were approved by general acclamation.
- b. Circulate the Committee [Membership Roster](#) for sign-in
- c. [Accomplishments](#) and [Bi-Annual Report to Regional/State Board](#) Daniel Cozad presented the Bi-Annual Report provided to the State Board members and Regional Board and its location on the web.

**2. Funding and Fundraising Subcommittee Report ( Tim Johnson)**

- a. Recommended approach and plan and need

Tim Johnson discussed the Subcommittees report and recommendations. The Subcommittee recommends the review and hiring of a federal lobbyist to assist CV-SALTS in developing the funding program for federal appropriations and grants. There was a lot of discussion amongst the board. The next step is to discuss who to approach and what the budget is, what to ask for, and how to keep the project funded on an ongoing basis.

To get funding from Washington which is required to keep the project going, CV-SALTS really needs to have a Federal lobbyist advocating on their issue, particularly on the impact of the magnitude on agriculture and urban areas if the situation doesn't improve.

The plan was to get most of the dollars out of the USDA, but that money is usually already allocated. So CV-SALTS can use a lobbyist to identify the other avenues of revenue available through the government.

Short-term money is going to have to come from existing plans. There is planning money and there is implementation money after the basin plan amendment is developed and approved. The drive is to get money for the implementation of the basin plan amendment recommendations. Funding Approach and Plan Development (outline below to be fleshed out for review on next call) including Federal, State and Local funding the next steps are shown below:

- i. Develop initial scope of work and expectations for lobbyist
- ii. Interviews with federal lobbying firms (4 initial firms, Ag and water focused)
- iii. Solicit fundraising lobbying costs from others preliminary budget \$250-300K per year
- iv. Develop (via consultant) what needs to be funded for implementation in summary and detail, projects, research, planning and implementation
- v. Target analysis for funding opportunities short term and longer term

Next conference call is August 9<sup>th</sup> with progress on the framing documents, develop a plan for phone interviews with lobbyists and bring back results to the committee.

b. [Notes on approach and Fundraising Plan](#)

This issue covered under 2a. Other discussion grants ensued.

Comment about a potential funding source: Prop 84 Delta San Joaquin River and Sacramento River Water Quality Grant Program. CV-SALTS may have some projects that would fall into this, perhaps to implement a couple of things that were in the NAWQA study. There is a public information meeting on the 29<sup>th</sup> of July, and the deadline is 13<sup>th</sup> of August for grant proposals. Information will be forwarded to Daniel.

Daniel responded that the first deadline was applicable to the Delta. The San Joaquin and Sacramento River part was going to come later, but that the 13<sup>th</sup> of August date should be used to drive the decision about what CV-SALTS would like to do and then decide whether or not it fits.

Nigel was going to try to make the information meeting on the 29<sup>th</sup>.

c. Luce Environmental Science Fellowship Proposal

The proposal approved at the last meeting was submitted. It was reviewed by the eight-member faculty group, with great feedback and no refining questions asked, and selected as one of five that will be done starting September/October 2010. Still waiting to see which group will select it as its project.

If it goes through, the technical committee would look after monitoring and making sure the project remains on task. The scope of the proposal was to look at management practices, management alternatives, salt management activities, and their cost effectiveness and implementation effects.

d. Approve Updated [Budget and Schedule for CAA Funding](#) 9/7/10 Board consideration (CAA - Clean up and Abatement Account Funding)

To bring our proposal to the executive board for approval before submitting to the State Board for the last two years of clean up and abatement funding, would have moved things to October. So the proposal was reviewed by the technical committee. The items were divided into proposal years, although the items would take longer than a year to complete, covering the end of 2010 to 2013/14. There are two large tasks:

***Collaborative surface and groundwater data collection analysis project*** – beginning the work of pulling that water quality data in whatever formats, to be analyzed and a decision made as to what to do to support the basin plan amendment. There is \$2 million allocated for that effort.

The second task is implementation planning and analysis – put together the implementation plan, do the cost analysis, do the impact analysis, the documentation for CQWA - \$1.8 million. The total cost is \$3 million. The costs are based on the work plan that was approved, but may not represent the sum total of all the work that will need to be done. However, the State Board strongly expects that this will be matched with in-kind and dollar contributions of the participants and other grant monies. Daniel asked for the executive committee to approve the proposal and report that the executive committee approved it when it's presented September 7. It isn't necessary to make a detailed list of the in-kind and dollar contributions already in hand, just the indication that efforts are being made to obtain that funding.

Approved by general consensus; abstention by Darrin Polhemus

### 3. Coordination of Programs

- a. Recycled Water Policy & Nutrient Management [Coordination Presentation](#) SWRCB (Darren Polhemus)

The Recycled Water Policy expects all those in the state to come up with salt and nutrient management plans for all ground water basins (140-160 identified ground water basins) in the state. The rest of the policy focuses on recycled water. The Recycled Water Policy was a stakeholder-developed policy. It was not written by board staff.

According to the policy, salt and nutrient management plans should include: i) a limitation plan; ii) monitoring of plan which includes constituent concerns; iii) California ground water quality analysis; iv) all sources of salt and nutrients; v) basin hydrology; vi) recycled water use and storm water recharge especially in the southern areas. It doesn't involve any management issues at this point. The concept was to refocus efforts on other areas instead of placing the entire burden of salt and nutrient management on recycled water uses. Monitoring of recycled water effects on salt and nitrate levels, a decision on what should be monitored and how it should be monitored beyond recycled water to be included in such plans is being considered by the state board.

The policy was adopted in 2009, and became effective May 2009. In July 2009, General Permit for Landscape Irrigation and Recycled Water was adopted, specifically focusing on those that use recycled water for irrigation purposes. In September 2009, there were coordination meetings between the state water boards and Water Reuse. Established a salt management coordinating group that the regional board is also working on. Also hired an recycled water ombudsman. Water Use did three kick-off workshops across the state. In May 2010, the Nutrient Management Group did the draft basin plan amendment templates. In June, the final advisory panel report came out.

Next work will be to decide what to do with the Constituents of Emerging Concern Advisory panel in terms of how and what to recommend for monitoring recycled water, and working with DWR regarding funds to be used to develop salt and nutrient management plans, and collect more information on recycled water use to evaluate reductions in waste and how is it being used.

Darren suggested that one way for him and Recycled Water to facilitate communication and information was to develop a website and include what's happening, what's been done kind of information. To include links to everybody working on such plans.

- b. Working with areas that will do a SNMP [Info Paper Policy Determination](#) & [R5-2010-0024](#)

The Committee members were presented with a paper that Daniel and Linda prepare about if those who are planning to do something about recycled water, what things should they be considering how does their plan fit, and a document that was approved by the board that laid out guidelines for working with organizations and people. Subplans or proposed work in individual areas need to be coordinated with CV-SALTS. The committee members were also presented with the resolution that the Regional Board that establishes a referral process to CV-SALTS.

Board members were asked, in light of a recent detailed request, if there was anything else they would recommend in providing information and answers to those that ask? Agreement among members that such individuals should be honestly told that CV-SALTS does not have the answers, yet, provide them with the answers already available, and that they need to get involved in the process.

**Daniel suggested that this issue be raised with the Public Education and Outreach Committee about providing materials based on information that is already available on a website. One member suggested that these kinds of inquiries may lead to opportunities for in-kind services.**

4. [Progress Criteria Milestones Update \(Daniel\)](#)

a. Review [DAC Representation and Outreach Plan](#)

Committee members were presented with a revised document based on feedback from both the Executive Committee and the Public Outreach and Education Committee. It also includes feedback from the quarterly environmental justice conference call. Feedback from this call included that CV-SALTS is doing a great job of getting information out and at a level the lay people can understand, but lacks a list of things that would allow organizations to get involved on a smaller level. This will come from defining the process and laying out when certain things will be undertaken. Material needs to be presented in a Reader's Digest version with fewer acronyms.

**Suggestion that a newsletter be issued that will be understood by the general public put out by CVSC and CV-SALTS that aligns with each aspect of the projects. Daniel agreed to bring it up to the Public Education and Outreach Committee.**

The document included a list of resources including RCAC that will be working with CV-SALTS in referring disadvantaged communities with salt or nutrient issues to CV-SALTS.

The document also included a list of disadvantaged communities according to the state board within the Region 5 boundaries. The Department of Water Resources does not keep a list of disadvantaged communities; that information is maintained by the integrated water management groups, which were provided with the document along with contact information.

Most of the comments were positive. The only negative feedback came on the concept of "offsetting financial need to participate". Daniel suggested finding other grant programs that help them participate, especially focusing on projects that would help them out of that. Recommendation that the definition and use of financial and technical assistance be redefined in terms of the help actually provided and available.

b. Discuss In-kind Support and Tracking opportunities and options

Nigel suggested that he provide templates that have been used to keep track of who participates. Daniel hoped that providing "credit" for in-kind contributions that that in turn would generate more time investment or willingness to invest time from those involved.

**Daniel suggested he look into at some online solutions and review Nigel's templates and bring back to the committee his findings for their consideration and approval.**

5. Policy and Actions discuss [Overall Approach updated](#) (deferred)

6. Receive Reports and Recommended Actions from Economic and Social Cost, Technical, and Public Education and Outreach Committees (Chairs)

a. Economic and Social Cost/Technical Committee

- i. Presentation by Jim Martin on a UC Davis study related to a water quality salinity objective for Putah Creek. Jim presented on the methodology and asked for technical review and feedback. The model is a transient model and very technically detailed. He is expecting feedback to be returned by the 30<sup>th</sup> of July.
- ii. Management practices evaluation approach for salt and nutrient management – providing work items under the management practices evaluation including the process, the type validated practices, whether the practices were new or developing, a sector schedule. Managed wetlands was added as a source. Technical effectiveness, implementability, cost effectiveness, the monitoring required, other regulatory and non-regulatory approvals that CV-SALTS can use, a management practice list, and management practices and technology presentations with the idea being that individual/organization be invited to present their technology to the committee for evaluation.

**Daniel requested approval of the committee to evaluate and qualify management and technology brought to the committee, but need expectations to be set to be able to present such management and technologies to the committee for review.**

Best Management Plan committee wasn't able to find a chair and it is anticipated to split up or roll over into Phase 2 by August.

- b. Public Education and Outreach Committee
  - i. There were no written comments from the outreach meetings. By the August meeting, the final report about the feedback from the workshops will be ready.
  - ii. Leveraging the salinity, salt management aspect of the California Water Plan and whether or not CV-SALTS should be sending that information out as outreach.
  - iii. Suggested that a quarterly update be issued or available, not just notes from the meetings.
  - iv. Coordination with the leadership group.
- c. Discuss IRWM Coordination and SWP Salinity Section (Deferred)
- d. Lower San Joaquin River Committee

The meeting on the 26<sup>th</sup> will be the third meeting of the group, which will compile all the information from the Regional Board and State Board about what was going on and figuring out the next steps, and what the basin plan amendment should look like.

- e. Updates from [Active Subcommittees](#)
  - i. BMP Subcommittee (covered earlier)
    1. [Technology Review and Presentation approval](#)
  - ii. Pilot Lessons Learned to change name (**Knowledge Gained Committee**) and present report in August
  - iii. Phase 1 BUOS Subcommittee Update - Work will be finishing in August

**7. Next Meeting August 12, 2010** – Final [2010 Calendar](#)

**8. Adjourned**