

CV-SALTS Executive Committee
Wednesday, February 10, 2010 1:30pm to 3:30pm

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

Executive Committee Chair Mona Schulman called the meeting at 1:30 followed by introductions of all present in-house and on teleconference.

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

Chair welcomed the group and telephone attendees and invited self introductions. The Chair indicated that a roster was being circulated.

Daniel Cozad suggested the Committee could go ahead with items A and C, and that he would request to pull item B from the consent calendar to address separately.

- a. **Review/Approve January 21, 2010 Executive Committee Meeting**
- Motion to approve by David Cory seconded by Linda Dorn. The motion was approved.
- b. **Approve [Scope Items 2A and 2B funded from BUOS Contract](#)**

Daniel Cozad introduced this topic which funds part of the pilot source study under the beneficial use and objectives contract from the State Board. This is an item the Executive Committee should consider and approve. This effort was included in the proposed budget the Executive Committee reviewed in July 2009. Tasks 2A and 2 B have been pulled from the Coalition Contract and added to the draft materials for this meeting. Committee approval would transfer this work to the new contract.

Rudy Schnagl provided an overview of the process that he will be following over the next year as the BUOS moves forward. In 2009, the state water board allocated \$1.2 million for salt and nutrient management planning in the Central Valley and all of this money will be dedicated to the CV-SALTS effort. This is seed money, with other money needed coming from other grants and services. A contract has been set up with the San Joaquin Drainage Authority for the full amount of \$1.2 million and the drainage authority will help facilitate use of these funds. Rudy will be the State Board fund manager and will be working with the existing CV-SALTS committee structure.

If the plan of this group is to involve use of the State Board funds, Rudy will ask the Committee to advise him on the scope of work for each project, whether the project is final, recommend projects for funding from the State Board, designate the committees with primary review responsibilities, and advise whether or not matching funds are available for the project. This is to get the committee's input before Rudy acts to provide money.

With the projects currently underway, Rudy would need verification that the Committee supports the project so that that action is on the books after the State Board contract has been finalized and also verify that the Committee approves the use of the money in the amount in the agenda, which is about \$260,000.

Rudy asked for a Committee vote on the item so he as the contract manager of the State Board allocated funds should have the Executive Committee verify moving forward with Task 2 A and B for the Salt and Nitrate Source Pilot Study and the use of the funds for that project.

Motion made by Linda Dorn and seconded by Parry Klassen.

Upon question, Daniel Cozad clarified that \$1.2 million is being contracted through the San Joaquin Drainage Authority for CV-SALTS work and Rudy is managing that on behalf of the State Board and Regional Board. That contract calls for beneficial use and objective study work and underneath that BUOS work is other work that will require a certain amount of money.

All in favor: Motion carries with one abstention by Darren Polhemus.

- c. Circulate [Membership Roster](#) for sign in - done

2. Issue #2 of the [Policy Issues List](#)

- a. Policy Issue 2, Policy Background on [Anti-Degradation - Whitepaper](#)

Bobbi and her firm were asked to provide a whitepaper to review some of the issues relating to anti-degradation.

The state policy applies to both ground water and surface water. It also applies to high-quality water – water quality is actually better than it has to be to meet the bare minimum of the objective. It refers to water use that existed as of November 1975 (passing of The Clean Water Act) or was suitable to have existed and you cannot eliminate an existing use.

Under the federal policy, Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 categories apply to all water not just high-quality. Tier 1 is water that is struggling to make the minimums. Tier 2 is the water that is higher quality to maintain a balance. Tier 3 is the outstanding national resource water – those waters that are important, such as Mona Lake and Lake Tahoe.

The materials and science behind the Beneficial Use and Objectives policies that CV-SALTS is working may re-designate or de-designate previous uses of water and/or potentially say the uses are acceptable, but new numeric targets will be revised. The anti-degradation will be part of that. It's a backstop as to what you can do in those other two areas.

You can designate the uses and you can adopt the objectives, but you can de-designate existing uses, you have to protect the sensitive use, and if you are going to allow some lowering of water quality – even if your science tells you that this beneficial use can be protected with this higher level of pollutant – you have to go through the analysis to show that allowing that higher pollutant level is consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State of California.

After discussion, Daniel asked of all the issues that CV-SALTS should be paying attention to if tools for addressing ground water should be an approach. Karl and several others agreed.

Rudy emphasized that as any basin plan amendment goes to the board it has to have a resolution with a finding that the proposed changes meet this policy. The staff report needs to go through this policy and include documentation showing the proposed amendments are in compliance with the policy. It's not just water quality, but there are economic and other factors that call for developing that

information earlier than the last minute. Rudy urged the Committee to consider that, as the work proceeds, that this be taken into consideration and develop the information for the anti-degradation discussion.

Chair suggested that it remain the framework for a whitepaper until the Committee gets further along in the process and start specifically addressing pollutants and situations where there is a case to address the factors and tools the group would use to address the beneficial use and objectives.

Suggestion that some of the key phrases be condensed into an executive summary so Committee members could review at a glance. Chair agreed. Bobbi agreed to do a bullet list.

3. Goals/Progress Criteria 2010 by Regional Board ([may be updated](#))

Rudy Schnagl indicated that he still needed to incorporate comments from Ken Landau. The list of items that are carry-overs from 2009 need some beefing up. A compiled list will be ready by April. That will give the committees time to look at it. In the interim, the group is not waiting for a completed list to get started on goals.

4. Approve Committee [Work Plan/Budget](#), subject to fund availability

No action requested, the item will be brought back when determined by the final Goals/Progress 2010.

5. Introduction of Coordination Programs for future approval/policy

a. New Programs presented at the Technical Committee (Daniel)

Daniel said there wasn't anything in the morning meeting that would warrant Executive Committee action at this meeting.

b. Recycled Water Salt and Nutrient Management Plan RWQCB Resolution

Due to the Recycled Water Policy there are calls for salt and nutrient management plans for the groundwater basins throughout the state. November 2009 the group discussed the role of CV-SALTS to develop those plans for the Central Valley. One of the concerns was, some independent group could approached the Regional Board with a plan for their local area and the Executive Officer directed Rudy Schnagl to prepare a resolution to ask the Regional Board to urge anybody who is not involved in CV-SALTS to plug in and work with this group in developing any plans. Rudy has drafted a resolution to do that in the package. Rudy asked for feedback on the resolution. The Committee was generally in favor of the concept behind the resolution the Committee indicated intent to recommend the resolution.

Chair asked for a motion that the Committee endorse the Regional Board resolution and encourage and ask for independent management plans to work through CV-SALTS and require approval prior to going to the Regional Board.

The motion was made by Bobbi Larsen and seconded by Nigel Quinn. The motion passed by unanimous vote, with Dr. Karl Longley abstaining.

c. Technical Committee [BMP Review Template](#)

Significant comments and changes were discussed in the Technical Committee and Daniel Cozad will continue to working on a review template. The Template and instructions on how to use the template

and what the information on the template means. The Template will be ready for April with recommendations to follow.

6. [Projects List & Grant Funding](#)/Appoint subcommittee (may be updated)

This list was presented to the Technical Committee. A subcommittee is going to be formed to add detail to the projects that CV-SALTS would like funding for. As the projects are developed, the Committee wants to be more overt about going after grant funding for project. As the list of projects is finalized, the Committee may wish to sit down with the granting agencies – the state Board, DWR and the federal agencies – and see where CV-SALTS fits. There is no grant titled to any of the programs, but these programs fit within existing grant programs.

Karl Longley commented that when presenting research needs, those need to be very specific to go after the funding.

Daniel Cozad commented that the recommendations from the Hoffman report would be the type of project to be added to the list as projects to seek funding for.

Suggestion that the goals be compiled into broader categories: monitoring, outreach, research to appeal to funders who are looking to fund certain types of projects. Then additional details added for funding.

7. Receive reports and recommended actions from Economic and Social Cost, Technical, and Public Education and Outreach Committee

- a. **Final Update on [Salt and Nitrate Pilot Study](#)** Presentation in March

Chair Nigel Quinn presented five items:

1. Salt Nitrate Pilot Implementation Draft Report – the Committee received several sets of comments which resulted in 26 pages of response. People wanted:

- a conclusion section
- to compare the salt balances in each of the pilot areas
- better use of visualization (eg: pie charts)
- significance of the data
- level of completeness in the data gathered.

The Salt Source report will be delayed by about a week. Presentation will be given on March 11.

2. Robin Grossinger gave a good presentation on the historical ecology of the delta. The **PRESENTATION is posted in the Presentation section and at this direct [Link](#).**

3. Best management practices review template – The review template was created for BMP plans not technology, however this needs to be clarified. The characterization of the BMP plans will be valuable. The BMPs will be area or industry specific.

4. Project list for grant funding will have a committee to assist.

5. Salt management alternatives – The Committee has a list of about 30 salt management alternatives. The Committee will have a separate meeting to expand the list of ideas and look to see what salt

management alternatives exist in other areas to add to the list and include a tie-in to studies. Rudy had suggested that a grad student might be able to help refine that list a little bit.

b. RFP to be issued for Phase 1 BUOS and request reviewers

The RFP will go out later in February for Phase 1 of the BUOS and that is GIS centric and what the beneficial uses are. The groundwater pieces are missing. Daniel asked for reviewers from the Executive committee. The Committee is waiting for the Draining Authority lawyer to review the standard contract between the Drainage Authority and CV-SALTS. Volunteers included: Nigel Quinn, Rudy Schnagl, Mona Shulman, Linda Dorn and recommended were Lisa Holm, and Parry Klassen.

c. PEOC Committee needs volunteer facilitators for [Outreach meetings April 26-27](#)

Joe DiGiorgio asked for more volunteers to run the meeting. Names will be needed at the March meeting.

Joe asked the Committee for recommendations for appropriate locations for those meetings. Joe provided a list of places that the Committee was considering. Options are Tulare, Ag-Tech Facility; Sac Regional facility used last month is available; recommendation that a location be found that's further north in Sacramento – e.g.: the Sutter County Ag Building – this one is tentatively booked. Daniel asked for feedback. Suggestion to use the Yolo County Farm Bureau which is close enough for both those in the north and near Sacramento. Tulare facility is a good facility.

The Committee will issue notices through email and press releases. There will be a list of questions that will be available for Committee review before the March meeting.

d. Other issues from Chairs - None

8. Next Meeting April 21, 2010 – Final [2010 Calendar](#) – at the Regional Board

9. Adjourned