

# CV-SALTS Draft Strategy Document

## Version 3 (6/09/10)

CV-SALTS was initiated by the Regional Water Quality Control Board in 2006 as a new collaborative stakeholder managed program to develop and implement a salinity and nutrient management plan for the Central Valley. The broad goal of CV-SALTS is to draft and implement a Basin Plan Amendment to provide a regulatory framework for management of salinity and nutrients in the Central Valley through a process that includes input from all of the constituencies who provide, use, consume or treat water in the Region. This Strategy Document presents a broad outline of CV-SALTS objectives, actions and goals, with reference to documents, plans, and studies that may be found at [www.cvsalinity.org](http://www.cvsalinity.org).

### GENERAL OVERALL OBJECTIVES OF A SALINITY MANAGEMENT PLAN

1. Mitigate adverse salinity effects on downstream and downgradient water users. Recognize that there are “gradations” of effect that can be offset. Recognize and address difference in groundwater and surface water. Recognize and address differences in salinity and nutrient management.
2. Achieve sustainability – no long term increasing trends in total salinity and in most harmful ions except to acceptable salt sinks.
3. Facilitate the implementation of ongoing and current efforts that are advancing salinity and nutrient management during the process of drafting, enacting, and implementing the Basin Plan Amendment.

### PRIMARY QUESTIONS TO BE RESOLVED IN MANAGEMENT PLAN DEVELOPMENT

1. What framework should be utilized for addressing potential alternatives?
  - a. **Policy Issue No. 1** – Regional basis, with sub basins and IRWM plans as necessary
  - b. **Policy Issue No. 2** – BUs identified and overlain with actual water quality to formulate regional and sub-basin plans. How will BUs be “re” or “de” designated?
  - c. Executive Committee to resolve funding/find grants, to support CV-Salts efforts. Funding for both short term for the BPA and long term for implementation assistance for stakeholders must be addressed. If grants, current budgets and voluntary donations do not suffice, then the Committee should consider lobbying for broader public funding to assist in this effort to promote the public benefit.
2. What are the best alternatives to achieve the objectives?
  - a. **Policy Issue 4, 5 and 6**. Identify areas for aggregation and management/harvest (incorporating existing projects); identify transport corridors, determine whether and where it would be appropriate within sub basins to encourage market based offsets/credits and trading. A salinity management plan may impact land use. Water rights may be impacted also. How do zoning or other land use rights get wrapped up in the effort? Is partial compensation appropriate? If so how would that be accomplished
3. What is the most equitable method to allocate costs and/or mitigation measures to implement the best alternatives?
  - a. **Policy Issue 11**. All stakeholders should participate? Who should bear the cost of treatment, aggregation or transport identified in item 2?

4. How should the preferred alternatives be implemented and monitored?
  - a. **Policy Issues 3, 7, 12, 16.** Are the Regional and State Boards already implementing interim goals? Does this Committee need to address them if they already are? What is the best point of compliance? Planning solutions will affect land use, are owners entitled to compensation for uses not allowed. Can affect be “scaled” so that if uses are limited, not eliminated, then less compensation is appropriate?

#### PROPOSED ACTIONS

1. Identify users adversely affected by salinity. Develop yield functions for salinity versus cost and/or water needs impacts to those users.
  - a. Workplan Item 1.C and 2 a. Identify and communicate with stakeholders and sources, and effects on water quality
2. Identify salinity status and trends for all major water sources. Overlay this information on the beneficial uses identified. This is the Salt study and BU study incorporated together. Where can we gather existing information to fill in the blanks?
  - a. Beneficial Use and Objectives study Phases I and II.
3. Identify acceptable salt sinks and their capacities for accepting and storing salt by Region.
  - a. Workplan Item 2.3 and f, and Item 3.
4. Calculate the salt assimilative capacity of the basins.
  - a. Workplan Item 3.
5. Identify alternatives for mitigation of salinity impacts. Workplan Item 3 b, e and 4 d, 7.c.
  - a. Construct drain to ocean
  - b. Reoperation, real time trading
  - c. Additional dilution/leaching water to impacted water users
  - d. Direct payments to impacted users to offset cost impacts of excessive salinity
  - e. Retire irrigation on salty soils
  - f. Treatment and separation/product recovery
  - g. Advanced technologies and R&D opportunities
  - h. Evaporative ponds
  - i. Tile drains
  - j. Others
6. Screen alternatives, calculate cost/benefit for best apparent alternatives.
  - a. Workplan Item 9 and 10.
7. Determine equitable allocation of costs to implement best apparent alternatives for salinity mitigation.
  - a. Costs may include imputed costs of extra water, BMPs, etc.
8. Develop implementation plan for management program
  - a. Workplan Item 10 d through g.
9. Develop Basin Plan Amendment concurrent with actions 3 through 8.
  - a. Workplan Item 12
10. Compliance and Monitoring.
  - a. Workplan Item 13.