

CV-SALTS Executive Committee Meeting

September 13, 2011 10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

Teleconference Only

(218) 339-4600 Code: 927571#

Posted 9-3-11 – Revised 9-9-11

Meeting Objectives:

1. Program Development to mirror the policy development meetings
2. Execute business actions for CV-SALTS

AGENDA

1) Welcome and Introductions Chair

- a) Review/Approve August 9, 2011 notes – 2 min
- b) Committee Roll Call and [Membership Roster](#)

2) Animal Drinking Water Quality Criteria Study- Dennis Westcot - 20 min

Action: Review and Approve recommendation from LSJR Committee

3) Lower San Joaquin River Committee Work Plan- Dennis Westcot - 20 min

Action: Review and Discuss status of Work Plan

4) 2011 CV-SALTS Progress Milestones Status Updated status and Program Funding - 5 min

Action: Review and discuss

5) Technical Project Manager Scope of Work Revisions Michael Steiger – 30 min

Action: Review, modify and approve the scope changes, discuss Basin Plan Scope and process for additional awards under the RFQ

6) Scope for CDM Basin Planning Support Services - 15 min

Action: Review and discuss

7) Management Practice Screening Tool Update –Parry Klassen – 20 min

8) Program Financial Report and Stakeholder input format – Daniel Cozad – 10 min

9) CV-SALTS Website Beta Review Request - Daniel Cozad – 5 min

10) Set next meeting objectives and date (September 15, 2011) and October conference call date

Review Schedule of Policy Discussions and other meetings - 10 min

10) Future Items

- a) 3a/3b Task Force Status
- b) Expected Future Roles of the State and Regional Boards, stakeholders, CVSC

CV-SALTS Committee Rosters

Executive Committee Membership			CV-SALTS Executive Committee Meetings During 2011															
Voters	Category/Stakeholder Group	Name	20-Jan	10-Feb	17-Mar	12-Apr	22-Apr	12-May	24-May	16-Jun	23-Jun	21-Jul	9-Aug	18-Aug	15-Sep	20-Oct	17-Nov	15-Dec
Leadership Partners																		
1	Central Valley Water Board	Pamela Creedon		✓	✓		✓	✓		✓		✓						
Alt	Central Valley Water Board	Jeanne Chilcott		✓		✓		✓	✓			✓	✓					
2	State Water Resources Control Bd.	Darrin Polhemus	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓						
3	Department of Water Resources	Jose Faria	✓															
Alt	Department of Water Resources	Ernie Taylor				✓		✓			✓	✓						
4	US Bureau of Reclamation	Roberta Tassey	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓					
5	Environmental Justice	TBD																
6	Environmental Water Quality	TBD																
CV Salinity Coalition																		
1	CASA	Bobbi Larson			✓	✓	✓			✓								
2	County of San Joaquin	Mel Lytle										✓						
Alt	County of San Joaquin	Brandon Nakagawa									✓							
3	CVCWA	Debbie Webster	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓					
4	City of Fresno	Steve Hogg	✓															
5	CA League of Food Processors	Trudi Hughes		✓	✓	✓	✓						✓					
Alt	CA League of Food Processors	Rob Neenan				✓	✓	✓			✓	✓						
6	Wine Institute	Tim Schmelzer	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓								
Alt	Wine Institute	Chris Savage										✓						
7	City of Tracy	Steve Bailey	✓															
8	Sacramento Regional CSD	Linda Dorn	✓	✓	✓								✓					
9	San Joaquin River Group	Dennis Westcot	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓					
10	City of Modesto	Nick Pinhey	✓															
11	California Rice Commission	Tim Johnson				✓	✓	✓		✓		✓						
12	City of Manteca	Phil Govea																
13	Tulare Lake Drainage/Storage District	Mike Nordstrom	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓					
Alt	Tulare Lake Drainage/Storage District	Doug Davis																
14	Stockton East Water District	Karna Harrigfeld	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓					
15	Western Plant Health Association	Renee Pinel	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓					
16	City of Vacaville	Royce Cunningham	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓					
Comm. Chairs/Co-chairs																		
1	Chair Executive Committee	Parry Klassen		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓					
2	Vice Chair Executive Committee	Jeff Willett	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓					
*	Technical Advisory Committee	Jobaid Kabir								✓		✓						
3	Technical Advisory Committee	Nigel Quinn, LBL	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓					
4	Public Education and Outreach	Joe DiGiorgio	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓					
5	Economic and Social Cost Committee	David Cory	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓					

* = Already votes as Leadership or Coalition member

Participants also identified for 8/9:

Pam Buford, CVRWQCB

Karl Longley, CSU Fresno

Mark Gowdy, SWRCB, Water Rights

Leila Khatib, Kennedy Jenks

Michael Steiger, EKI

Katy Walsh

Claus Suverkropp, LWA

Jim Martin, RWQCB

John Herrick

Fern Wilson, City of Vacaville

Betty Yee, RWQCB

Tom Grovhoug, LWA

Paul Martin, W.U.D.

Tom Griffith, Envirotech

Past Participants:

Stephen McCord, LWA

Erica DeHollan, LA C

Andy Malone, Wildermuth Env.

Chad Dibble, CDFG

David Miller, GEI Consultants

Gary Carlton, Kennedy Jenks

Jamil Ibrahim, MWH Global

Jay Simi, CVRWQCB

Jodi Pontureri, SWRCB

Mark Larsen, Kaweah Delta WCD

Lou Dambrosio, TWG

Rick Rasmussen, SWRCB

Stan Dean, SRCSD

Melanie Thomson, CUWA

Jennifer Clary, CWA

Gene Lee, Reclamation

Bruce Houdesheldt, NCWA/Sac Valley WQC

Cindy Paulson, CUWA

Geoff Anderson, DWR

Dan Odenweller, RWQCB

Danny Merkely, California Farm Bureau

Emily Alejandrino/Jim Martin, CVRWQCB

Emily Robidart Rooney, Ag Council

Gail Cismowski, CVRWQCB

Jenny Skrel, Ironhouse Sanitary District

Erick Althorp SSIWQC

Mark Dorman, Rainsoft Water PWQA

Mark Felton, Culligan Water and PWQA

Tess Dunham, Somach

Rick Staggs, City of Fresno

Robert Chrobak and Stuart Childs Kennedy/Jenks

Ron Crites, Brown and Caldwell

Lou Regenmorter, CDM

Jean-Pierre, J.P., Catiuela, Dairy

2011 CV-SALTS MILESTONES –Version 3 Approved 2/10/11
 (Technical Progress will be Measured Against Updated Workplan) Status as of 9/7/11

Month	Activity	Status/Target
February	Program Manager in place to conduct overall management, facilitation and administrative activities for the effort	Completed
February	Leadership meeting to obtain feedback on overall direction and goals of CV-SALTS	Completed
April	Framework developed for salt/nitrate identification studies (Assess the validity of the salt source survey pilot studies. If the approaches need modification, identify the adjustments that will be made to make the approach useful in the rest of the region.) [from Knowledge Gained Subcommittee]	Completed
May	Technical Project Manager Team in place to insure technical tasks needed to complete effort accomplished on time and on budget – scope in March, Procurement April, Award in May	Completed
June	Develop interim recommended review process for identifying Best Practical Treatment or Control for salinity and nitrate (screening tool) [from the Management Practice Subcommittee]	Subcomm meeting projecting Sept.
July	FINAL updated strategy including policy and framework	Policy work Underway Framework to follow policy
August	FINAL updated workplan containing the following elements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Five Year Critical Path: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Work to be performed, timelines, deliverables and budget by task number based on confirmed project funding leading to Salinity-Nitrate Management Plan and Basin Plan Amendment language ○ Unfunded work (with estimated cost) that would improve the final product ○ Milestones to insure timely progress ○ Five-year funding plan ✓ Identify needs for long term implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Activities ○ Continuous funding mechanism ○ Integrated monitoring system 	Tracking Policy projected December
September	Develop a process for coordinating with RWMG planning and implementation projects with a nexus with salt or nutrient management, and other ongoing efforts on salinity management	Outreach discussions
September	Identify administrative and technical program needs that could be met through in-kind services rather than financial contributions	Follows Efforts needed Solicit support
June and December	Prepare semiannual (June and December) status reports on funding and progress toward completing work plan tasks	June Completed December
December	Contracts for completing tasks included in the 5-year workplan have been awarded or are developed and pending approval.	Projected November

CV-SALTS Initiative Program Funding Report

As of August 31, 2011

State Waterboard Cleanup and Abatement Funding

	Funding	Expenditures	Date	Status	Billed
Allocated by State Board	\$ 5,000,000		2009		
Contracted SJVDA	\$ 1,200,000	Contracted	2009		
SJVDA Mgt. Services		\$ 95,948	2010	Ongoing	\$ 33,780
BUOS Phase I		\$ 50,000	2010	Complete	\$ 49,982
Program Mgt 2011		\$ 376,185	2011	Ongoing	\$ 118,256
Program Mgt 2012		\$ 291,571	2012	Contracted	
Technical Program Mgr.		\$ 400,000	2011	Contracted	
		\$ (13,704)			
Remaining Under Contract	\$ (13,704)	\$ 1,200,000			\$ 202,018
Approved Contracting approved SJVDA	\$ 3,800,000		2010	Approved	
			2011	Contracting	
Approved Funds Available	\$ 1,986,296		2011		
Funds to be approved by the Board	\$ 1,800,000		2012		
Total Remaining	\$ 3,786,296				

Central Valley Salinity Coalition

	Funding	Expenditures	Date
Member Contributions July 2008-to Dec. 2010	\$ 677,878		
2011 Contributions received to date	\$ 200,000		
Projected	\$ 40,000		
Total Revenue	\$ 917,878		
CV-SALTS/CVSC Support		\$ 291,253	2008-10
CVSC Support 2011		\$ 113,784	2011
Salt and Nitrate Pilot		\$ 170,228	2009
Remainig Payments		\$ 268,896	2010-12
Total Expenditures		\$ 844,161	
Projected Balance 12/31	\$ 73,717		

Salt and Nitrate In-Kind Contributions

	Funding	Expenditures
Reclamation SN Pilot	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000
Consultants SN Pilot	\$ 55,588	\$ 55,588
Co-Chair Support	\$ 36,000	\$ 36,000
Animal Watering WQ Study (proposed)	\$ 29,000	\$ -
New Stakeholder Project		
New Stakeholder Project		
New Stakeholder Project		
New Stakeholder Project		
In- Kind Total	\$ 520,588	\$ 491,588

Stakeholder/Partner Total	\$ 1,438,466
% Match Contracted	120%
% Match Approved	45%
% Match Allocated	29%



555 17th Street, Suite 1100
Denver, Colorado 80202
tel: 303 383-2300
fax: 303 383-3003

September 7, 2011

Mr. Daniel Cozad, Executive Director, CV-SALTS
Integrated Planning and Management, Inc.
360 Lakeside Ave
Redlands, CA 92373

Subject: Proposed Scope of Work: Regulatory Liaison Services to Central Valley Salts

Dear Mr. Cozad:

CDM is pleased to submit the attached proposal to provide Regulatory Liaison Services to Central Valley Salts. We look forward to the opportunity to work with you and your team on this important project. If you have questions or would like additional information, please call me at (303) 383-2478 (direct line) or (303) 345-3083 (cell).

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Richard Meyerhoff'.

Richard Meyerhoff, Ph.D.
Vice President
Camp Dresser & McKee Inc.

Proposed Scope of Work: Regulatory Liaison Services to Central Valley Salts

Project Background

Central Valley Salts (CV-SALTS) is working collaboratively with the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) to prepare a Basin Plan Amendment (BPA) to adopt a Salt and Nutrient Management Plan. CV Salts is led by a Program Management/Facilitation Team (“Team”) consisting of Mr. Daniel Cozad (CV-SALTS Executive Director), Mr. Tim Moore (Regulatory Facilitation), and Mr. Michael Steiger (Technical Program Manager, TPM). CV-SALTS requests that CDM provide additional support to the Team by providing special Basin Planning Assistance services. The following tasks, deliverables, schedule and budget will provide the desired support services for a performance period of one year.

Task 1 – Salinity and Nutrient Management Plan Development Support

CDM will advise and support the Team in the development of technical scopes of work to ensure that the planned work supports the requirements for a BPA. This effort includes the following two subtasks:

Task 1.1 – Participate in Technical/Executive Committee Meetings

CDM will participate in up to six Technical or Executive Committee meetings as requested by the Team. The proposed budget assumes attendance at up to six meetings in Sacramento, CA and includes time for meeting preparation, attendance, and completion of requested follow-up activities. Other direct costs (ODCs) are incorporated into Task 4. It is assumed that CDM will be given sufficient notice of the requested meeting (date and purpose) to provide opportunity for scheduling, make economical travel arrangements, and prepare for the meeting.

Deliverables: Participation in up to six meetings; submittal of post-meeting materials, as requested.

Schedule: Meetings are attended upon request.

Task 1.2 - Provide Assistance to Development of Technical Scopes of Work

CDM will participate in discussions on the development of scopes of work that involve the technical and regulatory framework for the planned work (e.g., overall tasks, needed deliverables, and relevance to BPA). The budget assumes that CDM will not prepare first drafts of technical scopes of work, but will provide review and recommendations of potential improvements to draft scopes of work developed by the TPM. It is also assumed that no additional travel to Sacramento, CA is required by this subtask. Required discussions will either occur via teleconference or in-person. If the latter, these meetings will occur as part of already scheduled travel to Sacramento to participate in activities under Task 1.1 or Task 2. Budget includes up to six teleconferences or in-person meetings to discuss scope of work development and assumes up to six scopes of work will be reviewed.

Deliverables: Participation in teleconferences/meetings to develop technical scopes of work; written reviews of draft scopes of work.

Schedule: Teleconferences and in-person meetings, as requested; reviews of draft scopes of work within one week of receipt of the document.

Task 2 – Basin Planning Assistance Support to the CVRWQCB

As requested, CDM will provide direct Basin Planning Assistance to the CV-SALTS program and to CVRWQCB staff. Examples of the types of assistance to be provided under this Task include developing strategies for preparation of the Salt and Nutrient Management Plan, review/discussion of technical studies or materials developed through CV-SALTS, and development of Basin Plan Amendment materials

coordinated with regulatory facilitation. The proposed budget includes up to four in-person meetings in Sacramento, California with CVRWQCB staff, and time for meeting preparation, meeting attendance, and requested follow-up actions. Additional budget is included for periodic teleconferences (up to one/month). Other direct costs are incorporated into Task 4.

Deliverables: Participation in up to four meetings and periodic teleconferences; submittal of Basin Plan revision sections and post-meeting materials, as requested.

Schedule: In-person meetings are attended upon request, but to the extent practicable, will be coordinated with other planned travel, e.g., as may be requested under Task 1.1.

Task 3 – Coordination with Facilitation/Program Management Team

CDM will participate in periodic teleconferences or in-person meetings with the Team to support implementation of the CV-SALTS program and ensure any Basin Planning Assistance activities (e.g., as conducted under Task 2) are coordinated with the Team. It has been assumed that a majority of these meetings will occur via teleconference and that in-person meetings will be coordinated with other travel activities conducted under Tasks 1 or 2. The budget includes time for meeting participation/attendance and follow-up actions.

Deliverables: Teleconferences and in-person meetings, as requested.

Schedule: Teleconferences are attended upon request; in-person meetings are also attended as requested, but coordinated with other travel activities under this contract to minimize ODCs.

Task 4 – Project Management/Administrative Activities

This task covers internal project management and contract administration activities, e.g., preparation of invoices, and other direct costs associated with the implementation of Tasks 1, 2 and 3.

Deliverables: CDM will submit regular invoices with documentation per the requirements established by the contract.

Schedule: CDM will submit invoices in a timely manner per the requirements of the contract.

Budget Estimate

Table 1 summarizes the budget for the proposed scope of work. The period of performance is one year. The budget assumes that Richard Meyerhoff (CDM) will perform the work for Tasks 1, 2, and 3, and will receive internal assistance by other CDM staff for execution of Task 4. In addition to the assumptions provided above, the budget is based on a total of eight meetings in Sacramento, California over a one year period (this assumes that Task 3 meetings and at least two Task 2 meetings can be coordinated with Task 1.1. meetings). ODCs are based on \$800/trip using Sacramento federal per diem rates. Each travel event includes air travel to/from Denver, CO, one nights lodging in Sacramento at a government contractor rate, two-day car rental (with auto expense to refuel car), two days of per diem meals (at 75% per diem for two travel days), and airport parking.

Table 1. Budget Estimate to Provide Regulatory Liaison Services to Central Valley Salts

Task	Task Description	CDM Hours	Total Labor	ODCs	Total
Task 1.1	Technical/Executive Committee Meetings	72	\$16,200	\$0	\$16,200
Task 1.2	Technical Scopes of Work Development	42	\$9,450	\$0	\$9,450
Task 2	Basin Planning Assistance to CVRWQCB	80	\$18,000	\$0	\$18,000
Task 3	TPM/Program Manager Coordination	24	\$5,400	\$0	\$5,400
Task 4	Project Management	16	\$2,600	\$6,400	\$9,000
Totals		234	\$51,650	\$6,400	\$58,050

Attachment 3

CV-SALTS Management Practice Screening Tool Nomination Form

This screening tool application has limited instructions for the completion of the form. Reviewer instructions will be developed in a second document. The nominator of the practice will provide all available information for the practice and may include estimated information to be verified if noted in the text. Should additional information be required to complete the review it will be requested.

*In the pilot phase additional standardization of requested information on the management practices will likely be developed. Additionally review of the practice implementation and effect on overall salinity and nitrate management in the Central Valley may be further assessed at a future date. Submittal of management practices for inclusion into the toolbox should answer the following questions with the best information available to the submitter. **Please annotate responses with references and source documents, list these under Question 7.***

1. **Title – Please provide a short descriptive title for the practice**
2. **Description – Please provide a short (1-2 paragraphs) description of the practice/technologies to summarize the practice, industries and important information**
3. **Constituent Salts or Nutrients Managed** – Identify the primary and secondary constituents (EC TDS, Nitrates other nutrients etc) that are treated, reduced or managed by this practice *and how they are reduced or managed.*
4. **Applicability** – Describe the documented application of this practice, where how and how extensively the practice has been implemented what conditions or circumstances limit the application of this practice. Industry specific application and limitations may be developed and show as attachment A. Such limitations may include industry, region, *soil type, media or other limits.*
5. **Practice Benefits and Impacts** – Describe the documented benefits of implementing the practice (what does it do) including any negative impacts of implementation (including cross media/air/energy/supply etc)

6. **Effectiveness Documentation** – 6 a. Describe the documented effectiveness of implementing the practice on the target constituents. Provide any available information on cost to achieve the effective implementation. 6 b. Summarize and critical factors or limitations to effectiveness. If documentation of a cost benefit study please reference it below in 7.

7. Supporting studies, Research and Source Documents – List all documents referenced in responses above or other documents that provide information evidence or background on the technology or practice and electronic availability.

8. **Implementation**

8.1 **Costs** - Summarize and document costs for implementation of this practice both Capital and Annual operations and maintenance costs. If possible, express in industry relevant units of \$/acre foot or \$/million gallons, \$/ton or etc. to allow comparison with other practices.

8.2 **Status and Potential** – Describe the Historic and current level of implementation, at the level know. List any information known on the potential full implementation of this practice

8.3 **Monitoring Documentation** – Describe the level of monitoring and documentation available to support the practice. If known, what additional monitoring is needed? If known what level of monitoring will be needed at implementation.

9. **Other Regulatory Approvals or Requirements** – Has this practice been approved or required by any other government agency or independent standard setting body, if so summarize this and any information you may have on the process and status of approvals.

Criteria that will be used for acceptance of the Management Practice (version for nominator to be consolidated with changes in the document V-9)

4 Standards

Screening of practices to include in the toolbox requires the review of practices for effectiveness in reducing salt and nitrate in the system. The Screening tool uses the following standards as documented by the proposer of the practice for screening.

4.1 Technical Effectiveness – does it work?

Demonstrating technical effectiveness is critical for a management practice to be implemented and accepted by industry or communities. Evidence of technical effectiveness is demonstrated by lab, pilot and demonstration studies and evaluation of the studies. Does the documentation indicate strongly that the practice removes, destroys, manages or otherwise reduce any negative impacts to beneficial uses associated with its presence and assist with compliance or improvement of the waters of the valley.

4.2 Implementability – can it be used broadly?

Implementability includes both feasibility as well as well as broad applicability. In most cases, satisfactory implmentability is demonstrated by documentation of the use of the management practice by a significant portion of the sector and considers other issues related to cost and efficiency covered in other sections. Implmentability of management practices may consider cross-media impacts, and look for management practices that reduce any detrimental effect to other media while achieving the goals of the management practice. These should be identified and any impact quantified if possible.

4.3 Cost effectiveness – is it economic to implement today?

Cost effectiveness is critical to being an effective best practice. Low efficiency costly practices are not likely to be broadly implemented. High value practices will likely be implemented with minimal regulatory requirements. The assessment of effectiveness related to cost is not always a simple as dollars per ton of salt or pound of nitrate, often costs include a technically trained workforce to implement, operate and maintain the practices. Additionally, this may vary across industry and across regions. The cost effectiveness should strive to take into account all benefits to the entity implementing the practice as well as direct and indirect cost of implementation. In other words not just the technology but the impacts on quality of the product or preparation or disposal of wastes and other potential cross media impacts. These costs should evaluate life cycle benefits and costs of implementations and societal and environmental benefits and costs, when possible.

4.4 Monitoring – proving it works?

Both the ability to monitor as well as the length and breadth of the monitoring history will be reviewed as a part of screening. Monitoring during the implementation stage may be greater in developing practices than fully validated practices that have already completed it.

Attachment 1

Applicability checklist by Industry or Process

Agriculture

Food Processing

Manufacturing

Wine

WWTP

Water Supply Management

Water Treatment

San Joaquin

East

West

Tulare

Sacramento

Lake/Foothills

OTHERS