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 November 15, 2011 notes – 2 min
   b) Committee Roll Call and Membership Roster

2) 2011 CV-SALTS Progress Milestones Status Updated – Daniel Cozad - 5 min
   Action: Review and discuss Milestones and Contracting

3) Proposed Calendar for 2012 - Daniel Cozad – 10 min
   Action: Review and provide revision or approve

4) Updates from Subgroup evaluating MUN Archetypes &
   CVWB Presentation-Draft Workplan for City of Willows MUN Eval. – Jeanne Chilcott– 20 min
   Action: Review and Discuss

5) Mgt. Practice Subcomm - Effective Management Practice Evaluation - Parry Klassen – 10 min
   Action: Status Update and Next Steps

6) Technical Project Management: Work Progress and Budget Status – Michael Steiger - 10 min
   Action: Review and Discuss

7) Five Year Work Plan and Strategy/Framework - Daniel Cozad- 20 min
   Water Quality Zone Mapping
   Action: Status Update – January 19, 2012 expectations

8) Regional Forum Design Team Participation – Daniel Cozad – 10 min
   Action: Review and Discuss

9) State Board Presentation 12/6/11 link only for your information only

10) Set next meeting objectives/date - January 17th Admin Call, January 19th Policy Session
    Review Schedule of meetings December 16, 2011 Conceptual Modeling Related- 10 min

CV-SALTS meetings are held in compliance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act set forth in Government Code sections 11120-
11132 (§ 11121(d). The public is entitled to have access to the records of the body which are posted at www.cvsalinity.org
CV-SALTS Executive Committee Meeting
November 15, 2011 10:00 AM to 12:00 PM
Teleconference Only

(218) 339-4600 Code: 927571#

Attendees are listed on the Membership Roster

AGENDA

1) Welcome and Introductions Chair
   - The meeting was brought to order by Chair, Parry Klassen.
     a. David Cory moved to approve, and Joe DiGiorgio seconded, and by general acclamation the October 19, 2011 meeting action notes were approved.
     b. Roll call was completed.

2) 2011 CV-SALTS Progress Milestones Status – Updated Status and Program Funding
   - Daniel Cozad reviewed current status of individual milestones and program funding.
     • The 5-Year Work Plan is still scheduled for completion in December.
     • A preliminary scope for items related to long-term implementation was included in the agenda under item 6.
     • An outreach letter to the IRWM groups was included in the agenda under item 8.
     • Contracts for completing 5 Year Work Plan tasks are forecast past December, and will follow as quickly as possible after completion of the work plan.

3) CV-SALTS Executive Committee Policy Discussions and Decisions
   - The committee reviewed the 14 discussion and decision items as outlined in the memorandum. It was agreed that the following changes should be made to the memorandum:
     • Item #2 is to be revised to indicate the proposed Salt & Nutrient Management Plan will be structured as an overall master plan, supported by regional plans. This structure is consistent with the approach being taken by the Technical Advisory Committee, and has been previously endorsed by the Executive Committee. Subsequent references in the document to the Salt and Nutrient Management Plan will be revised accordingly.
     • Daniel Cozad will revise the final two sentences in item #12. The revision to include, but not limited to: Replacing the phrase “CV-SALTS will provide” to “CV-SALTS anticipates providing.” Replace “solely by” with “supported by.”
     • Debbie Webster moved, and David Cory seconded and by general acclamation the memorandum was approved with the inclusion of the above edits.

4) Mgt. Practice Subcomm – Effective Management Practice Evaluation
   - After discussion, Jeanne Chilcott moved, and David Cory seconded and by general acclamation the document was approved contingent upon the following changes and subcommittee follow-up:
     • The subcommittee commits to holding follow-up meetings to discuss in detail:
       o Who will actually do the work
       o What it would cost to do the evaluation/s.
       o Determine what the final product should look like for comparison purposes.
     • Pam Buford will review the document and provide edits to the subcommittee to be included in the next revision.

5) Technical Project Management: Task Approval Prioritization
Michael Steiger presented the committee with a budget update as of October 29, 2011. As of October 29 the Budget Incurred = $65,000, and Budget Needed for Work through April 2012 = $169,000.

Five “Priority Tasks” for Technical Project Management have been identified by the small group:
  - Participate in Meetings
  - 5-Year Work Plan
  - Conceptual Model
  - Assist Lower San Joaquin River Committee
  - General Management

Completion of the Priority Tasks will result in anticipated expenditures of $234,000, or approximately 60% of the original budget of $400,000.

Other tasks identified by the small group are: Assist with Management Strategies, Manage Phase II BUOS and Archetype de-Designation.

Michael Steiger confirmed for Pamela Creedon that the 5-Year Work Plan was scheduled for delivery in December 2011.

Per Dennis Westcot the LSJR Subcommittee is currently modifying the second draft of their work plan with an estimated completion date of mid-December. At that point they will need the assistance of the Technical Project Manager to help with the scope of work for getting the various components of the work plan completed.

Michael Steiger and Andy Safford are coordinating with Daniel Cozad on the scheduling of the meeting with modelers prior to the December 16th Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

6) CV-SALTS Implementation Planning

Daniel Cozad presented an initial draft of a “Strategic Salt Accumulation Land and Transportation Study” (SSALTS). The study proposes 3 early phases of work:
  1. Identify current locations where salt is accumulating intentionally.
  2. Identify characteristics of such storage locations as well as any regulatory/institutional barriers and perform cost/benefit analyses.
  3. Focus on near term export or transport mechanisms.

Daniel will draft Version 2 of the document, which will identify project types and locations for those projects. These proposed projects to be used as a basis for pursuing additional funding. Committee members who have additional input they would like to see in Version 2 should call or email Daniel.

7) State Board Meeting – CV-SALTS Progress-Winter 2011

Jeanne Chilcott reviewed the plans for the December 6th presentation before the State Board. It was noted that there were three items the Board wanted answers to:
  a. Why so little of the first 1.2 million dollars had been spent
  b. Current status of the 3.8 million dollar contract
  c. Relationship of CV-SALTS with the IRWM group

Jeanne also recommended that the stakeholders also review the Funding Plan for the Board, and wrap up the presentation on a positive note by explaining that CV-SALTS is exploring the opportunity to be a bridge between the disadvantaged communities and funding sources by providing technical grant application services for those communities.

David Cory will represent the Coalition and Parry Klassen will be representing CV-SALTS. David Cory also recommended that another representative from one of the other stakeholder groups also participate in the presentation before the Board.

8) IRWM Draft Letter and Call for Projects

Daniel Cozad reviewed for the committee the draft letter to be sent out under Pamela Creedon’s and Parry Klassen’s signature to IRWM groups. A notation will be added to the
letter that there are two enclosures. Daniel will secure approval via email from Pamela and Parry to utilize electronic signatures. The letter will be mailed November 20, 2011.

9) **Set next meeting objectives and date (November 17, 2011) and conference call date**
   - Per Parry Klassen, Tim Johnson will be taking the lead on reactivating the Fundraising Committee. A meeting has been scheduled for Monday, November 21st at 1:00.
   - The next Administrative Conference Call date was set for December 12th from 1:00-3:00.

*CV-SALTS meetings are held in compliance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act set forth in Government Code sections 11120-11132 (§ 11121(d). The public is entitled to have access to the records of the body which are posted at www.cvsalinity.org*
### CV-SALTS Committee Rosters

#### Executive Committee Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CV-VALTS Executive Committee Meetings During 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Past Participants:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CV-VALTS Executive Committee Meetings During 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CV-VALTS Executive Committee</th>
<th>During 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CV-VALTS Executive Committee</td>
<td>20-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CV-VALTS Committee Chairs/Co-chairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair Executive Committee</th>
<th>Royce Cunningham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chair Executive Committee</td>
<td>Dennis Westcot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CV-VALTS Leadership or Coalition Members

4. = Already votes as Leadership or Coalition member

#### Participants also identified for 11/17:

- Pam Buford, CVRWAQCB
- Earl Longley, OSU Fresno
- Tom Groshoup, LWA
- Jennifer Clary, CWA
- Tessa Dunham, Samach
- Paul Martin, W.U.D.
- Bruce Houdeshield, NCWA/Sac Valley WQC
- Mark Felton, Culligan Water and PWQA
- Leila Khiti, Kennedy Jenks

#### Executive Committee Membership

1. Pamela Creedon
2. Darrin Polhemus
3. Jose Farta
4. Eline Taylor
5. Bobbti Larson
6. Chris Bailey
7. Dennis Westcot
8. Gary DeJesus
9. Tim Johnson
10. Phil Govea
11. Mike Nordstrom
12. Doug Davis
13. Renna Pinel
14. Royce Cunningham

#### Past Participants:

- Tom Griffith, Envirotech
- John Herrick
- Katy Walsh
- Mark Gowdy, SWRCB, Water Rights
- Betty Yew, RWQCB
- Claude Suverhopp, LWA
- Rik Rasmussen, SWRCB
- Michael Steiger, EKI
- Andy Safford, EKI
- Jean-Pierre, J.P., Catielisa, Dairy
- Jim Martin, CVRWAQCB
- Stan Dean, SRSID
- Melanie Thomson, CVWA
- Gene Lee, Reclamation
- Cindy Paulson, CVWA
- Geoff Anderson, SWR
- Dan Odenweller, RWQCB
- Emily Aleksandrinjim Martin, CVRWAQCB
- Gary Carlton, Kennedy Jenks
- Jamie Brahms, MWH Global
- Jay Simi, CVRWAQCB
- Joel Portenier, SWRCB
- Mark Larson, Kaweah Delta WCD
- Lou Dambrinos, TWG
- Rick Stagg, City of Fresno
- Ron Citres, Brown and Caldwell
- Lou Regenmerter, CDW
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Status/Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Program Manager in place to conduct overall management, facilitation and administrative activities for the effort</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Leadership meeting to obtain feedback on overall direction and goals of CV-SALTS</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>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]</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Develop interim recommended review process for identifying Best Practical Treatment or Control for salinity and nitrate (screening tool) [from the Management Practice Subcommittee]</td>
<td>Completed, with updates in 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>FINAL updated strategy including policy and framework</td>
<td>Policy/Framework January</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| August        | FINAL updated workplan containing the following elements  
- Five Year Critical Path:
  - 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
  - Activities
  - Continuous funding mechanism
  - Integrated monitoring system                                                                                                             | Revise Based on Decisions in Policy discussions with the Scope from TPM in December Preliminary Scope Complete, more detailed scope and contracting in Jan/Feb |
<p>| 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 Letter and Project Call in December                                                        |
| September     | Identify administrative and technical program needs that could be met through in-kind services rather than financial contributions                                                                 | Solicit contribution to identified project items in January                                         |
| June and December | Prepare semiannual (June and December) status reports on funding and progress toward completing work plan tasks                                                                                       | June Completed December to be presented in January                                                  |
| December      | Contracts for completing tasks included in the 5-year workplan have been awarded or are developed and pending approval.                                                                               | Projected based on scope in January from SOQ review                                                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Fri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**
- 2nd or 3rd Thursdays
- Dark Green Exec Comm Policy
- 2nd or 3rd Tuesdays
- Lt. Green Hatch Exec Comm Admin
- First Monday except conflicts
- Yellow Salty 5
- Light Red conflicts
- Dates Recommended Dark
Evaluation of MUN Use Archetypes
for POTW Receiving Waters
Minutes from November 16, 2011 1-4pm Meeting

Attendees:
Debbie Webster – Central Valley Clean Water Association
Thomas Grovhoug – Larry Walker and Associates
Theresa Dunham – Somach Simmons & Dunn
Roberta Tassey – United States Bureau of Reclamation
Jeanne Chilcott, Anne Littlejohn, Calvin Yang – CV Regional Water Quality Control Board

Meeting Objectives:
• Understand unique characteristics of four archetype candidates: Colusa; Live Oak, Willows; and Biggs
• Identify pros/cons of pursuing each archetype (e.g. time constraints; work already completed and still needed; ability to apply findings on broader scale; etc.)
• Develop initial strawman scope/workplan for MUN evaluation of receiving waters
• Draft a recommendation to the Executive Committee on which archetypes to evaluate and the scope of CVSalts activities.

Meeting Summary
• Identified policy issues to discuss with regulatory agencies (USEPA, State Board, Regional Board and later with the Corp of Engineers)
• Discussed the POTW archetypes in detail and scope (sub-basin) for each
  o Initial consensus was to set Biggs to the side until we could confirm their interest in collaborating since they are currently pursuing land discharge; there is an advantage to doing all of the remaining three due to their unique drainage patterns so we should aggressively pursue leveraging opportunities
  o If we cannot do all three, we developed criteria to rank the archetypes
  o Drafted tasks and did a preliminary ID of collaboration potential and tasks that could be completed with staff vs. those needing contract dollars
  o Brief review of Regional Board contract laboratory costs and options for potential scans
• Next steps:
  o Fine tune tasks for strawman scope and work plan
  o Consolidate monitoring information and ID gaps and potential partners
  o Start initial monitoring plan and QAPP
  o Next meeting review tasks and workplan w/focus on collaboration potential
    • Expand group to include Sac Valley Coalition (spoke to Bruce yesterday and he’s willing); Rice Commission (either Tim or a rep); Dischargers
  o Set meeting with Regulatory reps

The group also discussed the bigger picture (Jeanne Chilcott’s new task is to identify appropriate beneficial uses for ALL Ag dominated water bodies) and concurred that the best way to move forward was to start with these specific archetypes for MUN and slowly expand the group as we look at the broader issue and other beneficial uses. We will look for opportunities to do needed evaluations for the other beneficial uses as we move forward with these archetypes for time and cost effectiveness.
Background and pros/cons of four potential archetypes:

Maps and fact sheets were reviewed for Colusa, Live Oak, Willows and Biggs Wastewater Treatment Plants. Highlights include:

- **Colusa WWTP** –
  - Most recent permit: December 2008
  - BPA Decision Date: December 2014
  - Compliance Date: December 2018.

  Effluent discharges to an Unnamed tributary built for irrigation and stormwater drainage. This tributary flows to Powell Slough and then into the Non-MUN designated Colusa Basin Drain (ISWP Category C1).

  - Pros – The most work on the BPA process has been done to date, relatively short distance to the Colusa Basin Drain via Powell Slough
  - Cons – No characterization of Powell Slough or the Unnamed Tributary found in the ISWP (still needs further research). Unsure of how the flow into a natural water body (Powell Slough) may complicate the de-designation process. However, this may in fact be a Pro because it could be more reflective of some of the San Joaquin River Basin scenarios.

- **Willows WWTP**
  - Most recent permit: October 2011
  - Basin Plan Amendment Decision: October 2015
  - Compliance Date: October 2016

  Effluent discharges to either Agricultural Drain C (ISWP Category C1) or the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation Drainage Canal 26-2 (ISWP Category C2) and flows to Logan Creek (ISWP Category B1 through nearby wildlife refuge and C3 for 2.5 mile stretch to Colusa Basin Drain).

  - Pros – The water bodies have been identified in ISWP, includes the aspect of groundwater recharge in the area, economies of scale by combining this candidate with Colusa
  - Cons – There is a longer pathway to the discharge point at the Colusa Basin Drain, it is much further up the watershed, there are potentially more complications with Logan Creek flowing through at nature preserve

- **City of Live Oak WWTP**
  - Most recent permit: June 2011
  - Compliance Date: June 2016.

  Effluent discharges to District 777 Lateral Drain No. 1 (ISWP Category C1) and flows directly to East Interceptor Canal and Wadsworth Canal (both ISWP Category C1) before reaching the Non-MUN designated Sutter Bypass (ISWP Category C3).

  - Pros – The water body types are all the same (C1) for the flow into the Sutter Bypass (no natural water bodies), POTW is a willing participant
  - Cons – Its relatively straightforward flow pattern may make de-designation simpler, this model may not be as reflective of the majority of other scenarios, especially in the SJR basin.
• City of Biggs WWTP – Most recent permit: **May 2007.** Compliance Date – **none.** Effluent discharges to a constructed agricultural drain, Lateral K and flows through a series of canals before reaching the Non-MUN designated Butte Creek (ISWP Category B1) and the Non-MUN designated Sutter Bypass (ISWP Category C3). The discharger has not followed through with the 2007 permit requirement for a beneficial use designation study and has not submitted any decision to pursue the BPA process. Conversations with CV Water Board staff indicate that they may be pursuing a land-discharge permit in the future.

  o Pros – ?
  o Cons – least information available of the hydrologic pattern, interest of the POTW is questionable since they are considering land-discharge

**General Information Needs:**

• Hydrologic Pattern, Field Surveys
• Confirmation of waterbody types moving downstream
• Flow measurements
• Water quality information
• Water of the Nation determination

**Criteria for Candidate selection**

After reviewing all four candidates, the overall consensus of the planning group was a preference to pursue three out of the four candidates (Colusa, Live Oak and Willows). The City of Biggs was given the lowest priority, but they will be contacted to gauge their interest in the BPA process before being removed from consideration.

If resources and time are prohibitive to address all three, the candidate selection criteria are:

• Work accomplished to date (ease of completion)
  o History (basin, water body)
  o Hydrology, flow characterization
  o Water quality information (effluent and receiving water)
  o Water rights
  o Field surveys (e.g. intakes)
• Ability to apply findings on a broader scale (e.g. San Joaquin River Basin Ag. Drains)
  o Complexity of drainage pattern (e.g. flow through wildlife refuge)
  o Support ag concerns in addition to POTW issues
  o Ephemeral receiving water bodies
• Willingness of POTW to partner
• Ability to leverage other resources
• Permit timing – Compliance date
• Economy of scale

**Strawman Scope/Major Tasks**

• Planning
  o Coordination with SWRCB/USEPA and later COE
  o Strategic Compliance
    ▪ Identify what it takes to be in compliance (POTW and ILRP)
• Evaluate type of Basin Plan action or other alternative (UAA/SSO)
  ▪ Where would be the decision point for pursuing “incidental use” and/or site specific objectives
• Lessons learned from Vacaville – incidental or seasonal use?
• Consider 10-g factors as developing effort and gathering data
  • Identify contributors/task leads
    ▪ Funding/leveraging of resources
• Water of the US determination (top priority for CV Salts)
• Identify Constituents of Concern
• Data compilation/assessment (e.g. history, hydrology, field surveys)
• Additional water quality/flow monitoring assessment
  ▪ Table of Lab Analysis Costs provided for constituents of concern identified to date
• Use assessment (MUN for this specific effort)
• UAA or scientific analysis
• CEQA scoping
• Economic Analysis
• Staff Report/CEQA equivalent
• Peer Review
• Circulate staff report

Next Steps

• Send out meeting notes (Reg. Bd staff)
• Updated strawman scope via email (all)
• Develop evaluation work sheet (initial draft Reg. Bd staff)
• Complete evaluation using identified criteria (all)
• Consolidate monitoring and ID gaps (initial work Reg Bd. Staff)
• Draft monitoring plan and QAPP (initial draft Reg. Bd. Staff)
• Focus next subgroup meeting on confirming workplan and collaboration
• Schedule Meetings
  • Internal Staff Meeting: staff from ILRP, SWAMP, and NPDES (permit writers) to discuss current monitoring, flexibility of permits (can requirements be changed, can regional monitoring replace existing monitoring?), and leveraging resources. Tentative date: mid December 2011
  ▪ Regulatory Meeting with staff from State Board, EPA to discuss regulatory issues relating to BPA process. Tentative date: January 2012
  ▪ Regulatory and Stakeholder Joint Meeting: POTWs, ILRP Coalitions (Sac Valley/Rice Commission) and NPDES (permit writers) to gauge interest and participation, discuss leveraging opportunities. Tentative date: ?
Draft Workplan to Evaluate MUN in City of Willows POTW Receiving Waters

Jeanne Chilcott
Senior Environmental Scientist

Agenda Item #9
Central Valley Water Board
1 December 2011
Why are we here?

- Concern during permit adoption that MUN may be inappropriate
- Flexibility allowed in permit to pursue Basin Plan Amendment
- Staff directed to move forward with MUN evaluation and provide update on workplan
• MUN applies via the Drinking Water Policy
• Constituents of Concern Include:
  • Nitrate
  • Chlorine By-products
• Cost to Comply Estimated at:
  • $3 to $7-million
Time Schedule Order

- **October 2015**: Decision on pursuing Basin Plan Amendment
- **October 2016**: Compliance
Moving Forward with MUN Evaluation

- Triennial Review workplan provided staff
  - No $$$
- City of Willows interested
  - Amendment may provide relief from upgrade costs
  - But limited resources to pursue
Moving Forward with MUN Evaluation

CV-SALTS (Central Valley Salinity Alternatives for Long-Term Sustainability)

- Identified Willows as potential MUN archetype (case study)
  - De-designation
  - Use modification (e.g. “incidental”)
  - Site Specific Objectives
  - Compliance point
Staff Met with CV-SALTS Subgroup (16 Nov. 2011)

- Drafted
  - Regulatory Policy Issues
  - Tasks/Activities for Evaluation
  - Potential Areas of Collaboration
Policy Issues

Lessons learned from Vacaville

- Coordination with SWRCB/USEPA
- Strategic Compliance
- Decision point for pursuing a Basin Plan action or other alternative
- Consider applicable state and federal policy as developing effort and gathering data
### Draft Willows MUN Evaluation Workplan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Conditions/Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Alternatives/CEQA Scoping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Conduct/Assess Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Staff Rpt/SED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Board Adoption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAL Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Decision on pursuing basin plan amendment

- **N:** N/A
- **D:** Decision
- **1-4:** Dates

= staff collaboration

= anticipate contract $$$ need
Next Steps

- Fine Tune Tasks with input from
  - Regulatory Agencies
  - Discharger
  - Rice Commission
  - Sac Valley Coalition

- Confirm collaboration

- Draft Monitoring Plan and QAPP
  - Initiate sampling ASAP
Questions?
40 CFR 131.10(g) Factors

1. Naturally occurring pollutant concentrations prevent the attainment of the use; or
2. Natural, ephemeral, intermittent or low flow conditions or water levels.
3. Human caused conditions or sources that cannot be remedied or would cause more environmental damage to correct
4. Dams, diversions, or other types of hydrologic modifications.
5. Physical conditions related to the natural features of the water body unrelated to water quality.
6. Controls more stringent than those required by sections 301(b) and 306. Would result in substantial and widespread economic and social impact
### BUDGET STATUS FOR TECHNICAL PROJECT MANAGER THROUGH 25 NOVEMBER 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Budget in Contract and Amendment No. 1</th>
<th>Amount of Budget Authorized to be Spent</th>
<th>Estimated Amount Expended through 11/25/11</th>
<th>Percentage of Authorized Budget Expended</th>
<th>Estimated Percentage of Work Completed</th>
<th>Summary of Work Completed Through 25 November 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Assist with 5-Year Work Plan</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$22,600</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Completed draft work plan elements and schedule for CV-SALTS program; submitted on November 23rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Manage Central Valley Conceptual Model</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$37,900</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>Completed a draft general approach to develop a Central Valley Salt and Nutrient Management Plan, and prepared a draft memorandum summarizing performance goals and questions for preparing the Conceptual Model. The documents will be provided to the Technical Advisory Committee for review and comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Assist with Management Strategies</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Participated in one conference call with the Management Practices Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Manage Phase II BUOS</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No services provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Assist with Basin Plan Amendments</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$15,900</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Developed planning-level scopes for de-designating archetype water bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Participate in Meetings</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$24,400</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>Prepared for and attended 7 Executive and Technical Advisory Committee meetings through end of November 2011. Anticipated attending 9 meetings total through end of December 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - General Management</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$14,900</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>Prepared cost projections for the CV-SALTS program, assisted with preparing the CV-SALTS comment letter on the City of Davis Salinity Study Work Plan, and participated in two Lower San Joaquin River Committee meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$205,000</td>
<td>$116,100</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agricultural Water Quality Zone Mapping

Concept
The protective level of salinity for Agriculture varies due to many factors within the Central Valley. The determination of the appropriate objective or standard to protect the Agricultural Beneficial Use (AGR) is done by the Regional Board based on many factors often with limited data related to on the ground physical conditions without a site specific objective. To reduce the generality and provide better information for the Regional Board and the Stakeholders to protect, but not over protect a system summarizing the constraints and needs for areas of the Central Valley would be highly useful to the Board and Stakeholders for both planning in CV-SALTS as well as permitting by the Regional Board.

Purpose and Use
The primary purpose of the AGR Zone Map would be to identify primary constraints such as soils salinity and type groundwater and irrigation supply available. With this base what crops could “reasonably” be grown could be demonstrated and understood. Additionally, improved crop type information from CDFA, DWR, DPR and County Ag Commissioners could be aggregated to show the “actual significant crops grown” (based on % acreage) which could be used to lead to the levels needed to protect those crops rather than the most sensitive crop or the general assumption of 700 EC being protective of all crops in all locations. These two coverages could be further combined and utilized with CV-SALTS Executive Committee “Reasonable Crop Yield Protection” percentages to determine a reasonable water quality objective that is more appropriate. This would not prevent additional information or study providing better data and a Site Specific Objective being performed.

Additionally, because crop yield is an economic issue and crop value is also an economic issue, the committee discussed reviewing these, this platform would allow these analyses to be done. The use of these coverages and date fit well with the existing BUOS framework completed in prior efforts and also would provide information that may be used in the Conceptual Model and CV-SNMP.
GIS Layers and Data Sources
Additional information on the data sources and layers that may be used for this analysis are shown below:

Existing BUOS Layers/Objectives
Incorporate the Geodatabase layers developed and reviewed in the Phase 1 BUOS which contains many base layers and beneficial use and objectives from the existing basin plan as well as some information on problem areas.

Boundaries, political, watershed drainage, groundwater basins or others
Add to those already completed in the BUOS Phase 1, any political, watershed, irrigation or water district, groundwater, IRWM group or other boundaries which are needed or appropriate for water quality zoning for AGR.

Natural Surface Water Supply
What is the surface water supply available to the area? It is critical to have the water that would be available with and without the CVP and SWP or other regional water transfers. These coverages may take some development and may require some assumptions if data is not available. This is looking for high level information, not every farm served by every district.

Groundwater
Groundwater quality and quantity available for agriculture in the area summarized to the basin or sub-basin level. If known, long term trends for the groundwater quality for salinity or other limits for ARG use would be helpful. Assumptions may need to be made where data is not available.

Historical Crop Data
Historic and recent data on crops grown, production, and yield and crop value would be ideal for the coverages in this section. Assumptions may need to be made where data is not available.

Suitable Soil Conditions
Soil type and conditions that would limit the crops that can be grown are needed, sodic soils, soil types and the agronomic soil conditions which naturally limit crop production and yield with normal irrigation and other assumptions as needed.

Climate Conditions
Climate conditions are needed including temporal rainfall, temperature and etc. that would indicate the crops that would thrive and as these affect water requirements, salinity sensitivities, etc.

Efforts Needed
Because this is a concept description if the Executive Committee believes this is a work product that may be of significant use to CV-SALTS, its stakeholders and the Regional Board detail will need to be developed by those with more detailed information on the GIS and other data sources that would be
useful or needed. This effort to more fully develop the concept and an attendant scope of work will be needed as soon as possible.

**Duration and Cost**

It is difficult to estimate the timeline needed and costs to assign to this effort, however significant work was achieved in the 6 months and $50,000 that was used for the BUOS Phase 1. With this as a model this could be a reasonable initial estimate for this task.

**Committee Review**

If there is interest in the study and product, the Executive Committee should recommend the Technical Committee Review and further develop concept and scope. There is considerable overlap with other ongoing efforts such as the conceptual model and Knowledge Gained Subcommittee efforts. These need to be integrated and decisions made as to the most appropriate place to gather and integrate this work. The committee should forward a preliminary scope and information on data availability with an updated cost and schedule to the Executive Committee for approval. Because this effort involves information from CV-SALTS Partners, DWR, Reclamation, CDFA etc., coordination with them should be completed.

**Final Scope, Selection and Contracting**

After completion of these steps and reviews the Technical Committee should prepare a final scope for use in selecting from among qualified contractors in the existing SOQ or if none, additional solicitation.
Dear South Central Water Manager:

You are invited to help shape a new format for regional involvement on water issues. Below is a brief description of the effort, followed by a specific request for your participation.

Background: Overview of New Regional Outreach Approach
The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) is sponsoring a coordinated process for regional outreach on water management and planning for the Update 2013 California Water Plan. The new approach builds on the regional outreach conducted for Update 2009 of the California Water Plan (CWP). The format involves regional meetings, called Regional Forums that provide opportunities to:

- Coordinate information from Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) efforts from each region to describe regional conditions, objectives and priorities to better inform finance and investment options.
- Receive updates and provide feedback on emerging policies, program guidelines, and grant criteria associated with various agencies.
- Network with other local water management and planning groups to share best practices and lessons learned.

Key features of Regional Forums:
- Meetings among local stakeholders in each of the 12 DWR Hydrologic Regions/Overlay Areas
- 2 – 4 hour meetings held throughout the year, as needed
- Less travel time for participants with a webinar/conference call format and satellite locations

Design Teams will support the Regional Forums
The Regional Forums are designed to support local integrated water management and planning efforts. Regional Forum discussions will consist of Design Teams, small groups (4-10 people) convened to serve in each region.

The members of the proposed Design Teams are those who are working on important water issues such as agricultural and urban water uses, water use efficiency, ecosystem restoration, flood management, and local/State/Tribal/Federal agencies and programs. To be effective, the Regional Forums must address the most relevant regional issues, and connect with multiple constituencies and stakeholders within each hydrologic region.

Anticipated time commitment for Design Team members: Approximately 4 – 5 hours for each Forum meeting in your region (e.g., 2 or 3 per year) to: flag current efforts and issues, review and refine agenda content, assist in outreach to interested parties.

It is hoped that Design Team members will provide input on current issues and assist with outreach to multiple local water interests, including: agricultural and urban water users, water use efficiency, ecosystem restoration, flood management and local/Tribal/Federal entities.

WE WOULD APPRECIATE YOUR INVOLVEMENT AS A DESIGN TEAM MEMBER.
Your comments or suggestions on the approach, or other potential Design Team members, would be greatly appreciated.

PLEASE CONTACT ERNIE TAYLOR at etaylor@water.ca.gov (or telephone 559-230-3352) TO RSVP OR RECEIVE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.