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 Executive Committee Meeting
August 9, 2011 9:00 AM to 12:30 PM
Sacramento Regional Sanitation District Offices – Sunset Maple Room
10060 Goethe Rd., Sacramento 95827
(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 Mike Nordstrom seconded, and by general
      acclamation the July 21, 2011 meeting action notes were approved
   - b. Roll call was completed.

2) State Board Hearing on CV-SALTS Progress in Winter 2011
   - Jeanne Chilcott advised the committee that the Division of Financial Assistance had
     contacted the Central Valley Water Board staff to determine the status of the annual CV-
     SALTS presentation to the State Board. Per language included in Resolution #2010-0042
     this annual requirement must take place by September each year.
   - Regional Board staff was able to negotiate a later presentation date and presented
     the Executive Committee with a list of potential State Board meeting dates in the Sept-Nov
     time frame. After discussion David Cory moved, Mike Nordstrom seconded, and by general
     acclamation November 15th was set as the target date for the annual presentation to the
     State Board.
   - Resolution language specifies the progress report will include:
     - A detailed accounting of expenditures
     - Services received
     - A line item report of in-kind and contract services contributions from Coalition
       members and/or additional public and private entities
     - A summary of work accomplishments to date
     - A timeline for completion of work
   - The detailed line item reports of in-kind services from committee members are to be
     forwarded to Jeanne and Daniel no later than the end of October. Daniel Cozad will be
     working with Jeanne on drafting the presentation. It was proposed that the presentation
     to the State Board be a joint presentation by both CV-SALTS and Regional Board staff.

3) 2011 CV-Salts Progress Milestones Status Updated Status and Program Funding
   - Daniel Cozad provided a six-month progress report for the committee in the Jan-June
     Progress & 2011-Program Planning.
   - A discussion was held on what projects should be documented, and how, for the CV-SALTS
     Initiative Program Funding Report. Jeanne Chilcott suggested that although it was
     important to include dollars being spent via regulation, the characterization of program
     funding would carry a lot more weight when including those projects being initiated
     outside of the regulatory process.
   - Joe DiGiorgio brought up a concern that there might be current projects under
     consideration that might make sense in a CV-SALTS setting, but will not get funded unless
     they know it will help them through the regulatory hurdles that may or may not be there in
     the future. Daniel and Joe will work together to determine the best way to characterize
     this type of pending project status.
Daniel will format and distribute a Contribution Form for members to submit specific project expenditures for inclusion in the ongoing Program Funding report and the annual presentation to the State Board.

4) **South Delta Water Agency Letter**
   - Nigel Quinn and John Herrick briefed the committee on their proposal to develop a study to identify sources of information on leaching in the South Delta where there is a lack of data.
   - Mark Gowdy will also work with Nigel and John on developing this study for review by the Technical Advisory Committee and subsequent recommendation to the Executive Committee.
   - August 26, 2011 was set as the next Technical Advisory Committee meeting date.

5) **Technical Project Manager Recommendation**
   - CV-SALTS received submissions from four firms and interviewed three teams. Michael Steiger, EKI, was selected as Technical Project Manager. Additionally, Richard Meyerhoff, CDM, was selected for some specialty consulting services related to basin planning.
   - It was the recommendation of the Selection Committee that the Executive Committee authorize the contracts with EKI and CDM for the TPM scope at a cost not to exceed $400,000 for a term of 3 years;
     - and to direct the Selection Committee, Program Manager, and Technical Project Manager to again review the Statements of Qualifications for the necessary skills required by other CV-SALTS technical efforts, in an effort to quickly secure the services of these firms without having to go through another full round of procurement.
   - Linda Dorn moved, and Royce Cunningham seconded, and by general acclamation the Technical Project Manager selection was approved.
   - Daniel Cozad expressed appreciation for the time, attention and detail that the Selection Committee reviewers put in to reviewing the Statements of Qualifications.

6) **Triennial Review Update on Salt-Related Issues**
   - Betty Yee briefed the committee on the Triennial Review Process and its relation to the current CV-SALTS process.
   - The Triennial Review results in a prioritized list of basin planning issues, and a basin planning amendment may result.
   - The current Triennial Review Workplan has been released for public review and comment.
   - The workplan identifies 14 high priority issues. Although “Salt & Nitrate Management” is listed as #1, per Betty the issues are not ranked and all 14 issues are considered of equal priority and are numbered for identification purposes only.
   - Written comments on the workplan are due August 29, 2011 and the public hearing for the Review is set for October 2011.
   - The Triennial Review Presentation is available on the CV-SALTS website.

7) **San Joaquin Delta Flow and Salinity Standards Update**
   - Mark Gowdy reviewed the current status of the development of the basin plan amendment which began in 2009.
     - On track to have a draft circulate for public review in early December, with a board workshop in January
     - Tentative adoption hearing in June 2012
   - A discussion of the Variance Policy and Interim Salt Program (also addressed in the Triennial Review discussion) took place. Betty Yee clarified that this is a short-term Central Valley-wide program intended to offer relief from salinity requirements while CV-SALTS is under development. EPA is insistent that these short-term variances exist only for the CV-SALTS development period, after which the program is retired.
8) **Calaveras Salt-Related Regional Board Basin Plan Amendment**

- Jim Martin summarized the Regional Board’s work on finding an alternative permitting approach for the Royal Mountain King Gold Mine
  - This is based on an individual site and individual permit (fault zone/fractured bedrock)
- Primary importance of this issue is that a basin plan is under consideration that would de-designate these areas of poorer water quality, and remove MUN and some of the other uses
- Jeanne Chilcott pointed out that although it is a pretty isolated area, the board does look at de-designating uses and, although rare, the State Board does recognize this as a potential solution in certain circumstances.

9) **Water Quality Resource Management Strategies**

- Jeanne Chilcott advised the committee that she is working with Jose Faria, at the request of the Department of Water Resources, to review the current salinity management strategy in the California Water Plan.
- Jeanne and Jose are requesting the involvement of CV-SALTS in an effort to ensure that the appendices in the new plan accurately reflect the goals and objectives of the CV-SALTS initiative. Inclusion of CV-SALTS concerns in the Water Plan has positive implications for future CV-SALTS funding strategies, specifically in support of the argument for why a CV-SALTS implementation program should be a bond eligible cost.
- Specific topics to be included in the water plan suggested by Jeanne were
  - Groundwater salinity management
  - Demonstration of the domino/ripple effect of Central Valley salinity issues throughout the state
- The following people volunteered to collaborate with Jeanne and Jose on preparing the draft for the rewrite by October 14: Leila Khatib, Nigel Quinn, Parry Klassen, Linda Dorn, Daniel Cozad and Paul Martin.

10) **Knowledge Gained Subcommittee Update**

- Michael Steiger briefed the committee on the status of subcommittee projects and requested the Executive Committee approve the Framework Document.
- Linda Dorn moved, and Paul Martin seconded, and by general acclamation the Framework Document was approved.
- Jim Martin and Michael Steiger suggested that it would also be beneficial for the Technical Advisory Committee to review the document. Nigel Quinn agreed and the item was added to the August 26th Technical Committee Meeting agenda.

11) **Management Practice Subcommittee Update**

- Per Parry Klassen, the next subcommittee conference call is scheduled for August 22nd.
- As of yet there is no update on FREP, selection notification is expected in September.

12) **CV-SALTS Website Subcontract Design Update**

- Per Daniel the beta version will be up for a week.
- Charles Gardiner will be putting together summary material for content.

13) **Set next meeting objectives and date (August 18, 2011) and conference call date**

- The next Policy Session is scheduled for August 18th.
- The next Administrative Conference Call is scheduled for Tuesday, September 13, 2011 from 10:00 – 12:00.
## 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Renee Pinel</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></td>
<td>Central Valley Water Board</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></td>
<td>Central Valley Water Board</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></td>
<td>State Water Resources Control Bd.</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></td>
<td>Department of Water Resources</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></td>
<td>Department of Water Resources</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></td>
<td>US Bureau of Reclamation</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></td>
<td>Environmental Justice</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></td>
<td>Environmental Water Quality</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></td>
<td>CV-SALTS Coalition</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></td>
<td>Central Valley Water Board</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></td>
<td>Central Valley Water Board</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></td>
<td>County of San Joaquin</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></td>
<td>County of San Joaquin</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></td>
<td>CV-CAWA</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></td>
<td>City of Fresno</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></td>
<td>CA League of Food Processors</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></td>
<td>CA League of Food Processors</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></td>
<td>Wine Institute</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></td>
<td>Wine Institute</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></td>
<td>City of Tracy</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></td>
<td>Sacramento Regional CSD</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></td>
<td>San Joaquin River Group</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></td>
<td>City of Modesto</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></td>
<td>California Rice Commission</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></td>
<td>City of Manteca</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></td>
<td>Tulare Lake Drainage/Storage District</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></td>
<td>Tulare Lake Drainage/Storage District</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></td>
<td>Stockton East Water District</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></td>
<td>Western Plant Health Association</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></td>
<td>City of Vacaville</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>

### Comm. Chairs/Co-chairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comm. Chairs/Co-chairs</th>
<th>Chair Executive Committee</th>
<th>Vice Chair Executive Committee</th>
<th>Technical Advisory Committee</th>
<th>Technical Advisory Committee</th>
<th>Public Education and Outreach</th>
<th>Economic and Social Cost Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parry Klassen</td>
<td>Jeff Willett</td>
<td>Jobaid Kabir</td>
<td>Nigel Quinn, LBL</td>
<td>Joe DiGiorgio</td>
<td>David Cory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Participants also identified for 8/9:

- Pam Buford, CVWRQCB
- 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 Grovhouge, LWA
- Paul Martin, W.U.D.
- Tom Griffith, Envirotech

### Past Participants:

- Stephen McCord, LWA
- Eric DeHollan, LA C
- Andy Malone, Wildermuth Env.
- Chad Dibble, CDFG
- David Miller, GEI Consultants
- Gary Carlton, Kennedy Jenks
- Jamil Ibrahim, MWH Global
- Jay Simi, CVWRQCB
- Jodi Ponturet, SWRCB
- Mark Larsen, Kaweah Delta WCD
- Louis Dumbroso, TWG
- Rick Rasmussen, SWRCB
- Stan Dean, SFCRD
- Melanie Thomson, CUWA
- Jennifer Cary, CWA
- Gene Lee, Reclamation
- Bruce Houdesheldt, NCWA/Sac Valley WQC

* = Already votes as Leadership or Coalition member
<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>Subcomm meeting projecting Sept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>FINAL updated strategy including policy and framework</td>
<td>Policy work Underway Framework to follow policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| August    | FINAL updated workplan containing the following elements  
  ✓ Five Year Critical Path:  
  o 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  
  o Unfunded work (with estimated cost) that would improve the final product  
  o Milestones to insure timely progress  
  o Five-year funding plan  
  ✓ Identify needs for long term implementation  
    o Activities  
    o Continuous funding mechanism  
    o 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  | 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

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

### Central Valley Salinity Coalition

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

### Salt and Nitrate In-Kind Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reclamation SN Pilot</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants SN Pilot</td>
<td>$55,588</td>
<td>$55,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair Support</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Watering WQ Study (proposed)</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Stakeholder Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Stakeholder Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Stakeholder Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Stakeholder Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Kind Total</td>
<td>$520,588</td>
<td>$491,588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stakeholder/Partner Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder/Partner Total</th>
<th>$1,438,466</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Match Contracted</td>
<td>120%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Match Approved</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Match Allocated</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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,

[Signature]

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>CDM Hours</th>
<th>Total Labor</th>
<th>ODCs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1.1</td>
<td>Technical/Executive Committee Meetings</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>$16,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$16,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1.2</td>
<td>Technical Scopes of Work Development</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$9,450</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>Basin Planning Assistance to CVRWQCB</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>TPM/Program Manager Coordination</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>234</strong></td>
<td><strong>$51,650</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$58,050</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Management Practice Subcommittee’s (Subcommittee) charter is to assist CV-SALTS to improve salt and nitrate management through industry and community management practices, identifying and screening the management practices to improve implementation and monitoring of results. This document is part of the Management Practice Document Review developed in 2010 and 2011. This approach and process draw from others used to review stormwater and water conservation practice and criteria.  

1 Management Practice Review Approach  
At the recommendation of the CV-SALTS Committees or in accordance with the sector schedule below the Subcommittee will evaluate a management practice in accordance with the following process and standards. These standards will be used to screen management practices for inclusion in a “toolbox” of Management Practices (MPs) which have been vetted in the CV-SALTS process to assist others in reducing salinity and nitrate. This “toolbox” would provide a range of new and existing management and practice options, their documented effectiveness, expected reductions, current status of implementation and cost when available. The listed practices provide early implementation opportunities and the basis to recommend reasonable implementation requirements for the Basin Plan Amendment. In addition, the “toolbox” identifies new technology and innovative practices that may provide further improvement and flexibility. 

1.1 Products  
A brief description of the products of the Subcommittee’s efforts are described in the following sections. 

1.1.1 Screening Tool  
The Subcommittee uses the enclosed procedure and standards along with a related checklist to evaluate the presence of adequate evidence and information to characterize the utility and efficacy of MP’s to reduce or manage salt components and nitrates. The purpose of the screening tool and standards is to assist in the review of the scientific and monitoring documentation, not to perform that assessment or certify a practice for purposes other than those evaluated. The use of the screening tool requires that the Subcommittee (or help available to it) be able to understand the information provided not

---

1 International Stormwater BMP Database Performance evaluation [http://www.bmpdatabase.org/MonitoringEval.htm#PerformanceEval](http://www.bmpdatabase.org/MonitoringEval.htm#PerformanceEval)

necessarily be experts in the scientific area or the region it is being applied. The screening tool checklist will result in practices added to the “toolbox”. The screening process will rely on groups, industries, and practice proponents to nominate and complete the nomination form and supporting information for evaluation. This process will be described in the sections below.

1.1.2 Toolbox of Practices
The Management Practice Subcommittee will utilize volunteers and technical support available to it to review and evaluate management practices that reduce salt constituents and nitrates of relevance to the Central Valley. Initially the “toolbox” may be a reviewed set of electronic documents for each practice with supporting materials. Later, as the number and diversity of practices increase, the “toolbox” format will likely need to become more sophisticated to facilitate its use. The “toolbox” and the practices were extensively discussed among the Subcommittee members.

The Subcommittee identified the best use of the “toolbox” as a source of documented and validated practices that regulated entities could use to develop their management plans for salinity and nitrate for both voluntary action and Regional Board consideration as part of the permittees plan or other regulatory programs.

A factsheet or summary technical document should be prepared for practices accepted into the “toolbox” so that potential users can easily evaluate the practices for their own use. Other examples of “toolbox” development include the Stormwater BMP Manual3 and the Salinity Guideline4. The Subcommittee however wants to ensure that users of the “toolbox” understand the need to evaluate any practice for their own application. Additionally, regulatory programs and permits should not inappropriately default to the “toolbox” as a requirement for any specific facility or location.

Dischargers will be able to take advantage of the information developed on the treatment and control options provided in the “toolbox”, but the “toolbox” will not limit their options. Any discharger that wants to use an alternative approach to manage salt or nitrate will be able to submit information that will be evaluated by the same process the committee followed when creating the “toolbox”. This consistency will provide the discharger and Regional Board a clear understanding of how proposed practices perform relative to practices documented in the “toolbox”.

2 Process
The process for documenting new or developing practices and validated practices differ. The new and developing and validated practices are described in section 3 of this document. The process for each is summarized below (additional details or modifications may be made by the Subcommittee). After a call for and nomination of practices by an industry, the practices will be evaluated for acceptance in the “toolbox” with the screening tool, or further information and study may be requested and developed, as needed. The Subcommittee may then recommend to the Executive Committee that the practice be included (or not) in the toolbox.


The Subcommittee will likely request support from the Technical Project Manager or contract for support or consulting entities where their support is needed to develop documentation. The Subcommittee will also propose projects for grant support or coordination with other efforts where this is consistent with MP development goals.

2.1 Sector Review Schedule
The Pilot Salt and Nitrate Source Implementation Study\(^5\) identified sources of salt. Each significant source of salt shown in the report will be scheduled for review. Review priority will be based on salt and nitrate loading that was reported in the pilot implementation study. This initial list and prioritization is intended as a guideline, and should not result in exclusion of unlisted sources. The list will be reviewed and revised as needed by the Subcommittee. Industries or communities which have prepared

Management Practice documents may request to be reviewed ahead of schedule, subject to Subcommittee approval. The Subcommittee will establish the final schedule for review of practices and technologies in each sector, at a pace that is manageable but that reviews BMPs from all significant source before implementation plan development. As processes are reviewed, the common BMPs will be reviewed for consistent assumptions and completeness. When a practice’s effectiveness is obvious based on readily-available information, it may be recommended for approval by the Executive Committee with less rigorous review or scientific study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Preliminary Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pilot Implementation candidates- Significant sources</td>
<td>August 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Surface Drinking and Irrigation Water</td>
<td>October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Groundwater Drinking and Irrigation Water</td>
<td>October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Irrigated agriculture/Fertilizer</td>
<td>January 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Non-point source/stormwater</td>
<td>January 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Wetlands</td>
<td>January 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Wastewater/Industrial dischargers</td>
<td>May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Food processing industries</td>
<td>May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dairy and CAFO</td>
<td>October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Water treatment and softening</td>
<td>October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Septic tank discharges</td>
<td>October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Other point sources and discharges to land</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Atmospheric deposition and other sources</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2 Conflicts
Because the Subcommittee has an active role in the review recommendation for approval of practices, members of the Subcommittee proposing practices will disclose any conflicts and recuse themselves from decisions where they have a material financial or business interest.

### 2.3 Committee Test Run
Subcommittee members has performed a “test run” of the screening tool and checklist to identify gaps in the tool and to better understand the level of effort that will be required to complete the review. This review took place in summer 2011. Parry Klassen, Linda Dorn and Debbie Webster provided 2 to 3 practices to screen from Ag and waste water treatment industries. The test run had a limited variety of practices to make the effort manageable.

### 2.4 Committee Pilot Testing
As the Subcommittee continues developing the screening tool and toolbox the Subcommittee may prepare a technical scope of work for pilot implementation of the screening tool on several practices. This testing will expand on the reviews completed by the committee in the “test run” and help improve the screening tool and “toolbox” as well as help to determine the cost of the review process. The Pilot Test was encouraged to include a broader variety of practices, including physical change projects and outreach or management projects, in order to better explore diverse practices.
2.5 Consultant Scope of Work

After pilot testing, the committee may recommend broader application through a scope of work for larger scale review of practices for the “toolbox”.

3 Practice Types

To simplify review and inclusion in the “toolbox” the management practices have been separated into three types: validated practices, new or developing practices, and indirect or policy practices. All types of practices may be included in the “toolbox” if they meet the standards provided in section 4.0 as screened in the tool. Each type of practice represents a different stage or expectation for the documentation and analysis. Additionally, practice types may characterize single practices or sets of practices that address salt, nitrate, or both. Additional types of practices, or practice variants, may be developed in the future. Validated practices are intended to be a “high bar” for completely validated practices. Most other practices will fall into the developing category. Developing practices require additional evaluation and monitoring before they can be validated.

3.1 Validated Practices

Management practices for which information shown in Attachment 1 (to be developed by the Subcommittee) is available should be submitted under the validated practices category. The standards (described in Section 4) for effectiveness and field implementation should be met by documentation including scientific studies (university research, trade research publications, other technical literature), by monitoring results, or by some other verifiable evidence. These practices will allow the greatest implementation flexibility and lowest monitoring requirements. Attachment 1 will provide the information and evaluation framework and formats for information to be submitted. The result will be a compendium of information concerning the practice or action that makes it amenable to implementation (inclusion in the “toolbox”).

Management Practices that have been evaluated by other Best Management Practice programs acceptable to the Subcommittee may be submitted in their existing formats provided they contain equivalent information.

3.2 New or Developing Practices

Many management practices to address salt and nitrate are new or documentation is still being developed, demonstrated or validated. The identification of a practice as new or developing should not detract from its perceived effectiveness or value, but only indicates it status of implementation and review. New or developing practices will not have all documentation under the standards section and will not generally have monitoring necessary for full validation. When practices characterized as new or developing it may be anticipated that additional monitoring or information may need to be provided by implementing industries or communities for it to be considered a fully validated practice.

3.3 Indirect or Policy Practices

Another grouping of practices includes practices that are deemed appropriate or necessary, that may not directly impact salt or nitrates in the environment, and for which the only possible quantification of impact may be a broad estimate. For these practices, inclusion in the “toolbox” will be based on industry recommendations or regulatory requirements or where they are a clear adjunct to other
practices. Examples of such practices may include public outreach to improve awareness of urban and rural water users, or economic incentives (e.g., rate structures and fees) to reduce salt and nitrate releases. When salt and nitrate load reductions cannot be reliably estimated, cost effectiveness of the practice may be impossible to determine.

4 Standards
Screening of practices requires review of their effectiveness in reducing salt and nitrate in the system. If a practice is demonstrated as superior to general current practices for salt and nitrate management, and meets other (e.g., cost, feasibility) criteria, then it warrants consideration for the “toolbox”. General practice is defined as the unregulated or unimproved baseline. Industries that previously or voluntarily reduced salt or nitrate discharges will not be penalized for such leadership. The demonstration of Best Practices may be highly situational or impossible to determine before practices are implemented and monitored in several locations. The Subcommittee will further develop screening standards to provide additional detail on standards as needed. The Screening tool implies the following standards, requesting the proposer of the practice to provide readily available documentation of the practice relative to each. The standards discussion in this section includes the directions to reviewers in reviewing the evaluating a nomination.

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. Reviewers will look for evidence of technical effectiveness as demonstrated by lab, pilot and evaluated demonstration studies. The documentation should indicate the practice removes, destroys, manages or otherwise reduces negative impacts to beneficial uses from salt and nutrient constituents or otherwise assists with compliance or improvement of the waters of the valley for these constituents.

4.2 Implementability – can it be used broadly?
Implementability includes both feasibility as well as well as broad applicability. In most cases, satisfactory implementability 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.

4.3 Benefits and Impacts
In evaluating the implementability of management practices the Subcommittee should consider the benefits and impacts of the management practice. Have the benefits and impacts been acceptably quantified? Do the benefits appear to outweigh identified negative impacts of its implementation?

Additionally, the Subcommittee should consider cross-media impacts, such as impacts to air quality, water supply, energy consumption and other water quality constituents. The ideal practices are effective on salt and nutrient constituents and have few or minimal impacts to other areas.

Reviewers should 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.
4.4 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 encouragement. Reviewers’ 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.

The ideal practice nomination will provide information on the practices costs on an industry appropriate unit bas per acre, per acre foot, per million gallons, per ton or etc.

4.5 Monitoring – proving it works?
Reviewers should evaluate both the ability to monitor as well as the length and breadth of the monitoring history as a part of screening. Monitoring during the implementation stage may be greater in developing practices than fully validated practices that have already identified critical monitoring parameters for implementation and operations.

4.6 Other Regulatory or Non-Regulatory Approvals
CV-SALTS may be able to defer to prior decisions made by Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Water Board) and State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) collectively Waterboards, Department of Public Health, building codes or other accreditation groups for validation. Where appropriate this should be done to reduce the cost and delays associated with duplication of validation.

Additionally, in cases where a practice is obvious broadly implemented and effective it may be recommended with less rigorous review or scientific study for approval by the Executive Committee.

5 Management Practice Toolbox
The Subcommittee will establish and update a list of management practices for each sector in the form of a “toolbox”. The “toolbox” will change as more information is reviewed and may also be used to track management practices, alternatives and technologies. The list will be maintained by the Subcommittee and Central Valley Salinity Coalition (CVSC). The “toolbox” will be available on the cvsalinity.org website and facilitate tracking the status of evaluation, verification, and monitoring. The Preliminary list of practices is shown as Attachment 2; this list will be updated or replaced as the “toolbox” is developed by the Subcommittee.
6 CV-SALTS Management Practice or Technology Presentations

Management Practices and Technologies that warrant recommendation for approval by the CV-SALTS Technical Committee and Executive Committee will have been reviewed according to the processes described previously. Recommended items will have been found to merit wider application to CV-SALTS stakeholders. Recommendations will be possible at meeting times, and may thus need to await accommodation on meeting agendas. Technologies warranting recommendation should have been monitored during several pilot deployments to demonstrate effectiveness. Exceptions may be granted by the Subcommittee for practices that show special promise or at the request of the Executive Committee. Executive or Technical Committee members may recommend practices for Subcommittee consideration at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

Vendors or technology proponents who wish to have specific practices evaluated for inclusion in the “toolbox” should contact the Central Valley Salinity Coalition or the Subcommittee Chair.
Attachment 1

This attachment provides information on the review of Management Practices for inclusion in the CV-SALTS “toolbox” for reductions in salt and nitrate that are significant to the Central Valley.

Screening Tool Checklist Process

The Subcommittee will use the evaluation framework process in Section 2 and standards in Section 4 to review management practice documentation.

1. Industry nomination or source section request
2. Formatting for screening tool by nominator or tech support
3. Assessment of submitted data by Subcommittee and additional info/expert review, if needed
4. MP Subcommittee and Technical Committee recommend practices
5. Executive Committee Approves and Toolbox is updated
6. Practice Implementation, Operations and Maintenance, Monitoring, Reporting
7. Revision, if needed and review

This is also shown in Figure 1 in Section 2.

Draft Screening Tool Nomination Form: The nomination of the practice will require some standardization of information on the Management Practices.

1. Title
2. Description
3. Constituent Salts or Nutrients Managed
4. Applicability
5. Practice Benefits and Impacts
6. Effectiveness Documentation
7. Supporting studies, Research and Source Documents
8. Implementation
   8.1 Costs
   8.2 Status and Potential
   8.3 Monitoring Documentation
9. Other Regulatory Approvals or Requirements

The Subcommittee developed the Screening Tool Nomination Form with brief instructions for users shown in Attachment 3 to ensure proposed practices meet the standards presented in section 4.0.
A preliminary list of potential management practices to manage salt and nitrate as suggested by the subcommittee is listed below: THIS LIST IS TO BE PROVIDED BY THE COMMITTEE AS HOMEWORK FOR THE 9/12/11 MEETING.

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 
6. 
7. 
8. 
9. 
10. 
11. 
12. 
13. 
14. 
15. 
16. 
17. 
18. 
19. 
20.
Potential Practices (listed to promote discussion, not as nominations to prioritize)

1. Irrigation efficiency/reduce irrigation – Reduce salts in imported water or evapotranspiration of groundwater
2. Tailwater reuse/drainage recirculation – reduced discharged of salt
3. Growing salt tolerant crops – reduced imported water while maintaining production
4. Evaporation ponds, solar evaporators – isolates the salt to allow management
5. Salt separation and utilization – fractionate and create products for reuse or sale
6. Drain water and brackish water desalination - Isolates salt for management
7. Detergent reformulation - source control
8. Industrial biomass and brine management – isolates salts and potentially reuses salts
9. Reduce imported feed for CAFO’s – reduces salt import from feed sources
10. Reduce seepage from brine conveyance - reduces dissolution of salt from soils
11. Industrial salt source reduction/reuse – reduces salts for production
12. Increase export of salt containing products - exports salt unless salt is brought in to produce products
13. Increase salt export in surface waters leaving the region
14. Increase outdoor landscape irrigation efficiency – reduces imported water/groundwater use
15. Increase indoor water use efficiency – reduces imported water and groundwater use
16. Reduce water softening need or shift to ocean disposal of brine – reduces salt from residential indoor plumbing
17. Local salt collection and disposal – Disposal and removal from basins
18. Increase salt discharge at EBMUD – ocean discharge and removal from basins
19. Salt collection and treatment (ocean qualified brine) for ocean discharge – ocean discharge and removal from basins
20. Deep well injection for storage and recovery of salts – Removal of salt from basins, with recovery when economic
Attachment 3

Screening Tool Nomination Form

Att. 3 is currently a separate document and will be incorporated when complete.
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 broad applicability. In most cases, satisfactory implementability 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. Implementability 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Contributions</th>
<th>FY06/07</th>
<th>FY07/08</th>
<th>FY08/09</th>
<th>FY09/10</th>
<th>FY10/11</th>
<th>Projected FY11/12</th>
<th>Projected FY12/13</th>
<th>Projected FY13/14</th>
<th>Projected Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member Contributions</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td>$ 257,878</td>
<td>$ 270,000</td>
<td>$ 275,000</td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
<td>$ 350,000</td>
<td>$ 1,602,878</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted by CVSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 375,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 439,124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 55,558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. SNPS Pilot</td>
<td>$ 170,228</td>
<td>$ 106,896</td>
<td>$ 162,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 439,124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. SNPS Consultants</td>
<td>$ 55,558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 55,558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Other TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 650,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 869,682</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Reclamation SNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Co-Chair Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 36,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 36,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pledges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Animal Drinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 29,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 29,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Kind Labor/Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 29,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Sac Regional</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
<td>$ 70,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ??By industry? Activity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 535,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,404,682</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td>$ 403,786</td>
<td>$ 614,896</td>
<td>$ 306,000</td>
<td>$ 265,000</td>
<td>$ 315,000</td>
<td>$ 1,404,682</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose of this form is to capture projects/improvements related to salt and nutrient management and quantify stakeholder expenditures supporting CV-SALTS.

### Data Requested

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency or Group Name</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Zip Code of Facility</th>
<th>Salinity Coalition Member?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project or Effort Name</th>
<th>Purpose and Description</th>
<th>Approx. Start Date</th>
<th>Completed Date</th>
<th>Contributes to CV-SALTS By</th>
<th>Notes or Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital or Contract $</th>
<th>In-Kind Labor $</th>
<th>Study or Other $</th>
<th>Management or BMP $</th>
<th>Other Funds Pledged $</th>
<th>Total Cost To Date $</th>
<th>Grant Funds $</th>
<th>Report As of __ Date</th>
<th>Notes or Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Required Cost %</th>
<th>Reported As of __ Date</th>
<th>Notes or Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other information</th>
<th>Notes or Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**Explanation of Expected Information**

- **Agency or Group Name**: Common Name
- **Contact Name**: Person or position
- **Phone**: Contact phone
- **Email**: Contact email
- **Zip Code of Facility**: Zip Code for the Facility if one location or otherwise add in notes
- **Salinity Coalition Member?**: Yes or No
- **Project or Effort Name**: Common Name
- **Purpose and Description**: Brief Description and Purpose
- **Approx. Start Date**: Date 1/1/2011 format
- **Completed Date**: Date 1/1/2011 format
- **Contributes to CV-SALTS By**: Brief explanation of how it contributes to CV-SALTS
- **Capital or Contract $**: Dollars Current year
- **In-Kind Labor $**: Dollars Current year
- **Study or Other $**: Dollars Current year
- **Management or BMP $**: Dollars Current year
- **Other Funds Pledged $**: Dollars Current year
- **Total Cost To Date $**: Dollars Current year
- **Grant Funds $**: Report if any grant funds were received
- **Percent Required Cost %**: Rough percentage that was a permit required 0-100%
- **Reported As of __ Date**: Date 1/1/2011 format
- **Other information**: Any other information that you feel is relevant