

CV-SALTS Executive Committee Meeting

March 17, 2011 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM

Sacramento Regional Sanitation District Offices
10060 Goethe Rd, Sacramento 95827

Teleconference (218) 339-4600 Code: 927571#

Posted 3-7-11 Revised 3-14-11

Meeting Objectives:

1. Set priorities from Consolidated Basin Plan Issues and detail 2011 actions of CV-SALTS.
2. Continue developing a sustainable structural/procedural framework with long term viability.

AGENDA

1) Welcome and Introductions Chair

- a) Review/Approve [February 10, 2011](#) notes – 2 min
- b) Committee Roll call and [Membership Roster](#)

2) Basin Plan Identified Issues – 2 hours

Tim Moore - Review [Basin Plan Issues Prioritization Summary](#)

Action: Selecting *high priority* regulatory policy initiatives for 2011

Lunch on your own

3) [Salinity Leadership Group Meeting Recap and notes](#) from [February 24, 2010](#) – 15 min

Parry to review Action: Summarize and recap discussion points Review recommendations for 2011 by Charles Gardiner

4) [2011 CV-SALTS Progress Milestones Updated](#) Approved Final Version 3 10 min

Daniel to present budget [Used/available Cleanup and Abatement](#), Action: Review and discuss

5) Technical Project Manager Scope Committee Update – 10 min

6) [Groundwater Strategy CV-SALTS Workplan](#) revised – 20 min

Pam Buford or Linda Dorn to review workplan: Action: discuss and approve

7) Management Practice Subcommittee Update Status – Parry – 15 min

8) Set next meeting objectives and date (April 21, 2011)

9) Public Education and Outreach Committee breakout communications and messages – 20 min

Joe DiGiorgio and Charles Gardiner

10) Future Items

a) [Technical Objective Recommendations](#) and [Questions](#) from the Knowledge Gained Committee Update – Lisa - 15 min Deferred

b) 3a/3b Task Force Status – 10 min

c) Expected Future Roles of the State and Regional Boards, stakeholders, CVSC

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 Notes

February 10, 2011 9:00 AM to 3:00 PM

Sacramento Regional Sanitation District Offices
10060 Goethe Rd, Sacramento 95827

Attendees: Are listed on the Membership Roster

AGENDA

- 1) Welcome and Introductions
 - i) Meeting brought to order by Chair, Parry Klassen, and roll call completed.
 - ii) Karna Harrigfeld moved to approve, and Joe DiGiorgio seconded, and by general acclamation the January 20, 2011 meeting action notes were approved.

- 2) Basin Plan Identified Issues
 - i) The committee with facilitator Daniel Cozad reviewed issues and needs which were consolidated into categories. The group reviewed and approved the general description with changes and recommended and discussed other consolidations and changes.
 - ii) Specific issues/needs will be revised and updated per discussion and presented for review in March.

- 3) Revised Governance, Voting and Quorum requirements shown in [Updated Standing Rules V-8](#)
 - i) Rules were approved by affirmative vote upon motion of David Cory and second by Nigel Quinn including the following two changes:
 - Quorum is to be defined as “greater than 50%.”
 - Regional Committees to be clarified as “reporting back to Executive Committee.”These changes will be made in the document and posted as approved.

- 4) [Lower San Joaquin River Committee Letter](#)

Dennis Westcot introduced a request from the LSJR Committee for concurrence and direction from the Executive Committee on moving forward with an analysis to determine whether a change in designation is warranted for Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN) and for Industrial Process Supply (PROC) for the San Joaquin River from Mendota to Vernalis.

- 5) [Lower San Joaquin River Committee Project Request](#)

Dennis Westcot introduced a request from LSJR Committee for concurrence from the Executive Committee to refer two water quality studies to Technical Committee. Scope of Work and cost estimates were provided: Evaluation of Wildlife and Aquatic Life Water Quality (est: \$52k) and Evaluation of Animal Drinking Water Quality (est: \$29k). General consensus was to refer to the Technical Committee with a 60-day timeline for response; requested follow up date from Technical Committee is to be April 15, 2011.

- 6) [Salinity Leadership Group Agenda](#) for [February 24, 2010](#)

The draft agenda was reviewed and discussed. By general acclamation the agenda was approved upon motion by David Cory and second by Nigel Quinn.

7) [2011 CV-SALTS Progress Milestones Updated](#)

Daniel and Jeanne Chilcott reviewed the document and changes. Daniel will be the point person as the Program Manager position review and reporting. It was requested that Daniel provide a budget of what is left in Cleanup and Abatement for the committee's discussion.

Jeff Willett moved to approve, and Pam Creedon seconded, the updated Milestones were approved by vote.

8) [Groundwater Strategy CV-SALTS Workplan](#)

Workplan document was reviewed and will be revised and resubmitted for approval at the March 17 meeting. In "Objective" include: "Ensure that ground and surface water within the Central Valley Region are protected from impacts of salts and nitrates such that all applicable beneficial uses are attained." Additionally, completion dates for items 3 and 4 will be changed to May 2014. Pam Buford will make changes the committee requested and provide for approval in the March meeting.

9) [Technical Objective Recommendations](#) and [Questions](#) from the Knowledge Gained Committee
Lisa will schedule Technical Committee meeting. Questions on page 41 of the packet will be moved to the March 17 meeting. The Subcommittee was requested to reconvene to provide recommendation by the April meeting.

10) Management Practice Subcommittee Update and Projects for funding was discussed and the committee requested the committee identify a date for a conference call to discuss status and provide feedback by the April meeting.

11) 3a/3b Task Force Status

The Committee recommended the Committee conduct a conference call to begin work on the document and missing efforts. Dr. Longley requested to be added to the list.

12) Set next meeting objectives and date (March 17, 2011) and approve final [2011 calendar](#)

Linda Dorn moved, and Pam Creedon seconded, to approve final 2011 calendar. Time changes to the March 17 meeting are as follows:

Central Valley Salinity Coalition will meet at 9:00 AM

Executive Committee will meet at 10:00 AM

13) Future Agenda Items to be Calendared for Discussion/Action or Removed

The following items have been moved to the July 2011 agenda:

- i) Develop the contents of the CV Salinity and Nitrate Plan
- ii) Expected Future Roles of the State and Regional Boards, stakeholders, CVSC

CV-SALTS Committee Rosters

| Executive Committee Membership | | 2011 February | 2011 March |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------|---------------|
| Nomination Category | Name and | | |
| Leadership Partners 1 | 1 Pamela Creedon/Jeanne Chilcott Regional WQCB | ✓ | |
| | 2 Darrin Polhemus, State Water Resources Control Board | ✓ | |
| | 3 Jose Faria/Ernie Taylor Department of Water Resources | | |
| | 4 Lisa Holm, US Bureau of Reclamation | ✓ | |
| | 5 TBD - Environmental Justice | | |
| | 6 TBD - Environmental, Water Quality | | |
| Comm. Co-chairs | 1 Parry Klassen, Chair Executive Committee | ✓ | |
| | 2 Jeff Willett, Vice Chair Executive Committee | ✓ | |
| | 3 Joe DiGiorgio, Public Education & Outreach Comm. | ✓ | |
| | 4 Lisa Holm, Technical Advisory Committee | ✓ | |
| | 5 Nigel Quinn, Technical Advisory Committee | ✓ | |
| | 6 David Cory, Economic and Social Cost Committee | ✓ | |
| CV Salinity Coalition | 1 Bobbi Larson, CASA | | |
| | 2 Debbie Webster, CVCWA | ✓ | |
| | 3 Dave Cory, San Joaquin River Drainage Authority | ✓ | |
| | 4 Steve Hogg, City of Fresno | | |
| | 5 Trudi Hughes/Mona Shulman, Ca League of Food Processors | ✓ | |
| | 6 Tim Schmelzer/Chris Savage, Wine Institute | ✓ | |
| | 7 Steve Bailey, City of Tracy | | |
| | 8 Jeff Willett, City of Stockton | ✓ | |
| | 9 Linda Dorn, Sacramento Regional CSD | ✓ | |
| | 10 Dennis Westcot, San Joaquin River Group | ✓ | |
| | 11 Nick Pinhey, City of Modesto | | |
| | 12 Tim Johnson, California Rice Commission | | |
| | 13 Phil Govea, City of Manteca | | |
| | 14 Parry Klassen, E. San Joaquin Water Quality Coalition | ✓ | |
| | 15 Mike Nordstrom/Doug Davis Tulare Lake Drainage/Storage District | ✓ | |
| | 16 Karna Harrigfeld, Stockton East Water District | ✓ | |
| | 17 Renee Pinel, Western Plant Health Association | ✓ | |
| | 18 Travis Peterson, City of Vacaville | ✓ | |

Participants Identified:

Geoff Anderson, DWR

Bruce Houdesheldt, NCWA/Sac Valley WQC

Dan Odenweller, RWQCB

Danny Merkely, California Farm Bureau

Emily Alejandrino/Jim Martin, CVRWQCB

Emily Robidart Rooney, Ag Council

Gail Cismowski, CVRWQCB

Jenny Crouse, Ironhouse Sanitary District

Erick Althorp SSWQCB

Mark Dorman, Rainsoft Water PWQA

Mark Felton, Culligan Water and PWQA

Mark Gowdy, SWRCB, Water Rights

Rick Staggs, City of Fresno

Robert Chrobak and Stuart Childs Kennedy/Jenks

Ron Crites, Brown and Caldwell

Erica DeHollan, LA C

Tess Dunham, Somach

Stan Dean, SRCD

Fern Wilson, City of Vacaville

Jim Martin, RWQCB

Karl Longley, CSU Fresno

Andy Malone, Wildermuth Env.

Chad Dibble, CDFG

David Miller, GEI Consultants

Gary Carlton, Kennedy Jenks

Jamil Ibrahim, MWH Global

Jay Simi, CVRWQCB

Jodi Pontureri, SWRCB

Joe LeClaire, Wildermuth Env.

Ken Landau, RWQCB

Larry Rodriguez, Kern County WA

Mark Larsen, Kaweah Delta WCD

Rita Schmitt-Sudman, WEF

Rob Beggs, Brown and Caldwell

Roberta Firoved



CV-Salts Executive Committee Meeting on March 17, 2011

Discussion Outline: Proposed Approach for Updating the Basin Plan

I. Regulatory Drivers

- A) Impaired Uses (303d, TMDLs, permits)
- B) Salt and Nitrogen Management Plan
- C) Focal Areas for Basin Planning
 - 1. Beneficial Use Designations (esp. MUN & AGR)
 - 2. Water Quality Objectives (esp. EC, Nitrate & individual ions)
 - 3. Anti-degradation Policy (esp. criteria defining Maximum Benefit)
- D) Axioms Governing Approvable Regulatory Alternatives

II. Beneficial Use Designations

- A) Presumptive Uses (Federal, State & Regional)
- B) Existing vs. Potential Uses
- C) Exceptions/Exemptions
- D) De-designation Options Under 40 CFR 131.10(g)
- E) Sub-classification Options
- F) Segmentation Options
- G) Suspension Options
- H) Beneficial Use Zoning Options

III. Water Quality Objectives

- A) Use Protection Thresholds
- B) Default Objectives
- C) Performance-based Objectives (BAT, BMP, MEP)
- D) Site Specific Objectives
- E) Permit Translators
- F) Waste Load Allocations
- G) Averaging Periods
- H) Points of Compliance
- I) Offsets
- J) Variances

IV. Anti-Degradation Policy

- A) Federal vs. State Requirements
- B) Requisite Trigger Conditions
- C) Exceptions based on "Maximum Benefit"

V. Homework for Next Meeting

Federal Criteria for Reclassifying a Designated Use
40 CFR 131.10[g]

- 1) Naturally occurring pollutant concentrations prevent attainment of the use.
- 2) Natural, ephemeral, intermittent or low flow conditions or water levels prevent attainment of the use, unless these conditions may be compensated for by the discharge of sufficient volume of discharges without violating State water conservation requirements to enable uses to be met.
- 3) Human caused conditions or sources of pollution prevent the attainment of the use and cannot be remedied or would cause more environmental damage to correct than to leave in place.
- 4) Dams, diversions or other types of hydrologic modifications preclude attainment of the use, and it is not feasible to restore the water body to its original condition or to operate such modifications in a way that would result in attainment of the use.
- 5) Physical conditions related to the natural features of the water body, such as the lack of proper substrate, cover, flow, depth, pools, riffles, and the like, unrelated to water quality, preclude attainment of aquatic life protection uses.
- 6) Controls more stringent than those required by Sections 301(b) and 306 of the Act would result in substantial and widespread economic and social impact.

CALIFORNIA WATER CODE
Section 13000

“...activities and factors which may affect the quality of the waters of the state shall be regulated to attain the highest water quality which is reasonable, considering all demands being made and to be made on those waters and the total values involved, beneficial and detrimental, economic and social, tangible and intangible.”

CALIFORNIA WATER CODE
Section 13241

“It is recognized that it may be possible for the quality of water to be changed to some degree without unreasonably affecting beneficial uses. Factors to be considered by a regional board in establishing water quality objectives shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, all of the following:

- a) Past, present, and probable future beneficial uses of water.
- b) Environmental characteristics of the hydrographic unit under consideration, including quality of water available thereto.
- c) Water quality conditions that could reasonably be achieved through the coordinated control of all factors which affect water quality in the area.
- d) Economic considerations.
- e) The need for developing housing within the region
- f) The need to develop and use recycled water.”

Axioms for Establishing or Revising Water Quality Standards

- 1) Appropriate beneficial uses must be designated. (40 CFR 131.10a)
- 2) Uses must be designated where the use is actually being attained. (40 CFR 131.10i)
- 3) Water quality objectives must protect the designated uses. (40 CFR 131.11a)
- 4) Water quality objectives must protect the most sensitive use. (40 CFR 131.11a)
- 5) Existing uses may not be downgraded or deleted. (40 CFR 131.10-h-1)
- 6) The level of water quality necessary to protect existing uses shall be maintained. (40 CFR 131.12a)
- 7) Existing uses are those uses actually attained in the water body on or after November 28, 1975, whether or not they designated. (40 CFR 131.3e)
- 8) REC1 and Aquatic Life Habitat (ALH) are presumed to be attainable (40 CFR 131.10d)
- 9) Failure to designate REC-1 and ALH requires a UAA (40 CFR 131.10j)
- 10) Water quality objectives must protect downstream beneficial uses (40 CFR 131.10b)
- 11) Deleting or downgrading a designated use requires a UAA (40 CFR 131.10j)
- 12) Subcategorizing with less stringent water quality criteria requires a UAA (40 CFR 131.10j)
- 13) Uses are deemed attainable, and may not be removed, if the use can be achieved with cost-effective and reasonable best management practices for nonpoint source control. (40 CFR 131.10d and 40 CFR 131.10-h-2)
- 14) May delete, downgrade or subcategorize a use only under certain conditions (40 CFR 131.10g)
- 15) Seasonal uses are allowed. (40 CFR 131.10f)
- 16) EPA's recommended water quality criteria are presumed to be protective for the associated designated uses. (40 CFR 131.11)
- 17) States may adopt and implement mixing zones, variances and low flow policies (40 CFR 131.13)
- 18) Regional Board must consider factors identified in Section CWC §13241, including economics, when adopting water quality objectives to protect beneficial uses.
- 19) Undesignated waterbodies have the same beneficial uses and objectives as the designated waterbodies to which they are tributary (CV Basin Plan)
- 20) Where current water quality is better than necessary to protect designated uses that existing higher quality must be preserved unless allowing lower quality is demonstrated to continue to protect existing uses and would provide "maximum benefit to the people of California." (SWRCB Res. No. 68-16)

CV-SALTS Basin Plan Needs & Issues - Version 6

The CV-SALTS program will address the following areas related to basin planning for salt and nitrates. As these areas are addressed the following overarching considerations are essential to success.

- a. Public health impacts of contaminated drinking water sources by nitrates are a significant concern in many areas. As the Basin Plan is developed these areas will be a priority for programs developed. Areas where current supplies do not provide drinking water meeting nitrate standards should receive regulatory focus.
- b. It is essential that the CV-SALTS program develop a framework and process that encourages holistic beneficial use protection where control programs are developed holistically understanding the interrelation and interconnection rather than individually.
- c. The CV-SALTS programs will include the water supply and the salinity issues from recycled water supplies. The CV-SALTS programs will be developed as equivalent to the Salt and Nutrient Management Plan required by the Recycled Water Policy.

Identifications numbers (I or N) refer to the original summary.

1. Volume/Concentration Flow - Maximum Benefit/Anti Degradation

This area emphasizes the need to consider salinity under a variety of hydrologic conditions, including drought, and the interrelations between water supply/volume, concentrations of salts, and the protection of beneficial uses and to determine what is needed to support a “maximum benefit” case if lowering high quality water will occur under the Anti-degradation Policy.

- a. Develop a real-time management program with stakeholders addressing flow & quality issues and determine how it could be applied beyond the San Joaquin River, if appropriate. N-1
- b. Recognizing that Delta objectives impact quality and quantity of water delivered to San Joaquin Basin and beyond better link water quality & quantity in the basin plan. N-3
- c. Consider constraints on the system under a variety of hydrologic conditions, and define the range of conditions, including normal, wet, and drought periods. I-3
- d. Evaluate the need and define the process to comply with the State Anti-degradation Policy, as well as Federal policy where surface waters are degraded.

2. Beneficial Use

This area is focused on developing and improving the definitions and characterization of Beneficial Uses and identifying the science needed to refine or de-designate existing designations in surface and groundwater.

- a. Consider appropriate designation, or dedesignation, of existing, potential, beneficial uses including limited MUN and Ag uses. MUN is assigned to waters unsuitable for drinking or prohibited by DPH. N-18, I-13
- b. Review problematic beneficial uses established for surface and ground water via Sources of Drinking Water Policy or set based on the tributary rule. Review and revise beneficial uses to ensure they are reasonable and appropriate. Identify groundwater basins and their applicable beneficial uses in the S-SJR Basin Plan. Consider modifications or exceptions to the Sources of Drinking Water Policy in setting uses. For Ag drains with beneficial uses set by the Tributary Rule and Sources of Drinking Water

Policy, designate and/or dedesignate, beneficial uses based on sound scientifically information. (Live Oak ag drain example) N-19, I-1, I-6 and N-22

- c. Refine reaches and groundwater subbasins for selected water bodies. Ties to objectives. N-15

3. Objectives

The Objective area is closely linked to the Beneficial Use area and includes setting objectives, while accounting for background, averaging periods, and better defining the objectives measurement and monitoring. Additionally, this area includes improving guidelines for interpretation and implementation of objectives (including narrative objectives).

- a. Develop salinity objectives to protect beneficial uses for specific sub-regions based on sub-region specific conditions, including limited cropping patterns or use, or zones of protection. Develop appropriate criteria for site-specific salinity objectives to protect AGR beneficial uses. N-12, N-23
- b. Develop a process and framework for determining "naturally occurring background concentrations," coordinated with Waterboards ongoing efforts and expanding to groundwater. N-10
- c. Develop a process and framework for determining "Reasonable Protection" and what factors are to be considered as the basis for determining appropriate objectives and management tools. N-8
- d. Review and modify water quality objectives with appropriate averaging periods. N-13 and I-4
- e. For the TL Basin Plan, evaluate the current maximum average annual increase range of 1 to 6 uS/cm and develop the appropriate models to determine the optimum management of the TL Basin for the longest life possible. N-14
- f. Review the organic components of TDS/EC definition and if other measurements of salt should be used in lieu of TDS/EC. Table 1A #19
- g. Address inconsistencies between groundwater exception found in Basin Plans (TDS>3,000mg/l, EC>5,000 µS/cm) and secondary MCL standards. I-14
- h. Establish a process to determine objectives when all objectives cannot be simultaneously met based on beneficial use priorities. Consider changes, exceptions or variances under drought or other conditions. Ties to beneficial uses and implementation, links to water recycling. N-5
- i. Develop Basin Plan provisions for determining compliance with groundwater objectives, to reduce likelihood for effluent quality standards to be set to receiving water standards. Include guidelines for interpreting and applying narrative objectives and for the use of MCLs for MUN designation. I-2
- j. Determine a process for translating narrative objectives to enforceable numeric water quality limits. Ties to implementation. I-9
- k. Define criteria for "good quality ground waters" in the Basin Plan statement "Discharges to areas that may recharge good quality ground waters". I-15 and I-8 Page and IV-11 of Tulare Lake Basin Plan.

4. Program for Implementation - Variance, Offsets, Time Schedules/Compliance Schedules, Credits, Adaptive Management, Mixing Zones

This area of emphasis includes the largest by number of issues and suggested needs and activities. The program for implementation will likely be broader than changes to the Basin Plans and will identify actions needed to implement the "regulatory and non-regulatory" salt management strategies, which should include an adaptive management approach. This plan of implementation should include programs which are voluntary, program- or industry-membership governed or compulsory by regulation. The program for implementation could possibly include: credits, offsets, variances and time schedule/compliance schedules and other management alternatives. This area of emphasis also includes the need to identify long term

sustainable salt and nitrate balance or management programs consistent with the Anti-degradation policy findings in volume concentration and flow area.

- a. Develop short & long term strategies to achieve economically and environmentally sustainable salt balance, with steps needed to achieve the goal including adaptive management processes. This could include interim steps and a framework for implementation. N-6, I-11
- b. Develop Basin Plan section or other policy and process for reviewing, considering and approving best available scientific and information (attenuation, local soil conditions, criteria changes, etc.) when determining guidelines related to:
 - whether and to what degree discharges will affect or contribute to long term salt balance including:
 - groundwater quality
 - mixing zones for groundwater (and develop guidelines for application/use)
 - guidelines for site-specific studiesand when new information should supersede previous or less definitive/applicable information on guidelines or criteria. Additionally, the Program of Implementation should include feedback loops to ensure accurate interpretation of narrative objectives for permits. N-2, I-7 I-12 and N-4. This item links to objectives.
- c. Develop an offset policy for credit, trading with adequate accounting and monitoring processes to reduce costs and increase compliance. Table 2 A # 64
- d. Develop the Plan of Implementation section's timelines and triggers with the understanding that certain receiving waters will require many years to meet salinity and nutrient WQOs. N-9 and I-17.
- e. Ensure that if processes or programs are making adequate progress toward meeting objectives, these processes or programs can continue unless constrained by site specific parameters. #25, T2A
- f. Review and deter salt collection, aggregation and final disposal options (e.g. a valley-wide drain, several smaller drains, evaporation basins etc) are viable and the role of the SJR in elimination of salts while protecting beneficial uses. N-24 and I-5
- g. Address the mutual interdependence and tradeoffs among salt minimization and environmental issues and water supply impacts. Table 1-A #20
- h. Evaluate and determine the appropriate planning period (precedent for 20 years) for the Basin Plan. The implementation plan should address potential changes in the beneficial uses during at least that period; controlled vs. uncontrolled degradation. I-11
- i. Within the Plan of Implementation, provide a process and guidelines for determining "best economically achievable treatment practices" and the process updating the guidelines outside the BP.
- j. Evaluate potential to permit a specified salinity increase for consumptive use, up to a specified limit, including review of the (current) TL Basin Plan approach (500 EC over source water EC) for setting effluent limits. Develop consumptive use guidelines and process for revision, in conformance with salt balance definition usable in all BP Regions. Ties to objectives N-20
- k. Include appropriate regulatory programs which are interconnected with salt and nitrate, such as the Irrigated Lands program, as part of the program implementation. Table 1-A #33
- l. Clarify what defines "good quality ground waters" as use on page IV-11 of Tulare Lake Basin Plan - "Discharges to areas that may recharge good quality ground waters.....", N-21
- m. Assess flow records and pattern of use information to develop objectives and a basis for variance or modifications under low flow or other climatic conditions. N-7

CV-SALTS 2011 Leadership Group Workshop Notes

February 24 2011 1:30 PM to 3:30 PM

CAL EPA Building, 1001 I Street, Sacramento, CA
Coastal Hearing Room

Attendees are listed in the attachment

OVERVIEW

An executive review of the CV-SALTS project was presented to the Leadership Group. Past accomplishments, current project status, and future focus were covered. Feedback and recommendations were solicited from the Leadership Group to clarify strategic direction for the project for 2011-2012, as well as long-term goals.

AGENDA

1) Welcome and Introductions, Opening Comments – *Tam Doduc , Kate Hart*

Tam Doduc emphasized that the State Water Board has demonstrated their commitment by investing heavily in the stakeholder process, and will continue to insist that additional funding be contingent upon results. Kate Hart echoed the same sense of urgency from the Regional Water Board indicating that they were already seeing salinity related issues with permits coming before them.

2) CVSLG and CV-SALTS Initiative Progress Determination Finding and 2011-12 Goals - *Pamela Creedon*

Pamela Creedon reviewed the major changes to the CV-SALTS initiative since 2009, and Advances and Progress made to date; while also reiterating the concern that the initiative has fallen behind schedule. It was concluded that with the progress that has been made, and with the following 2011 Milestones in place, the recommendation would be made to the Central Valley Water Board, "that we continue with the stakeholder process in developing this salt and nitrate management plan":

- Complete both framework & salt and nitrate source study, plus a screening tool to identify effective and economical management practices
- Ensure technical management team in place; project on time & on budget
- Update initiative strategy to include overall policy and framework
- Work plan to include 5-year CRITICAL PATH ensuring Recycled Water Policy requirements are met
- Identify unfunded work, with estimated costs to improve final product and a continuous funding mechanism & proposed integrated monitoring system
- Have contracts awarded or pending for critical work plan tasks
- Provide semi-annual progress reports towards completing work plan tasks

3) Future CV-SALTS Moving Forward – Basin Plan Policy and Regional Framework – *Mona Shulman*

Mona Shulman reviewed the current status and accomplishments of the Executive Committee and covered in detail the four major areas of emphasis established by the committee:

- Balancing Water Supply & Quality
- Beneficial Uses
- Water Quality Objectives
- Program for Implementation

In response to discussion regarding the required feedback mechanism for input into these four key areas, it was suggested that the Needs & Issues document be considered simply as an outline of WHAT needs to be done; all stakeholders are encouraged to offer continual feedback regarding HOW to move forward in these areas to ensure that all suggestions are considered, and if agreed upon, incorporated into the work plan.

In response to a question to the group regarding priorities in the four areas, discussion centered around the fact that although there may be some inherent order in the logic in which the four areas are approached, it was agreed that all four areas are of equal importance to the initiative.

4) Existing Stakeholder Support & Proposed Funding Plan – *Jeff Willett*

Jeff Willett reviewed both the overall current economic costs of salt and nitrate to the Central Valley, and California as a whole, and the current and future costs to administer the CV-SALTS project. The point was made that given the current \$544 million annual impact, and potential future impact without a management program, the dollar investment in CV-SALTS is only “pennies on the dollar.”

Future funding options, and concerns, were the largest area of discussion. The inquiry was made regarding what private sector grants or sources had been considered. To pursue private foundation funding a succinct plan with time frame and goals is needed to apply for such funding. There was further discussion regarding the return on increased engagement with the Multi State Salinity Coalition, and outreach to political leadership, in furtherance of the effort to gain a level of federal funding comparable to areas outside of California.

5) CV-SALTS Visions of the Future Implementation – *David Cory*

David Cory reviewed the universal impact and long-term focus of the success, or failure, of a salt and nitrate management plan. Two key approaches for the Leadership Group were cited as key to the success of the CV-SALTS initiative moving forward:

- Broader stakeholder and public education and engagement
- Expand the primary vision of the initiative beyond 2015

Discussion centered on how to promote proactive participation vs. reacting to salt and nitrate “disasters.” It was pointed out that we already have communities in the Central Valley facing disasters; communities without drinking water, growers who can no longer cultivate their land.

6) Salinity Leadership Group Actions – *Parry Klassen*

Parry Klassen summarized the panel presentations and concerns and issues raised by stakeholders in response. Based on the discussion points summarized, recommendations from the group for moving forward will taken up by the Executive Committee.

7) Closing Message – *Tim Moore*

Tim Moore advised that, based on the past performance of other salt management plans, CV-SALTS has about a 33% chance of success. To that end, the recommendation is to focus short-term efforts on building a replicable mechanism for fixing salt and nitrate related issues that can be transferred to other efforts in the future.

2011 CV-SALTS MILESTONES –Version 3 Approved 2/10/11

(Technical Progress will be Measured Against Updated Workplan)

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

CV-SALTS Initiative Program Funding
As of March 1, 2011

Cleanup and Abatement Funding

| | Funding | Expenditures | Date | Status |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------|---------------|
| Allocated | \$ 5,000,000 | | 2009 | |
| | | | | |
| Contracted SJVDA | \$ 1,200,000 | Contracted | 2009 | |
| BUOS Phase I | | \$ 50,000 | 2010 | Complete |
| Program Mgt 2011 | | \$ 376,185 | | Ongoing |
| Program Mgt 2012 | | \$ 291,571 | | Contracted |
| Remaining Contracted | \$ 482,244 | | | |
| | | | | |
| Approved Not Contracted | \$ 2,000,000 | | 2010 | Approved |
| | | | | |
| Remaining Approved | \$ 2,482,244 | | | |
| | | | | |
| Remaining to be Approved | \$ 1,800,000 | | 2011 | |
| | | | | |
| Total Remaining | \$ 4,282,244 | | | |

Coalition and Partner funding in preparation

Action #6.4.1 CV-SALTS Develop a Salt and Nitrate Management Plan

Goals: Through the CV SALTS initiative, a collaborative stakeholder effort, develop a basin plan amendment to implement a comprehensive Salt and Nitrate Management Plan for surface and ground water within the entire Central Valley Region.

Action: Amendment to the Basin Plans covering the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River, Tulare Lake and possibly the Bay Delta Plan. The amendment will address review of beneficial use designations and establishment of new water quality objectives for salts and nitrates as appropriate. The amendment will also establish a comprehensive implementation plan to protect water quality and achieve compliance where those water quality objectives are not met.

Objective: Ensure that ground and surface water within the Central Valley Region are protected from impacts of salt and nitrates such that all applicable beneficial uses are attained. .

Time schedule: CV-SALTS Executive Committee is currently re-evaluating the issues and needs that the Stakeholders and the Central Valley Water Board believe are most critical to complete in this basin planning process. The results of this will be used to update and revise the following workplan, schedule, and budget.

Resource needs: As noted in the goal of this action the CV-SALTS initiative is a broad effort to develop a comprehensive Salt and Nitrate Management Plan for the entire Central Valley Region. Over \$1 million dollars has been put towards the planning effort and \$5 million has been allocated for the next three years from the Clean-up and Abatement Account. Resource needs are estimated by stakeholders based on CV-SALTS May 2009 workplan to be approximately \$20 to \$40 million for the development and implementation of the Salt and Nitrate Management Plan.

Workplan Task(s) Narrative Description:

The following tasks have been developed by CV-SALTS committees in an attempt to capture the efforts needed to complete a basin plan amendment and produce an implementable Salinity and Nitrate Management Plan for the Central Valley.

Some of the sub-tasks under Task 1 are underway during the current re-evaluation of the needs and issue. Based on the outcome of the re-evaluation the following workplan tasks will be updated by October 2011.

Task 1 Program Development

1.1 Scoping and revising the CV-SALTS Strategy

1.1.1 Update schedule, critical path, milestone monitoring, and program implementation

- 1.1.2 Budget/Funding Plan and Financing Program
- 1.1.3 Continue to increase membership

Deliverables: Semi-annual Status Reports **Date:** June/Dec
Final Updated Strategy (including policy & framework) July 2011

- 1.2 Initial Efforts and Pilot Studies
- 1.2.1 Westside Salt Assessment

Deliverable: Report **Date:** May 2011

- 1.2.2 Salt and Nitrate Sources Pilot Implementation Study Report

Deliverable: Report **Date:** Completed Feb 2010
http://intpln.com/Docs/Final%20SNSPIS%20Report%20Submittal_02.22.10%20ESOnly.pdf

- 1.2.3 Assess Validity of Salt and Nitrate Sources Pilot Studies (Tasks 1.2.1 and 1.2.2)

Deliverable: Report identifying adjustments to make studies useful for the rest of the Central Valley Region **Date:** April 2011

- 1.2.4 Develop interim recommended review process for identifying Best Practical Treatment or Control (BPTC) for salinity and nitrate

Deliverable: BPTC Screening Tool **Date:** June 2011

- 1.3 Consolidate and Prioritize Issues to be Addressed
- 1.3.1 Solicit Stakeholder and Regional Water Board issues and needs
- 1.3.2 Categorize into areas of policy and technical work
 - 1.3.2.1 Integrate prior work and develop work needed to address consolidated issues and needs
 - 1.3.2.2 Update CV-Salts workplan based on prioritized issues and needs

Deliverable: Final 5-Year Workplan **Date:** Aug 2011

- Technical Project Management Team
- 1.3.3 Under direction of the CV-SALTS Executive Committee will manage task 2 to insure technical tasks needed to complete effort accomplished on time and on budget

Deliverable: Contract awarded **Date:** May 2011

Task 2 Technical Studies, Research, and Monitoring to Support Prioritized Needs and Issues

2.1 Scope and initiate contracts to support development of basin plan amendments through technical studies, research, and monitoring. This task will be further defined and deliverables identified following the completion of Final 5-Year workplan in August 2011.

Task 3 Basin Plan Amendments to the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and Tulare Lake Basin Plans

3.1 Basin Plan Amendments

3.1.1 Development amendment language and supporting documents

3.1.2 Coordinate with Regional Board for review and approval with the State Water Board, Office of Administrative Law, and USEPA.

Deliverable: None during this workplan time frame

Date: June 2014

3.2 Implementation Plan in support of Basin Plan Amendment

3.2.1 Identify actions needed to implement the “regulatory and non-regulatory” salt management strategies.

Deliverable: None during this workplan time frame

Date: June 2014

| Action #6.4.1: CV-SALTS Develop a Salt and Nitrate Management Plan | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| Time Frame: January 2011 through June 2012 | | | | | |
| Task # | Task Description | Task Deliverable | Coordination Commitment | Contract Dollars | Completion Date |
| 1 | Program Development 1.1 Scoping & revising the CV-SALTS Strategy | -Updated Final Strategy based on re-evaluation of schedule, critical path, and milestone monitoring and program of implementation -Semi-annual Status Reports | ~\$400,000 as of Dec 2010 in stakeholder support from CVSC | ~\$500K in CAA support Utilized | Began in 2007 and will continue through at least 2014 |
| | 1.2 Initial efforts and Pilots | - Salt and Nitrate Sources Pilot Implementation Study - Westside Salt Assessment - Report on Validity of Pilot Studies - BPTC Screening Tool | ~\$450,000 for stakeholder studies CVSC and \$350,000USBR | | Feb 2010 May 2011 Apr 2011 June 2011 |
| | 1.3 Consolidate and Prioritize Issues to be addressed | - Final 5-Year Workplan | ~1850 hours for July 2009 to January 2011 and \$50,000 in stakeholder in kind support | \$100K CAA Support utilized | August 2011 |
| | 1.4 Technical Project Management Team | -Contract Award | | \$? CAA | May 2011 |
| 2 | Technical studies, research, and monitoring to support needs and issues | Scope and initiate contracts to support the basin plan issues above with technical studies and data as needed, This task will be better defined by August 2011. | | CAA funding ~\$4.3 Mil will need other funds | June 2014 |
| 3 | Basin Plan Amendment | - Develop amendment language and supporting documents Coordinate with for review and approval with State Water Board, OAL, and EPA. -Implementation Plan | | | June 2014* |

*Potential for time extension

Questions for the Executive Committee from the Knowledge Gained Subcommittee, 11/09/10

Until it is clearer what the subcommittee is tasked to do, it will be difficult for the subcommittee to do its work effectively or to come up with something that is clear and focused and that we know is going to fulfill CVSALTS needs. Therefore, a few of us have prepared some directed questions to help the Executive Committee give us the needed direction. The memorandum attached to the November 18 agenda should also highlight possible discussion points per the direction of the Subcommittee's work.

Essentially: What is the ultimate product desired from the subcommittee?

1. CVSALTS funded a pilot salinity and nitrate sources study that was narrowly focused. The Knowledge Gained subcommittee has discussed the need to expand the scope in order to develop more broadly useful data. Does the Executive Committee prefer to limit the subcommittee's work to a review of the sources study as is, or to expand the subcommittee's work to a broader context of review of up to three pilot salinity/nitrate studies?
2. Should the subcommittee limit its technical review to questions that the sources study answered, or should it review the study in a broader informational context (to inform planning and water supply/quality management in addition to mass loading).
3. Should the subcommittee review the three known studies to inform future direction of salinity and nitrate data gathering?
4. Should the subcommittee review the three known studies to inform a methodology for prioritizing areas to (regulate/plan/manage)?
5. Should the subcommittee review the three known studies to inform identification of management strategies or identification of problem types (in addition to source types)?
6. The subcommittee believes that the analysis of sources should be done in the context of the beneficial uses being protected (an analysis of river water quality should be done in the context of the desired water quality outcome). Does the executive committee agree? And if so, would the executive committee advise the subcommittee on whether/how it should evaluate for existing/future antidegradation, beneficial uses, water quality objectives and control practices? Should some of this work be phased? Or can it be flexible enough to adapt to changes in these endpoints?
7. Should salinity and nitrate studies determine assimilative capacity in groundwater or surface water? Is there some guidance the subcommittee should employ in assessing whether the studies have done this?

CV-SALTS Annual Meeting Calendar 2011

| JANUARY | | | | | | |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| MON | TUE | WED | THU | FRI | SAT | SUN |
| | | | | | 1 | 2 |
| 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 |
| 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 |
| 31 | | | | | | |

Sac Regional

| FEBRUARY | | | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| MON | TUE | WED | THU | FRI | SAT | SUN |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 |
| 28 | | | | | | |

Sac Regional

| MARCH | | | | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| MON | TUE | WED | THU | FRI | SAT | SUN |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 |
| 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | | | |

Sac Regional

| APRIL | | | | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| MON | TUE | WED | THU | FRI | SAT | SUN |
| | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 |
| 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |
| 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | |

Sac Regional

| MAY | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| MON | TUE | WED | THU | FRI | SAT | SUN |
| | | | | | | 1 |
| 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 |
| 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 |
| 30 | 31 | | | | | |

ACWA Downtown

| JUNE | | | | | | |
|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| MON | TUE | WED | THU | FRI | SAT | SUN |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |
| 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 |
| 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | | | |

Sac Regional

| JULY | | | | | | |
|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| MON | TUE | WED | THU | FRI | SAT | SUN |
| | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 |
| 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |
| 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 |

Sac Regional

| AUGUST | | | | | | |
|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| MON | TUE | WED | THU | FRI | SAT | SUN |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
| 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 |
| 29 | 30 | 31 | | | | |

Sac Regional

| SEPTEMBER | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| MON | TUE | WED | THU | FRI | SAT | SUN |
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 |
| 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |
| 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | | |

ACWA Downtown

| OCTOBER | | | | | | |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| MON | TUE | WED | THU | FRI | SAT | SUN |
| | | | | | 1 | 2 |
| 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 |
| 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 |
| 31 | | | | | | |

Sac Regional

| NOVEMBER | | | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| MON | TUE | WED | THU | FRI | SAT | SUN |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 |
| 28 | 29 | 30 | | | | |

ACWA Downtown

| DECEMBER | | | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| MON | TUE | WED | THU | FRI | SAT | SUN |
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 |
| 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |
| 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | |

Cal EPA?

SALTY 5 Coordination Meetings

| | |
|-----------|------------------|
| 1/3/2011 | Salty 5 January |
| 2/7/2011 | Salty 5 February |
| 3/7/2011 | Salty 5 |
| 4/4/2011 | Salty 5 |
| 5/2/2011 | Salty 5 |
| 6/6/2011 | Salty 5 |
| 7/11/2011 | Salty 5 |
| 8/1/2011 | Salty 5 |
| 9/12/2011 | Salty 5 |
| 10/3/2011 | Salty 5 |
| 11/7/2011 | Salty 5 |
| 12/5/2011 | Salty 5 |

CV-SALTS Committee Meetings

| | |
|------------|---------------------------|
| 2/24/2011 | Salinity Leadership Group |
| 1/20/2011 | Committees Meetings |
| 2/10/2011 | Committees Meetings |
| 3/17/2011 | Committees Meetings |
| 4/21/2011 | Committees Meetings |
| 5/26/2011 | Committees Meetings |
| 6/16/2011 | Committees Meetings |
| 7/21/2011 | Committees Meetings |
| 8/18/2011 | Committees Meetings |
| 9/15/2011 | Committees Meetings |
| 10/20/2011 | Committees Meetings |
| 11/17/2011 | Committees Meetings |
| 12/15/2011 | Committees Meetings |
| 1/11/2011 | LSJR Committee |
| 2/17/2011 | LSJR Committee |
| 3/24/2011 | LSJR Committee |
| 4/28/2011 | LSJR Committee |

Potential Conflicting Meetings

| | |
|-----------|------------------------|
| 1/10/2011 | Special Meeting |
| 1/4/2011 | State Board Meeting |
| 1/5/2011 | State Board Meeting |
| 1/18/2011 | State Board Meeting |
| 1/19/2011 | State Board Meeting |
| 2/1/2011 | State Board Meeting |
| 2/2/2011 | Regional Board Meeting |
| 2/2/2011 | State Board Meeting |
| 2/3/2011 | Regional Board Meeting |
| 2/4/2011 | Regional Board Meeting |
| 2/15/2011 | State Board Meeting |
| 2/16/2011 | State Board Meeting |
| 3/1/2011 | State Board Meeting |
| 3/2/2011 | State Board Meeting |
| 3/15/2011 | State Board Meeting |
| 3/16/2011 | State Board Meeting |
| 4/5/2011 | State Board Meeting |