# CV-SALTS Management Practice Nomination Form

*This Nomination Form includes limited instructions for the completion of the form. Initial reviewer instructions are included the Subcommittee Screening Document and will be further developed in future work. 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.**

**A. Is this nomination for a plan or programmatic activity as opposed to a field implementation practice or technology? ☐ YES ☐ NO**

**if yes, complete the following sections as appropriate, if no proceed to question 1.**

1. **Title – Please provide a short descriptive tile 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. Whenever possible quantify the effeteness of the practice as completely as possible. 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**.** Indicate what level of review if required for that regulatory requirement or guidance?

Standards and information repeated for the Nominator from the Subcommittee screening document.

# 4 Standards

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

## 4.1 Technical Effectiveness – does it work?

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

## 4.2 Implementability – can it be used broadly?

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

## 4.3 Cost effectiveness – is it economic to implement today?

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

## 4.4 Monitoring – proving it works?

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

# Nomination Form Attachment 1

## Applicability checklist by Industry, Processes or Region

*The following industries, processes and regions may have specific screening requirements that the Subcommittee will develop in the future.*

| ***Industry or Process*** | ***8. San Joaquin*** | ***9. East Valley*** | ***10. West Valley*** | ***11. Tulare Lake*** | ***12. Sacramento*** | ***13. Lake/Foothills*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1.** Agriculture | | | | | | |
| **2.** Food Processing | | | | | | |
| **3.** Manufacturing | | | | | | |
| **4.** Wine Industry | | | | | | |
| **5.** WWTP | | | | | | |
| **6.** Water Supply Management | | | | | | |
| **7.** Water Treatment | | | | | | |
| **14.** OTHERS | | | | | | |