

Modesto Workshop Feedback Summary

The following summarizes the 17 workshop forms turned in after the Modesto Workshop on December 13, 2018.

Ranking: The average was 8.6

Most Valuable:

- Timeline, maps, options for compliance
- Schedule of Basin Plan Amendments and requirements
- Whole workshop
- Good general concept laid out with good information
- History, Panel Discussion and Tess Dunham
- Outline of expected implementation actions/timeline; potential overlap with GSAs and water quality coalitions in forming/managing management zones.
- Focus on the priorities
- Comparison of differences and similarities between GSA and management zones
- Overlap with SGMA, PPT showing requirements and where efforts may overlap.
- Management zone formation; critical groups to include; immediate solutions or theories; long-term proposal examples.

Would be Helpful

- A list of existing groups (GSAs, irrigated lands, etc.) in each basin (especially priority 1 basins) that are known and aiming for same/similar goals.
- Network opportunities (City of Lodi)
- How is this going to work?
- Follow Up
- Include all stakeholders “stormwater” not considered but is being considered as a funding source.
- List of pertinent contacts: regulatory, GSAs, water quality coalitions, EJ groups
- Periodic Updates
- Additional information from panel questions
- Better ideas/more ideas how to develop solutions for long term; list of permittees that the letter will be sent to.
- More guidance on how we accomplish all of this; the state has very [high] expectations of local control and, speaking from experience, I do not.
- Management zone updates
- More “overlap” resources; by that I mean if folks are wanting materials, or holding discussions on identified overlapping efforts and cost sharing, it would be great if that was shared; No one should have to reinvent the wheel, sharing resources is great.
- How other drinking water constituents of concern may follow a similar regulatory reaction.
- Information on where to connect with parties forming management zones.

Industries Represented: POTW, government, stormwater, environmental consulting services, water, irrigation or conservation district, irrigated agriculture, food processing, GSA, dairy

Tulare Workshop Feedback Summary

The following summarizes the 10 workshop forms turned in after the Tulare Workshop on December 13, 2018.

Ranking: The average is 8.65.

Most Valuable:

- Standards and pathways to achieve compliance
- What is coming in the near and far future
- Realizing various organizations are not coordinating with each other to decide how to prepare to CV-SALTS, e.g. mid-Kaweah and Kaweah Basin.
- Tim Moore's presentation and explanation of need, purpose, actions timeline and consequences of the salinity and nitrate regulations and the situation in the state of California
- Overview of program and differences/similarities between CV-SALTS program and SGMA
- The opportunity for collaboration between SGMA and CV-SALTS
- The focus on water quality for drinking purposes of the different regulations, programs, organizations and departments.
- Overview of the nitrate challenge in the Central Valley
- Management Zones -expectations for discharge for waters <10 mg/l
- Presentations provided a great overview of the nitrate regulations, GSAs, SGMA, and management zones. This workshop was very helpful in learning about the nitrate issue.
- Discussion and overview of management zones and the Q&A

Would be Helpful:

- Combine information and dialogue
- Bring the salinity component into the discussion
- Additional panel speakers (e.g. DACs and non-profit organizations)
- Additional time for Q & A and additional time for the panel discussion
- Additional information on the role of ILRP
- There was a focus on DACs but there was no speaker, but there was no representative that provided a DAC perspective on SGMA and CV-SALTS
- Examples of programs and projects or even programs of other subjects that have worked like air quality
- A bit more on the context of the purpose of the discussion would be helpful. The questions and concerns at the end were important.
- Requirements for drinking water discharge to waste which is minimal. Discharge to waste is a necessary function of meeting water quality and should be considered minimal, are we still required to comply? Ultimately, we are treating > 10 mg/l. (We should respond to this one - Tamara Kelly, Cal Water System, tkelly@calwater.com)
- A workshop that covers the western Kern County area would be helpful, where the oil and gas industry would be discussed.

Industries represented: Other Agriculture, Irrigated Ag, Ag Trade Assn., Water, Irrigation or Conservation District, Dairy, Engineering Services, DAC/EJ, NGO, Engineering Consultant, Oil and Gas, Environmental Consulting.