

CV-SALTS Technical Advisory Committee Meeting ACTION NOTES

Convened: July 25, 2014 from 10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

Participants: Roger Reynolds (Chair), Nigel Quinn, David Cehrs, Daniel Cozad, Richard Meyerhoff, Joe LeClaire, Glen Meeks, Jeanne Chilcott, Carolyn Geisler-Balasz, Danielle Moss, Vicki Kretsinger, Penny Carlo, Mike Johnson, Tom Grovhoug, Thomas Harter, John Dickey, Karna Harrigfeld



Agenda

Item 1: Welcome & Introductions

- Nigel Quinn moved to approve, and Jeanne Chilcott seconded, and the Meeting Action Notes from May 30th were approved.

Item 2: SSALTS Phase 2 DRAFT Report – Identification and Characterization of Selected Salt Treatment Options

- Joe LeClaire, CDM Smith, walked the committee through an outline of the DRAFT Report. The full DRAFT Report had been circulated to the Committee for review on July 16th.
 - Joe LeClaire will revise the draft report based on comments received from committee members.
 - Further written comments should be provided to Joe LeClaire no later than Friday, August 8th.
 - The Final Report, with a Response to Comments table, is planned for delivery to the Executive Committee by September 1.
 - The Final Report is planned to be submitted to the Executive Committee for approval at the September 12th Administrative Meeting.

Item 3: International Salinity Forum – Discussion with Salinity Experts

- Daniel Cozad summarized the June 16th discussion held with salinity experts. Daniel provided a five page [summary](#) of the discussion held in response to the following five questions posed to the expert panel by CV-SALTS:
 1. *During droughts and other times the target salinity values may be exceeded on an infrequent basis. How often can permanent crops endure salinity of the applied water exceeding the Mass and Hoffman threshold value by 10-50% during short periods for 1 or 2 years when a wet winter could follow the drought?*
 2. *Most crop tolerance modeling has used annual averages for determining the plant responses to soil salinity or salinity in the irrigation water. Are there periods/stages in the crop growth cycle that are more critical and should therefore be a focus, in developing water quality protection criteria? How can the temporal variability be captured and use for regulatory limits?*
 3. *The steady-state model used by Ayers and Westcot assumed standard surface applied irrigations with a 2-3 week interval between irrigations which was standard irrigation practice 40 years ago. Is the present crop tolerance data (Mass and Hoffman) applicable under present irrigation practices? How important is irrigation timing in modeling crop tolerance under field conditions? Would levels of sensitivity to salinity in applied water differ significantly for drip and microspray, relative to surface irrigated fields?*
 4. *Most modeling of plant responses has used steady-state models for analysis. How good are the transient models? Is the amount of data needed for their analysis better suited to a smaller plot of land where the variables can be measured and recorded or can they be applied to widespread areas with variable field conditions? When data is available should CV-SALTS prefer transient models?*
 5. *Based on your practical experience, which factors are most critical for developing models for determining crop tolerance criteria under field condition present today in areas similar to the Central Valley of California and how would you suggest these be used to make regulatory decisions?*

Item 7: Other CV-SALTS Project/Contract Updates

Richard Meyerhoff provided the following written update for items a) and b):

- a) Phase II Conceptual Model/Richard Meyerhoff
- b) Tulare Lake MUN Archetype/Richard Meyerhoff

Richard Meyerhoff provided the following written update for items a & b:

- **Phase II Conceptual Model**
 - Task 3 is complete.
 - Attached to the meeting agenda are (a) Final Technical Memorandum - *Groundwater Data Refinements & Updates to Support Salt, Nitrate, and Water Balance Estimates for Archetype Area, SNMP, and Future Work*; and (b) Comment/Response table based on Project Committee review.
 - These documents were accepted by the Executive Committee at the July 11 meeting
 - Task 4 – Management Zone Archetype (Alta Irrigation District area)
 - Stakeholder kickoff meeting held on June 5 in Dinuba. LWA team continues to coordinate with Kings River Conservation District.
 - LWA team is currently primarily working on the subtask that involves characterization of the Management Zone area (surface/groundwater data, land use, etc.)
 - Task 5 – Preliminary SNMP development; a draft Table of Contents was drafted and revised based on Project Committee input. A final draft was approved by the Executive Committee with a request for a few targeted edits. Once these are complete, the document will be posted to the website
- **Tulare Lake Bed MUN Archetype**
 - Revised draft technical report reviewed by Fresno Regional Board staff; revised report includes recommendations for delisting boundaries for both MUN and AGR uses.
 - Meeting between Tulare Lake Drainage District (TLDD) team and Fresno Regional Board staff was held on July 7 to discuss Board staff comments and determine next steps.
 - MUN delisting - General agreement reached on proposed MUN delisting boundary pending final review of well log data being provided by TLDD to Board staff.
 - AGR delisting – Currently, the proposed AGR delisting boundary is the same as the proposed MUN delisting boundary. The proposed AGR boundary is being reconsidered based on outcome of July 7 meeting; final proposed AGR delisting boundary will likely be different (i.e., somewhat smaller) than proposed MUN delisting boundary.
 - CEQA scoping –
 - TLDD team would like to have one CEQA process for MUN and AGR delisting; therefore, CEQA process is on hold pending revisions to address Board staff comments on AGR delisting proposal.
 - CV-SALTS has funded the CEQA process for MUN de-listing; however, funding to support costs associated with CEQA process for AGR de-listing need to be identified/discussed
- c) SSALTS/Roger Reynolds – The current status of this project was summarized under Item 2. The tentative goal for initiation of Phase 3 work is sometimes in October.
- d) MUN POTW/Jeanne Chilcott – A stakeholder meeting is being coordinated for September. Initial Draft Staff Report will be out in August. Still trying to stay on target to have a Board hearing in December.
- e) Lower San Joaquin River Committee/Mike Johnson – Danielle Moss has provided a set of documents for the LSJR Committee to review for a discussion of draft objectives during the 7/30 meeting. Additionally Jim Brownell is completing some Hoffman Model runs with scenarios provided by John Dickey.

Item 6: Next Meeting/Call

- The next Technical Advisory Committee Meeting is tentatively set for Tuesday, August 26th, from 10-12.
- Joe DiGiorgio thanked the Committee again for their contribution to the work done on the Dixon Site Specific Boron Study.