

MEETING SUMMARY

CV-SALTS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE POLICY SESSION NOTES – JUNE 20, 2019

PREPARED FOR: Kern River Watershed Coalition Authority (KRWCA)

PREPARED BY: Casey Gudel/Land IQ
Stephanie Tillman/Land IQ

DATE: July 24, 2019

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this meeting summary is to document the presentation and discussion items from the June 20, 2019 CV-SALTS Executive Committee Policy Session. The main purpose of this meeting was to update the Committee on the status of the following ongoing items: State Board approval process of BPA; management zone pilots; P&O Study Work Plan and fees; and public education and outreach committee activities.

BACKGROUND

Central Valley Salinity Alternatives for Long-Term Sustainability (CV-SALTS) is a collaborative stakeholder driven and managed program to develop sustainable salinity and nitrate management planning for the Central Valley. The goals of CV-SALTS are as follows:

- Sustain the Valley's lifestyle
- Support regional economic growth
- Retain a world-class agricultural economy
- Maintain a reliable, high-quality urban water supply
- Protect and enhance the environment

CV-SALTS includes four working groups:

1. Technical
2. Public Education and Outreach
3. Economic Social Cost
4. Other (CEQA, policy development, etc.)

ACRONYMS

AID – Alta Irrigation District Archetype	NIMS – Nitrate Implementation Measures Study
ACP – Alternative Compliance Program	P&O Study – Prioritization and Optimization Study
BP – Basin Plan	SGMA – Sustainable Groundwater Management Act
BPTC – Best Practicable Treatment and Control	SMCL – Secondary Maximum Contaminant Level
GSA – Groundwater Sustainability Agency	SNMP – Salt and Nutrient Management Plan
IAZ – Initial Analysis Zone	SSALTS – Strategic Salt Accumulation Land and Transport Study
ICM – Initial Conceptual Model	WQO – Water Quality Objective
ILRP – Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program	
LSJR – Lower San Joaquin River	
MUN – Municipal beneficial use	

SUMMARY AND RELEVANCE TO KRWCA

- **State Board Schedule for Basin Plan Amendments** – A workshop is scheduled for July 2, 2019 and the adoption hearing for August 20, 2019, although it this is tentative. The adoption hearing could be in September.
- **Management Zone Pilot Study Projects** – Reviewed the draft Early Action Plan (EAP) for the Turlock Management Zone. Comments are needed by June 26. Drafts for both pilots will be sent out to the Executive Committee.
- **State Board workshop presentation outline** – Stakeholder groups that are presenting at the workshop need to submit their presentations and handouts to the State Board by June 27. It is important to submit the names of the people presenting on panels.
- **P&O Study Workplan** – The P&O Study Workplan Draft was presented to the committee. Any comments should be submitted by July 15. Considering this is intended to be a guidebook/scoping tool for consultants, please review for flow and logic.
- **P&O Study Implementation Fees** – The permit and fee structure for the P&O Study was presented. Irrigated Agriculture Coalitions will be responsible for approximately 33% of the annual budget. If a permittee chooses not to participate, but then decides to later, back fees, late fees and collections fees will be charged. Any comments should be submitted by July 15.
- **Public Education and Outreach Committee** – The PEOC Committee is finalizing a number of documents for outreach including a press release for the State Board Workshop, a fact sheet and power point presentation. Any comments on the press release should be submitted by noon on June 24. Comments on other items can be submitted by July 15.

MEETING NOTES

The Meeting Notes from the May 23, 2019 Executive Committee Meeting were approved with no changes.

Basin Plan Amendments – State Board Consideration Schedule: Patrick Pulupa (Regional Water Board)

- The State Board Workshop is still on track for July 2, however the State Board Meeting for adoption on August 20 is tentative; it could be September.
- Patrick and DeeDee D’Adamo met with Jared Blumenfeld about the policy. They had a good conversation and Blumenfeld was very receptive. There was concern with averaging in regards to management zones and compliance, however Patrick noted that it was an outgrowth of State Board policy and noted that the programing elements stay the same regardless of averaging.
- Additionally, Blumenfeld doesn’t want to see bottled water solutions. Patrick noted that this is a bridging solution. He believes this is just part of his style, but reinforced the need to frame it as a “not - bottle water solution” but a larger effort with bottled water as a way to bridge before infrastructure, etc is built. Overall, messaging should be long term solution does not include bottled water.
- Karl Longley (Regional Water Board) noted that kiosks are not necessarily functional for those with transportation issues need bottled water.
- JP Cativiela (Dairy Cares) noted that Point of Use is included as well. He believes the Administration would rather have money invested in point of use systems. Karl: Point of Entry would be a better solution due to concerns with access to homes as Point of Entry refers to outside of home. Parry Klassen (East San Joaquin Water Quality Coalition) noted that the Central Coast doesn’t like the point of entry because of the challenge of distinguishing it with other water uses.
- Parry continues to have frustration with the opposition reporting that high nitrates in water may cause vomiting or cancer. Patrick noted the need to get out of the comfort zone to combat the false messaging. It is important to stick with critical issue of infants and pregnant women. Parry suggested engaging a third party to substantiate/disprove any claims. JP suggested a fact sheet from Agency for Toxic Substances & Disease Registry, ToxFAQs for Nitrate & Nitrite. Patrick suggested this be brought to the committee for further discussion at the next meeting.

Update on Management Zones – Richard Meyerhoff (GEI Consultants)

- The two pilots held Steering Committee Meetings last week. Their focus was on the first draft of Early Action Plan (EAP). A copy is included in the meeting packet from the Turlock Management Zone, starting on page 7. There are some differences between the two.
- The Steering Committees are reviewing and have a deadline to submit comments by June 26 of next week. If Executive Committee participants want to comment, please do so by the deadline.
- Richard presented a power point which is included as an attachment “GEI_Exec Comm Presentation_062019.”
- Discussion at the two Steering Committee Meetings included:
 1. How to identify potentially affected residents
 - Turlock MZ: Proposes to use an approach used in Salinas area. This involves the use of GIS mapping, GoogleEarth images, County APN numbers to identify residences and develop a mailing list.
 - Kings River East GSA/AID Area MZ: Considering an alternative approach. This involves developing a list of all residences within the boundary and removing

those served by a Public Water System. Those remaining would be on the mailing list.

2. Temporary water provisions

- Structured in two parts: Primary Source: Kiosks and Secondary Source: Alternative Water Delivery (for those who can't get to a kiosk)
- The draft describes the two programs, implementation approach and outreach to residents.
- Water Kiosks:
 - Turlock MZ: Up to 8, Kings River East GSA/AID Area MZ: Maximum of 4
 - The actual number will be dependent on ability to find locations, ability to connect with a compliant DDW and finding willing property owners.
 - The EAP should identify "target areas", while the first implementation task would be to finalize the locations.
 - Discussion items from stakeholder included: 1) Eliminating restrictions on time/day access (24/7); 2) Are water jugs made available to residents; 3) Add monitoring text (metered, usage, etc)
- Alternative Water:
 - Draft focuses on bottled-water delivery, but will be expanded to provide in-home Point of Use systems as an alternative.
 - Describes criteria to participate and process to apply, including having water tested if necessary. Applicants can provide their own data with the application or request testing.
 - Discussion items from stakeholders: 1) Remove proof of residency language; 2) Add adaptive management text – ability to adjust as program is developed; 3) Add monitoring text

3. Implementation schedule

- Turlock MZ: A table is provided on page 24 of the meeting packet. By 6 months in, submit 2 kiosks to DDW. Looking at 2 kiosks installed by end of year, with 4 more submitted to DDW. By end of two years, all kiosks in, wells tested, alternative water delivery is functioning.
- Question: Notification happens prior to approval and installation, if residents are out of the area of the first installed, can they apply? Richard said he would have to look into it.

4. Preliminary costs

- Turlock:
 - First 6 mo - \$178,000 (identify & outreach with residents, finalize kiosks locations, submit kiosks to DDW, Reporting)
 - Second 6 mo - \$182,125 (submit 4 kiosks to DDW, install 2 kiosks, alternative water delivery program implementation, reporting)

- Year 2 - \$469,875 (submit 2 kiosks to DDW, install 6 kiosks, AWD implementation, reporting)
 - Annual Cost Post Year 2 - \$247,950 (kiosk management, AWD implementation, reporting)
 - Water, electrical not included in these costs
- It was discussed that in Farmersville the largest challenge has been finding locations that are suitable with willing property owners. Some site locations cost more than the kiosks themselves (eg. paving a parking lot). For a kiosk, you need a compliant water system as testing from a private well is cost prohibitive. Cost per kiosk is approximately \$50,000.
- There are sections in the draft that have placeholders for more information. This will be complete by the next draft.
- The pilots are formalizing steering committees, pending State Water Board action and continue to do outreach with dischargers.
- Have initiated development of Preliminary Management Zone Proposal elements – this will be used to form template materials for others.
- Parry commented that this process has progressed from a pilot project, to it's getting real, really quick. There is a lot to be done on structure and management. They discussed forming another non-profit, who is going to pay, what's the board going to be made up of. They were reminded that even though many want to get the GSAs involved, they are under a different authority.
- Adam Laputz (Regional Board) commented that if there was a way for the Regional Board to assist in developing who will be the decisions makers, they could help as it could take up to a year.
- JP commented that his biggest concern is a lack of understanding of participants, the time it takes to bring the community along. He suggested utilizing the grant funding to get the planning aspect done first. It is important that people get their comments in. The grant funding will run out soon and there are only have a few meetings left to get into the meat of the how organized and how paid for. He also suggested the need to get DDW involved in these meetings.
- Sam Safi (Sacramento Regional CSD) inquired about what the level of engagement is with the GSAs? Turlock MZ: GSAs are in the room. Could they be helpful? Really varies from location to location. How do the boundaries align? Two GSAs in one in Turlock GSA, one GSA plus a little extra in the Kings River East GSA/AID Area MZ.

State Board Workshop Presentation – Anne Littlejohn (Regional Board)

- A revised draft outline is provided in the packet on page 119.
- The Stakeholders Panels will include: Management Zone Pilot Study Panel (Parry Klassen, Charlotte Gallock, Maria Huerra), Environmental Justice Stakeholders (Jennifer Cleary), Drinking Water Panel (Sacramento River Source Water Protection, Contra Costa Water District), Salinity Coalition (David Cory, Bobbie)
- Individual stakeholder comment cards will be accepted.
- Presentations and electronic files of any handouts are needed by noon on June 27. The names of people participating on panels are also needed.

P&O Study Workplan – Richard Meyerhoff

- A draft of the P&O Study Workplan is provided in the meeting packet on pages 27-118. A power point presentation was presented and included as an attachment “GEI_Exec Comm Presentation_062019.”
- Please provide comments by July 15. Look for flow, logic as this is intended to be a guidebook/scope of work for contractors.
- A revised draft will be provided at the next meeting with an estimated cost and schedule.
- Section 1 – Background & Purpose, and Section 2 – Workplan Approach have been revised based on previous comments.
- Tess Dunham (Somach, Simmons & Dunn) commented that Section 2 did a good job of talking about salt management regions but not about tying into the larger region and larger efforts.
- Section 3 has a proposed organization structure but is missing some items and will be completed as the document is finalized. Revised document will include cost.
- Section 4: Workplan Task 2 – Programmatic Activities: written very administratively, please review to ensure the intent was captured.
- Section 4: Workplan Task 3 – Non-Physical Projects: will impact physical projects. If there are studies that should be included, please comment.
- Tess inquired where surface water management comes in – for instance, Bay Delta, flow issues. Richard responded that Section 3.1.2 is supposed to cover it, but it’s written very broadly.
- Figures in Section 4 – Richard asked for assistance with these figures to ensure the logic makes sense.
 - JP inquired about the steps: Task 4.2 has you assess, Task 4.3 how you get to sustainability? Richard confirmed, you figure out how short you are and then the projects that need to be done. It was also noted that economic analysis should be done early for nonphysical projects are important if going down the TMDL/Mgmt Zone approach and regulatory framework.
 - Tess inquired where the economic viability falls in the schematic? Richard noted it could be here, but follows further down in the document.
 - Tom Grovhoug (Larry Walker & Associates): To the degree sustainability is defined by the target settings, some ability to assess cost of physical and nonphysical projects. Understood what it took to get to certain targets, which helped people decide what were viable projects. Potentially add conceptual model in 4.1.1.
 - There was a question on the difference in Salt Management Areas and Salt Management Regions. Salt Management Area is where salt can be gathered and held prior to disposal.

P&O Study Implementation Fees – Daniel Cozad (San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District)

- A power point presentation was provided and is included in the meeting packet on page 120.
- Daniel noted that not a lot has changed in the organization since it was first presented over a year and a half ago.
- The cost will be \$15,000,000 over ten years with an average cost of \$1.5 million per year.

- Each of the industries came up with an amount that could be afforded. While all approved, no one particularly liked it or found it equitable.
- Resolution 1004:
 - Pay before notice to comply: Credit of 20%
 - First year selection process for opting for Path B
 - If after the first year decide to go with Path B, will pay back fees all the way back to the beginning, including late fees and collection fees
 - Will track how much paid and what cost is, credits will be applied
- Industry allocations:
 - Communities: \$493,000 (32.9%)
 - Irrigated Lands: \$496,182 (33.1%) – By acreage, salinity factor. If the two groups (Sac Valley Water Quality Coalition & Tule Basin Water Quality Coalition) that have indicated they will not participate in path A want to come back, other coalitions' fees will be reduced with back fees paid.
 - Dairy: \$57,750 (3.9%)
 - Food Processors: \$128,100 (8.5%)
 - Wine: \$77,550 (5.2%)
 - Oil/Gas: \$160,000 (10.7%)
 - Others: \$87,500 (5.8%)
- Nicole Bell (South San Joaquin Water Quality Coalition): Will Regional Board take action on the people that chose Path A but didn't fulfill responsibilities? Yes, the Regional Board is prepared to do so based on their experience with ILRP.
- Stephanie Hiestand (City of Tracy): Similarly, with those who join the P&O and have not paid, will the Regional Board take action on those? Yes.
- SAMP fee structure discussions will begin in August.
- Submit any comments by July 15.
- Will revisit after first year, may need to adjust.

PEOC Update – Nicole Bell (South San Joaquin Water Quality Coalition)

- Nicole reminded the group to use link in Meeting Agenda to log outreach events.
- A draft press release is included in the meeting package on page 124. This needs to go out prior to the workshop, so please submit any comments by Monday, June 24 at noon. The group approved the release with grammatical updates and any changes from Tess.
- Email communications are being sent out to people who participated in workshops, as well as Executive Committee participants. Feel free to forward to interested parties.
- A P&O Fact Sheet is included in the meeting package on page 127. The PEOC is seeking approval. It was noted that a few additional edits will be coming in. Nicole suggested submitting those changes prior to the next meeting to get in packets for approval.

- A revised CV Salts Power Point has been developed based upon comments from those who have used it for outreach. A link is provided in the meeting agenda. Provide comments by July 15.
- PEOC meets at 3pm on the Tuesday before Exec Committee Meeting and welcomes participation.
- A website refresh and landing page redesign is in progress. A beta site is being developed but is still a couple months down the road for review.

Review Meeting Schedule

- July 2: State Water Board Workshop
- No Executive Committee Meeting for July
- August 15: Policy Meeting
- August 20: State Board Adoption Hearing (Tentative)