

# Meeting Notes

February 2, 2012 3:00PM  
Offices of the Rice Coalition

Meeting with representatives from:  
Sacramento Valley Coalition, Rice Coalition

## Appropriate Beneficial Uses for Agricultural Drains Receiving NPDES Discharges

### Attendees:

#### Central Valley Water Board

Anne Littlejohn  
Calvin Yang  
Jeanne Chilcott

#### California Rice Commission

Tim Johnson  
Roberta Firoved

#### Northern California Water Association - Sacramento Valley Coalition

Bruce Houdesheldt

### Meeting Objectives:

- Provide an introduction and status of the project
- Identify process for working together
- Identify key participants and/or contacts
- Review monitoring sites and accessibility
- Identify level of involvement

### Meeting Summary

- Background
  - Background was provided on the current project covering:
    - Why we are here – POTW discharges to Ag. drains, MUN designation via Basin Plan's interpretation of the Drinking Water Policy, resulting economic implications to small communities
    - CV Salts stake in the project – CV Salts has a parallel process in place reviewing MUN designation in agricultural drains with the POTW watersheds serving as potential archetypes for future work. Since both coalitions are involved with the CVSalts effort, there was familiarity with the current effort.
    - Future extension of initial study within POTW receiving waters to broader analysis of Central Valley agricultural dominated water bodies
    - Project timeline and scope based on City of Willows permit
  - Issue was raised as to how information gathered from initial field survey to evaluate current uses (e.g. potential illegal diversion for MUN) would be utilized.

- Initial survey strictly to document. Policy issue as to impact: if water body under federal jurisdiction, use is considered “existing” even if illegal; more flexibility under state jurisdiction. CVSalts is to discuss policy implications of this topic. This archetype may give a specific example.
- How are we going to work together?
  - a. Both coalitions indicated their interest in staying involved with the project. There was the general agreement that from the CVSalts perspective, this project did provide value to the Coalitions and their long term objectives. Tim Johnson pointed out that the CA Rice Commission is already involved with three other Regional Board projects so their resources are spread very thin.
    - *Decision: Continued communication will be conducted primarily through email and phone calls. Representatives from the coalitions will be involved in stakeholder meetings whenever possible.*
  - b. The primary contact for the CA Rice Coalition will be Roberta Firoved, but Tim Johnson would like to be copied on any communication. Bruce Houdesheldt will continue to be the main contact for the Sacramento Valley Coalition. Water and irrigation districts were brought up as other potential stakeholders that should be considered.
    - Action Items:
      - Coalitions will send any potential contacts to Anne Littlejohn.
      - Bruce will determine whether to add an agenda item on this effort to an upcoming grower coalition meeting. Tess Dunham may be able to provide the update.

## **2. Review of Monitoring Sites and Accessibility**

- a. A list of potential monitoring sites from the Draft Monitoring Plan was reviewed and briefly discussed. A list of ILRP monitoring sites in the area was also reviewed. CA Rice Commission indicated that the ILRP Colusa Basin Drain site was part of their program and they have many years’ worth of data from their monitoring programs (ILRP monitoring and Rice Pesticide monitoring). The majority of the ILRP sites belonged to the Sacramento Valley Coalition. Currently Pacific Ecorisk does the monitoring for Sacramento Valley Coalition and Kleinfelder does the monitoring for the CA Rice Coalition. Multiple contracts exist for the laboratory analyses for both coalitions.
- b. The need for conducting field surveys and reconnaissance in each area was discussed.
  - Action Item: Bruce H. will review the sites provide potential contacts for those areas.
- c. Neither coalition could provide any commitment of funds or resources to the project at this time.

## **3. Next Steps**

- a. Details were provided on the next planned stakeholder meeting for mid-February to review the Draft Monitoring Plan. Calvin Yang provided additional information on the Draft Monitoring Plan, including a discussion on potential analytes to be monitored and frequencies.
- b. Both coalitions wanted to be invited to the meeting to review the Draft Monitoring Plan. However, the schedule for the CA Rice Coalition was very tight for most of February.
  - *Action Item: Anne Littlejohn will send a Meet-o-Matic email to determine coalition availability for the next stakeholder meeting to review the Draft Monitoring Plan.*