

**COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL ADVISORY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES**

**California State Capital
1315 10th Street
Sacramento, California**

Advisory Council Beginning Time: **Wednesday, October 25, 2017, 8:30 a.m.**

Designated Federal Officer: Kib Jacobson

Presiding: Vice-Chairman Eric Millis

I. Welcome and Introductions Millis

Advisory Council (Council) Vice Chair Eric Millis called the meeting to order. As there was no one in attendance who had not been previously introduced at the Forum meeting held earlier, he decided to dispense with introductions. Millis thanked California for hosting the group in Sacramento. A roster was circulated to take attendance for the meeting. A copy of the attendance roster is attached to these minutes as Appendix A.

II. Acceptance of letters of substitute members Millis

Millis noted a few alternates that were at the meeting in place of regular Council members. These were Jeff Inwood for Clint Chandler from Arizona, Chris Harris for Tanya Trujillo from California, Andrew Burns for John Entsminger from Nevada, Rolf Schmidt-Petersen for Tom Blaine from New Mexico and Steve Wolff for Pat Tyrrell from Wyoming.

III. Review and Approval of Agenda Millis

Vice Chair Millis asked for any suggested changes to the agenda. As there were none, a motion was made to approve the agenda. The agenda was approved, and a copy is attached as Appendix B.

IV. Draft Minutes of 2016 Fall Council Meeting – Moab, UT Millis

Millis noted that since the Advisory Council did not meet in the spring, the meeting minutes to be addressed were from the October 2016 meeting in Moab, Utah. He asked if there were any suggested changes to the minutes from the Moab meeting. As there were none, a motion to approve the minutes was made and seconded. The motion passed.

V. Election of Chairman and Vice Chairman Millis

Millis explained that he was acting in the position of Vice Chairman for this meeting and changes in leadership were in order. David Robbins moved that Eric Millis be elected Chairman and Bill Hasencamp be elected Vice Chairman of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Advisory Council by acclamation. That motion passed.

VI. Charter Renewal

Jacobson

Kib Jacobson explained that what they have tried to do for the past couple of Advisory Council Charter renewals was get the renewal to occur in July instead of later in October. Waiting until October for renewal makes it difficult to plan for a fall meeting of the Advisory Council. They have been successful in getting it a little earlier but are still shooting for a July renewal. He reported that they didn't anticipate any changes to the charter, but it is possible that the new administration may want to make some modifications. He commented on a question that had arisen regarding designating alternates. The Department had taken the position that the governors should be the ones designating alternates. The practice in the past has been that Council members designated their own alternates. Jacobson reported that he has worked with the Solicitor and others in the Department and he thinks they have the nod to do that. Also, some of the recent appointment letters from the governors have included language saying that the members can designate their alternates. Jacobson said that he would follow through with an effort to get language in the charter that would allow members to designate their alternates and that it would be helpful if governors include that language in future appointment letters. Jacobson indicated that as language for the charter becomes available, he will share any suggested changes with the Council.

VII. Items from the Forum

Hasencamp

Bill Hasencamp reported on three items coming to the Advisory Council from the Forum. The first was program funding level requests for Congressional testimony and the Advisory Council Report. The second was recommendation of funding for the Basin States Program to be spent in the 2017 FOA. The last was a letter on management of the LCRBDF. Millis noted that each of these items will be addressed later on the agenda.

VIII. Agency Reports on Responses to the 2016 Advisory Council Report

Millis

Chairman Millis expressed appreciation to the federal agencies for all the good work that they do for the program. He invited the agencies to give a brief report on their responses to the 2016 Advisory Council Report.

USDA-NRCS

Pedro Ramos

Pedro Ramos noted that the biggest concern in the Advisory Council Report had to do with staffing. He explained that they are trying to increase their staffing to previous levels, but in the meantime they have been able to deliver their programs by bringing in folks from the outside to assist in writing contracts and designing projects.

Reclamation

Jacobson

Kib Jacobson reported that Reclamation's response to the 2016 Advisory Council Report dealt mainly with the Paradox Valley Unit. They expect to have the Record of Decision by the summer of 2020. The zero liquid discharge process is moving forward and they hope to get some good results on that. The other subject addressed was the funding issues which will be discussed further in the meeting.

BLM

Cole Green

Cole Green noted that BLM had responded to several questions in the Advisory Council Report. She reported that BLM has become more involved with the EIS process and the alternatives being considered at Paradox, especially at the field offices level. She said that once they receive the Record of Decision, BLM will be ready to be as involved as needed. As for the question of BLM looking further into a line

item, Green responded that the Washington office does not have a line item in their plans. She addressed the question about the relationship between sediment and dissolved salts and explained that there are plenty of studies supporting that relationship and they didn't see any benefit of spending more money on that effort.

USGS

David Susong

Dave Susong noted that they are appreciative of the Advisory Council's comments and support in recognition of the science that USGS contributes to the program, and they look forward to continuing that relationship. He noted that they have one Achilles' Heel within the USGS, and that is timeliness on some of their reports and products. He explained that they are aware of that and are doing their best to get a few products out, specifically the modeling reports associated with Paradox.

FWS

Creed Clayton

Creed Clayton reported that comments from the Advisory Council largely thanked the Fish & Wildlife Service for their role in the salinity control program and recommended they continue in their efforts to support the program. He noted that FWS's role includes independent review and technical assistance on salinity control projects, which includes being a cooperating agency for the Paradox project. They will also provide consultation under the Endangered Species Act and will continue to assist with wildlife habitat replacement projects such as identifying and assisting with future projects and summarizing the status of past wildlife habitat replacement projects that have been completed.

EPA

Peter Monahan

Peter Monahan noted that the EPA appreciates the comments from the Council and they will continue to participate and support the triennial review and work with the states in getting the water quality standards approved. They are also supportive of the Paradox Valley EIS process and the NEPA process and are happy to hear that the schedule has been pushed to 2020.

IX. Federal Agency Reports on 2017 Accomplishments

EPA

Monahan

Monahan reported that the EPA water program staff from their three regional offices provided federal NPDES permit updates for the 2017 Review. They also provided updates on state and tribal water quality standards related to the program. They continue to participate as a cooperative agency in Reclamation's effort to prepare the EIS statement for Paradox Valley, and several staff members are actively participating in that effort. Monahan reported that Region 8 will continue to be the lead for EPA, with Regions 6 and 9 helping to coordinate the efforts for the Forum and the Council. He noted that not much has changed with the water quality standards for tribes from the previous years. There are five tribes applying for TIS for water quality standards and EPA is reviewing those requests. Monahan reported that water quality standards for implementation from the 2014 Review have been approved in some states and others are pursuing adoption. He noted that Nevada is going to try to adopt a measure to automatically adopt future salinity standards updates. The Environmental Commission in Nevada may or may not approve. He also reported that New Mexico and Utah put the 2017 Review on their websites for comments this past summer.

USGS

Susong

David Susong shared a PowerPoint that is attached to the minutes as Appendix C. He reported on a few of the products that USGS completed in the last year, including several significant studies throughout the Basin which are now being incorporated into the program. These accomplishments include an enhanced and updated SPARROW II model, a study of baseflow salinity loads and trends over time, updated regression equations for estimating salt loads across the Paradox Valley and a groundwater flow model for the Paradox Valley which is close to being finished. Susong explained that the SPARROW II model is a special statistical model that relates watershed characteristics to salinity observed in the stream at stream flow gauges. The model is calibrated and then the areas are divided into small watersheds. They are then able to estimate the loading, where it comes from and what it is attributed to in each of the watersheds. These data are used by the Science Team and the Work Group to prioritize potential salinity project areas and FOA possibilities.

The baseflow salinity loading project looks at where salinity loads originate. The data showed that about 89 percent of the total load is from baseflow versus streamflow. This number may be overestimated as it also incorporates snow melt runoff and storm events. Taking this into consideration, the actual load from baseflow would be more like 75 – 85 percent. It comes through the groundwater system, picking up the salt through return flows and deep percolation from irrigated agriculture. Susong reported that the USGS will be coming out with a journal article and press release on this subject. He noted that the Acting Assistant Secretary for Water & Science has asked for a briefing on this and is also interested in learning more about the salinity control program. Susong said he will work with Don Barnett on the possibility of the Forum providing more information to the Department on the scope of the program.

Susong then reported that Alisa Mast from their Colorado office has been working on updating the regression equations for estimating salt loads from the Dolores River. The program has been successful and they have a better picture of how much salt is being removed between the gages. They are now showing an adjusted number of 80,000 plus tons of salt removed per year.

Susong then mentioned their Paradox numerical model, which is a density dependent groundwater flow model. He explained that they were behind on getting this out, but benefited by the delay as they were able to gather a fair amount of new information to incorporate into the model. The purpose of the modeling effort is to really understand the valley scale flow system and transport and how that affects the actual discharge out of the Paradox brine and in the valley. They are beginning to test some scenarios with this new model and hope to publish a report in FY2018. It is already essentially being used by the project folks at Paradox.

Susong reported on some other ongoing activities, one of which is their project at Pah Tempe Springs near St. George, Utah. He explained that these springs produce about 90,000 tons of salt annually. Washington County Water Conservancy District is partnering with the states and USGS on this and is funding the drilling. This may turn out to be similar to what is happening at Paradox. They would be trying to capture and treat the salt load to keep it out of the Virgin River. Susong reported that drilling should be completed by the first of the year and they should have collected the water quality samples they need. The results should be available in three to four months, and they hope to be able to give a report by the spring Forum meeting. Chris Harris wondered if the TAG and Science Team might need to consider what else is going to be needed in the context of actually developing a project at Pah Tempe.

Harris commented that there are several technical work groups that have been identified in the context of the implementation of Minute 323, one of which is the salinity work group. It is focused on Title I activities and developing more effective water quality objectives for treaty deliveries between the United States and Mexico. There has not been a formal proposal yet, but they have discussed modifying or adopting a different salinity differential than is contained in Minute 242. Harris felt that in order to entertain

discussions on this matter between the seven basin states and ultimately with Mexico, there needs to be a much better understanding of salinity trends Basinwide, including what has occurred historically since the program was implemented and what the prognosis is for the future. It would be important to understand the impacts on water quality at Imperial Dam and also to consider potential impacts from climate change. Harris thought that the last trends analysis done by the USGS in the Basin was in the late 1990s. He thought it would be important for the TAG and potentially outside cooperators to develop an effort with the USGS to reinitiate a Basinwide trends analysis which could provide information that would be needed in binational discussions with Mexico and in discussions among the basin states that may lead to a modification of the Minute 242 differential. Patrick Dent noted that the TAG would discuss this item. Harris volunteered to make available the scope of work for this effort, along with names of those involved in the work group from both the U.S. and Mexico. He suggested that the need to get the data is probably over the next 3-5 years. He felt that the Forum and Advisory Council should periodically be updated on these activities to keep abreast of things as they develop.

USDA-NRCS

Ramos/Clint Evans

Ramos began with a highlight on some Farm Bill actions that were happening. The Farm Bill was set to expire at the end of FY2018 and hearings were being held. He felt that EQIP seemed to be a fairly safe program and the overall budget seemed to be quite stable. There was some proposed legislation which would actually make some improvements in the program. He encouraged the group to keep track of what's going on and participate where possible. Ramos reported that in 2017 they obligated \$12.7 million in EQIP. They had originally allocated \$14.3 million, but the difference was a result of some problems with their contracting system in making the deadline of September 30th. They are trying to resolve those issues so this doesn't happen again. He reported that Utah and Colorado are making program announcements for 2018 and they expect to be able to turn over ineligible applications for Bureau consideration for funding in the spring. Ramos explained that with the shortage of staff, they have engaged technical service providers quite a bit more than in the past for planning and working on developing tasks for TA contracts. They are working on the inter-agency agreement and developing more specific tasks to take to the Work Group. They still anticipate being able to deliver all the work products that are being requested above and beyond their program requirements. They will review what the Work Group and Forum are requesting and determine if they can do it and what the cost would be. He commented that NRCS is throwing out a ballpark number of about \$200,000 agreements as opposed to million dollar agreements. This will not take away from the partnership work they do with local partners, state agencies and conservation districts.

Clint Evans gave additional information regarding staffing and budget. He reported that they were funded through December 8th under the current continuing resolution. They had a 6.6 percent reduction in their mandatory funding due to sequestration, along with a slight reduction in discretionary funds for conservation TA. They anticipate that those reductions will carry through into the budget bill. As far as staffing, they were still under the ongoing hiring freeze and have not been able to fill internal positions. The Agency has submitted a request to the Department to advertise internal vacancies that would not increase the overall staffing numbers, but would allow promotion of employees internally and get staff moved to critical locations. Evans detailed the number of vacancies in some of the states and noted that they have staff on detail covering the critical duties, but this is not a good long-term solution. They were allowed to hire a few external entry level positions late in the summer, but it will take time to get them trained. Evans reported that they have contracted with a private firm to take on some projects in Colorado where they have had a substantial engineering project backlog. They also have 42 positions in Colorado that are funded through a variety of partnership agreements to help fill some of the voids. Evans also reported that their Lower Gunnison Regional Conservation Partnership Project is in the final stages with the watershed plan and they are hoping to begin construction in late November.

Patrick Dent asked a question about how NRCS uses non-NRCS employees to help fill some of their roles. Ramos replied that they have quite a bit of latitude in their use of TA funds. He explained that when they use technical service providers, they use all their own equipment and are not located in NRCS offices, unlike partnership agreements where there is no difference between a partner employee and an NRCS employee in terms of work location, equipment use, etc. Dent wondered if an NRCS salinity coordinator could be hired in that manner to provide coordination services. It would certainly not be ideal, but might be a possibility while they are working through employment issues. Evans recommended that this would be a good discussion to have with Acting Chief Jordan and Astor Boozer.

Evans brought up the point that the states of Wyoming, Colorado and Utah are using different calculations on TA percentages associated with the salinity control program. They suggested the Work Group consider this issue and come up with a recommendation on how to align that process and be consistent.

It was suggested that Barnett and Dent work closely with NRCS to help facilitate getting a salinity coordinator designated as soon as possible through further discussion and exploring options, etc. Chairman Millis agreed that it would be a good idea.

FWS

Clayton

Clayton reported that Endangered Species Act, Section 7 Consultations have been conducted in the states for salinity control projects. He noted some of the endangered species that are involved in different project areas. One of the Paradox new well locations is very near a Gunnison Sage Grouse critical habitat, so that would come into play as alternatives are being considered there. He noted that FWS continues to participate in meetings and phone calls related to Paradox, and in particular how the alternatives might affect migratory birds. Clayton reported that they have also participated in water quality discussions, with a particular emphasis on selenium which can tamper or affect the options for habitat replacement projects. He noted that most of the salinity control project areas are proportional and concurrent for habitat replacement. There are a couple of units that still need to do habitat replacement or complete what they are working on. There are a minimal number of areas where the habitat replacement has failed and additional work needs to be done.

BLM

Green

Green noted that everything is on track regarding the work with USGS. She reported that BLM has been looking at the lands which are moderate to highly saline and those that are most erosive. Many of these areas are where BLM has done rainfall simulation studies. In their work they have gathered a great deal of data, reaching from plot scale to watershed scale samples. They are correlating with USGS on rainfall events, trying to get data on the initial flux of a storm when it hits and then flows into the river. They have gathered data from four types of storm simulations, all types of soils and various types of vegetation. All of the information that has been gathered can be used in the modeling processes, both with the SPARROW II model and with an APEX model. Green noted a big difference between SPARROW and the APEX model. She explained that SPARROW is great on a larger scale where it is doing estimated loads and APEX is useful when you want more specific information regarding sediment yield and routing with a particular watershed using erosion equations. Green emphasized that BLM is working with USGS and they are sharing information back and forth which can be used in a variety of projects. She noted that some of the results of the initial modeling are mentioned in the FAR. Green shared a PowerPoint with the group showing tons of salt retained in the past several years and detailing work being done in some of the states, along with other accomplishments of BLM (see Appendix D).

The Council then took a short break.

Reclamation

Stacy Wade

Stacy Wade shared some highlights from Reclamation's Lower Colorado Region. Drought contingency continues to be a major focus in the LC Region. The previous water year was very helpful, allowing them to operate in normal conditions, but Lake Mead is still very low. They have also been involved in transitioning from Minute 319 to Minute 323 and moving that implementation forward. The LC Region has been working on the Pilot System Conservation Program, which is a cost-share program to find potential solutions for helping to mitigate the drought. Wade reported that in 2017 they executed 13 implementation agreements under the Pilot System Conservation Program which are expected to conserve approximately 98,000 AF of water in Lake Mead. They issued the call letter in October for new proposals under the program for 2018. Wade reported that the current salinity differential was 124-136 ppm compared to the target range of 135-140 ppm, so they are hovering right at the low end of the range. Lastly, after a very lengthy process, they are moving forward on a revision of the salinity model tool that is used for the economic damages assessment. Wade was pleased to announce that the funding was made available and the solicitation for the contract to update the model was going out that same day, with the award expected by December 15th.

Jacobson reported that in the FAR Reclamation talks about the Desert Lakes monitoring. This was actually part of the Huntington Cleveland Irrigation Company project, a larger effort which began long ago. As the Huntington Cleveland project was located in an almost closed basin, they decided it would be a good location to monitor the impacts of the salinity control program. So they started monitoring near the Desert Lakes to track changes in groundwater, salinity concentrations, etc. They also collected other data and took pictures every year at the same location. Jacobson felt that it was time to write a report on what they have learned from their efforts, so they will be writing up a proposal that will go to the Science Team for their consideration. Jacobson also mentioned that Jim Prairie had run the CRSS model for the 2017 Review and he came up with some new numbers which will be used over the next three years. Jacobson referred to a table in the FAR regarding the Paradox Valley Unit injection well which includes a lot of data over the past year. He reported that maximum pressure reached 4700 psi in September, which is still well below the 5200 psi that was reached prior to the 2013 earthquake when the operating regime was changed. He noted that there were 8100 tons of salt injected in August 2017. He also mentioned that there is a significant seismic network watching the seismic activity occurring underground. Included on the table are seismic events greater than 0.5 in magnitude. He noted that the seismic activity has been greater in recent months and Reclamation is taking steps to be prepared in the case of another event.

X.A. Basin States Program – Basin Funds Status and Accounting

Brad Parry

Parry reported on what happened in the last fiscal year (see slides in Appendix E). Collections at Hoover and Parker-Davis totaled \$8.7 million and the transfer from the Lower Basin was \$9.8 million. The cash balance dropped a little from the beginning, and a little more was spent than the previous year. Parry noted that the last year was the first year that some of the 2015 FOA projects actually started construction, so more funds were needed initially. Transfers will go back and forth depending on project phases and cash balances. Dent noted that the mill revenues from Parker-Davis have always been at about \$1.56 million, but they were \$100,000 short this year. Parry responded that sometimes it is based on how the revenues are collected or when they are posted. It could be that some of the revenue spilled over into October because of the time of posting.

Parry moved to his second spreadsheet and explained that with the recommended change in repayment, he didn't foresee a payment withdrawal that year. He noted that the current accrual amount was \$11.947 million. Going forward, the plan was to walk down the balance in the fund as much as possible while seeking to generate a fix to the repayment issue. Parry indicated that Reclamation is supportive of the plan,

but with a total owing of \$24 million and a payment of \$7.9 million due in 2039, he suggested that plans be made in the near future to figure out a plan of attack to make sure those payments can be made.

Regarding the Basinwide Program, Parry showed another spreadsheet which is included in Appendix E. He noted that in 2017 there were several projects that began funding for construction and purchase of pipes and materials, etc. They were able to spend about \$11.6 million strictly on construction contracts. A few past projects were closed out. They spent about \$1 million on non-contract costs. This expense should start to go down in the future because of their Quality of Water Program that doesn't require cost share. Parry noted that extra funds became available as some of the projects did not expend all of their funding. Also, additional funds in the amount of \$385,000 became available at the end of the year through the efforts of the UC regional office. Parry expects that in 2018 they will fully obligate and expend the available funds.

Parry reported on several projects that were moving into construction, on hold or near completion and some that were just getting started. He explained that pipe prices have skyrocketed and that high density polyethylene is not available due to significant storms in the south this year. As a result, some of the projects were holding off on purpose in the hope that prices will go down. Reclamation is being patient with these problems. They plan to obligate funds so that the companies can move ahead when they see a reduction in prices. Leading into the FOA these high prices create a little concern. They don't want the applicant's proposal to be too low to cover costs and they don't want to see higher cost per ton numbers as a result of high prices.

In regards to the FOA, Parry noted that they do need to have projects on line by FY2019 to cover their appropriations. The FOA will end November 14th. Parry commented that they are excited about the interest in salinity control from the applicants. The listening sessions and the FOA sessions in the states went extremely well and they even added an extra meeting in Colorado to accommodate the turnout. Parry reported that they are happy to have Don Barnett, Warren Turkett and Vic Nguyen participating in the Application Review Committee.

X.B. Update on State Ag Agreements projects

Mark Quilter/Cindy Lair/ Keenan Hendon

Cindy Lair reported that during the past year there have many discussions within the partnership about how the future of the state ag agencies will look as participants in the salinity program. She mentioned that this has furthered her resolve and commitment to make it work in Colorado because of the great benefits it has for agriculture on the western slope and also for meeting their water quality requirements downstream. She reported that they had a number of 2015 EQIP handoff projects which were delayed for some time due to backlog, and they have appreciated NRCS including those projects in their cultural resource contracts. She was pleased to announce that they have about five projects that are finally entering the implementation phase. Lair reported that they have been working with Reclamation to develop a cost estimate of what it takes to run the program from the state perspective. They have also responded to the request of the Forum to define what strategic importance and reasonable cost effectiveness looks like with relation to EQIP pass-off projects as they are anxious to use the limited funds available in the most productive way for salt savings. Lair was happy to report that they have hired a grant manager to help handle the distribution of funding in the future so they will be ready and able to work with Reclamation on any future FOA pass-offs. She noted that their Lower Gunnison coordinator, Beth Karberg, has worked really hard to help applicants put forward quality applications for the FOA process and has helped them gain access to more funding from the state side of things to help buy down the salt savings. She felt that the outlook for the program was much stronger than the previous year.

Mark Quilter reported that they received two projects from the last FOA. The first project is substantially completed, but will require a few modifications. The second project has been held up as they try to solve

some issues with clearances. They have completed many of the requirements and obtained the necessary easements, but they will need to make a design change due to the Steinaker Dam being taken out of service for a few years. This will actually produce an improved project in the long run. This project is moving ahead. Quilter reported that their coordinator has been helping with EQIP signups and helping with the FOAs that are coming in, and there is a possibility of two FOA projects coming in from the Ute Tribe.

Keenan Hendon shared a PowerPoint presentation (attached as Appendix F) with an update on Wyoming's Basin States Program. He reported that they had an allocation of \$2.8 million for funding of the program. He shared information about a 2015 hand-off project that is pending due to a delay in a Reclamation MOA project that is in line with this project. They are hoping to get this project out to bid in 2018 with construction to follow. He reported that they also have the Blacks Fork study and are pleased that Reclamation was able to come up with some supplemental funding for the project. They will be working with USGS and Reclamation to move it forward. Hendon noted some future activities that Wyoming will be working on.

X.C. Basin States Program – Status of Basin States Program

Marcie Bainsou

Marcie Bainsou shared a spreadsheet showing state ag obligations (see Appendix G). She noted that her numbers for out years were just estimates, but they are firming up the numbers as they look at the new contracts and the new tasks. For the State of Colorado they obligated \$127,000 last year. Utah had a big obligation of \$2.6 million in 2017 due to the FOA pass-off projects from 2015 that went into construction. These pass-off projects are fully funded. Utah will need approximately \$150,000 in 2018 to do bare minimum work. Wyoming is getting ready to go into construction later this year so they have \$1.1 million in 2017 from a FOA pass-off project and in 2018 they will need another \$900,000 to finish that project. Bainsou discussed various other contracts on her spreadsheet. She noted that in 2018 they plan to withdraw \$5.1 million from the Lower Basin Fund and just over \$1 million from the Upper Basin Fund. Dent explained that part of the reason Bainsou's spreadsheet is so detailed is because they have been asking a lot of detailed questions over the years about how she is allocating money within the Basin States Program and they wanted a comprehensive review of all the expenditures. He reported that the Work Group and the TAG have looked at this in detail and are quite comfortable with Bainsou's report.

Bainsou reported that with regard to the state ag agreements, they were asked to come up with some tasks. She had a rough list of some ideas as they are moving ahead on this request. She noted that Cindy Lair had recently sent her an excellent and comprehensive list of tasks in which she included costs. This has been most helpful as they try to understand realistically what it takes for the states to do some of the various tasks. She has asked the other states to do the same. They are working with the NRCS on the tasks for the NRCS state agreements, and they should be coming together soon.

X.D. Basin States Program – Funding Recommendations from TAG

Millis/Patrick Dent

Chairman Millis noted that this subject was a follow-up to the previous day's discussion about the LCRBDF and the upcoming FOA. Patrick Dent noted that the TAG was recommending that the Advisory Council advise Reclamation to spend up to \$16 million in Basin States Program money in the upcoming 2017 FOA. The TAG would also provide a memorandum with that recommendation in writing. There was a motion to accept the TAG's recommendation which was seconded and approved.

X.E. Recommendations on Short-term Management of the LCRBDF

Hasencamp

Bill Hasencamp mentioned that they had a good discussion on a letter to send to Reclamation regarding the short-term management of the LCRBDF. It was recommended that the Advisory Council consider approving this letter. There was a motion to that effect that was passed by the Advisory Council.

XI. Allocation of Payments between Upper and Lower Basin Funds

Parry

Brad Parry noted that the Lower Basin pays 85 percent and the Upper Basin pays 15 percent of the cost share in order to meet the requirements of the Salinity Control Act. Chris Harris commented that they would certainly love to, at some point in time, entertain a discussion of the cost-share relationship between the two basins. David Robbins commented that they have been engaged in that conversation for five years but recognized that it is hard to get all the way to the table with the current fund imbalance in the Lower Basin Fund. Robbins noted that they remain willing to have that conversation whenever the three Lower Basin States are ready to discuss it. A motion was made to maintain the 85/15 split and look for a time when this discussion can take place. The motion passed.

XII. Direction to the Technical Advisory Group (TAG)

Millis/Dent

Patrick Dent noted that the TAG would pursue adding to the Science Team's discussions some additional focus on salinity trend analysis in the Colorado River Basin. NRCS also requested that the TAG look at how TA calculations are forwarded to Reclamation to give more consistency in calculating the cost share required for TA expenditures. They also wanted to investigate the possibility of getting NRCS to find and staff a salinity coordinator position to support the salinity control program. They also have a standing assignment to review all the SIR recommendations from the Science Team.

XIII. 2017 Advisory Council Report

Millis

Chairman Millis addressed items that should be included in the 2017 Advisory Council Report. These would include the program funding recommendations that were discussed in the meetings and outlined in Memo 2017-71. Dent mentioned some items that were brought up in the federal agency reports that may be included in the Advisory Council Report. These included such things as staffing issues within NRCS, Reclamation items such as Paradox, funding recommendations and LCRBDF issues. He suggested the creation of some sort of concept level of the Pah Tempe project and the steps necessary to get to implementation. Also Dent suggested that FWS continue to work on addressing wildlife issues, and he also expressed the desire to find larger, more contiguous areas on which to address wildlife issues. A motion was made to include the program funding recommendations and other items brought up by Dent in the 2017 Advisory Council Report. This motion was approved.

XIV. Items for the Forum

Hasencamp

There were no items that needed to go back to the Forum from the Advisory Council meeting.

XV. Other Business/Actions

Millis

There were no other items of business brought up at this time.

XVI. Public Comment

Millis

There were no comments from any of the public in the audience.

The Advisory Council meeting was then adjourned.

AGENDA
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL ADVISORY COUNCIL

California State Capital
1315 10th Street
Sacramento, California

Advisory Council Beginning Time: **Wednesday, October 25, 2017, 8:30 a.m.**

Designated Federal Officer: Kib Jacobson

Presiding: Vice-Chairman Eric Millis

- I. Welcome, Introductions Millis
- II. Opening Comments Jacobson
 - A. Acceptance letters from members designating alternates Jacobson
- III. Review and Approval of Agenda Millis
- IV. Draft Minutes of 2016 Fall Council Meeting – Moab UT
 - A. Review Jacobson
 - B. Action Millis
- V. Election of Chairman and Vice-chairman Millis
- VI. Charter Renewal Jacobson
- VII. Items from the Forum Bill Hasencamp
- VIII. Report on the responses to the 2016 Advisory Council Report Millis
 - A. USDA-NRCS
 - B. Reclamation
 - C. BLM
 - D. USGS
 - E. FWS
 - F. EPA
- IX. Federal Agency Reports on 2017 Accomplishments (about 15 minutes each)
 - A. EPA Peter Monahan
 - B. USGS Dave Susong
 - C. USDA-NRCS Pedro Ramos/Dave Mason
 - D. FWS Creed Clayton
 - E. BLM Cole Green
 - F. Reclamation Stacy Wade/Jacobson

- X. Basin States Program (BSP)
 - A. Basin Funds Status and Accounting Brad Parry/Marcie Bainson/Wade Jacobson
 - a. Basin Fund Payments / Accrual Jacobson
 - b. Basinwide Program Update Parry
 - c. 2017 FOA Parry
 - B. Update on State Ag Agreements projects Mark Quilter/Cindy Lair/Keenan Hendon
 - C. Status of Basin States Program Bainson
 - a. State Ag Agreements
 - b. NRCS Agreements
 - c. SIR (studies, investigations, research) agreements Dave Susong
 - d. Other
 - D. Funding Recommendations from TAG Millis/Patrick Dent
 - E. Recommendations on the FY 2018 Management of the LCRBDF Hasencamp
- XI. Allocation of Payments between Upper and Lower Basin Funds Parry
- XII. Direction to the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Millis/Dent
- XIII. 2017 Advisory Council Report Millis
 - A. Program Funding Recommendations Millis
 - B. Discussion of Items for Report Dent
- XIV. Items for the Forum Hasencamp
- XV. Other Business/Actions Millis
- XVI. Public Comment Millis

Adjourn Meeting:

Approximately 12:00 p.m.