

Subcommittee on Drinking Water  
Draft Report  
on the Meeting of March 18, 2002  
to the  
Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee

The Drinking Water Subcommittee met on March 18, 2002 (the meeting agenda is attached).

***Meeting Summary***

Meeting notes of February 8, 2001

Meeting notes from last meeting were reviewed without comment.

Follow up from 3/12 BDPAC meeting

The Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC) met on March 12, 2002, at which time DWS submitted its workplan to the Committee. Co-Chairs also recommended new members to the BDPAC chair. Last action item from the Subcommittee meeting on February 8, organizing a retreat or workshop meeting, is still in process. The major issues discussed at the BDPAC meeting were the funding and organization of the committee. Next meetings were scheduled in June, September and December. The September meeting will be held in Southern California and will focus on water quality. After the BDPAC meeting, the Chairs of each Subcommittee met as the Steering Committee to discuss how to integrate communications between Mr. Gary Hunt, the BDPAC Chair, and the Subcommittees.

Subcommittee membership

New members were announced; there are now 14 members of the Subcommittee. However, the Subcommittee is still looking for members with expertise in the watersheds, wastewater, and public health/epidemiology areas.

Report on current program activities and funding strategy

John Andrew presented on the CALFED Drinking Water Quality Program (DWQP) status. He reviewed the budget and funding sources of the DWQP in years 2000, 2001 and 2002, and also previewed the proposed budget for year 2003. John also reviewed the activities during year 2001 and presented the priorities of the DWQP for the next three years. DWQP will get \$20.5 million from Prop 40 with substantial additional funding possible if the water bond passes in November.

Issues/discussion

- How to cross-cut funding for projects under DWQP but with impacts/benefits in other CALFED programs areas. The Subcommittee discussed this issue and concluded that this group will help identify the linkages. The Subcommittee needs to cooperate with other subcommittees to ensure benefits to all programs.

- How can the DWS address under-funding in general and problems with balance associated with bond funding requirements? Adequate funding for each of the DWQP elements is important, but because of constraints in bond legislation, balance has not been achieved. Agricultural drainage/ runoff and treatment technology are currently lagging. The program needs to look for other funding sources to achieve the multiple objectives of the program.
- The Subcommittee would like to see reporting of projects and results.
- The Subcommittee would like the opportunity to provide general comments on future proposal solicitation packages.

### Role of the CALFED Agencies in the DWQP

In order to meet CALFED Drinking Water Quality goals, the Subcommittee also discussed the roles of the three major water quality agencies (i.e. USEPA, DHS and SWRCB) responsible for the program. These agencies should have an active role in both implementing and funding the CALFED Drinking Water Quality Program. Dave Spath (DHS), Karen Schwinn (USEPA), and Jim Bennett (SWRCB) reviewed their agencies' key responsibilities related to the DWQP. The Subcommittee concluded that the task is to develop, understand, and implement a strategic plan as a framework to provide funding priorities and guidance for agency collaboration.

***Action Items: Each of the three agencies will prepare a list of projects for public health needs and a summary of available water quality funding in California. This list should include priorities and how they were established to help the Subcommittee understand what kind of competition these drinking water projects are faced with. The list should be ready for the April 26 meeting.***

### Strategic Plan – including defining “An Equivalent Level of Public Health Protection”

Marguerite Young presented a draft diagram showing the elements of the Delta drinking water supply system and its relationship to “an equivalent level of public health protection” (ELPH). She reviewed each component involved in the matrix of the system-wide solution related to ELPH. The Subcommittee discussed these issues in depth, and concluded that this could be the conceptual model used to develop its strategic plan.

### Issues/comments/ideas

- What is the most cost-effective combination of source control, water management, and treatment?
- The strategic plan should incorporate the “multiple barriers” concept.
- Subgroups of water utilities may need different strategies to achieve drinking water quality goals.
- Advances in treatment technology and current treatment trends have a bearing on the ELPH issue. For example, many utilities have already switched/committed to ozone.
- Risks associated with emerging pollutants/new regulations must be considered.
- The DWQP strategic plan should be similar to water supply integrated resources plans.

*Action Item: Members will forward comments, questions and suggestions to John Andrew by March 29. John will compile and add narrative to finalize the diagram.*

Next Meetings and agendas:

**April 5, 11:30 am to 2:30 pm**

Draft Agenda:

Subcommittee membership

Conceptual framework for a water quality strategic plan, including defining “An Equivalent Level of Public Health Protection”

Establishment of technical workgroups

**April 26, 9:30 am to 3:30 pm**

Draft Agenda:

Water quality funding

Workshop: “An Equivalent Level of Public Health Protection”