

Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee  
Subcommittee on Drinking Water  
Draft Minutes  
Meeting of January 31, 2003

The Drinking Water Subcommittee met on January 31, 2003 (meeting agenda attached).

*Meeting Summary*

Co-chair Greg Gartrell made two announcements. First, he introduced new member Michael Stanley-Jones. Michael has been active in water management issues and working with many water districts to develop water management initiatives. He currently is the Sustainable Water Program Manager of the Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition. The other change of the Subcommittee is that Jim Sequeira has retired from the City of Sacramento.

Draft minutes November 22, 2002

The Subcommittee reviewed and approved the minutes from the November 22 meeting without further comment.

Business items

John reported to the Subcommittee that the Southern California Water Dialogue would meet on February 18 and March 18. The focus of both meetings will be on water quality. The February 18 meeting will be held at Metropolitan Water District headquarters in Los Angeles. John will email more information to the members.

Incorporating Environmental Justice into the CALFED Drinking Water Quality Program

Ken McGhee, the CALFED Environmental Justice (EJ) Coordinator, gave a presentation on the activities of the EJ Subcommittee.

- The EJ definition that the EJ Subcommittee operates on is that all people, regardless of race, socio-economic status, culture, or national origin, should enjoy the same benefits of protection of environmental laws.
- The EJ Subcommittee is trying to make sure that their work is fully integrated with the programmatic work of the other CALFED programs.
- The key element of the EJ concept is meaningful public participation. Other subcommittees need to include the EJ community.
- The EJ concern regarding the funding issue is that we need to have an awareness of environmental justice issues built into the early stages of any solicitation process.
- Also important to the EJ community is to have participation in technical groups and have greater influence on statewide policies, such as citizen-based water quality monitoring. There will be more opportunities in the future for EJ community to work with other groups in other areas with a more direct link to water issues.

- The single most important question that has come up nationwide regarding EJ is how planners conduct environmental analysis. A simple tool, which EPA has been promoting, is to use a worksheet with a series of questions about EJ and the community. The worksheet helps the planners discover what impacts there might be from a project, so planners can understand what those benefits and burdens could be and what EJ concerns the community might have.

### Delta Drinking Water Policy

Paul Gilbert-Snyder from the Drinking Water Program of the Department of Health Services gave a presentation on the development of the Drinking Water Policy for the Central Valley.

A small group of members representing the California Bay-Delta Authority, the Central Valley Regional Board, the Department of Health Services, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District, and California Urban Water Agencies is working to establish a comprehensive Drinking Water Policy for the Delta and the upstream tributaries by the end of 2004, as required by the ROD. As this committee proceeds, additional stakeholder input will be needed, especially from the agricultural community and the urban storm water runoff representatives.

Paul also reported that he is the project manager for the project. The goal of the workgroup is to develop a comprehensive technical package, and to provide recommendations in supporting documentation, that can be used by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board as a foundation for the development of the Drinking Water Policy. The policy is likely to be in the form of a basin plan amendment. The committee has been meeting for several months, and a four-year work plan and a management structure have been developed. The target completion date of the work plan is the end of 2006.

The implementation stage will start within the next month. The work plan tasks that will be implemented include first identifying existing data (i.e. DBP, pathogens, pesticides) and the data gaps, developing preliminary conceptual models (i.e. Task 3a), and identifying a range of potential water quality goals and policy elements (i.e. Task 7).

Paul also talked about the fiscal situation of the project. The preliminary estimate on the cost is \$750,000 to \$1 million. Elaine Archibald from the California Urban Water Agencies stated that her organization is working closely with the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District. Both agencies have agreed to contribute \$150,000 each to get this project started: \$75,000 each to start on the initial tasks as identified above, and then another \$75,000 each to either continue with those tasks or to start on other tasks. Both agencies are also hoping the CALFED will commit to fund more than \$150,000 which is currently identified for this project in its available funds.

Other highlights and comments from the discussion on the work plan and its process include:

- The decision on whether or not it will be numerical standards or narrative policies has not been made.

- The role of the Regional Board is that they are the key member of the work group. They will provide their input to the work group on what kind of public involvement they need, and ultimately they will do the work for the development and adoption of the plan.
- The final product of the entire process is not to replace the State Water Resources Control Board D-8863 or any policy, but only to enhance the policy and establish water quality objectives.
- Are the current efforts of the Regional Board and their activities in the next four years going to come in at a timely fashion?
- A workshop will be organized with the Regional Board permitting staff.
- Need to state in the work plan that there will be intersect with other regional upper watershed monitoring groups and efforts.
- The study or the end product of this process is only for the Central Valley region.
- Need to involve the agricultural community, and have that outreach performed early in the process.
- The end product of this work group is to establish standards, which should be practical and can apply to the specific water bodies.
- Rather than calling it the 'work plan', it is really the 'technical analysis' to support the development of the Drinking Water Policy.
- Speaking as a CUWA board member, Tim Quinn stated CUWA's position that the policy is an important CALFED action, and that more CUWA funding may be available to support the development of the policy in the future.

***Action Items***

- *John Andrew will report back to the Subcommittee on CALFED's funds for this project.*
- *John will also draft a call for nominations for members from the agricultural community. Members should forward interested parties or make suggestions on any individuals to John in a week.*

DWQP funding/Prop. 50

Dave Spath from the Department of Health Services (DHS), and Phil Wendt and his staff from the Department of Water Resources (DWR) talked about their agencies' budget plans for DWQP including how to allocate the money funded by Prop. 50.

The highlights of the discussion were:

- DHS:
  - Budget Change Proposal for staff was denied.
  - With Prop. 50, there is potential for funding water quality projects in the CALFED solution area.
    - Chapter 3, water security
    - Chapter 4, \$435 for implementation:
      - Provide funds to match federal grant for the State Revolving Fund (SRF)
      - Grants to help southern California agencies to address Colorado River water supply reductions

- Funding under Chapter 6 is overseen by DWR. DHS will work with DWR on the \$100 million dollars involved in this chapter.
- DWR:
  - The Safe Drinking Water Loan Program: DWR does the administrative work, and DHS takes care of the technical portion.
  - \$50 million from Chapter 6 of Prop. 50 is for desalination projects. Desalination Task Force is undertaken to be formed under AB 2717. Both DWR and MWD are working in this area. The criteria for funding have not been developed yet.

#### Issues/comments/ideas

- SB21: Senator Machado emphasized to have competitive grant programs instead of earmarking the funds.
- Timing is important. Use the money that has a deadline first, and save money from other sources for later.
- Marguerite commented that there are two ways to do the math on the \$435 million with regards of 60% set aside for Southern California. With Marguerite's calculation, the amount is \$195 million.

#### ***Action Item***

- *John will report back to the Subcommittee at the next meeting on CALFED's discretionary funds.*

#### Strategic plan:

#### Nominal Group Technique

Dr. Ron Linsky from the National Water Research Institute gave an overview of the NGT technique. He also described how to use this technique to gain consensus out of a variety of viewpoints.

NGT was developed in the 1960s by Dr. Delbecq. It includes fundamentally four parts. The main thing for the entire process is to have a focal point, which is a precise question asked in less than twenty-three words. Also, the NGT workshop is controlled, even though there is a negotiating component involved with it.

The Subcommittee discussed how it could develop questions to make the NGT technique support the development and implementation of the strategic plan. Members agreed that this should be an EPA-sponsored activity rather than that of the Drinking Water Subcommittee.

#### Questions and comments

Q. How would this Subcommittee come up with a question for this group to focus on?

A. First, have input from all the members; secondly, prioritize the ideas; and then have some consolidation on the ideas. NGT can be a powerful tool to provide the core element for creating the question leading to the right product at the end for the Subcommittee.

Q. How much time can NGT save the participants on the process?

A. It has taken a full year to get where we are now. The NGT could help accelerate the next phase of the strategic plan.

***Action Item***

- *Members will define three good questions. The Subcommittee will have further discussion at the next meeting.*

Letter of support from California Urban Water Agencies

The Subcommittee went over the Letter of Support from CUWA and had some discussion on the subject.

- The purpose of the letter is first to indicate CUWA's support for the process and interest in the development of the strategic plan; secondly, the letter and the attached outline are something for this Subcommittee to review.
- The strategic plan is a generic framework developed by the Subcommittee to identify the problems and the tools to deal with these problems. It will eventually become an investment strategy, which has common elements and regional elements. The letter from CUWA serves the purpose of identifying tools.
- The successful approach to achieve ELPH could be 'bottom up' as well as 'top down'; however, local and regional input is important, because they are the ones who have to meet drinking water standards.

***Action Item***

- *Members will send their comments on the letter to Lisa Holm and Lynda Smith.*

Drinking Water Policy Framework

The Subcommittee had an in-depth discussion on this subject. Members urged joint interaction between subcommittees, either by setting up a joint meeting with the Ecosystem Restoration Subcommittee and others, or participating their meetings to get their feedback. The goal is to get the framework adopted by the full BDPAC committee at the next BDPAC meeting.

Issues/comments/ideas

- The article in the Sacramento Bee stated that the projects from the Ecosystem Restoration Program could cause adverse affects on drinking water quality. This is an example of why the Drinking Water Policy Framework was developed. It provides CALFED a mechanism to deal with cross-program benefits and conflicts, and ensure balanced implementation of the program.
- Frictions and conflicts will not just go away, because they are in the system. The purpose of the framework is not to 'derail' other programs because of the drinking water quality impacts from their projects; instead, it is intended to integrate all the elements under CALFED.
- Invite the Science Program to have their help to focus and prioritize the research questions that may arise in the future.

***Action Item***

- Set up a joint meeting with the Ecosystem Restoration Subcommittee.

Transition plan

John gave a brief update on the California Bay-Delta Authority and the current process of setting it up. The Subcommittee had some discussion on the appointees of the Authority.

Dave Spath and Karen Schwinn reported to the Subcommittee their agencies' roles during this transition time.

Issues/comments/ideas

- State side: resources will be an issue for the DHS. Prop. 50 will allow DHS to fund the projects in the solution area, but its BCP for staff was denied. With the budget situation that the State is facing, it will be difficult for DHS to staff up in the foreseeable future.
- Federal side: there is no budget and no authorization at this time.

Public comments/issues

None

Next Meeting

February 28, 2003

9:30 AM – 12 noon

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

Agenda for February 28, 2003

- NGT key questions
- Drinking Water Policy Framework