

Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee  
Subcommittee on Drinking Water  
Draft Minutes  
Meeting of November 22, 2002

The Drinking Water Subcommittee met on November 22, 2002 (meeting agenda attached).

*Meeting Summary*

Draft minutes October 25, 2002

The Subcommittee reviewed and approved the minutes from the October 25 meeting without further comment.

Business items

John reported a few things to the Subcommittee:

- CALFED hired its first full-time Environmental Justice coordinator Ken McGhee, and his office is located in the Bonderson Building. He will be introduced to the DWS next meeting to address some EJ issues.
- Still in the process of revising workplan. The workplan will be discussed at the next BADPAC meeting on December 4, 2002.

Water quality challenges

Walt Wadlow introduced Angela Cheung from the Water Utility Division of the Santa Clara Valley Water District for a presentation on water quality issues and experiences SCVWD has had. Angela Cheung's presentation is at [http://calfed.water.ca.gov/BDPAC/Subcommittees/SCVWD\\_Presentation\\_11-22-02/SCVWD%20DWS%20Presentation\\_files/frame.htm](http://calfed.water.ca.gov/BDPAC/Subcommittees/SCVWD_Presentation_11-22-02/SCVWD%20DWS%20Presentation_files/frame.htm).

Angela talked about the challenges SCVWD faced in the past. She also briefly went over the overview on SCVWD treated water.

- The source water is from the Delta. It comes either from the South Bay Aqueduct or the San Luis Reservoir. The local reservoirs are backup options for emergency need.
- When there are challenges in water quality from imported water, SCVWD will use the local sources for water supply.
- SCVWD's total capacity is 222 MGD. SCVWD is the water wholesaler to seven retailers, and it serves a population of seven million.
- Most deliveries to the retailers are treated, except to some small agriculture users.
- Imported water also is used to recharge the groundwater basin; all extractions by pumping are done by retail agencies.

- Treated water delivery can be increased during an energy crisis, because contractors will not prefer to extract groundwater for their demand. Groundwater is a long-term option during drought.
- SCVWD is also a flood management agency, and rarely do they store imported water in local reservoirs.
- Even though water quality changes taking place in the Delta generally do not have a direct impact on the SCVWD water quality, they can show up rapidly in SCVWD water system.

In addition, Angela talked about the physical characteristics and operations of San Luis Reservoir and its water quality.

- SCVWD has elevated solving the low-point issue at San Luis Reservoir. One of the reasons is it frees up water to benefit a lot of the state. For both CVP and SWP contractors, there is an advantage to fully utilize the San Luis Reservoir in terms of full drawdown and then full refill. This issue is an action associated with the ROD.
- Modeling has shown that there will be more years with further drawdown in the future, therefore it is not tangible in the long-run for SCVWD to rely upon continued operation at the San Luis Reservoir above 300 TAF to protect water quality.
- The low-point problem occurs when the demand is the highest. If we draw below the storage of 300 TAF in the reservoir, there is an algae problem. If the water elevation drops below 369 feet, which is only 35 feet above the lower intake, then algae will be drawn into the lower intake.
- Quantity versus quality: the future operation of the San Luis Reservoir is to take advantage of 200 TAF of storage and also address the water quality issues. The objective is to maintain 300 TAF in wet and normal years, 100 TAF in dry years.

Angela also talked about the Treated Water Improvement Project, which is the largest water quality project that SCVWD has ever undertaken. First stage implementation was just completed, and the biggest challenge for this project was to maintain the operation of the treatment plants while undergoing major construction. Stage two will start construction over the next three years for the next two treatment plants and finish in 2007.

Walt also pointed out that the strategy is that in addition to local investment in the treatment capabilities, we will also need investments in source water quality improvement.

#### Comments/questions

Q. Is fine particulate matter a problem in not getting particulates to settle out in the settling basins or is it a problem of break through in the filter?

A. We are able to remove them in the treatment process, however it doesn't settle out in the reservoir as quickly as we like it to.

Q. What are the factors attributing to the high TTHM after chlorination?

A. Drought is the main reason. Water treatment plant technology change is good but that change alone is not enough to prepare for the kind of water quality conditions during the drought. The improvement of the treatment technology should be focused on poor water quality for multiple years during the drought.

Q. Do you use something else for oxidation in addition to chlorine?

A. Yes, we do. We just completed the first stage of our water improvement project and in that first stage, a packet of potassium permanganate was used to help.

Q. What is your strategy for pH suppression? What bromide level does the sulfuric acid strategy designed to address?

A. Up to 0.6 ppm. During drought time, it's between 0.6-0.7 ppm.

Q. What was the decision on settled water ozonation?

A. The issue for SCVWD with the higher ozone doses earlier is the formation of bromate. It makes much more sense from a process perspective to use the ozone after taking stuff out, and it is more cost-effective as well.

Q. Phase I and II mainly are done to address disinfectant by-product issues but not the San Luis Reservoir low-point issue, so does SCVWD have a research program to find the physical solutions to treatment or perform any investigations to solve the low-point problem?

A. The low-point project is being handled by a subgroup, and Montgomery Watson Harza is the consultant. SCVWD worked with the consultant in the pilot study only. Part of what is challenging in terms of just handling it from a treatment standpoint or improving source water quality is the physical size (i.e. the volume of water) and trying to treat the source quality water characteristic. Dealing with this level of an algae problem is a physical nightmare from a treatment plant standpoint.

Q. If there is a physical connection to the Aqueduct bypassing the reservoir, what are the impacts on remaining users out of the reservoir?

A. It's not a problem for the downstream contractors, but it is a problem for other irrigation district distribution systems, such as San Benito County's. The bypass would improve water quality for the whole San Felipe Division.

### Prop. 50 funding recommendation

Kate Hansel gave an overview of the Prop. 50 and also went over the chapters related to funding for CALFED. She provided summary tables to explain what are in Prop. 50 and Prop. 40 that could benefit the CALFED Drinking Water Quality Program as well as others that are statewide objectives. Patrick Wright, Director of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program, also joined the discussion on the principles relating to CALFED and statewide funds.

### Issues/comments/ideas

- Currently, CALFED is going through a process to determine how to allocate some of the Prop. 50 and Prop. 40 money. The Department of Finance wants to know the plan right now so that it can appear in the January budget, and CALFED would like to have enough time for input because Prop. 50 just passed. Hence, CALFED is faced with a time crunch to put in the budget.
- CALFED recognizes the problems with the given budget year. CALFED is trying to establish a process of minimizing the conflicts between agencies and avoiding what the Legislature did with other Propositions, which is to earmark the money for their favorite projects.
- Under water quality in Prop. 50, there are three State Departments listed and three chapters related to those. Chapter 7 is related to the program elements under CALFED; however, the target money for the Drinking Water Quality Program is not mentioned here. John Andrew has been working with the agencies based upon the ROD objectives to determine what is the funding that is needed from Prop. 50. To have a balanced program, it is essential to have the money for the Drinking Water Quality Program as well. CALFED's proposed total is \$356 million for the DWQP.
- For Prop. 40, there is funding for non-point source solution programs, and also for an agricultural water program quality grant program.
- Regarding the role that the agencies will play in the administration of the funds, the agencies need to make sure there is a certain level of consistency and coordination at the beginning and the end of the process without causing problems with their own guidelines.
- The biggest challenge is to be able to prioritize the projects and making it transparent so everybody's input can be brought into the process, not just this Subcommittee's.
- The challenge for the Authority is that the governance bill, passed last year, changes the process. That change in the process is something that makes us need to have a transparent process and accountability.
- There is room for interpretation on the chapters, and there is different guesses as to what the overlap of projects is going to be.
- CALFED's role is to work on the coordination between agencies. CALFED does not dictate their priorities.
- The principle of allocating money (see Comments/questions).
- Desalination issue (see Comments/questions).
- This committee should advise to split the \$100 million under Prop. 50 Section 79545, with \$50 million allocated to "Pilot and demonstration projects for treatment..." and another \$50 million to "Drinking water disinfecting project using UV technology and ozone treatment". Also, it should be awarded through some sort of competitive process administered by DHS. Competition should reflect specific criteria and objectives with projects competing collectively with funds in Chapter 6 Section 79545 Subsection (b) and (c).
- The same principle of money allocation applies to Chapter 8 of Prop. 50. It should be a coordinated process for two agencies to split \$500 million for the first part – Section 79560. The goal is to make sure that all the projects that come in have to be kept consistent with the integrated regional water management. There is also another \$140 million under Section 79565 for the Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB) on

- projects related to water supply reliability and water acquisitions. This section will help environmental, water quality and regional water supply reliability.
- SWRCB administrates the Prop. 40 money. CALFED would still prefer to estimate the numbers by the likely overlap between the total amount and the amount that might be spent in the solution area instead of earmarking a specific portion for CALFED.
  - In terms of awarding the money in Chapter 8, it is extraordinarily important to have coordination. The money from Chapter 8 is at least as important to CALFED as every dollar in Chapter 7 of Prop. 50. We are moving in the direction of implementation of regional programs, which must be coordinated with statewide policy as it is coming through the CALFED process and the CALFED authority. Also, we need to encourage regional plan to promote better water quality.
  - Considering forming a subcommittee to ensure the kind of coordination that has been discussed above, and also trying to prepare some written communication.
  - From the Department of Health Services perspective, we should work with a subgroup of the Subcommittee, and try to develop a process under the criteria whether it is in the CALFED solution area or not.
  - The general concept is that these pots of money are not fixed. There might be more than one pot of money to solve some problems such as Delta conveyance, levees or security of the public water supply, or emergency preparedness for levees.

#### Comments/questions

Q. How did you come up with the numbers for CALFED?

A. The numbers were developed for the purpose of budgeting. We looked at how much we have been given to date, and how much the framework agreement stated. We also looked to Prop. 50 for where the money is available, and then we estimated the amount.

Prop. 50 and a number of other propositions are statewide money. There are also a couple of other different ways to come up with the numbers for CALFED. One way is to earmark a portion of it to CALFED, which is the option we are trying to get away from, because this will only reduce the coordination from the other agencies. What CALFED prefers is to spend all the statewide money through one process instead of several, and make sure to the extent that money is spent in the solution area or towards CALFED's goals and objectives. This will be done in a way that is consistent with CALFED. Instead of having four or five different programs, we will only have one program and make some accommodations for the fact that we have a certain set of principles that will balance in science and public review for the CALFED portion and statewide program as well. This basic principle of ours is a challenge from an accounting perspective, because the Department of Finance and others want to know the numbers. Therefore, our strategy is that we prefer to put as high a number as we think appropriate and then asterisk it to say that money may be spent on programs related to CALFED. We may not know what that number is until the end of the process.

Q. What was meant by 'Desal'? What does "brackish waters" mean?

A. Brackish is, for example, a kind of salt problem that you have in groundwater in the Inland Empire. That water is considered brackish, and 'desal' means getting the salts out and getting a usable supply.

As a little insight, there will be a strong legislative attempt to move almost all of the \$100 million (under Chapter 6, Section 79545) into this category (i.e. bullet (a)).

### Prop. 13 non-point source pollution control RFP

Bill Campbell from the SWRCB presented the overview of Prop. 13 grant programs and statutory requirements.

#### Issues/comments/ideas

- Prop. 13 has a lot of strings attached due to the way the bond was written; however, within those strings, the Drinking Water Quality Program still can work out ways to meet its goals and objectives. There is \$12.8 million altogether from Prop. 13 that is available this fiscal year for non-point source pollution control. It is a CALFED Category A fund, which means it does go through the CALFED Management Group.
- The SWRCB still is not sure about what other programs are going to be in the RFP, which is about to be issued in January 2003.
- In Prop. 13, there are some limits on the size of the project. From a management standpoint, due to a lack of staff resources, it would be better to even out the money funded on projects over time to avoid delay in contracting.
- The biggest constraint is that the eligible applicants for Prop. 13 fund can only be local public agencies or non-profit organizations formed by landowners.
- There are also requirements on geographic allocation. Sixty percent of the money has to go to six counties in Southern California.
- The main thing that the SWRCB wants to accomplish with this RFP and all future RFPs is to have the confidence to pick a number of projects that the SWRCB thinks are worthy of going ahead.
- The Subcommittee should provide some feedback to the SWRCB, including what kind of priorities this Subcommittee would like to see funded by this RFP.
- Chapter 7 in Prop. 50 has language actually saying that projects funded will be carried out with science; however, the chapters that the Drinking Water Quality Program are going to be looking for funding do not have that kind of language. Projects like source water assessment monitoring usually are unable to be funded out of those funds. DWQP is unable to fund its 'science agenda' out of Prop. 50.
- Both DWQP and SWRCB are looking for feedback on RFP criteria.

#### Comments/questions

Q. Will the SWRCB administrated projects meeting multiple objectives get brownie points?

A. Yes, we prefer that a project that will meet some of those objectives gets a brownie point.

Q. How do you separate a drinking water project and a watershed project?

A. We do not think there is a difference, and we have been crafted into thinking there is a difference through this particular programming. In fact, there is so much overlap.

With the given intent of this particular pot of money, funding watershed projects is eventually going to be good for drinking water quality. DWQP would like to get the Subcommittee's input on what types of priorities to recommend for this \$12.8 million, including the types of projects and types of criteria that can fit within the constraints that we have to live with.

Q. CALFED governance requires adherence to certain standards that we have established regarding input from local entities and committees. Do you feel that those provisions apply to the SWRCB and to Prop. 13 process or do they predate that?

A. They certainly apply to that money that has been designated for CALFED.

### Strategic plan

Comments from the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) and City of Sacramento were discussed at the meeting and will be incorporated into the draft Conceptual Framework after the meeting.

The Subcommittee finalized the Conceptual Framework, and also discussed what needs to be done next.

### Issues/comments/ideas

- Consistency issue: whatever the policy is, it has to work for all the regional boards.
- The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) should adopt water quality objectives for many constituents that adversely affect drinking water supplies in the basin plan. Also, the CVRWQCB should adopt a policy on drinking water quality as a specific tool of the strategy to be consistent with the CALFED ROD.
- The numerical targets set by the California Urban Water Agencies were not the product of a comprehensive risk assessment nor a watershed management plan that considered the ability to achieve the targets.

Carolyn Yale from EPA presented a proposal to use the available federal funding (\$50,000) from EPA to make use of the process of the Nominal Group Technique (NGT) to address any specific questions the Subcommittee might have with the strategic plan. The available grant is with the National Water Research Institute (NWRI).

Issues/comments/ideas

- In a NGT, a group of 30 to 35 people drawn from different disciplines addresses an issue. It is not directed by the Subcommittee; however, some members could be invited. The product will come back to the Subcommittee for its consideration and deliberation.
- The most important thing for this Subcommittee is to be able to evaluate the actions included in the implementation.
- The next step for the Subcommittee is to have some broad concepts of how this plan (i.e. framework) could be implemented. Does it need to be incorporated into statute? What is the State role in the implementation versus the role of the local agencies that are actually treating the water? What is the financing scheme for it?
- The Subcommittee needs to start a description of the things that are being planned. We need to have some details on the tools, which provide the technical side for the process. There are also criteria to establish, such as how to select projects. The Subcommittee and agencies might not be ready for this now, but it will be by April or later.
- Resolving the conflicts between the State agency and local/region options and benefits. The group assembled by the NWRI will help the Subcommittee answer the questions on the statewide level, so how do we reconcile the statewide plan with the local options?
- In order not to let the money from Prop. 50 sit around, the Subcommittee needs to move forward on good projects that are easily identified; meanwhile, the Subcommittee can work out the long-range plan.
- Try to integrate the efforts of different agencies into one. The overall result is to capture the local initiatives on ELPH and blend them into a 'cohesive plan'. The challenge is how to use public policy and public financing to make sure the desired result will be achieved.
- The next stage of activity is to develop those specific plans related to the Conceptual Framework, and the Subcommittee will try to set dates on the things needed to be accomplished. Also for the next meeting, let's have a presentation on the NGT so the members will get a better idea on what it means.

Public comments/issues

None

Next Meeting

January 31, 2003

9:00 AM – 1:00 PM

Agenda for January 31, 2003

- EJ

- DWQP funding and Prop. 50
- NGT
- Strategic plan