

Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee
Subcommittee on Drinking Water
Draft Minutes
Meeting of February 28, 2003

The Drinking Water Subcommittee met on February 28, 2003 (meeting agenda attached).

Meeting Summary

Draft minutes January 31, 2002

The Subcommittee reviewed and approved the minutes from the January 31 meeting without further comment.

Business items

John reported to the Subcommittee that the Southern California Water Dialogue meeting on February 18 focused on water quality, and there was a good turn out for that meeting. Both Subcommittee members Bob Neufeld and Sujatha Jahagirdar gave presentations on behalf of this Subcommittee. The presentations would be posted on the DWS website. The next SCWD meeting on March 18 will also be focusing on water quality, and co-chair Greg Gartrell will attend as well.

John also reported on the use of the DWQP State General Fund project monies. Primarily, that money has been used to fund the Drinking Water Quality PSP effort, including the Southern California Regional Forum, the Bay Area Regional Forum, and the CALFED Task Force. Currently, that money is also going to the DWQP Monitoring and Assessment Program. John mentioned that his program would be able to contribute up to \$500,000 for the development of the Drinking Water Policy, and the final amount will be dependent upon the future policy of the State Board, the Regional Board.

John also reported that the Project Tracking Report will be posted on the DWQP website. The next report will reflect the ELPH concept as well as different categories for money allocation. The Subcommittee can pass their recommendation regarding categorizing projects to the BDPAC.

Co-chair Marguerite Young announced that the Clean Water Action has appointed Michael Stanley-Jones to be the new director. Since Michael is also a member on the Subcommittee to represent the Clean Water Action, therefore, Marguerite will represent the Environmental Water Caucus from now on.

Delta Drinking Water Policy

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

The workgroup has come up with a formal name, which is the 'Central Valley Drinking Water Policy Work Group'. The workgroup is currently working with the Regional Board and the State Board to develop a workshop that will take place in April. The purposes of the workshop will be:

- Discuss the existing State Board and Regional Board policies with regard to drinking water and how those policies are implemented.
- Get a better feel for what needs to be accomplished with the ROD commitment.
- Discuss the Board's process for developing and adopting policies.

The workgroup is also working with the CALFED Science Program to refine and further develop the conceptual model tasks. The additional task added is to prepare an implementation and outreach strategy, such as a mission statement, to clear up confusions among the other groups.

The other progresses this workgroup has made recently included:

- Draft conceptual models of Tasks #2, 3a, and 7 are being developed;
- Literature research and review of policies have been conducted;
- The MOU between the CUWA and the Sac Regional was signed and finalized this week.

Paul addressed some of the concerns this Subcommittee raised in the last meeting:

- The nature of the workgroup: one concern was that the policy will be made by a workgroup that does not seem having the authority to make policy. Paul emphasized that the workgroup is led by the DHS and the Regional Board, which are both the regulatory agencies that develop policies. So, the workgroup is both technical and policy-making.
- Resources: even though the resources for the workgroup is limited, yet given the nature of the current State funds, the workgroup will effectively use the money that is available now to develop a work plan in an efficient and economic way.
- Above dam watershed modeling and monitoring efforts: the workgroup agrees that above dam efforts in some cases can be very valuable, so the workgroup will look both below and above dams and use the models that have already been developed to evaluate the information.
- Coordination between the workgroup and the Regional Board: the workgroup recognizes that its work product is part of the Regional Board's policy process, and the workgroup will work closely with the Regional Board. The workshop in April is one example.

Other issues and comments from the discussion on the development of the policy included:

- The General fund money from CALFED DWQP is tied up in a couple of Master Service Agreements. CALFED staff needs to work with the workgroup and decide what would be appropriate to carry out whichever the task is and run task orders out of the master Service Agreements.
- The workgroup may use the funds from CALFED earlier, because this General Fund may run out after June 30.
- The State Water Resources Control Board and the Regional Board are in full support of the development of the policy.

- The workgroup will be looking at how to integrate the various scientific and technical aspects into the policy development. It will be a lot of work to address all the issues, including having a balanced approach and a good coordination between competing beneficial users.
- The workgroup will also focus on new constituents that have not previously been identified.
- The staffing levels that the Regional Board needs to apply to the development of the policy will vary over time. At this point, it is not efficient to have too many staff to work on the project. However, a great level of staff effort will be needed in the future when the workgroup starts putting together a basin plan and when the basin plan goes through internal review and board hearings.
- The main thing that the workgroup needs right now is the input and the guidance from someone who is familiar with process and who can attend the meeting to ensure the workgroup stays on the right track in terms of collecting useful information.

Action Item

- Have presentation or update at every DWS meeting on the development of the policy.

DWQP funding/Prop. 50

Jim Bennett from the Executive office of the State Water Resources Control Board gave an update on the status of the SWRCB funds related to the CALFED Drinking Water Quality Program. Currently, there is \$20 million available from Prop. 13 for DWQP; and there is \$18.85 million from Prop. 50. Also, there is \$9 million through both Prop. 13 and Prop. 50 for the Water Recycling Program.

Barbara Evoy, Chief of the Division of Financial Assistance of the SWRCB, reported that the SWRCB had a consolidation in January, and now they can have all of the money from propositions and take the Revolving Funds from other programs all into one place to have better coordination. The total number of the grants in the RFP which will be going out is 319, and the money totals up to \$138 million.

The Subcommittee also had some discussion on how to appropriately allocate the money for projects. Members agreed that it is a challenge to integrate the work and coordinate between different agencies because the money is from multiple sources and there are multiple criteria and benefits for different projects.

Strategic plan key question development:

Karen Schwinn from the US Environmental Protection Agency led the discussion on the development of the NGT key questions.

Karen first briefly gave the background on this subject and indicated that the purpose of this discussion was to see whether the Subcommittee could use the NGT as a mechanism to make progress on the implementation of the Strategic Plan and move it forward. A number of questions were received from representatives of CUWA after the last DWS meeting, and three of

them were picked for discussion during this meeting. The meeting participants also briefly had a mock process of the NGT to deliberate over the questions.

The three potential questions for NGT were:

1. What actions would have the greatest water quality benefit and how should the costs of these actions be allocated?
2. What are the barriers to achieving ELPH and what would be the most successful strategies for overcoming those barriers?
3. What is the measurement of a successful CALFED Drinking Water Quality Program?

Issues/comments/ideas

- The fourth concept in addition to benefit, barriers, measurement is how to implement. What is the State's role or the Federal government's role in trying to implement the Strategic Plan?
- The barriers can be misallocation of costs or misallocation of financial resources.
- NGT process is not to create new information. It is supposed to help separate the things that do not belong to meet the goals of the questions.
- The product of an NGT is a report that is a consensus amongst the participants about the question
- What this Subcommittee needs to focus on is to get some thinking on how to apply grants for water quality and avoid evaluating questions.
- As for the plans for spending Prop.13 money, different agencies might have different directions to take. The baseline issue is how to integrate the policy and the funding around an ELPH strategy that needs to be consistent amongst the various regions and also recognizes differences as well.
- Focusing on the strategies rather than actions. What is this Subcommittee's implementation strategy?
- What this Subcommittee needs to focus on right now are those policy decisions that would lead to establishing the statewide drinking water policy. What we need to do is to establish the policy and decide how we are going to achieve that and then allocate the money to achieve those particular goals. Technical things will follow after this.
- The Strategic Plan also needs to adapt to changes in constituents and demographic characteristics. It will be helpful to have some technical people come in and help the Subcommittee understand the growth and shifting in population in the State.
- NGT can also help generate specific ideas about the specific problems in different regions. Using some sort of a case study to work through the ELPH with each particular perspective.
- We also need to address the problems and face the barriers instead of working around them.

Action Item

- The Strategic Plan needs to be an item on every Subcommittee meeting's agenda.

Drinking Water Policy Framework

The Subcommittee talked about having joint meetings with the Ecosystem Restoration Subcommittee and the Water Supply Subcommittee. The target date will be April 25.

Call for nominations from the agricultural community

The Subcommittee had some discussion on issuing a call for nominations for two additional members representing the agricultural community. The notice will be sent to all BDPAC members, DWS members, and some potential candidates including representatives from the Kings River Association, the Imperial Irrigation District, and other Southern part of the state.

Public comments/issues

Co-chair Greg Gartrell announced that he and the other co-chair Marguerite Young were invited to give their statement to the Hearing of the Senate Agriculture and Water Resources Committee on March 18. All the co-chairs of the various subcommittees of the BDPAC will also be there. Three things presented to the Senate Committee will be:

- A Draft Policy Framework on water quality for CALFED
- The development of the Strategic Plan
- The funding and opportunities of Prop. 50

Greg indicated that these three things are closely tied in with the issues that will be addressed at the Hearing, which include the role of jurisdiction of this Subcommittee, the major issues the DWS is trying to address, and the implementation of the ROD from the Subcommittee's perspective.

Next Meeting

March 28, 2003
9:00 AM – 12 noon
East Bay Municipal Utility District
Oakland Administration Center and Business Office
375 11th Street
Oakland, CA

Agenda for March 28, 2003

Nominal Group Technique
Delta Drinking Water Policy
Drinking Water Policy Framework
Update on call for nominations from the agricultural community