

Bay-Delta Authority Committee
Subcommittee on Drinking Water
Draft Minutes
Meeting of June 27, 2003

The Drinking Water Subcommittee met on June 27, 2003. A list of attendees from the voluntary sign-in sheet is at the end of this document.

Meeting Summary

Draft Minutes April 25, 2003

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

Policy Framework Update

Co-chair Greg Gartrell reported that at the June 5, 2003 meeting of the Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC), the Drinking Water Subcommittee's Recommended Draft Policy Framework was presented to the BDPAC for comments and discussion. Questions and concerns were raised regarding Policy 4d, where the Drinking Water Subcommittee (DWS) recommends that "Operational decisions processes should explicitly consider and report impacts to water quality." Reviewers requested clarification on this recommendation; does the DWS expect reports and potential closures on operations that occur daily, or in the fall or other sensitive times of the year, or was the DWS referring to impacts resultant from long-term projects. Members of the Subcommittee discussed the language and intent of the recommendation, and agreed that the DWS is concerned with water quality impacts from all types of operational decision processes. The Subcommittee strongly agreed that operational impacts to water quality should be of equal concern to impacts on fisheries and water supply. The Subcommittee agreed to leave the language under 4d unchanged.

A DWS member asked about strengthening the language of 4b to reflect the important role of a mitigation monitoring plan (under CEQA). The DWS agreed to strike the word "may" and change the word "provide" to "provides" so that Policy 4b now reads "A project's or action's mitigation monitoring plan (under CEQA) provides a vehicle for monitoring of impacts and implementation of this policy."

The Subcommittee discussed the next steps in getting the Policy Framework approved, as well as onto the agendas of other BDPAC Subcommittees. It was proposed to have the final Policy Framework Recommendations available for BDPAC approval and adoption in early fall.

Action Item

- *Greg Gartrell will report clarification and changes regarding Policies 4b and 4d to BDPAC policy reviewers.*

Multiple Disinfectants Research

Brad Coffey, Metropolitan Water District (MWD), gave a Power Point presentation to the Subcommittee on MWD's involvement with multiple disinfectants and Ultra Violet (UV) light. After displaying a map depicting the service area of MWD, Brad explained that MWD treats both

SPW (State Project Water) and CRP (Colorado River Water). He described MWD's treatment philosophy, and provided an explanation of the formation of disinfection by-products. The water quality issues of concern to the treatment process included: disinfection, disinfection by-products, salinity, other contaminants, aesthetics of the water (including color and odor), and intentional contamination (terrorist threats). Factors in selecting the appropriate treatment technology included: disinfection, taste/odor control, salinity control, DBP control, and cost. Past technology evaluation activities involved regulatory participation, technology evaluations, process design, and construction.

Brad explained the basics of UV light and effectiveness on reducing levels of giardia and other contaminants that would require large doses of applied UV. Brad described how MWD has addressed the concern of the scale-up of UV disinfection. MWD looks for the modeled effect on microorganism concentration.

Brad reviewed the project objectives:

- Integrated UV treatment may minimize chemical/microbial risk while allowing for increased variation in Delta water quality
- Integrated process which must achieve multiple treatment objectives
- Sequential combination of UV light with ozone, chlorine, and chlorine dioxide.

It was concluded that integrating UV light could achieve multiple water quality objectives.

Brad displayed a graphic of the research approach, which was to review literature, optimize oxidation, integrate coagulation, improve filtration, and integrate UV light.

In sum, the multiple disinfectant technologies

- will be assessed for multiple water quality objectives,
- may allow variations in SPW quality through integrated treatment, and
- UV is not a "silver bullet" but a helpful tool.
- the power of UV is that it is highly effective against Giardia/Crypto without producing DBPs

Questions and Comments

- The work will begin in July and be an 18 month-long project.
- There will be open flow filters to allow for UV post-filtration.
- Lamps have not been strongly considered for clear wells because distance between the water and lamps reduces the success of UV treatment.
- A member asked how, if the project is sequential, could MWD compare and integrate. Brad explained the equation for the project and how it could be manipulated as needed.
- The energy level for the UV units has been designed to accommodate 4-kilowatt lamps.
- Perchlorate cannot be eliminated with UV, ozone, chlorine, or chlorate. The only way to rid water of perchlorate is through ion exchange, membrane separation, or bio-reduction.
- The UV systems can be retrofitted into older facilities or integrated into existing facilities without extra pumping. New integrated facilities could be built, as well.
- The long-term effects of UV are that UV lamps can degrade and result in a spectrum change. In addition, changing organic components can affect effectiveness.
- Sensors monitor the reliability of the UV lamps, however, it has not been resolved how effective the sensors are. MWD is working on that concern.
- The initial and daily costs of the UV projects were speculated and discussed.

Multiple Disinfectants Research, continued

David Briggs, Contra Costa Water District (CCWD), provided the Subcommittee with a Power Point presentation on the work and research CCWD has been involved with regarding multiple disinfectants research. David explained that the motivation behind the research is that treatment optimization and robustness are important, redundancy is another advantage, and processes can vary seasonally depending on source water conditions, resulting in high levels of disinfection at all times. Providing a research overview, David explained that previous ClO₂ experiments in 2001-2002 focused on bromate/other DBPs control and operational issues. Pending future ClO₂ experiments focus on high algal loading events and disinfectant synergy involving ClO₂. A research project involving a Bay Area collaborative effort, scheduled to run between 2003-2006, will focus on disinfectant synergy involving UV, ozone, chloramines, and ClO₂ (Phase 1) and advanced filtration technologies such as MIEX (Phase 2) or membranes. David explained the research efforts in detail during the rest of his presentation.

CCWD source water is diverted from the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta and the Los Vaqueros Reservoir. David provided water quality readings for turbidity, TOC, pH, average alkalinity, and bromide. Bromate formation has been a concern at the Randall-Bold Water Treatment Plant (RBWTP), where historically bromide readings have varied from 5 to 69 ppb (resulting in potential problems complying with 10 ppb). Bromate control technologies include pH adjustment, ammonia, chlorine dioxide, pre-chlorine/pre-ammonia, and split ozone addition. Chlorine dioxide is helpful because it reduces the ozone demand (decrease ozone dose) and increase ozone half-life (increases CT, decreases ozone dose). David displayed a table that showed successful bromate control with chlorine dioxide at the plant in 2002. He also explained how chlorite can oxidize with ozone and form chlorate, resulting in no chlorite in the effluent.

David described in further detail the pending research results from this year regarding bromate control with chlorine dioxide at RBWTP. ClO₂ reduces bromate formation from ozonation process. An adjustment of pH to 6.0 was effective in controlling bromate formation, while the addition of ammonia was less effective. It was reported that minimal chlorite is leaving the plant, most is converted into chlorate, and no perchlorate was formed. Finally, there has been no major impact to the RBWTP filtration processes. This recent study provides additional findings regarding disinfectant synergies with chlorine dioxide and ozone.

David completed his presentation with a review of the Bay Area Collaborative Research. The scope of the research is to examine variable water of the Delta (daily, seasonal, locational) and impacts on treatment, and to focus on DBP control/reduction and increased disinfection potential. In addition, the technologies to be tested include applications of multiple disinfectants and advanced filtration. David displayed a list of the ten participating water treatment plants and their proposed technologies. He reviewed the two phases of the research, as well as the scale of the research. The schedule of the Bay Area Collaborative Research is to finalize the experimental plan in summer 2003, complete experimental set-up and site preparation in fall 2003, begin Phase 1 experiments in winter 2004, begin Phase 2 experiments in winter 2005, and complete the experiments in spring 2006.

Central Valley Drinking Water Policy Update

Lynda Smith, MWD, provided the Subcommittee with an update on the Central Valley Drinking Water Policy (CVDWP). Lynda reported that the Work Group for the CVDWP has been meeting, and consultants are conducting a thorough review of data regarding drinking water where the quality is of concern. The consultants are tasked to finish this review in the next month. Then, a conceptual Policy will be developed, with some funding provided by the EPA. The Work Group will hold a workshop with the Central Valley's Regional Water Quality Control

Board (CVRWQCB) in September to explain the purpose, scope, and schedule of the work plan. Lynda reported that the Work Group is recruiting for a broader representation of stakeholders, particularly from the agricultural community and storm water run-off management. The Work Group is planning to develop public outreach materials (fact sheets, brochures) for the September CVRWQCB workshop.

Questions and Comments

Q. Years ago, the RWQCB examined making policies to improve the quality of water in the Delta. The literature review conducted at that time made it appear to be not possible, particularly because of the dredging in the Delta. How is it possible now?

A. Lynda was unfamiliar with the earlier work that had been done; the Work Group is still early in the process. As the consultants finish their data and literature review, there will be a more rigorous effort to develop policies that focus on benefiting the Delta. Ken Landau (CVRWQCB) later addressed the DWS regarding the dredging concern, reporting that the answers to those problems are not well known. Frequently, the only dredging standards that have been developed do not apply to dredging in the Delta. Ken believes the funding for that research has been lost.

Q. How do the efforts of the Work Group address problems on the agricultural front? Will it integrate with the Agricultural Discharge Program of the CVRWQCB?

A. The two programs will likely share information, but will not be linked. The Work Group is focussed on all pollutants that affect Delta water quality, not just the agricultural impacts. Ken Landau addressed the DWS and explained that they are trying to develop better management practices and regulatory tools for ag run-off. CVRWQCB has a monitoring program that aims to address a variety of drinking water constituents, but they are having budgetary problems implementing that program.

Q. It was mentioned that the Work Group is targeting ag and stormwater run-off representatives to diversify the group. Are there other targeted stakeholders? Is the Work Group as well formed and diverse as it hopes?

A. It is an on-going effort of the Work Group to involve additional stakeholders. More are always welcome. However, it is the desire of the Work Group to only involve people who will actually devote time, resources, and effort to the CVDWP. This is not a group for observers.

Q. When will outreach materials be available for us to review?

A. The Work Group is preparing materials for the September workshop at CVRWQCB. Perhaps some of that information would be available for review at the August DWS meeting.

Action Item

- *Time will be arranged on the August DWS agenda for a fuller presentation on the CVDWP. Public outreach materials will be prepared for and reviewed at this DWS August meeting.*

Business Items

Nominal Group Technique Update

Karen Schwinn, US EPA, provided a brief update on the NGT workshop scheduled for the last week of July (7/29-7/31) at Cal Poly, Pomona. Ron Linsky, National Water Research Institute, is handling the workshop agenda and registration. Sixty people have been invited for thirty available slots. Once participants register with Ron, an information packet is sent explaining the purpose and schedule of the NGT Workshop. Karen will provide a full report to the DWS at their August meeting.

Action Item

- *Time will be arranged on the August agenda for a full report on the NGT Workshop.*

General Announcements

Sam Harader, DWQP Interim Program Manager, provided meeting attendees with a list of the newly appointed California Bay-Delta Authority (CBDA) members and an organizational chart for the CBDA. Sam announced that the CBDA will meet August 14 to provide for introductions and to address initial business items.

Sam introduced the consultants from Public Affairs Management (PAM) who will be assisting Sam and the DWS with meeting preparation and support. Co-chair Marguerite Young suggested that the consultants work with Sam and the co-chairs to determine additional methods of meeting support (agenda preparation, meeting facilitation, etc). John Clerici, PAM Project Manager, and Sonja Wadman, Project Associate, agreed to have a telephone conference soon with Sam and the co-chairs to discuss the possibilities.

Action Item

- *Co-chairs, Sam Harader, and PAM consultants will have a telephone conference before mid-July to discuss additional meeting support services and products that could be made available to the DWS.*

Sam reported that the announcement for the permanent position of Drinking Water Quality Program Manager had been posted. Active recruitment will follow. Brochures explaining the position and application procedures were made available to meeting participants.

Sam informed the Subcommittee that three nominations for the agricultural representative position on DWS have been submitted to him. The co-chairs will review the applications, conduct telephone interviews, and make a decision regarding appointments. There was discussion regarding the number of potential appointees; co-chair Marguerite Young offered her opinion that if each of the three nominees were qualified and available, then why not appoint all three. A Subcommittee member asked which regions of the State the three potential nominees would represent and suggested that more representation from Southern California is needed to balance out the Subcommittee.

Sam announced that a California Watershed Council is being formed to determine how bond funds might be distributed. Co-chair Marguerite Young asked if there was DWS representation on that Watershed Council. David Spath, Department of Health Services (DHS), reported that he might attend the first meeting on Monday, June 30, 2003. Co-chair Marguerite Young reported that in May, there had been a discussion about involving the DWS in the Watershed Council, yet she has heard little about the Council meeting until just now. She requested a report on the Watershed Council, and how the DWS should be involved, at the August meeting.

Action Item

- *Time will be arranged on the August agenda for a presentation on the Watershed Council.*

Sam reported that the Bulletin 160 process is beginning to address water quality and suggested DWS involvement. The first meeting of those interested in B160 was held the day before, on Thursday, June 26. A Subcommittee member present at this DWS meeting was also present at the B160 meeting. He reported that the objectives of the two groups are similar except in scope:

the B160 group is reviewing drinking water quality objectives on a statewide level, not just in the CALFED solution area. Other agency staff involved in the DWS were also in attendance at the B160 meeting. Co-chair Marguerite Young expressed concern that she did not hear of the meeting until the last minute. She expressed a desire for more cross-communication among Subcommittee members when meetings pertaining to drinking water quality occur. It was suggested to place the DWS co-chairs on the distribution list for B160 meetings. A presentation on B160 was recommended at the next DWS meeting.

Action Items

- *Place co-chairs on appropriate distribution lists pertaining to drinking water quality to ensure DWS involvement. DWS members shall share e-mail notifications of meetings.*
- *Arrange time on August DWS agenda for update/presentation on B160.*

Co-chair Marguerite Young announced that on July 11, a joint meeting of the Watersheds and Environmental Justice Subcommittees will be held at Hunter's Point. Members of DWS have been invited to attend. Co-Chair Greg Gartrell will attend and represent the DWS.

Action Item

- *Co-chair Greg Gartrell will attend and represent the DWS at the July 11 joint meeting.*

Drinking Water Quality Program Plan

Sam Harader provided the DWS with the revised (6/23/03) version of the Drinking Water Quality Program (DWQP) Multi-Year Plan. In the April DWS meeting, the original draft Plan was reviewed by the DWS, and various suggestions to the format and content were made. Sam, with the assistance of agency staff and others, re-arranged the draft DWQP Plan to reflect the desired changes. Sam explained the content and layout of the revised Plan, which begins with a Goals and Objectives description, including the Equivalent Level of Public Health Protection (ELPH) Draft Decision Tree, and then covers the regional description of California water quality. The remaining sections of the Program Plan focus on work being done in the various categories of the ELPH actions (improving Delta water, improving imported water, improving local sources, exploring treatment options, and maximizing water use efficiency), and concludes with a discussion of program management.

Sam reported that there are CALFED Record of Decision (ROD) commitments coming up for DWQP and/or DWS. One such commitment is that "the DWS will conduct an initial assessment of progress toward meeting water quality targets and alternative treatment technologies by the end of 2003." Sam stressed that in order for this to occur, a great deal of extra staff time is needed but not necessarily available. He suggested that a Task Group might need to be formed to assist staff with this assessment, and proposed putting this request on August's agenda.

Sam also reported that the SWRCB has released a consolidated RFP which includes \$31.5 million in Year 3 (2003) funds for the DWQP. They have received approximately 126 proposals for DWQP funds; the selection process will begin in Year 3 with final project selection in Year 4. Sam explained that this is a major boost of funding for the DWQP, and there is a great deal of work to be done.

Questions and Comments

- A Subcommittee member noted that in the Work Plan there are descriptions about water quality in the various California regions and recommendations to improve the water quality—

in essence a conceptual ELPH strategy for each region. The Work Plan appears not to discuss how the regional plans could be integrated, and CALFED's role in that integration.

- It was asked if some of this grant money could be applied towards developing regional plans; what authority does this Subcommittee have to designate some grant/bond funding for regional planning. Sam answered that Prop 50 funds are available for integrated regional water management planning.
- A report of some ideas for obtaining regional plan funding at the next DWS meeting in August was requested.
- Tim Quinn, MWD Southern California, responded that his group has been working hard to get the Southern California regional plan together, and was not planning on waiting for CALFED direction or coordination. It was reported that a CALFED staff person is confirming the progress of regional plans. A Subcommittee member suggested that a brief update or presentation be made at the next DWS meeting from someone working on a regional plan to hear about the struggles and successes of developing/implementing a plan.
- Co-chair Marguerite Young commented that other BDPAC Subcommittees have submitted lists of criteria required for Prop 50 funding. She strongly suggested that the DWS develop its criteria list (i.e., include methods that further ELPH objectives in all proposals). She recommended putting this on the agenda for August. A subcommittee member asked if the DWS had the authority to direct the granting agencies on submittal requirements. He feels that a direct discussion with the three agencies needs to occur because DWS is not mentioned in Chapter 7. Co-chair Marguerite Young responded that the DWS does have the authority to recommend criteria, and repeated that other BDPAC Subcommittees have already submitted their criteria to ensure implementation of their program polices.
- A Subcommittee member had a specific question regarding the language of the SWRCB RFP. He was referred to the SWRCB web site where the RFP is posted.
- Co-chair Marguerite Young stated her appreciation for the time and effort put into revising the Work Plan and asked about the next steps. Sam Harader reported that any last minute comments might be able to be incorporated, if they are sent to him ASAP. The effort is now to produce an "executive summary" of all of the different CBDA Program Plans that are more reader friendly, and take the Program Plans to the new Authority for approval/adoption.

Action Items

- *Arrange time on the August agenda to discuss forming a Task Group to help with the assessment that is due to the BDPAC at the end of 2003.*
- *Arrange time on August agenda for discussion of DWS criteria for bond/grant funding.*
- *If time allows, have a brief report scheduled on August agenda regarding steering funding sources towards regional planning efforts.*
- *If time allows, arrange time on the August agenda for an update on a regional plan process.*

Program Staffing and Resources

Under the Bay-Delta Authority Act of 2003, the DWQP has three implementing agencies, USEPA, DHS, and the SWRCB. As management of the DWQP and funding shift from CALFED (now the CBDA) to the implementing agencies, roles, responsibilities, and available resources need to be identified. The Subcommittee received brief reports on program staffing and resources that would be made available to the DWS from the various implementing agencies.

Speaking on behalf of the CBDA, Sam Harader informed the group that the CBDA has some minimal funding available for staff, including the DWQP manager position that has just been announced, and clerical support.

Wayne Pierson, SWRCB, reported that there was no Drinking Water staff position designated in the recent budget proposal for the SWRCB. Ken Landau, CVRWQCB, asked Wayne if the CALFED Drinking Water funding that was lost before had been used; the answer was yes, but it will be returned once the budget has been approved. It was clarified that most of that money had been spent on TMDL development, on drinking water issues and salinity.

David Spath, DHS, reported that a staff person will be involved in CALFED activities. As an implementing agency for Prop 50 funds, obvious overlapping with the DWS and others will occur. David reminded meeting participants that Prop 50 issues money to projects statewide; the extent to which DHS can apply funding towards the CALFED solution area will be seen. DHS is holding back on its draft criteria to the legislature, but the draft criteria will be a stand-alone bill and not a trailer bill to Prop 50. When the time nears to present this criteria bill, DHS will seek DWS input. DHS will hold workshops regarding this issue, and David agreed to ensure that Sam Harader and the DWS co-chairs are on the distribution list. Later in the meeting, David reported that posted on the DHS web site is information regarding a small amount of grant money that is available in the form of loans. This program was briefly discussed; interest rates are low now.

Karen Schwinn, USEPA, informed the Subcommittee that there was no designated CALFED staffing available, but the State grants should remain stable. The EPA is involved with Prop 50 and Prop 13 funds. The EPA has spent a great deal of money to further the objectives of the DWQP. For example, they have provided funding for the Bay Area Collaborative mentioned in David Briggs' Multiple Disinfectants Research presentation, they are funding the NGT workshop, and they will assist with the Central Valley Drinking Water Policy discussed earlier by Lynda Smith.

Karen reported that on Saturday, June 28, 2003, there will be three public hearings for the Federal authorities to explain how they will monetarily support CALFED. USEPA receives its funding authority by being responsible for overseeing State implementation of the Clean Water Act and State Drinking Water Act.

Program Financing

Kate Hansel, CBDA, provided the Subcommittee with a handout that showed two tables of Year 4 proposed funding for drinking water quality. Kate described the near-term and long-term plan for program financing. The handout, which details the short-term funding, displayed funding for the California Bay-Delta Program, whose agencies include the CBDA (receives funds from General Fund), DWR (funding sources include the General Fund, Prop 13, and Prop 50), and SWRCB (funding from Prop 50). The total amount available for the California Bay-Delta Program is \$3.110 million. The second table on the handout details Statewide Proposition 50 Drinking Water Quality Funding, whose implementing agencies are DHS, SWRCB, and DWR. There is \$150.815 million available through Prop 50 for drinking water quality funding. Kate reported that the sooner these three implementing agencies can come together and make their draft budgets available, the better.

Regarding long-term funding, Kate described the process, timeframes, and deliverables of the long-term financing report. There will be three reports, the first of which will likely be an issues summary paper for the BDPAC August meeting. This paper will also describe the framework of who pays what and the benefits. Consultants are working on this first issue paper, and there will be an independent panel to review the report and framework, most likely in July. There may a delay in getting the finance report completed, due to the unresolved issue of potential user-fees

described in the ROD. Kate hopes to have the finance report ready for the Governor's January 10, 2004 budget. Now that the CBDA has appointed members, the process can move forward slightly by having at least the first issue/framework paper available for the August BDPAC meeting.

The finance plan is on a 20-year timeframe horizon, with a seven-year first stage. The BDPAC will be asking what is the projected amount of money that each project element will need for the next 20 years. Reviewing each program plan task, the BDPAC will ask the Subcommittee how tasks were funded in the past.

Questions and Comments

- Co-chair Marguerite Young had a question regarding money from 414—she was informed that 414 money cannot be applied towards drinking water quality projects.
- A representative of the SWRCB commented that they are encountering layoffs and may not have resources yet to draft a new finance plan; they would like to be able to finish the old work before starting new staff on new projects. SWRCB finance plans also must involve or receive approval from the California Watershed Council.
- DHS indicated that they were nearing completion of their draft report. It was requested that the DWS be able to review the draft report at the August meeting, if time allowed.
- DWS members asked how they could develop measures that cover the ELPH strategy from top to bottom. Kate responded that the DWQ Program Plan had been reframed to include ELPH. Addressing problems with the North Bay Aqueduct is a good example, but additional information is needed.
- Kate asked the Subcommittee if they have been considering long-term financing in their meetings. Co-Chair Marguerite Young responded that they have been focussed on the framework and policies of the DWS.
- It was asked where the Environmental Water Account (EWA) fits in to the financing objectives. Kate answered that the EWA is very complicated; it will be hard to measure the benefits or provide a description about the beneficiaries.

Action Item

- *If time allows, arrange space on August agenda for a review of the DHS draft finance report.*

Public Comment

Steve Macaulay, CUWA, expressed his appreciation of the last presentation. He asked what the stakeholder involvement has been in the process. He also questioned why, if the CBDA is a combined Federal/State project, why is it so concerned with the Governor's budget. Kate responded that the Governor ordered Kate to execute a budget review. She admitted that public involvement in the process could be difficult because of the sensitivity of the Governor's budget.

A member of the audience recommended using microphones or changing the arrangement of the Bay-Delta Room for upcoming meetings, since many of today's speakers were barely audible.

Next Meeting

August 22, 2003. The exact time and location will be determined later, but the meeting must be over by 1 pm if co-chair Marguerite Young is to be involved. Karen Schwinn reported that she will be unavailable this summer, with the exception of participating in the NGT workshop. All questions or comments for Karen can be directed to Liz Borowiec at USEPA.

Agenda for August 22, 2003

NGT workshop summary
CVDWP update, CVRWQCB workshop preparation and review
California Watershed Council presentation
B160 meetings update
Task Force creation for assisting with assessment required by ROD at end of 2003
DWS criteria for RFPs
DHS draft finance report review
Report on grant possibilities for regional water quality planning
Regional planning in progress update/report/presentation
Science Panel Questions (?)

Partial List of Attendees for the DWS Meeting 06-27-03

The following Subcommittee members attended the meeting:

1. Greg Gartrell
2. Sujatha Jahagirdar
3. Robert Neufeld
4. Pankaj Parekh
5. Tim Quinn
6. Michael Stanley-Jones
7. David Tompkins
8. Walt Wadlow
9. Leah Wills
10. Marguerite Young
11. Tom Zuckerman

Other meeting participants:

12. Elizabeth Borowiec
13. Brian Campbell
14. Brad Coffey
15. James Cornelius
16. Bill Crooks
17. Dave Forkel
18. Nicki Giese
19. Sam Harader
20. Lisa Holm
21. Ed Horton
22. Syed Khasimuddin
23. Karen Larsen
24. Kenneth Landau
25. Leslie Laudon
26. G. Ford Lee
27. Laurie Luke
28. Steve Macaulay
29. Terry Macaulay
30. Julie Maclay
31. Wayne Pierson
32. Karen Schwinn
33. David Spath
34. Mark Stadler
35. Phil Wendt