

California Bay-Delta Authority Committee  
Drinking Water Subcommittee  
Draft Minutes  
Meeting of October 24, 2003

The Drinking Water Subcommittee met on October 24, 2003 at 9:00 am. Co-chairs Greg Gartrell and Marguerite Young welcomed the group. Several subcommittee members participated by telephone. A list of meeting attendees from the voluntary sign-in sheet is at the end of this document.

***Meeting Summary***

Draft Minutes September 26, 2003

Elaine Archibald provided suggested changes to the Central Valley Drinking Water Policy Update section of the previous draft meeting notes. Edits will be reflected in the revised draft September notes, and will be re-distributed at the next DWS meeting for final approval.

Central Valley Drinking Water Policy Update

Elaine Archibald (CUWA) provided the Subcommittee with an update. She reported that since the last DWS meeting, the CVDWP proposal has been submitted to the State Water Board. She noted that Liz Borowiec of the US EPA has been assisting the group with the proposal. Agricultural stakeholders have been participating as well, and the CVDWP group has been cultivating relationships with San Joaquin Valley farmers.

DWS Agricultural Nominations

Co-chairs Greg Gartrell and Marguerite Young announced that they have reviewed the nominations of three potential candidates to represent agricultural interests in the DWS.

- Lynn Barris (Butte County)
- Aaron Ferguson (NCWA)
- Walter Ward (Modesto Irrigation District)

CBDA Meeting Updates

Co-chair Greg Gartrell reported that the DWS Policy Framework was presented to the California Bay-Delta Authority and its Director, Patrick Wright, at the last CBDA meeting. Greg stated that there were questions related to agricultural issues. Specifically, one CBDA member felt that the recommendations concerning agricultural run-off were not focused enough. Greg informed the Subcommittee that he plans on bringing the Policy Framework to the Working Landscapes Subcommittee to receive input. The co-chairs asked Eugenia Laychak if it would be possible for them to have a briefing with Patrick Wright or his CBDA support staff to provide further details on the Policy Framework. She responded that a briefing with Patrick Wright could be arranged.

It was also reported that there will be a joint meeting of the BDPAC and the Authority in early December, the objective of which is to provide “staff updates and briefings” to appointees.

Rock Slough/Old River Projects

David Briggs, Contra Costa Water District, provided the Subcommittee with a presentation on a set of projects identified in the conveyance portion of the CALFED ROD (2000). The Rock Slough and Old River projects will improve water quality in the south Delta, improve operational flexibility of CCWD, SWP and CVP, and could save water, as well as implement BMPs and reduce the load of key constituents. David stressed that the schedule of these projects is critical to meet the ROD and CBDA timeframes, and to attain cost savings. He explained that these are multi-faceted, innovative and creative projects, with linkages to permanent barriers, 8500 cfs, and the Working Landscapes and Watersheds Subcommittees of the CBDA. The projects target problem drains specified in the ROD and Drinking Water Program Plan, address the source control of key constituents, and are integral to the ELPH strategy. They will help to prevent local non-point source pollutants from degrading source water quality through surface water and ground water run-off. Specifically, projects on Veale and Byron Tracts and the Contra Costa Canal will address the problem and implement the corresponding part of the CALFED ROD, while the BMPs will address broader issues. David displayed graphs regarding salinity in Rock Slough and at Old River, and schematics detailing the Veale Tract, Byron Tract, and Contra Costa Canal solutions to the problem. He stated that due to the short timeframe associated with the projects, local partnerships or collaboration might need to occur to facilitate implementation. David concluded his presentation explaining the schedule, costs, and funding decisions required in December by CBDA to keep the projects on schedule.

A meeting participant asked for clarification regarding the funding sources. David responded that studies began in 2000 with CALFED agency funding (EPA and DWR) and are co-managed by DWR and the CALFED Drinking Water Program. Sam Harader added that since these were actions directed by the ROD and are being addressed by one of the CALFED agencies (DWR), it is considered a "directed action" that does not necessarily have to go through a competitive funding process.

Marguerite Young asked about the reasons for the drainage problem Byron Tract project and if other options had been considered. David Briggs answered that it is easier to change the drainage outfall. Greg Gartrell stated that changing the timing of drainage discharge was considered but was not feasible because discharge is timed based on PG&E rates. He explained the dynamics of the containment plumes. Greg stated that there are a number of opportunities related to BMPs and improved water quality.

Marguerite Young inquired if there will be a measurement component related to the projects. Greg Gartrell responded that there will be, and that CCWD will examine other options for wetlands improvement in the area.

Lisa Holm, CCWD, stressed that they are trying to fund local salinity reduction projects.

David Spath asked for the locations of the other drains to the Delta. Greg Gartrell showed the drains on projected maps in the presentation. Greg explained that when the drains were in operations, the plumes would create a dirty boil in the water.

Pankaj Parekh asked if impacts from other constituents were being addressed. David Briggs answered that CCWD is also concerned with agricultural drainage and organic carbon, but these pathogens are harder to control. Pankaj recommended that if they can't determine a standard number for organic carbon, then they should focus on BMPs and load reductions. CCWD agreed.

Plan for DWQP Funds at ABAG

Sam Harader provided a hand-out detailing the proposed allocation of remaining ABAG funds for the DWQP. There is approximately \$1.8 million available which must be expended by May 31, 2005. Expedited decision-making and subcontracting will be needed to use all of the funds available for this contract. Sam reviewed the items in a prioritized list, beginning with a request for Subcommittee support and an RFP regarding an initial assessment of progress and performance measures for the DWQP. In addition to providing funding for a Southern California ELPH strategy (through the Southern California Water Dialogue), short-time funding is being provided for the ABAG/CALFED Task Force. Marguerite Young asked Sam if this Task Force was familiar with the ELPH strategy. Sam responded in the affirmative. Pankaj Parekh asked if the Subcommittee could receive a clearer understanding of exactly what has been spent in which areas outlined on the hand-out.

Marguerite Young stated her feeling that she was not aware of other CBDA programs that fund regional plans or programs. Martha Davis, who is co-chair of the CBDA Watersheds Subcommittee and is assisting with the Southern California Water Dialogue, agreed that they have an obligation to address water quality because of the funding they have received from DWQP. She added her opinion that if the DWS is interested in sharing funding with the Watersheds Subcommittee to achieve similar goals, a discussion should occur with Watershed Program Manager John Lowry.

Eugenia Laychak commented that the Conveyance Subcommittee is also providing funding for regional planning in the form of a Delta Regional Coordinator (Ron Ott). Sam reported that there are currently four Regional Coordinators (none for the San Joaquin area yet).

Marguerite Young asked for clarification on the line item marked Expert Panel. Sam explained that the Science Program requires the DWQP to establish the goals and charge of a DWQP Expert Panel, including potential members. The Subcommittee discussed the need for an Expert Panel and integration with the Science Program, but was unclear about how to proceed. It was suggested to discuss the details of the Expert Panel at a later date.

***Action Item: DWS work with Sam on determining charge of expert science panel.***

Marguerite Young inquired about the costs associated with the insert for the Estuary Newsletter. She stated that she felt \$30,000 was a large amount of money for a non-profit organization to receive for printing and distributing a newsletter. When asked if the ERP was also contributing \$30,000 towards this joint effort, Sam said no, but that the two Programs have shared costs similar to this in the past.

Lisa Holm asked where money for strategic planning has been included. Sam responded that the first two items would likely cover those costs. Lisa asked if the group envisioned developing different ELPH strategies for different constituents. Sam recommended potentially establishing a work group to discuss those strategies.

Sam was asked how quickly the turn-around time is for ABAG to process contracts. He responded that ABAG is relatively fast, taking about 60-90 days from the issuing of an RFP to establishing a contract. The Subcommittee encouraged Sam to work with ABAG to move expeditiously through the subcontracting.

Proposition 50 Implementation and Ranking Criteria

Gary Yamamoto of DHS gave the Subcommittee a presentation about Proposition 50 implementation and ranking criteria. Gary provided an overview of Prop 50 implementation (chapters 3, 4, and 6), in addition to the AB 1747 requirements to develop project solicitation and evaluation guidelines. Gary also explained the circumstances surrounding disadvantaged communities, asking for input from the Subcommittee on EJ issues.

Gary noted that the DHS Prop 50 implementation contained seven new grant programs, and one continuing grant program (SRF). There are implementation requirements from both Prop 50 and AB 1747, and the draft criteria will be posted on the DHS web site ([www.dhs.ca.gov](http://www.dhs.ca.gov)). Also, public meetings soliciting input on the guidelines will be held in Northern and Southern California. The guidelines are to be finalized by March 15, 2004, with a potential RFP date of April 2004. Projects would tentatively be selected by October 2004.

Pankaj Parekh and others inquired about the definition of “disadvantaged communities.” Gary explained that disadvantaged is defined as “annual median household income less than 80% of the statewide annual median household income.” There were many comments regarding that percentage, and that the cost of living in specific areas can vary greatly. However, Gary explained that the definition is determined by statute, and is not subject to revision. David Spath speculated that perhaps the definition of a disadvantaged community could be melded into the SRF grant process. Gary added that “communities” are determined by their service area boundaries only—not by census tracks.

Marguerite Young asked if there were going to be multiple grant cycles, or just one. David Spath responded that the program is on a four year release schedule.

Michael Stanley-Jones asked about the process for conducting outreach for the criteria workshops. He referred to a “stakeholder list” and inquired how that had been established. Gary and David responded that outreach would occur via the web site and public noticing to eligible public water-system users and stakeholders. They referred to the DHS web site, which has a link to the “stakeholder list” that lists those who are on the source water stakeholder committee. David asked for recommendations from the Subcommittee on the subject.

The group discussed the “match funding” nature of the grants, and offered suggestions on how to establish the split criteria. A fifty/fifty split was proposed. The group was reminded that disadvantaged communities are not required to match any funding.

Pankaj Parekh commented that the grants appear to be focused on treatment methods. He asked if any funding would be applied towards research or regional studies. Gary answered that there is some money available for research, but most is geared towards infrastructure treatment.

David Spath added that Southern Californians are eligible to apply for the SRF grants. He explained that regional application or multi-agency efforts would be acceptable, but one agency would have to take the lead. He stated there is a maximum of \$20 million per year per lead agency.

There was a discussion about local objectives versus the definition of multiple objectives. Gary could not recall a specific definition for multiple objectives.

Marguerite Young requested clarification between the SRF Health Risk categories and the contaminants listed in Chapter Six. Gary explained that the list of contaminants in Chapter Six also includes contaminants considered to be “on the edge.” A list of those contaminants was provided to the Subcommittee. Marguerite recommended considering reallocation of funds under Chapter Five.

The group expressed concern that applicants should not be able to receive funding from more than one grant. Gary agreed and explained measures that would prohibit that from occurring.

An explanation of “monitoring” grants was requested. Gary and David explained that funding could be provided for a variety of activities, including individual monitors, collector sample input, or source water quality monitoring.

Elaine Archibald asked if a group such as CUWA could apply for a grant under Chapter 4. One water agency would have to take the lead position, but CUWA could perhaps facilitate the process. Elaine was asked what type of proposal she was contemplating. She responded that potentially a feasibility study that would identify other agricultural drainage options in the Delta. David Spath commented that he was not certain if that type of feasibility study would be fundable in that Chapter. He noted that DHS is looking to fund BMPs projects that would improve (source) water quality.

Michael Stanley-Jones asked how long it would be between the stakeholder review and the final priority list. Gary responded that it would probably be 30 days, depending on the number of comments and staffing resources. Michael inquired about the types of comments DHS was likely to receive. Gary speculated that issues might be raised regarding the documentation required to support the ranking/category of proponents.

The Subcommittee discussed how AB 1747 requires public meetings. David Spath suggested that DHS follow the CDBA stakeholder review process. Some members of the group felt that a stakeholder review might result in a conflict of interest. It was suggested to have a third party “expert” review of the criterion instead.

***Action Item: DWS provide feedback to DHS on implementation and ranking criteria, particularly on project selection, solicitation, funding, the priority list, and stakeholder or expert review.***

### Regional ELPH Plans

Karen Schwinn, US EPA, addressed the Subcommittee and reviewed the purpose of the NGT workshop held in July, 2003. The NGT workshop was meant to highlight the most important issues/priorities that should be addressed by the DWS. Karen observed that the Workshop had identified the importance of regional and local water planning. Three DWS meeting participants provided short updates regarding the progress of the regional plans (covering Northern and Southern California) to the Subcommittee.

#### *Southern California*

Martha Davis informed the group that regional planning is a top priority for Southern California. The Southern California Water Dialogue is developing an assessment survey to determine where new water sources may be available, what key water quality issues are related, what treatment methods are being developed, etc. In Southern California,

new water supplies are coming from local sources, as well as from the Colorado River. Unfortunately, perchlorate is infiltrating many of these water supplies. A draft of the survey is expected to be completed shortly, with final versions to be distributed to General Managers of regional agencies, and retail and wholesale water agencies. A second questionnaire will be developed later as a follow-up to the initial effort. The Southern California Water Dialogue is hoping to have compiled data from responses to the first surveys within two weeks so that they can make a presentation at the joint meeting of the CBDA and the BDPAC in early December. Martha explained that the Southern Dialogue would appreciate DWS input and approval on water quality questions in the second survey. She commented that there are a few broad water quality questions in the first survey, but recommended the group suggest questions such as how implementation strategies might help meet the objectives in the CALFED ROD. Martha noted that the water quality questions of the second survey could focus on the structure of the ELPH diagram.

***Action Item: DWS assist Southern California Dialogue in developing next questionnaire to focus on elements of the ELPH strategy. An email list of those interested in assisting should be provided to Kathy Caldwell, Southern California regional coordinator.***

Martha was asked to comment on how the assessment would meet water quality needs in the Delta. She responded that Delta water quality is impacted by the amount of water that is diverted to Southern California. Martha stated that the water quality issues between Southern California and the Delta is a synergistic relationship with benefits and impacts flowing in both directions.

Lynda Smith, MWD, addressed the Subcommittee next with an update on Metropolitan Water District's efforts on developing a regional ELPH strategy. Lynda explained that MWD is a regional wholesale water provider. They are interested in:

1. Bay-Delta watershed improvements,
2. San Joaquin River Basin management actions, and
3. Joint-use of water in So Cal.

Lynda noted that some progress (e.g. at Frank's Tract) has been initiated to improve Delta water quality, though additional technical work is needed. MWD recognizes that water management programs can only be successful through partnerships. The priorities MWD has identified include the needed linkage of the three strategies (Delta, San Joaquin, So Cal), and a cost estimation. Work with local partners and technical studies will continue.

#### *Northern California*

David Briggs and Lisa Holm of CCWD spoke about the effort in the Bay Area to develop a regional ELPH strategy. Lisa provided a hand-out which showed an example ELPH diagram for Contra Costa Water District. This strategy has not been adopted by CCWD. David commented that in the past two years, many accomplishments and collaborative advancements have been made towards a regional understanding of water quality in the Bay Area. While there is not a regional ELPH plan yet developed, David noted that there is a task force and partnerships that are indirectly developing a strategy similar to the ELPH model. The Bay Area Blending Exchange group has become engaged and is broadening the scope of the task force to consider infrastructure planning, demand

management, etc. David commented that the Bay Area is on a similar path towards the same goal of regional water quality planning.

After reviewing the example ELPH diagram from CCWD, Marguerite Young asked where an investment from CBDA would fit in. Lisa Holm responded that it must be an iterative process—the local agencies will provide state and regional agencies with guidance. This would provide the appropriate tools and program flexibility.

Pankaj Parekh commented that in Southern California the water quality questions for the second survey need to be developed before a dialogue can happen. He asked David Briggs if any targets had been developed yet for Northern California. Lisa Holm responded that CCWD has adopted a salinity standard/target for the Los Vaqueros Expansion project (65 milligrams/liter), and that they plan to establish others.

Pankaj noted that initially CALFED target numbers were used, and now regional ELPH strategies are being developed with potentially different targets which may be more realistic for that region. He suggested looking at developing different standards for different regions.

Lisa Holm commented that it would be good to have an idea of what standards already exist and then make a connection. David Briggs added that he understands the need for guidelines and that the Bay Area effort is slowly establishing some. He said the group discussed the ELPH diagram six months ago, and he commented that Cindy Darling is the main contact for the Bay Area group who would have more knowledge about the progress of the task force.

### Strategic Planning

Sam Harader had requested that Charles Gardiner of Public Affairs Management make a brief presentation about Strategic Planning for the DWS. A Power Point presentation was developed and copies were made available to meeting attendees. However, due to time limitations, the presentation and discussion was deferred to a later meeting.

### Public Comment

There were no comments from the public.

### Review Action Items

Action items were reviewed and it was agreed that Sam, the co-chairs, and/or DWS support staff would follow-up with those whom have been assigned action items, as needed.

### Next Meeting

To be determined later, but November 21, 2003, was suggested. Location unknown.

### Agenda for November 21, 2003

To be determined later, though the deferred strategic planning discussion and an update on the performance measures workshop held on October 22 was suggested.

### **Partial List of Attendees for the DWS Meeting 10-24-03**

**The following Subcommittee members participated the meeting:**

1. Martha Davis (by phone)
2. Greg Gartrell
3. Michael Hanemann (by phone)
4. Pankaj Parekh
5. Ruben Robles (by phone)
6. Michael Stanley-Jones (by phone)
7. Marguerite Young

**Other meeting participants:**

8. Elaine Archibald
9. Elizabeth Borowiec
10. Bill Crooks
11. Ted Daum
12. Lori Grace
13. Sam Harader
14. Lisa Holm
15. Syed Khasimuddin
16. Eugenia Laychak
17. Julie Maclay
18. Lee Mao
19. Melinda Posner
20. Karen Schwinn
21. Lynda Smith
22. David Spath
23. Maria Tikkanen
24. Phil Wendt