

1. Why didn't people apply for Proposition 50 Chapter 8 (IRWMP) funds for regional ELPH plans?
  - a. Poor outreach?
  - b. Low priority need?
  - c. Benefits not clear?
  - d. High priority local/regional projects not water quality related?
  - e. Poor timing of PSP?
  - f. Burn-out on planning activities?
  - g. Unclear linkage between IRWMP and Regional ELPH Plans?
  
2. What is the purpose of a regional ELPH plan?
  - a. To inform WQP state-wide strategy
  - b. To inform the "Delta vision" – (the question of what conveyance in the Delta looks like twenty years from now, and informing the drinking water aspect of that discussion)
  - c. To assist locals/regions in identifying water quality issues, developing a framework to rapidly respond to emerging water quality, planning for and meeting future regulations and customer expectations
  - d. To blend water supply planning with water quality planning
  - e. To draw in utilities that haven't been involved or don't have the capacity to be involved
  - f. To describe the fundamental information underlying water quality decisions
  
3. Can we do targeted regional ELPH plans to inform the most immediate CALFED concerns while also starting the ground work on ELPH? (At the same time how do we ensure that the targeted regional ELPH plans are comprehensive enough to address the broader regional water supply/water quality issues; how do the broader issues affect the ELPH plans, if at all)
  - a. Potential targeted scope/schedule
  - b. Connection with CVDWP technical studies on Delta source waters
  - c. How much is needed to make decisions in Delta
  
4. What should be the contents of regional ELPH plans?
  - a. Identification of water supply and associated water quality (now, future)
  - b. Identification of water treatment processes and associated water quality (now, future)
  - c. Water quality reporting – constituents, frequency, averaging periods (based on current regulations?)
  - d. Local, regional water quality goals (taste as well as public health)
  - e. Identification of projects (local, regional) to improve water quality
  - f. Alternatives analysis of suite of projects (and what order of magnitude?)
  - g. Economic analysis of alternatives (including capital and O&M estimates, what order of magnitude?)

5. How do we get truly *regional* planning? Or how do we get comprehensive regional planning that incorporates ELPH as a component?
  - a. Identification of common water supplies, water quality goals, water quality issues, treatment processes
  - b. Identification of infrastructure, supplies that are geographically close within a region
  - c. Identification of processes/functions that could be more efficient at a regional level (efforts to protect common water supplies, develop goals, address issues, demonstrate treatment)
  - d. Identification of projects that result from this investigation
  - e. How do we balance local control with broader benefits?
  
6. What conditions should be imposed to end up with plans that can be coordinated/information that can be synthesized?
  - a. Water quality data reporting
  - b. Common basis for future population estimates
  - c. Common future assumptions about the Delta (perhaps a range)
  - d. Common future assumptions about treated water regulations
  - e. Common set of alternatives analysis criteria (including reliability)
  - f. Plan performance metrics based on content requirements, regional analysis
  - g. A vision for the synthesis/coordination that's established at the beginning of the process (including what we view to be CALFED's role in which water sources)
  - h. A way to address the coordination needed between water quality and water supply reliability