

Emerging Constituents Workgroup

February 10, 2009

ATTENDEES:

Rudy Fandel, City of Corona
Dianne Franks, City of Corona
Linda Garcia, WMWD
Ben Pak, CBWM
Greg Hamer, AMEC – Geomatrix Cons.
Sean McCarthy, CDPH
Jayne Joy, EMWD
Roger Lewis, LACSD
Erika de Hollan, LACSD
Edward Filadelfia, EMWD
Mike Wehner, OCWD
Jason Dadakis, OCWD
LeAnne Hamilton, IEUA

Tim Moore, Risk Sciences
Gerry Thibeault, CRWQCB
Douglas Headrick, SBVMWD
David Aladjem, SBVMWD/WMWD
Mark Bulot, SBVMWD/SAWPA
Sam Fuller, SBVMWD
Jack Nelson, YVWD
Joe LeClaire, WE Inc.
Kathy Kunysz, MWDSC
Valerie Housel, City of SBMWD
Mark Norton, SAWPA
Dawna Munson, SAWPA
Regina Patterson, SAWPA

Call to Order / Introductions

The Emerging Constituents Workgroup meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m. at the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority located at 11615 Sterling Avenue, Riverside, California. Introductions were made.

Approval of January 13, 2009 Meeting Summary

Mark Norton asked if there were comments or revisions to the January 13, 2009 Meeting Summary. Jayne Joy asked that a change be made on page 2, paragraph 4, second sentence. Delete the sentence and insert: "She would like to see consistent factual public literature." A second correction was made to page 2, paragraph 5, line 10: change the word "contacts" to "context." Hearing no additional comments or revisions, the meeting summary was received and filed as amended.

Upon motion by Jack Nelson, seconded by Jayne Joy, the motion unanimously carried:

EC 09/02-01

MOVED, approve the January 13, 2009 Meeting Summary as amended.

Second Draft Summary Report – Risk Sciences

Tim Moore reported that he has incorporated the comments he received into the 2008 Summary Report. The changes are identified in yellow highlight on the distributed copies of the Report. Mr. Moore briefly reviewed each of the highlighted changes to the document, and explained/clarified the more significant changes.

A suggestion was made on page 15, second paragraph, to delete the word “considering.” Mr. Moore also will reword the last paragraph on page 15, incorporating the Task Force comments.

Tim Moore presented and reviewed Table 2: Key Points from Expert Presentations reporting this table pulls together the most essential points that the Task Force believes are significant to draw on. Mr. Moore solicited the Task Force for any additions or changes to the Table. He also will include the appendix under each of the expert’s names, showing where that information can be found. A suggestion was made to correlate the table with the reference pages on the Summary Report.

Jayne Joy said she recalls discussion in their presentation that they were not going to regulate this yet, but relying on OEHA. Mr. Moore said DPH did not see it as their responsibility to do the risk assessment. He said he will make that distinction clear.

David Aladjem said Dr. Eaton spoke about the sensitivity of the analysis and used the caffeine example and made the point that when you have blanks, when doing the QA/QC, that unless you are very careful, you get a lot of hits in the blanks. Mr. Moore said he will expand on that item.

Mr. Norton suggested listing the appendices and asked that the title page read “2008 Progress Report of the Emerging Constituents Workgroup” instead of “for the”.

Mr. Moore asked that David Aladjem brief the group on the recycled water policy.

Mr. Aladjem reported the State Water Resources Control Board (Board) put out a draft recycled water policy that was based on stakeholder recommendation in early December with comments received back just before Christmas. The majority of the 70 comment letters received said they like where it is going, but suggested ways to make it cleaner. The two things the Board wanted to do was some technical cleanup in the language and some concern about incidental runoff. This was the one issue the stakeholder group was not able to reach consensus on. The three associations Water Reuse, CASA and ACWA proposed alternative language, the Board considered that and staff recommended the alternative language not be included. There was a Board meeting that made minor changes in language that you have to get prior notification of the EO as opposed to approval by the EO for this so that you knew what was going on, but at the same time there was regulation of incidental runoff to prevent the discharge of recycled water into a stream or creek during a storm event. That may be why the final version is not on web site. The Board was vocal about the blue ribbon panel. They charged the deputy director, Jon Bishop to proceed quickly. He will be meeting with the stakeholder group to discuss that with the idea of going back to the Board in March or April with a proposal.

There are some specific questions that will be asked of the blue ribbon panel in the policy itself. The State Board was clear that they want to reserve their ability to make recommendations, and have flexibility and freedom of action. Mr. Moore said the panel has a year to submit a report to the Board assuming they kickoff sometime this summer, things should be moving well by the Fall of 2010.

Gerry Thibeault reported the State and Regional Boards are meeting on February 23rd or 24th. The Regional Board's chair has been asked to give a presentation on what this region has been doing up to this point. If the finished version of the report was available it would be shared with this group. **Mr. Moore will provide a draft of the report when it is available.**

Phase 2 Scope of Work and Budget

Tim Moore presented the Emerging Constituents Workgroup 2009 Task Schedule stating that prior to beginning Phase 2, the group should have the NWRI/MWD/OC study report before trying to do too much. The schedule that was presented suggests what we could get done with the hope of pulling the study in before anything is finalized. The study is necessary before designing anything for the long term. It has been requested that a presentation be provided at the next meeting. At that same meeting, EC Workgroup on March 24th, the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project (SCCWRP) group has asked to present what they have been tasked to do and why.

In the Phase 2 effort we can answer the questions 1) where it is we want to gather data from; 2) when and how often we'd like to see that data; and 3) why are we collecting the data. In May and June time has been set aside to address some of the issues that were raised in the white paper. Some of it may go away like what to do about the definition of contamination, antidegradation, narrative translation and the issue of making sure the data are used in its appropriate context. The goal is to be completed by the November 2009 Regional Board workshop.

Mark Norton said he would provide a more accurate cost at the March meeting. Comments should be submitted to Mark Norton or Tim Moore.

Future Meetings

- March 24, 2009 at 1:30 p.m.
- April 30, 2009 at 1:30 p.m.

Adjournment

The Emerging Constituents Workgroup meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.