

Emerging Constituents Workgroup

May 19, 2009

ATTENDEES:

LeAnne Hamilton, IEUA	Chandra Johannesson, City of Riverside
Nel Groenveld, IEUA	Lyndy Lewis, City of Corona
Greg Woodside, OCWD	David Aladjem, SBVMWD/WMWD
Kathy Kunysz, MWDSC	Sam Fuller, SBVMWD
Bart Koch, MWDSC	Jack Safely, WMWD
Roger Lewis, LACSD	Edward Filadelfia, EMWD
Jodie Nygaard, LACSD	Jayne Joy, EMWD
Linda Garcia, WMWD	Norris Brandt, EVMWD
Bobby Gustafson, City of SBMWD	Gerry Thibeault, CRWQCB
Valerie Housel, City of SBMWD	Tim Moore, Risk Sciences
Sean McCarthy, CDPH	Mark Norton, SAWPA
Kristen Wardlaw, YVWD	Regina Patterson, SAWPA
Karen Baroldi, OCSD	

Call to Order / Introductions

The Emerging Constituents Workgroup (EC) meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m. at the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority located at 11615 Sterling Avenue, Riverside, California. Introductions were made.

Approval of April 30, 2009 Meeting Summary

Mark Norton asked if there were comments or revisions to the April 30, 2009 Meeting Summary. Greg Woodside asked that item 6 on page 4 be clarified. Tim Moore said he would discuss the item during the meeting. Hearing that, the meeting summary was received and filed.

Regulatory Implementation Issues Related to EC Monitoring - Risk Sciences

Tim Moore distributed the SWRCB's "Notice of Public Workshop on Climate Change Reuse Urban Runoff Measure Implementation" reporting discussions will include the expectation of a new state law as to how much of a million metric tons of CO₂ equivalent (MMTCO₂E) have to be divided by specific sectors, and shows how much of a carbon reduction is expected by certain water treatment processes. While there are expectations for reducing emissions, there is also some expectation that more treatment is needed.

The following are used in the collection of data:

BAT (Best Available Technology) - In California, ammonia control has risen to the level of being BAT. It originated as a water quality based standard for toxicity, but it has now come to be a technology based standard as well. Nitrification and denitrification are expected. Is there a requirement that if we have the technology to reduce or minimize, is it required that it be implemented? Is there enough difference in cost between chlorination and ozonation that if

you happen to be an agency that's deliberating on a treatment expansion or a new plant, is it reasonable that the Regional Board might expect you put in ozonation as a technology based standard? Jayne Joy said you may create other problems outside of ECs. Chlorination may work better on something else that may be toxic. This is site specific. Gerry Thibeault said Doug Drury and Jörg Drewes have shown that the different methods are more effective for certain constituents and not for others. Discussion ensued.

Jayne Joy stated the first draft of the general discharge permit states that if ECs were found in the recycled water, it was prohibited from being used. The language has been pulled based on comment. There is a workshop on that today. David Aladjem said that view is out there so we should take it into account and should not be using it in California. Mr. Moore said he wants the investigation program to go forward so it can be used as a template. We want to make sure there is enough substance behind the decision. Mr. Thibeault said the point of the process was to use different products and decide where the problem was.

Ms. Joy stated that EMWD is on board to do the monitoring, and further stated that it would be nice to document the process as we move forward.

303(d) List - In the Ocean Plan, the State Board said that some kinds of data are appropriate for some purposes. Individual samples of bacterial data may be sufficient to do initial monitoring or permit investigations, but by definition were not sufficient by themselves to support a 303(d) listing. If you have EC data studies that show the effects on liver enzymes and a collapse of a fish population, at what point would it be necessary to do a 303(d) listing? It's more surface water recharge than groundwater recharge. Is it an appropriate use of that data? Toxicity is a method defined parameter. The method we choose to measure it becomes the threshold for when it exists and when it doesn't.

Antidegradation - Antidegradation appears to be a policy which operates irrespective of harm. It indicates that you should not lower water quality unless your doing so would provide maximum benefit to the people of the State (Porter-Cologne language), or doing so is necessary to accommodate economic growth in the region (federal language). Many believe that when talking about degradation; it is not incumbent to make a demonstration that whatever new emission of mass with concentrations is occurring is harmful. We merely have to show that it should not be authorized unless doing so provides maximum benefit to the people of California. In that paradigm, it would be easy to see how ECs might be problematic.

How do we avoid a triggered antidegradation situation? Do you make a finding that it's not degradation, or make a finding that it provides maximum benefit? How do you make a finding that the presence of Tylenol, where it wasn't before, is not a degradation? Degradation isn't nearly the more mass or more concentration, it is more mass in the direction of something thought to be harmful. It implies trending towards harm.

Kathy Kunysz requested an outline that lays out the arguments. Mr. Moore said he will create an annotated bullet outline that will ultimately turn into water quality objectives. Mr. Fuller said once the small list is created, how do we identify frequency and location? Mr. Moore said he does not know yet. Mr. Fuller said it may be helpful to develop the white paper for the

Regional Board and useful to identify their process and public concerns. Mr. Moore said we implement what they tell us to say.

Blue Ribbon Panel - Status

Tim Moore reported all of the Blue Ribbon Panel has been named. The facilitator is SCCWRP. He stressed the importance of this Workgroup following the progress of the Panel. Mr. Norton suggested that those following the progress invite someone from the panel to a Workgroup meeting or write a letter outlining the Workgroup's concerns.

Future Meeting

July 14, 2009 at 1:30 p.m. (tentative)

Adjournment

The Emerging Constituents Workgroup meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Handout

1. SWRCB Notice of Public Workshop – Climate Change Reuse Urban Runoff Measure Implementation