

7/23/98

C-016541

Water Quality Issues Matrix
7/1/98

| | Water Quality Issues | When | | | | Type | | Workplan Efforts | Agency Participants |
|----|---|------------|-------|-----------|---------|----------|---------|--|--|
| | | Pref. Alt. | Final | Phase III | Elevate | Decision | Process | | |
| 1. | There is a perceived conflict between the development of wetlands and drinking water quality. (New) (DWR, USGS) | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | Rick Woodard developed a description of the significance of turbidity and TOC both to aquatic habitat in the Delta and drinking water quality. (See issue #2 attached 7/5 memo) | ART review and revise. |
| 2. | The relative importance of toxics as an ecosystem stressor must be better understood. There is some concern that the ERP does not adequately describe the relative importance of the various environmental stressors. (Phase II Doc.) | | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | <p>The Comprehensive Monitoring and Research Program (CMARP) will identify research and monitoring programs required to better understand the role of toxics and ecosystem health.</p> <p>This effort will also include the development of conceptual models to suggest various ways in which toxics might enter the system and how adverse effects might be observed.</p> <p>The early implementation program is funding limited research and monitoring of toxics.</p> <p>ERP will work with Water Quality Program to resolve.</p> | <p>CMARP</p> <p>Randy Brown, DWR</p> <p>Larry Brown, USBR</p> <p>Brue Herbold, EPA</p> <p>Karl Halupka, NMFS</p> <p>Fred Nichols, USGS</p> <p>Peter Stine, USGS</p> <p>Larry Smith, USGS</p> <p>Margaret Johnston, SFEI</p> <p>Elise Howard, TBI</p> <p>Pete Rhoads, MWD</p> <p>Bellory Fong, CALFED</p> |

C-016541

| | Water Quality Issues | When | | | | Type | | Workplan Efforts | Agency Participants |
|----|---|------------|-------|-----------|---------|----------|---------|---|--|
| | | Pref. Alt. | Final | Phase III | Elevate | Decision | Process | | |
| 3. | Conclusions regarding the relative significance of changes in parameters affecting drinking water (e.g., Table 6.1-1 p 6.1-9 Draft EIS/EIR) will be revised based on further work of water quality program. Analysis should reflect timing of impacts of alternatives due to staged implementation, relative to time frame of compliance with new drinking water standards. For example, differences in alternative with respect to bromides may not occur in the time frame for decisions needed for compliance with drinking water standards. (New) (EPA) | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | Added from Main Document Matrix. Offered as a heads-up. See issue #3 attached. | ART to review and discuss. |
| 4. | The quality of drinking source water at intake is "bottom line" to suppliers. Evaluate the significance of contaminants introduced from terminal reservoirs, watersheds, and aqueduct conveyance to treatment requirements and costs. Evaluate, in this context, the relative significance of Delta water quality and differences in this water quality with respect to alternative diversion options. (New) (EPA) | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | Added from Main Document Matrix. Offered as a heads-up. Water Quality workgroup is developing information at program level. | Drinking water workgroup. Brian Bergamaschi, USGS Bruce Macler, EPA roy Wolfe, MWDC Rich Breuer, DWR/MWQI Paul Gilbert-Snyder, DHS Bob Hultquist, DHS Roberta Borgonovo, LWV John Winther, Delta Wetlands K.T. Shum, CCWD Jerry Troyan, SRCSD Carl Lischeske, DHS Elissa Callman, Sacramento] G. Rded Lee, GFL & Associates |

| | Water Quality Issues | When | | | | Type | | Workplan Efforts | Agency Participants |
|-----|--|------------|-------|-----------|---------|----------|---------|---|-------------------------|
| | | Pref. Alt. | Final | Phase III | Elevate | Decision | Process | | |
| 5. | Should CALFED take a position resolution of long-term drainage problem. (New) (EPA) | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | Develop issue paper for Policy Group.. | ART review and revise. |
| 6. | The allowable concentrations for some constituents in the CALFED Water Quality plan are higher than in EPA's California toxics rule and NMFS/FWS' biological opinions. (New) (NMFS) | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | CALFED agencies need to resolve their differences and inform the program to ensure consistency. | ART review and discuss. |
| 7. | CALFED program too narrowly focused on drinking water quality with too little attention paid to environmental water quality. (New) (FWS) | ✓ | ✓ | | | | ✓ | Patrick Leonard to discuss with Rick Woodard to SEE. | ART review and discuss. |
| 8. | CALFED has not yet examined/described in the EIS/EIR how each conveyance feature will affect the common program. (New) (CDFA) | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | Steve Shaffer and Rick Woodard to discuss and report back to group. | ART review and discuss. |
| 9. | There are differing opinions regarding the most effective program approach: a regulatory framework to enforce the objectives versus an incentive-based or "safe harbor" approach to encourage voluntary partnerships to reduce non-point sources. (#1 on 6/2 Matrix, #5 on 7/1 Matrix) | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | Water quality program implementation measures are being developed by the WQ technical groups and will be incorporated in the WQ implementation plan. These measures are expected to combine incentive-based strategies with the appropriate regulatory framework. | All |
| 10. | This element needs to be better integrated with other parts of the Program, including ecosystem restoration and water use efficiency. (#2 on 6/2 matrix, #5 on 7/1 Matrix) | | ✓ | ✓ | | | | Integration of program elements will be an ongoing effort, which will be largely accomplished through the Implementation Plan that will synchronize and prioritize CALFED actions. | All |

| | Water Quality Issues | When | | | | Type | | Workplan Efforts | Agency Participants |
|-----|--|------------|-------|-----------|---------|----------|---------|---|--|
| | | Prof. Alt. | Final | Phase III | Elevate | Decision | Process | | |
| 11. | There is concern that this program element is not sufficiently aggressive or adequately developed to accomplish more than current water quality efforts. (#3 on 6/2 Matrix, #7 on 7/1 Matrix) | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | Advance work for Phase III has begun. The Water Quality Technical Group is developing additional program detail and prioritizing specific actions. The results of this effort will be available in time for the final EIS/EIR. | All, acting through the Water Quality Technical group and the subteams that are developing individual pieces of the program. |
| 12. | There are differing views on the specific drinking water quality targets as well as on the means to achieve drinking water quality objectives (providing the highest quality source water versus relying upon treatment methods). A cost comparison is also needed. (#4 on 6/2 Matrix, #8 on 7/1 Matrix) | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | An expert panel is being convened to evaluate the significance of bromide to the CALFED Preferred Alternative. The results of the panel will be useful for establishing drinking water quality targets. Cost comparisons will be included. The panel report will be available in August 1998. | All, acting through the Water Quality Technical Group which is helping to select the panel and formulate the tasks to be undertaken. |
| 13. | There is disagreement over whether the program should include dilution-oriented actions. (#5 on 6/2 Matrix, #9 on 7/1 Matrix) | | ✓ | | ? | | ✓ | A draft proposal is being reviewed by ART \$ either it will be resolved at the level or elevated as appropriate. | ART Management Team |