

May 30, 1997

To: 1. ~~Steve Yaeger~~  
2. Lester Snow

From: Rick Woodard



Subject: Ag/Urban Water Quality Technical Team Meeting

I attended part of today's meeting of the subject group, specifically through item 4 of the attached agenda. The following summarizes my observations:

1. Attendance - Neither Amy Fowler nor Steve Ritchie were present. I did not succeed in contacting them at the ACWA conference and I have not had an opportunity to see them since then. Therefore, I have not yet had the opportunity to understand more fully what they have been saying to you. I prefer to speak to them in person, but may resort to the phone if I don't run into them soon.
2. Draft Action Plan, version of May 21, 1997 (copy attached)

I commented on their problem statement *The water quality program appears to be a peripheral issue in the CALFED process. It is expected that water quality will not be a key component of the process and that financial resources will not be available to correct water quality problems.*

This is the gist of what I said:

- First, I think the statement is inaccurate and does not reflect current conditions, though it may arguably have had some basis in a historical sense.
- It needs to be understood that ecosystem problems were the fundamental basis for formation of CALFED and that these problems were, necessarily, addressed as a first order of business in the CALFED program. Accordingly, the authorizing legislation spoke primarily to this, and program development has followed that course. This is the reason why the ecosystem restoration component of the program is more extensively developed at this stage than are the water quality, system integrity and supply reliability components.

(At that point, Elaine Archibald said that she had been misled by the Prop. 204 title which did contain "safe drinking water" language)

- Though water quality has gotten a somewhat slower start, and somewhat less initial emphasis (as has also been the case with levees and channels) and although some of the water quality program structures are not yet fully in place, I am confident that CALFED management has made the necessary decisions to enable full development of this program component. In my view, therefore, it is not that water quality is peripheral to the

CALFED process, and it certainly is not to be expected that water quality won't be a key component. It is simply that we haven't completed development of the program. That is where I think the Ag/Urban group can help us as we move forward.

3. They are considering proactively seeking out environmental representatives. A policy group decision will be made soon on this. I told them that we had made some efforts to secure environmental group representation on the Water Quality Technical Group, and if Ag/Urban makes the decision to seek out their participation, I would provide them with the names and numbers of the environmental representatives we have found that are willing to become active in water quality deliberations.
4. I told them we would soon be forwarding recommendations to CALFED management for water quality modeling, and invited their assistance and recommendations.
5. Also attached is a copy of their work plan for the ag and urban caucuses providing some indication of what technical work they are performing and when the results are expected.
6. Elaine said Steve Ritchie had told Lester in their recent meeting that he had "heard a rumor" to the effect that thought was being given by CALFED to getting a water quality representative on the Ecosystem Roundtable, and that Ag/Urban strongly supported that. I was asked if I had heard such a rumor and responded that I had not, except that Lester did mention to me that Steve had made such a suggestion.

One of the attendees at today's meeting indicated Greg Gartrell and Amy Fowler should be able to adequately represent water quality interests on the roundtable, so I did not sense a strong unanimous conviction that additional water quality representation is needed on the Roundtable. Also, Elaine said that it was recommended to Lester that the Water Quality Program staff be involved in reviewing early implementation proposals and making recommendations.

I was asked what my thoughts were and I said, speaking for myself, that I am quite comfortable with Greg and Amy with regard to their ability to represent water quality interests, and I think the most important thing is to develop a sound structure for water quality program involvement in the decision making processes involving proposal of projects, review of proposals, funding recommendations, technical review of project reports, etc. I also told them that, predating their recent meeting with Lester, Steve had already described to me a conceptual approach that would accomplish this objective. And, I invited their assistance in developing this concept

Attachments

0530LS