

Rick Woodard, 08:22 AM 1/28/98 , Additional Comments on Issues

X-Sender: rwoodard@goldeneye
 Date: Wed, 28 Jan 1998 08:22:16 -0800
 To: jheath@water.ca.gov
 From: Rick Woodard <rwoodard@water.ca.gov>
 Subject: Additional Comments on Issues for January 28 Meeting
 X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by
 goldeneye.water.ca.gov id IAA12666

>From: Gfredlee <Gfredlee@aol.com>
 >Date: Tue, 27 Jan 1998 12:35:00 EST
 >To: jheath@water.ca.gov
 >Cc: lwintern@water.ca.gov, rwoodard@goldeneye.water.ca.gov
 >Subject: Additional Comments on Issues for January 28 Meeting
 >Organization: AOL (<http://www.aol.com>)
 >X-Mailer: Inet_Mail_Out (IMOV11)

>

> G. Fred Lee & Associates

>

> 27298 E. El Macero Dr.
 > El Macero, California 95618-1005
 > Tel. (530) 753-9630 • Fax (530) 753-9956
 > e-mail gfredlee@aol.com

>web site: <http://members.aol.com/gfredlee/gfl.htm>

>Please note the new area code for telephone and fax has been
 changed to 530

>

>Via e-mail

> January 27, 1998

>Judy Heath

>CALFED Bay-Delta Program

>Water Quality Technical Group

>1416 Ninth Street; Ste 1155

>Sacramento, CA 95814

>

>Dear Judy:

>

> Responding to your January 13, 1998 memorandum concerning
 the Water Quality

>Parameter Assessment Team meeting on January 28, 1998 in which
 you present a

>revised agenda, I wish to provide the following comments. Much
 of the

>material presented in your January 13, 1998 memorandum had been
 previously

>distributed in an undated mailing to the Parameter Assessment
 Team

>participants covering the December 3, 1997 meeting. I have
 provided detailed

Printed for Judy Heath <jheath@water.ca.gov>

1

Rick Woodard, 08:22 AM 1/28/98 , Additional Comments on Issues

>comments to Rick Woodard, with a copy to you, on a number of aspects of the
>December 3, 1997 meeting.
>
>Chromium VI
>
> I assume that since chromium VI has already been reviewed by the PAT that
>there is no need to fill out the forms provided with your January 13 memo on
>this constituent.
>
>Request Forms
>
> The Request Form for Addition or Deletion to the CALFED Water Quality
>Parameter of Concern List appears to be appropriate provided that those
>completing the form provide detailed information on the PROBLEM.
>
> With respect to the "Parameter Characteristics," the fourth item, "The water
>quality problem caused by the parameter is generally recognized..." should
not
>be a major issue. The chromium VI problem is not generally recognized.
>Problems should be brought forth and allowed to stand on their own merit.
>Whether an agency or the scientific community generally recognizes the
problem
>should not be an important issue.
>
> The third from last item, "Preponderance of data on the parameter shows
>concentrations exceed established criteria for the applicable medium..." is
>dangerous. We have already seen how CALFED management is using Long and
>Morgan sediment quality guidelines without proper public peer review.
>
> A characteristic that is not on this list that should be is "Accumulate
>within aquatic organism tissue (bioaccumulation) to levels that cause the
>organisms to be considered hazardous to higher trophic level

Rick Woodard, 08:22 AM 1/28/98 , Additional Comments on Issues

organisms

>including man's use of the organism as food."

>

> Another characteristic that could be included that should be considered is

>impairing the aesthetic quality of resources, such as tastes and odors in

>fish. There are some constituents which, while not affecting water use

>directly, affect the use of the resources by causing the fish to have

>obnoxious odors.

>

> There are a number of Parameters of Concern already on the CALFED list

which,

>in my opinion, would not stand up to the scrutiny set forth in this type of

>review. It is for this reason that I have recommended that the Parameters of

>Concern all be subjected to the same degree of review and that this effort

not

>be restricted just to those that are to be added or deleted from the existing

>list.

>

> Attached to this January 13, 1998 memo is a "Summary of Common Programs"

>where the second bulleted item, "Water Quality" includes the terms

"pollutant"

>and "pollutants." To my knowledge, CALFED has never defined "pollutant."

Its

>management uses the term loosely to mean any chemical constituent.

>"Pollutant" should be explicitly defined in CALFED documents as those

>constituents which impair the designated beneficial uses of the CALFED

>jurisdiction waters. This would be in accord with Porter-Cologne and Clean

>Water Act definitions. Under these definitions, a "pollutant" is not a

>constituent that in some places at some times from some sources may be

adverse

Rick Woodard, 08:22 AM 1/28/98 , Additional Comments on Issues

>to water quality. It is a constituent that has a high degree of potential to >be specifically adverse to water quality within the Delta and its associated >waters.

>January 28, 1998 Meeting Agenda

> In the Agenda for the January 28, 1998 meeting provided with your January 13,

>1998 memo, you have provided a list of parameters that are to be discussed.

>>From my experience, a number of these parameters, such as chromium VI, fall in

>a similar category as do a number of those already on the Parameters of

>Concern list, i.e. should be reliably monitored to determine whether there is

>the potential for a significant water quality problem. This monitoring should

>also include an evaluation of potential target values or, more appropriately,

>approaches for establishing load reductions of toxic - available forms of

>constituents.

> It is important that at the January 28, 1998 meeting a clear statement of

>what is going to be done with these target values be presented. The last time

>I heard anything on this was almost a year ago when at that time the Water

>Quality Technical Group was headed down a technically invalid path of

>conducting chemical constituent modeling to determine the load reductions

that

>must occur to achieve the target values. With very few, possibly no

>exceptions, the degree of understanding of load of constituent - water

quality

>impacts that exist within the Delta is so inadequate at this time that any

Rick Woodard, 08:22 AM 1/28/98 , Additional Comments on Issues

>attempts to do modeling of the type that was discussed a year ago to establish
 >appropriate loads will be a waste of money. Several years of properly
 >conducted, intensive work needs to be done on virtually all of the parameters
 >of concern before first, it is possible to define that there is a real water
 >quality problem associated with the parameter and second, define a target
 >value which could serve as a basis for establishing the load reductions of
 >those sources that contribute toxic, available forms of the constituent to the
 >waterbody that is impacting the Delta's resources.

>MTBE

> Ange Werner of the Sierra Club has recommended that MTBE be added to the
 >Parameters of Concern. I have considerable familiarity with MTBE as water
 >pollutant and have accumulated literature beyond that referenced by Ms.
 Werner
 >on this issue. It is my recommendation that MTBE, like a wide variety of
 >other parameters, be included with chromium VI as a potential Parameter of
 >Concern for which there is need for monitoring within the Delta to determine
 >whether its concentrations occur at sufficient levels to be a threat to the
 >aesthetic quality of drinking water, public health and aquatic life. The
 >problem of MTBE universally, thus far, are aesthetic quality, i.e. tastes and
 >odors, in water supplies. Contrary to the implications, there is considerable
 >information which indicates that it is not a significant threat to public
 >health or aquatic life. Yesterday, the American Water Works Association
 >newsletter announced that the US EPA has recommended MTBE levels of 20 to 40
 >ug/L in domestic water supplies based on objectionable tastes.

Rick Woodard, 08:22 AM 1/28/98 , Additional Comments on Issues

addressing

>bioaccumulation of constituents in fish.

>

> The sediment targets listed involving Long and Morgan co-occurrence values

>are, as discussed in previous correspondence, not appropriate guidelines for

>CALFED programs. These so-called guidelines are based on obviously well-known

>to be technically invalid approaches to estimate whether a constituent in a

>sediment is toxic. A far more reliable, readily implementable approach is to

>directly assess toxicity. This approach has been used since the late

1970s by

>the US EPA and Corps of Engineers in regulating contaminated sediments

>associated with dredging projects. It can and should be readily used in the

>Delta. No attempt should be made to use chemical concentrations in

sediments

>to estimate the critical concentrations of chemicals that are of concern

>because of their toxicity to aquatic life. There have been a number of

recent

>reviews of this issue, including those conducted by the US EPA and NOAA that

>have concluded that the use of the Long and Morgan values for estimating

>whether a chemical constituent in sediments is, in fact, toxic is about as

>reliable as flipping a coin. Over half the time, the Long and Morgan values

>have been found to be wrong when an unbiased set of data is used.

The focus

>in the CALFED Delta Water Quality Management Program should be on chemical

>impacts, i.e. toxicity bioaccumulation, and where problems are found,

>determine the constituent(s) responsible for the toxicity/bioaccumulation.

>

> I look forward to the discussions that will be held on January 28, 1998.

Rick Woodard, 08:22 AM 1/28/98 , Additional Comments on Issues

>Hopefully, this could be an important meeting to help set a more appropriate
>course for the CALFED Water Quality Management Program than has been
>formulated previously and apparently exists today.

>
>
yours,

Sincerely

>
>
Lee

G. Fred

>
>
Lee, PhD, DEE

G. Fred

>Copy to: R. Woodard
> L. Winternitz
> L. Snow

>
>
>GFL:oh
>