NOTES
INTERAGENCY MEETING
Source Water Assessment Program (SWAP)
April 14, 1977

Agencies represented at the meeting included:

- CDHS, WRCB, EPA, CDFA, CALFED, DPR, CCDEH, USGS, BLM, Placer County Environmental Health, Contra Costa County Environmental Health, DWR, Dept of Forestry and Fire Protection, RWQCB (North Coast, Colorado River Basin, Lahontan, Central Valley), US Bureau of Reclamation, US Forest Service

Dave Spath of CDHS Drinking Water Program welcomed attendees and provided background on SWAP development.

The agenda was reviewed and meeting objectives presented (see attached copy of agenda).

Judy Blume of EPA provided an overview of EPA's SWAP guidance development process and asked that people review the draft guidance distributed at the meeting and provide comments by June 13, 1997 to EPA.

Alexis Milea and Bob Hultquist overviewed the SWAP requirements, timelines for development and implementation and the CDHS approach used to develop the current draft.

Next the group commenced discussion of six "issues" identified to date related to the draft SWAP.

- **Standardized mapping to facilitate integration of information**

State Storage Retrieval System (CIRRUS) mentioned as a vehicle; possible contacts are Ken Harris (SWRCB), Paul Vasse (CDFG), Nassar Batini (DWR) and Clay Brandow (Forest Resource Assessment Program planning)
(Coordinated with Teale Data Center?) Developed originally to account for the cumulative effects of timber harvesting (hydrologic). It is a good place to start. Have expanded to include delineations in S. Calif. also, but status for central Ca is unclear.

Watershed survey mapping- Some larger utilities are on GIS (or may be able to be when updated), but they are not standardized. EBMUD uses Teale.
Should maps be standardized? Cliff Bowen stated that it would be useful. However, smaller systems do not have the resources to do GIS. It is possible that smaller system is included within a large system's watershed and the larger may map for the smaller. Perhaps set-aside money from the SRF could be utilized.

How should GIS be completed? DHS might be able to do smaller systems at some point in the future, given resources. Watershed could be addressed by a group with each participant taking a piece to complete the job.

Should GIS be mandated? Mandated for certain types of systems? Perhaps. Should set-aside money be used for standardizing GIS? Perhaps some link can be used that

- **Contaminant source inventories**

(The federal SWAP guidance requires that the state complete inventories of sources of contaminants that could contribute a contaminant for which there is an MCL; if some are excluded, the state must explain why. States can include additional contaminants that they believe are a health risk.

There are over 80 contaminants with MCLs in Ca, most found infrequently, especially organics. Some inorganics are found more frequently, particularly nitrate.

What type of contaminant sources should be defined/included? Possible to classify according to the SIC form. Look at specific industries that use some screening/grouping. Use draft contaminant inventory form for groundwater sources developed for the Wellhead Protection Program. Also, there is inf. available from various publications that list types of constituents which may come from a contamination source.

Many agencies have inf. on identified sources---underground tanks (UST), mines, etc. Can perhaps look at categories of types---databases may already be available, e.g., UST's. Landfill data is available, but not on GIS.

Perhaps can address the cumulative impacts by grouping contaminant sources.

Clarification on the use of the word "monitoring". When DHS uses it, it refers to monitoring done of drinking water sources for the purposes of evaluating water quality for compliance with the drinking water standards. There is also the case of the "monitoring well" drilled specifically to monitor the movement of one or more contaminants.

The contaminant source list perhaps should vary by the scale and/or type of systems to consider the feasibility of implementation; if too overwhelming, may be difficult to complete. The draft contaminant inventory list includes potential as well as existing sources. The volume of the contaminant may also be a consideration and should be considered in the susceptibility analysis. Historical practices are of interest since past activities are a concern. Cultural practices (e.g., how applied) may impact the effect on the water source. Could group by herbicides, pesticides, organics, diesel/gas, etc. The forms should be specific for groundwater and surface water sources.

- **Vulnerability/sensitivity assessments —Should risk ranking be done?**

Look at rate of travel of contaminants; some do not move. Some have properties that limit/enhance movement and thus risk impact. It could be possible to establish zone for categories of contaminants --- the criteria would be different for groundwater and surface water and could provide the baseline for analysis. EPA has a book on surface water --2 volumes entitled "Fate in the Environment".

Information—what data, assessments, delineations are available form other agencies or sources?

DPF --groundwater database; just starting a surface water database. Have a 100% use reporting database by section and township and range. May move into GIS; hare having some potential problems with this. Have information on specific pesticides---some inf. may be proprietary, but DPR could facilitate discussion.

DTSC ---hazardous waste disposal facilities, Class I. The County Environmental Health and Fire Departments (may be separate offices) keep an inventory of storage/generators of hazardous materials and pesticides used. Site mitigation. Again, needs to be tied to GIS to make useable. The Thompkins Guide converts latitude/longitude to addresses.

There is a statewide disposal site database.

There could be a range of implementation activities depending on location/size of watershed. Perhaps DHS could list the databases in the area available for communities/utilities. Or DHS could compile the inf. that is available on a state-wide basis and then local agencies could fill in the local sources. This inf. would create a broader view which a community could use as a basis for developing a more specific localized inventory.

AB1803 may have inf.

Other sources Storet, National Watershed Assessment Program, national Pesticides Survey, National Toxics Inventory; state fire marshal (pipelines); Regional Boards have inf. on waste discharge permits, some data on sewer lines, CAPO; Department of Water Resources has the MWQI Program and State Water Project; USGS has a GIS layer; confined animal feed lots, but number of animals not included at each location; NWIS, GWIS; GLM, Forest Service, Co. Ag Commissioners all should have animal grazing and land use plans.

- **Public participation**

DTSC - for the hazardous waste program; site mitigation regulation revision involves stakeholders. As of yet, no regulations have been developed.
Regional Boards - have public process w/major permitees/enforcement; they identify the stakeholders which are those who are involved in the particular situation.
Environmental Impact Statements, EIR and CEQA must involve stakeholders.
Inland Surface Water Plan - involving lots of consensus building; the process is bogged down, but it is not the process that is flawed, although at times it is quite painful and time consuming.
DPR - utilize newsletters to keep the involved stakeholders up to date and to keep them tied into the process inbetween drafts/sessions.
Cal/Fed - has a list of stakeholders (state and federal agencies) They have a technical team, management group, general public informational meetings. The groups meet separately, they do not meet all together; separate planning/policy aspects. Hired facilitators.
Early input on process is important; try to get input from a variety of groups. Workshops would be a good idea.

Who can participate on DHS technical advisory group? John Marshack, possibly (Central Board) and Neil Dubrovsky (USGS).

Agencies were reminded that the matrix of agency responsibilities is due May 1st.

A final check in with the agencies for points not previously mentioned was done:
Regional Board - Watershed Management Initiative and SWAP must coordinate; very similar; have contaminant sources; basin planning element, but need to coordinate on standards.
BLM - inf. on land they administer and the permittees
USFS - water quality monitoring data
Department of Forestry - ongoing monitoring of sediments
DPR - interested in watershed concept, mapping, information sharing, controlling pesticides to avoid surface water contamination
should involve **NRCS**

CDFA - ag statistics unit (the County Ag) may have inf. on confined animals and may know the number of animals; can help with identifying stakeholders including ag commodity groups; have fertilizer research program.
Ca Assoc of RCD - water quality, grass roots organization
Placer County Env. Health - involved in resource planning; coordinated resource plan for the American River; looking at fire management, stream restoration; will have this type of data; wants to talk with DHS at least, if not coordinate, together.
Riverside County Env Health - can give some assistance jot small systems; has some data
Contra Costa County - may have ability to help small systems; regulates individual sewer systems and hazardous waste
USGS - has a cost sharing program; can do sensitivity analyses
DWR - sanitary survey on state water project; access to large number of S. Cal stakeholders; contacts: Carl Hauge, Raymond Tom
Cal/Fed - Lots of places to integrate; throughout watershed efforts. For public participation, has lists of ag, industry, local consumers; can share water quality inf. both ways with DHS; can be funding partners on source investigations and help out local groups; education, policy, etc.

Attendees were thanked for their presence and told they would receive the next draft of the SWAP; the meeting was adjourned.