In Dgest of comments

(1) Importance of monitoring vs. implementing projects
(2) Suggestions for Bucordin Actions to put w/ importan of monitoring vs. implement projects
(3) Inrelation to CALFED RFP

Printed: 04-14-97
By: Howe, Carol
Priority: Normal
Topic: RE: CALFED Actions RFP
Sent: 04-14-97
From: rwoodard@goldeneye.water.ca.go
To: Howe, Carol; Carol Howe

Mail*Link»

RE: CALFED Actions RFP

>X-Sender: snluoma@dcrcamnl.wr.usgs.gov (Unverified)
>Date: Fri, 11 Apr 1997 19:01:27 -0700
>To: Chris Foe <chrisf@bptcp1.swrcb.ca.gov>
>From: "Samuel N Luoma, Supervisory Hydrologist, Menlo Park, CA "<snluoma@usgs.gov> (Sam Luoma)
>Subject: RE: CALFED Actions RFP
>Cc: aquasci@aol.com, awconsult@aol.com, bfinlays@hq.dfg.ca.gov,
> bherbold@aol.com, bobf@delta.dfg.ca.gov, brucet@sfei.org,
> chrisf@bptcp1.swrcb.ca.gov, dehinton@ucdavis.edu, dmfry@ucdavis.edu,
> gfredlee@aol.com, hbailey@evs.wa.com, jay@sfei.org, jtm@crl.com,
> karent@bptcp1.swrcb.ca.gov,
> "Kathryn M Kuivila, Research Hydrologist, Sacramento, CA "<kkuivila@usgs.gov>,
> "Lawrence H Smith, Supv. Hydrologist, Sacramento, CA "<lhsmith@usgs.gov>,
> "Larry R Brown, Research Physical Scientist, Sacramento, CA "<lrbrown@usgs.gov>,
> lwintern@water.ca.gov, mjsnyder@ucdavis.edu, mjunginc@aol.com,
> nsinghasemanon@cdpr.ca.gov, phyllisfox@aol.com, scottperl@aol.com,
> slanderson@lbl.gov,
> "Samuel N Luoma, Supervisory Hydrologist, Menlo Park, CA "<snluoma@usgs.gov>,
> spies@amarine.com, valc@bptcp1.swrcb.ca.gov, vicdv@bptcp1.swrcb.ca.gov,
> wabennett@ucdavis.edu, cdarling@water.gov.ca, rwoodard@water.ca.gov,
> "Samuel N Luoma, Supervisory Hydrologist, Menlo Park, CA "<snluoma@usgs.gov>
>
>Chris,
>I think there is a difficult problem with the way that the water quality
>subject areas are stated. The statement "Reduction of ...." implies that we
>know exactly what the problem is and how to fix it and all that is necessary
>is a "project" to do the fix. If these statements are carried forward they
>will leave the public with the naive impression that the water quality
>problems are simple, there is a clear perpetrator to blame (and we know who
>that is), and inaction has been the only reason the problems have not been
>fixed. In fact, we do not adequately understand the significance of some of
>these problems, we do not always know the cause where the problems are
>significant, and we certainly do not know the fix (the simple "just quite
>discharging it" fix is rarely a feasible option; nor will it withstand

>careful scientific or public scrutiny).
>
>I think the actions might be better stated like the following, in order to
>generate the most creative studies:

>2. Establish the ecosystem significance of the pesticides Chlorpyrifos,
>>Carbofuran, and Diazinon in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and
>Delta; verify the important sources among the surface agricultural drainages
>and Delta island drainages; and develop cost-effective mechanisms to reduce
>discharges from the significant sources.
>
>3. Establish the significance of pollutant inputs from urban storm runoff to
>the Delta and Bay, especially considering Diazinon and Chlorpyrifos,
>nutrients, salinity, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, PAH's and metals. Verify
>which of the pollutants create the greatest threat to significant species,
>establish which sources of urban runoff are the most important, and develop,
>test and monitor cost-effective mechanisms to reduce the most significant
>discharges.
>
>>4. Determine if reduction of copper, zinc, and cadmium inputs from abandoned
>>and inactive mines into Sacramento River above Hamilton City would be
>effective in improving the survival of critical species in the Sacramento
>River, Delta and North Bay ecosystems. Reduce inputs at places and times
>that would improve the survival of critical species.
>>
>>5. Establish the significance of selenium from subsurface agricultural drainage in
>>the Grasslands area to the welfare of the ecosystems of the San Joaquin
>River, the Delta and North San Francisco Bay. Establish the relative
>importance of other sources of selenium including internal sources from
>historic contamination, and establish which species are most threatened by
>existing or possible future contamination. Use this knowledge to determine
>how to most effectively remove the selenium threat to the critically
>affected species in the Delta ecosystem.
>>
>>6. Coordination of watershed water quality
>>activities related to toxic contaminant reduction
>>and development of watershed-wide solutions to water
>>quality problems affecting the
>>ecosystem.
>>
>>7. Establish the significance of the several possible sources of mercury
>contamination in impaired water bodies, as defined through the CALFED Water

>>Quality Program; consider and compare inputs from specific abandoned and
>inactive mines, gold mining activities and internal cycling as
>possibilities. Determine which of the critical species in the Bay ecosystem
>(or which resources) are most threatened by mercury contamination and
>develop a cost-effective program that reduces mercury contamination and
>threats to these species by attacking the most significant sources of the
>problem.

>
>CALFED has got to believe that focused science will help them solve the
>restoration problems in this estuary. Physical restoration is a useless
>endeavor without improved water quality, and the public knows that.
>Improving water quality is not a simple engineering problem. Properly
>focused studies are necessary for cost-effective solutions. I believe a
>statement of the need for actions like those above shows both an
>appreciation that the problems are challenging but also shows a plan of
>attack that is rational and systematic. It does not pre-judge who the
>perpetrators are, or that all problems are highly significant. Moderate
>statements like those above will allow all parties to climb aboard and
>support the CALFED studies.
>
>This was not succinct; but I hope it helps.
>
>Sam Luoma
>
>
>>PWT, I got this e-mail from Cindy Darling yesterday and need your help.
>>Some background. CALFED is composed of 4 groups including an Ecosystem
>>Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration Group. A number of you
>>participated in the water quality scoping efforts to develop a list of
>>constituents of concern that exceed Basin Plan water quality objectives or
>>other criteria and actions to reduce or eliminate the exceedances. Little
>>discussion occurred at the scoping meetings on the ecological significance
>>of the exceedances. Conversely, the Ecosystem Restoration Group divided
>>the Central Valley and Delta into habitats and key species and are
>>recommending a series of actions to attempt to restore them.
>>Unfortunately, the Ecosystem Restoration Group did not consider
>>contaminants. One of Cindy's jobs is to develop the RFP for spending
>>early implementation funds. She has asked the PWT to review the Ecosystem
>>Water Quality groups recommended priority actions and suggested criteria
>>for evaluating the proposals to ensure they are complete. CALFED hopes to
>>release the RFP in early May. Hence, our comments are only of value if
>>we get them to Cindy pronto.
>>
>>I think the best way we can help CALFED is to try and collate our
>>recommendations into a few succint comments, assuming we have any. Maybe
>>the best way is for each of us to review the actions and criteria and
>>e-mail me and the rest of the group with your thoughts. I will try and
>>collate these and send on to Cindy next thursday AM (17 April). I will
also
>>collect all the original comments and append them onto the back of the
>>document. What do you think? Does this make sense? Chris.
>>
>>---------- Forwarded message ----------
>>Date: Wed, 9 Apr 97 18:40:54 EDT
>>From:cdarling@goldeneye.water.ca.gov
>>To: chrisf@bptcp1.swrcb.ca.gov
>>Subject: RE: <NO SUBJECT>
>>
>>Thank you for helping solicit input from the IEP
>>Contaminants Effects Work Team. The questions I
>>would appreciate input on are:

>>Are there other additional actions that they would