

**RANKING OF WATER QUALITY ACTIONS LIST  
BY CUWA WATER QUALITY COMMITTEE**

Action/Rank/Comments

- |     |          |   |
|-----|----------|---|
| 1.  | High     | Will not benefit the North Bay Aqueduct.  |
| 2.  | Low      | Will not benefit the North Bay Aqueduct.  |
| 3.  | Low      | Will not benefit the North Bay Aqueduct.  |
| 4.  | Negative | May possibly increase TOC levels? Also, urban water conservation is already in place in most large communities.   |
| 5.  | Negative | May possibly increase TOC levels? Water reclamation is already being implemented in a number of areas, therefore benefit may not be as great.   |
| 6.  | Low      | Overall low, but potential high benefit for TOC removal. Studies underway by DWR to examine delta island drainage treatment. Does not address other sources of agricultural drainage. |
| 7.  | Low      | Will not benefit North Bay Aqueduct. Low priority for conjunctive use water.  |
| 8.  | Negative | Localized drinking water quality benefit only. Re-directs problem.  |
| 9.  | High     | Catastrophic event benefit only.  |
| 10. | High     | Laws already in place, need better/additional enforcement.  |
| 11. | High     | Laws already in place, need better/additional enforcement.  |
| 12. | Moderate | Where does "high quality" irrigation water come from? Action needs more details.  |
| 13. | High     | Eliminating Delta discharges near intakes would be a good first step. This could be very beneficial in the North Bay Aqueduct intake area.  |
| 14. | Moderate | Action needs more detail - need to address waterfowl concerns.  |
| 15. | Negative | This may actually increase TOC levels.  |
| 16. | Low      | How would brine be disposed of?   |
| 17. | Low      | Are existing stormwater permitting programs already going to do this? Assume this can only apply to Tracy, Sacramento, and Stockton.  |
| 18. | Moderate |   |
| 19. | Moderate |   |
| 20. | Moderate |   |
| 21. | Moderate | Needs more description.   |
| 22. | High     | Would gain support from wastewater agencies.  |
| 23. | High     | Not sure how much of a problem this is but it is a good idea, and probably only needs more enforcement.   |
| 24. | Negative | This may actually increase TOC levels. Is this really a problem?  |
| 25. | Moderate |   |
| 26. | Low      | How much of a problem is this?  |
| 27. | Low      |   |

28. Low Erroneous action item - filtration already required in California.
29. Moderate Benefits ecosystem only, related to specific geographic area only. What parameters are improved?
30. Moderate Ecosystem benefit only.
31. High Worthy goal but monitoring alone is not an action that improves water quality.
32. High (ADDED ACTION ITEM). Financial incentives for integrated pest management for agriculture (Bios Program).

3406g 210-0214-2030-000-00-0-0 Roefs

Roefs began negotiations with two candidates for the Delta Model Review Team being developed by The Peer Review Committee of the Bay Delta Modeling Forum. The candidates are people who are not employed by any of the agencies and have expertise on modeling. They would be employed for this purpose by the San Francisco Estuary Institute. Agency members of the team have already been appointed. Wong is Reclamation's appointee.

From  
Ted

CALFED 210-0863-6000-000-00-0-0 Roefs

Roefs and about 60 others attended a CALFED Water Quality Committee meeting on 11/20. Woodard now leads this group. Midway through the afternoon, Woodard said we were considering water quality actions independent of what is done in the Delta. While this explains why I and others had been somewhat mystified about the actions the committee is considering and the way in which those actions are evaluated, it is a mistake. Actions taken in the Delta can affect water quality quite dramatically and can affect the results of other actions. Several members of the audience commented on the lack of analytical work in the action selection process. Roefs said that we really did not have enough information to reduce the action set from 31 to 10. Howe, Gaston, and Dickey of CH2MHill made presentations on "acceptable ranges" of water quality parameters from the Ecosystem, Drinking Water, and Agricultural uses respectively. Several audience members commented that the Ecosystem acceptable ranges could not be met in the real world. Roefs made a similar comment about 0.7 dS/m EC criteria for agriculture. One could meet it by not diverting water in drought years but this would not be likely to be acceptable to water users. Written feedback was requested by 11/27. Another committee meeting may be scheduled for 12/9.

Meetings

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Date/Loc.</u>	<u>Attendees</u>	<u>Time</u>
Coordinated Operating Agreement	11/25 Rm. 1131 Resources Bldg.	Renning*, Roefs, DWR	10:00
CALFED Combined Water Quality Team	12/9	Roefs, Quinn, other agency personnel, stakeholders	1:00
Bay-Delta Modeling Forum Steering Committee	12/12 Concord	Roefs	9:30
Dedicated Yield Subgroup	12/5 3310 El Camino	Sandberg*, FWS, Roefs Swafford, consultants	8:00