30.15.00 D# WQ-96-248

Return-Path: <lsnow@honcho.water.ca.gov>
From: lsnow@honcho.water.ca.gov
To: rwoodard@water.ca.gov, Syaeger@water.ca.gov
Subject: RE: Disc. w Pat Wright re WQ report
Date: Mon, 6 Jan 97 13:12:17 PST

--- Begin Included Message ---

>From POP2-Server@honcho Mon Jan 6 09:46:52 1997
Return-Path: <76055.2213@compuserve.com>
Received: from zephyr.water.ca.gov by honcho.water.ca.gov (4.1/EXEC-1.1)
id AA04276; Mon, 6 Jan 97 09:49:16 PST
Received: from dub-img-2.compuserve.com (dub-img-2.compuserve.com [149.174.206.132])
by zephyr.water.ca.gov (8.8.4/8.8.4) with SMTP
id JAA21398 for <lsnow@water.ca.gov>; Mon, 6 Jan 1997 09:35:10 -0800 (PST)
Received: by dub-img-2.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)
id MAA05623; Mon, 6 Jan 1997 12:33:11 -0500
Date: 06 Jan 97 12:31:41 EST
From: "byron m. buck" <76055.2213@compuserve.com>
To: "Anson B. Moran" <amoran@puc.sf.ca.us>
Cc: elaine archibald <awconsult@aol.com>, wally bishop <wbishop@ccnet.com>,
richard denton <wrccwd@ccnet.com>, randy kanouse <rkanouse@ebmud.com>,
steve macaulay <macaulay@dcn.davis.ca.us>,
doug owen <74277.1067@compuserve.com>,
Lester Snow <lsnow@water.ca.gov>, Walt Wadlow <wadlow@ix.netcom.com>,
ed winkler <73414.3617@compuserve.com>,
roy wolfe <rwolfe@mwd.dst.ca.us>
Subject: Disc. w Pat Wright re WQ report
Message-Id: <970106173140_76055.2213_GHC48-1@CompuServe.COM>
Content-Length: 1375
Status:

I connected with Patrick Wright at EPA this morning. He indicated that their
(Bruce Mackler's) read of the draft document was that our consultant's
regulatory scenario was too conservative. He also expressed Felicia Marcus'
concern that we're painting EPA headed in direction they might not be going. He
expressed concern that they hadn't been asked their opinion of where the regs
were heading in this process.

I said I understood their concerns, indicated that this was a draft which we had out for just such comments and that the briefing/meeting was a place where the issue of regulation could be addressed. Further, that it is difficult as water providers for us to make any assessment of future regulations due to at least a perception of conflict, thus we hired an independent panel, intimately familar with the process to make that assessment. I also noted that EPA has been understandably reluctant to be difinitive on this issue due to the ongoing rulemaking process. The upshot of this is that we may have EPA make some more definitive statements about where the regs are going or at least, how far they're not going. This would auger for having the final report show a variety of water quality requirements based upon lesser regulatory scenarios. Patrick also indicated that they need to coordiate with DC on any definitive statements.

byron

--- End Included Message ---