

File *John Dickey*  
D# WQ - 97-298

**Dickey, John/RDD, 11:17 AM 1/9/97 , RE: your 12/18 memo on water q**

**1**

Return-Path: <JDickey@ch2m.com>

X-Ms-Tnef-Correlator:

<c=US%a=\_%p=CH2MHILL%l=CH2MHILL/GATE/00150F48@SMTPGATE.ch2m.com>

From: "Dickey, John/RDD" <JDickey@ch2m.com>

To: "rwoodard@honcho.water.ca.gov" <rwoodard@honcho.water.ca.gov>

Cc: "Howe, Carol" <carol.howe@us.mw.com>,  
"Ott, Ron (CALFED)"

<ronott@water.ca.gov>

Subject: RE: your 12/18 memo on water quality

Date: Thu, 9 Jan 1997 11:17:47 -0700

Encoding: 123 TEXT, 117 UUENCODE

X-Ms-Attachment: WINMAIL.DAT 0 00-00-1980 00:00

Rick -- Since we did not have a chance to discuss this yesterday, I will respond in this note.

I think the answers to Ted's questions are obvious to all of us. The question is probably how and whether to deliver them. I need to call him for input on our draft report, once that is out, but currently have no excuse to call. It seems to me that the response on these matters should come from you, since he directed the mail to you, and since they really go beyond technical questions. I will jot my thoughts into the message for your reference, and would be happy to help out in any other way that you would like.

By the way, we wound up with Carol's duty matrix filled out, and with a good start at a storyboard for the initial, technical part of the presentation. It looks like the "vision" part is as yet an outline, but once you put some meat to it, I am sure that Carol and the graphics staff can provide the images needed there.

-----  
From: rwoodard@honcho.water.ca.gov[SMTP:rwoodard@honcho.water.ca.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, January 07, 1997 12:45 PM  
To: Dickey, John/RDD; Gaston, John/SFO; ronott@honcho.water.ca.gov; carol.howe@us.mw.com; jheath@water.ca.gov  
Subject: your 12/18 memo on water quality

>Carol, John D: The following was sent today. Ted is obviously still not happy with the lack of scientific support for the actions. It seems to me we must try harder to explain that we have no intention whatever of spending money implementing actions without adequate study. Our priorities as listed now are entirely subject to change based on further investigation. As you see, he is also not comfortable with setting a salinity goal that might not be practical to meet. I would be interested in your thoughts on how best to address Ted's comments.

**Printed for rwoodard@goldeneye (Rick Woodard)**

**1**

Return-Path: <TROEFS-IBR21E@ibr2gw80.mp.usbr.gov>  
>Date: Tue, 07 Jan 1997 12:54:31 -0800  
>From: Ted Roefs <TROEFS-IBR21E@ibr2gw80.mp.usbr.gov>  
>To: rwoodard@water.ca.gov  
>Cc: rickb@honcho.water.ca.gov, EHOWARD-IBR21E@ibr2gw80.mp.usbr.gov  
>Subject: your 12/18 memo on water quality

>  
>I've finally gotten around to reviewing this memorandum. I am having  
>some trouble coming up with any comments that will be useful to the  
>process that appears to have been defined. The reason for this is  
>that there is difficulty in connecting the solutions proposed to the  
>goals of the process. Consider the high priority action  
>"Implementation of Integrated Pest Management in surface drainage  
>source areas, especially for parameters of concern. (Action 11, 32B)"  
>If this is implemented, pesticide loads to the Delta and tributary  
>streams will be reduced. Some of these pesticides have been shown to  
>be toxic to test organisms at some times and places. The test  
>organisms are not the species of most interest to those concerned  
>about ecosystem health. It is entirely possible that this program  
>could be implemented and that it would have absolutely no effect on,  
>say, salmon populations. My point is that the science does not exist  
>to warrant the expenditure of resources that might be made.  
The issue of test vs. indigenous species cannot be dealt with by the water  
quality team. However, with available data and an eye to species of  
concern, the ecological subteam somehow developed a list of pesticides that  
warranted the status "parameter of concern", presumably because of their  
potential to impact sensitive Delta species. Now we need to reduce the  
loads of these pesticides, or reject the work of the subteam. The  
constructive point from Ted's input, for me, is a reminder that this and  
related projects/actions should be focused on pesticides that are on the  
POC list, and not shotgunned onto any old acre of the Valley. So, we need  
to tie the pesticide use to land uses, then target those land uses. The  
dormant spray program is an example.

>  
>Unfortunately, this comment is not unique to this measure. Other  
>high priority actions appear not to have been subjected to the test:  
>do we know enough about the science to say that the action will have  
>the desired effect? The water quality committee is a mixture of  
>technical expertise and stakeholder interests. What the committee  
>should thinking about is how to bring more specific scientific  
>expertise to each of the measures being considered as high priority.  
>In some instances, this might be done by finding specific expertise  
>in the academic community to evaluate the proposed measures. In  
>other instances, there may simply not be enough knowledge to evaluate  
>the proposed measure. If that is true, the action should not be  
>characterized as "high priority."

>

The answer here is the one you gave yesterday. Our cooperators need to have a clear, pictorial, long-term vision of how and when sufficient study will be effected to allow informed decision making. You have articulated this many times and in several different ways. I don't think these folks are dense, but they are risk averse, and we need to find the words, actions, assurances, and credible, logical vision of our future process that will make them trust us enough to participate constructively. To do this, we probably need to do some research regarding their concerns, try to address them, pilot our message with sensitive folks, polish it some more, and then take it on the road. This means that the stakes for your "vision" part of the presentation are high, and that we need to do some reality checking to make sure that it conveys to each audience a measured, logical process that will perform needed analysis as it goes.

>Your memo also mentions target ranges for parameters. As I commented >earlier, I don't see the utility of listing 0.7 EC as a target for >agricultural water quality. In those areas where the water quality >is worse than this, it would take heroic measures such as desalting >or building a San Joaquin Valley Drain to make any significant >improvements.

Agricultural water quality criteria ranges need to be looked at in context. The documentation of subteam results that will be in the appendix of the report explains the technical basis for the ranges in some detail. At the policy level, we need to be explicit about the use of these ranges. They provide an intication of the needs of sensitive crops. We need to explicitly recognize that some locales currently receive water that is less than this ideal quality, and that CALFED will not necessarily be able to address this problem. However, the criteria should serve to inform CALFED actions by defining what agricultural water quality is. CALFED goals and solution principles, as I understand them, suggest that actions may in fact improve irrigation water quality in parts of the Delta, and should not result in significant degradation of water quality in export areas. The intent of the salinity criteria is clearly not to establish a level that must, through some magic, be achieved at every headgate in California.

>  
>  
>

begin 600 WINMAIL.DAT

M>)\^(@D3`0:0" `\$\$`~~~~~!`\$`0>0!@`(``Y 0`~~~~`#H`\$`(@ <  
M&`\$\$\$E032Y-:6-R;W-O9G0@36%I;"Y.;W1E`#\$(`0F`0`A`~~~~,D9#0C9%  
M,S%%-C8V1# Q,4(Q1#-\$-#4R,#-#,3 P,#`^08!((#`X`~`#-!P\$`"0`,  
M`<!P`\$`/P`06`P`.....S0<!`D`"P`1`"\!`M`0\$`-@`0`@`~~~~(  
M`@`!!( !`"4`~`!213H@>6]U<B Q,B\Q."!M96UO(&]N('=A=&5R('U86QI  
M='D`\$`@P!`Y`&!@3`7`~`0`Y`\$`<J&I9\_KL!`@!P`\$`~`~`E`~`~`4D4Z