

Meeting Notes

Evaluation of the MUN beneficial use in Agriculturally Dominated Water Bodies

February 20, 2015

9:00 AM

Location: Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board Office, 11020 Sun Center Drive, Suite 200
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670: Training Room

Attendees:

California Urban Water Agencies – Elaine Archibald

California Rice Commission – Roberta Firoved

Central Coast Cooperative Monitoring – Sarah Lopez (*by phone*)

Central Valley Clean Water Association – Debbie Webster

Central Valley Water Board – Anne Littlejohn, Cindy Au Yeung, Jeanne Chilcott

Kings River Conservation District – Casey Creamer (*by phone*)

Larry Walker and Associates – Tom Grovhoug

San Joaquin Tributary Authority – Dennis Westcot

Robertson-Bryan Inc. – Michael Bryan, Michelle Brown (*by phone*)

Sacramento River Joint Source Water Protection Program – Bonny Starr

San Joaquin Valley Drainage Authority – David Cory

Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District – Dennis Tristao

Turlock Irrigation District – Debbie Liebersbach

Meeting Summary

Goal of meeting: Obtain stakeholder feedback on the development of the Region-wide MUN Evaluation Process Basin Plan Amendment and prepare for Fresno Board Workshop in April 2015.

Basin Plan Amendment to Establish a Region-wide MUN Evaluation Process in Ag Dominated Water

Bodies

- Project Background/Overview: Central Valley Water Board Staff provided a brief review and background on the project
- Review of Project Alternatives and Action Items from September 2014 meeting
 - Staff provided a review of 4 project alternatives, including the preferred alternative of a region-wide MUN evaluation process using a water body categorization framework.
 - Action items from the September meeting included development of the preferred process using a San Joaquin River case study (San Luis Canal Company)
- San Luis Canal Company (SLCC)
 - Central Valley Water Board staff has been working with SLCC to complete a draft water body categorization report of all of their district water bodies.
 - Staff has also gone on two site visits to evaluate the district operations and validate findings
 - Findings include:
 - Total of 232 water bodies
 - 230 **C1** water bodies
 - 2 **M1** water bodies
 - Poso Slough
 - Salt Slough (already in Basin Plan with NO MUN)
 - All constructed or modified to convey agricultural drainage (no Supply Only channels)
 - Extensive hydrologic modifications (weirs, pumps, lifts, pipes, concrete lining, etc.)
 - ILRP and district water quality monitoring
- Discussion Items
 - Water Body Listings – Level of Detail. Central Valley Water Board staff initiated a discussion regarding the level of detail needed in the Basin Plan for listing potentially over 6000 water bodies. For example, the ISWP Report listed approximately 150 water bodies for SLCC in 1992. Currently, the district has named and mapped 232 water bodies. Do we need to list all of them in the Basin Plan or is there a way to make a

“tributary” type rule to provide coverage for non-listed water bodies? What would the cut-off be for listing or not listing a water body – a specific length? Acreages drained? Other? Stakeholder comments were as follows:

- General agreement that there should be some type of rule for covering connecting non-listed water bodies.
 - Suggested language for constructed water bodies: *The Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN) beneficial use designation of any specifically identified C1 water body will apply to its unidentified upstream C1 water bodies that provide continuous or intermittent flow to the identified C1 water body.*
The Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN) beneficial use designation of any specifically identified C2 water body will apply to its unidentified downstream C2 water bodies that receive continuous or intermittent flow from the identified C2 water body.
 - Having a specific cut-off using a length of water body or acreage served is too restrictive – water districts may vary greatly in size and number of water bodies.
 - Staff should work with each district to identify main system water bodies – keep it flexible.
 - Name the modified and natural water bodies, and use a “tributary” type rule just for constructed water bodies.
 - Use the word “distributary” instead of “tributary”.
- LIMITED-MUN. Central Valley Water Board staff asked for feedback on the options provided for a LIMITED-MUN definition and water quality objective. Stakeholder comments were as follows:
- The term “limited” makes the water body sound like it is already compromised in terms of water quality.
 - Could another word be used like “dormant” MUN?
 - Using the terms “conventional treatment” and “extended treatment” is not appropriate, as treatment methods can greatly vary.
 - Would Department of Drinking Water (DDW) ever permit a LIMITED-MUN water body? Central Valley Water Board staff indicated that in discussions with DDW,

they indicated that the LIMITED-MUN beneficial use would not prohibit permitting. DDW examines a number of other factors in their permit evaluation.

- Secondary MCLs are reported to the public by water purveyors, so it is not appropriate to remove them from the water quality objectives.
 - Use of Antidegradation policy in the objective seems like “hand-waving” and does not provide enough specific guidance.
 - What would happen to the designation of the water body if it supplies MUN in the future?
 - Using different “classes” of water bodies for the LIMITED-MUN category is too complicated – simple is better.
- Monitoring/Surveillance. Central Valley Water Board staff identified monitoring and surveillance as an issue area that needed further stakeholder input at a future meetings. Staff asked stakeholders to identify specific concerns. Comments were as follows:
- How to we evaluate the cumulative impacts of re/dedesignations?
 - Will the LIMITED-MUN beneficial use water bodies be required to have monitoring conducted (similar to the Sources of Drinking Water 2B exception requirement for ddesignated water bodies)?
 - Concern that monitoring will not quickly detect water quality changes – are there regulatory processes in place to catch a problem in a timely manner?
 - What type of evaluation will be done on the monitoring data and by whom?
 - What are the long-term cumulative impacts of these potential changes? How do we evaluate and assess for this?

Discuss Project Schedule and Future Meetings

- Sacramento POTW Basin Plan Amendment
 - Regional Board Hearing to consider adoption of the amendment – April 2015 Board meeting in Fresno.
- Region-wide MUN Process Basin Plan Amendment
 - Basin Plan Amendment Workshop – April 2015 Board meeting in Fresno. Staff invited stakeholders to participate in a public forum.

- Next Stakeholder Meeting – will be scheduled after April 2015 workshop.

Action Items:

- *Any stakeholders interested in being part of a forum for the April Workshop will contact Anne Littlejohn*
- *Anne Littlejohn will send out Meet-o-Matic schedule and Save-the-date emails for the next stakeholder meeting.*
- *Meeting notes will be posted to the website*