

# BACWA Recycled Water Committee Meeting Notes

EBMUD Headquarters – 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Small Training Room

February 5, 2014

10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

## 1) Introductions – C. Muñoz

- Linda Hu - EBMUD
- Alec Naugle – Regional Water Board
- Jessica Zadeh –CSJ/SBWR
- Nathan Hodges – CCCSD
- Roanne Ross – WBA for Redwood City
- Vince Christian – Regional Water Board
- Tom Hall – EOA
- Lorien Fono – BACWA
- Beverly James – Novato Sanitary District
- Rhodora Biagtan – Dublin San Ramon Services District
- Andria Loutsch – CDM Smith for NBWRA
- Ben Livsey – Region Water Board
- Christy Kennedy – RMC for Sonoma Valley County Sanitary District
- Dave Richardson – RMC
- Cheryl Munoz - SFPUC  
*On phone*
- Eric Hansen – City of San Jose
- Michelle Young - City of San Jose
- Eric Rosenblum - Enviro Perspectives
- Ken Torke – Palo Alto
- Leah Walker – City of Petaluma
- Jayne Strommer – Delta Diablo Sanitation District
- Pam John - SCVWD

## 2) Presentations on Salt/Nutrient Management Plans – A. Naugle/C. Kennedy

### a. *Overview from the Regional Water Quality Control Board* ([link to presentation](#))

Alec Naugle from the Regional Water Board gave a presentation on the Region's development of Salt and Nutrient Management Plans. He reported that 31% of SF Bay area water supply is local groundwater and surface water. Most of that (20% of the total, or 2/3 of the local supply) is groundwater, which is used for both urban water supply and agriculture. Regional Water Boards don't have resources to initiate SNMPs. There are 28 groundwater basins in Region 2, of these there are eight priority basins due to either being the highest use by volume or have major community reliance. The three initial priority basins that are preparing SNMP are Santa Clara Valley, Livermore Valley and Sonoma Valley. Each of these have a single administrative entity currently managing the basin are acting as a lead agency for the Regional Water Board to work with. The Regional Water Board expects the other 25 basins to prepare SNMPs eventually. How these are going to get done and who is responsible for getting these done is unclear

A primary technical challenge to SNMP development is how to determine assimilative capacity. Since there is some assimilative capacity in the three priority basins studied, they are not going through a scientific review. While these basins are fine overall, there are some hot spot exceedences and there are now management actions for those areas. In areas where water quality objectives (WQOs) are exceeded, antidegradation issues come into play, although beneficial reuse is considered a large benefit to offset some degradation. When there's incremental degradation and WQOs are met, there still needs to be an antidegradation analysis. They plan to finalize the three plans in 2014 and adopt a basin Plan Amendment in 2014/15. They're hoping the other five priority basins

(Clayton, Niles Cone, Westside, Half Moon Bay and Pascadero) will take the lead in developing their own SNMPs. There is a map of “gamma” priority basins developed by the State around the 2001/2 timeframe which focuses on pollutant concentrations, but not groundwater use. The eight basins in the presentation are the ones that the Regional Water Board is most concerned about.

The Regional Water Board expects the other 25 basins to prepare SNMPs eventually, particularly before a recycled water project is approved by the Regional Water Board. How these plans are going to get done and who is responsible, beyond the Regional Water Board's, for getting these plans done is unclear. Regional Water Board indicated they would like the plan done before a recycled water project is approved by the Regional Water Board. There was discussion on the appropriateness of obligating an agency that wants to a permit for a water recycling project to prepare a SNMP for a basin. Recycled water tends to be a very small contributor of salt or nutrients to groundwater recharge compared to other sources. A requirement for a SNMP can be a discouragement to the expansion of recycled water in the Region. It was pointed out that preparing a SNMP is not a requirement of the General Permit 96-11.

Eric Rosenblum asked if, given the drought and the Governor's request for suggestions on ways to ease administrative requirements to support increases in recycled water, whether there are workarounds to help expedite recycled water projects in the absence of adopted SNMPs. The 96-11 order helps to facilitate projects and streamline the permitting process. Alec said they recognize that there are basins without the resources to do SNMPs and we need to figure out a way to easily look at impacts. Alec likes the idea of a tiered approach with offramp.

*b. Sonoma Valley Salt Nutrient Management Plan – Dave Richardson and Christy Kennedy ([Link to presentation](#))*

There are 2,200 permitted wells in Sonoma Valley and there was an existing stakeholder group that meets monthly. More than 50% of the water used locally is from local groundwater. There are two areas that are beneath sea level. Groundwater levels are generally declining in the shallow aquifers. They relied on extensive nitrate and TDS monitoring as part of putting together an SNMP. Salt gradient increased towards the Bay. There was generally very low nitrate. They did a mass balance and recycled water only contributes about 1% of TDS, and 2.8% of nitrate to the basin. They set 10% of assimilative capacity as a cap, and found that no project scenarios were close for TDS. They did get close for nitrate but did not exceed the threshold. To fill data gaps they asked CDPH and local well owners to report TDS level more frequently. The SNMP is done, but changes in the document could be triggered by future projects so go to the website to get the latest version: [www.scwa.ca.gov/SNMP/](http://www.scwa.ca.gov/SNMP/)

*c. Salt Nutrient Management Plan Guidance Document*

The guidance document is one of the appendices in the [IRWMP](#). It has seven steps for putting together an SNMP. There are off ramps built in at various steps. After initial basin characterization there are off ramps 1) if there are limitations for groundwater as public water supply, and 2) if no exceedence of water quality objectives are projected.

Linda asked if you could streamline the first steps if you know *a priori* that your groundwater isn't useful as a public water supply. Dave Richardson compares it to putting together CEQA documentation in terms of the level of effort. Alec said they are not interested in holding up recycled water projects without a an adopted plan, but you still have to address the concern, which means they probably won't let it stand in the way where there aren't known groundwater quality problems. Bev asked about cost of SNMPs, as well as the cost to get to the first offramp. She pointed out that it's not a practical requirement to require these to be done prior to recycled water projects being permitted, given the drought emergency. There should be an extension in the due date for SNMPs in the policy. Tom Hall brought up that we should also be looking at developing SNMP offramp definitions of *de minimis* recycled water loadings – i.e. where the recycled water salt and nutrient loading contribution is tiny compared to the overall applied water loadings to the groundwater basin. Eric asked Tom to draft some language he could use for his reply.

**3) BAIRWMP & Prop 84 Updates – C. Muñoz/L. Hu**

*a. Update on BAIRWMP activities*

*i. DWR review of Plan scheduled to be completed by end of Mar 2014*

This has slipped from previous timing goals.

- ii. *Provide agencies a resolution template for adoption. Needs to be adopted by May 11, 2014 by any agency that is receiving a Round 1 or 2 grant.*

This is a problem given DWR's late review. We are anticipating minor comments from DWR, so it's alright if Agencies/Cities adopt the current version and allow for minor editorial changes later. Some have heard that there are concerns our side of the region that the SFB plan isn't "integrated" enough.

- b. *Update on Prop 84 activities*

- i. *Round 2 update*

Round 2 projects got final approval by DWR on February 4..

- ii. *Round 3*

- *Local Call for Regional and Subregional Concept Submittals*

- (a) *Funding allocations for regional and subregional projects*

The Coordinating Committee has set local deadlines for project proposal submittals. Regional proposal deadline is March 31. Subregional proposal deadline is April 30. The CC has set targets for regional and subregional pools to both have a range of \$20M to 50M. There are at least five regional projects expected to be submitted: The BACWA nutrients proposal (which may include the recycled water projects), a pipeline transfer to Bethany Reservoir (Contra Costa Water District), Shoreline Sustainability, NOAA precipitation forecasting, and regional conservation. Steve Richie said that recycled water projects should apply for both regional and subregional. Cheryl will distribute a template for project information that needs to be submitted for the regional project to this committee's mailing list. The due date is February 10.

- (b) *Recycled water projects Need the following information:*

- Project name/description/scope/ primary contact/ lead agency
- Included in 2013 IRWM Plan?
- Ready to Proceed? Provide Schedule (CEQA, Design, Construction 2016-2021)
- Can you provide 25% local match? Provide total project cost
- Can you provide cash for consultant (\$10-25K) for regional applicants (FY15)
- Can you clearly define/ measure project benefits (AFY, MGD)
- Can you provide benefit/cost analysis when needed?
- Which regional priorities can your project meet?
- Which functional areas does project address
- Describe how project is regional in scope
- Disadvantaged Communities?

#### **4) Legislation Updates and Discussion – E. Rosenblum**

- a. *Legislation*

- i. *US Green Building Council legislative proposal to expand allowable uses of recycled water and conditionally mandate installation of dual plumbing*

Eric discussed this with the representative from GBC, and explained that there needs to be some common sense provisions, such as not having requirements where there are no plans to do recycled water in the area, or where the area is going to potable reuse. There is no BACWA consensus on how to whether or not to support this (see last month's meeting notes).

- b. *Regulations*

- i. *Response to Governor's request for suggested measures that can be taken to increase recycled water availability and use during this drought.*

There were five areas in the January 14 letter to the State's Deputy Legislative Secretary for Agriculture, Environment and Natural Resources from WateReuse and CASA. WateReuse having conference call today? from 3-5 pm to add on suggestions. Industry is hitting pretty hard on relaxation of requirements for shutdown tests. See [letter](#). At BACWA's General Meeting Steve Moore exhorted our community to "think bigger" about our drought recommendations.

- ii. *Other updates*

#### **5) Partnership Updates – J. Strommer/B. James**

- a. *WRWC – Info on Recycled Water Survey*

Collaborated with ACWA/NACWA/CASA/WateReuse to put out survey. [Summary of results](#) is on WRWC website. Contact Jane if you would like to take the survey and have not yet done so, or if you have questions.

**6) Announcements/Agency Updates – All**

Next WaterReuse meeting on 2/21 on drought response. They are exploring webcasting this.

**7) Next Meeting** – March 5, 2014 from 10:00 am to 12:00 pm, 6th Floor Conference Room at EBMUD Headquarters