

# Tulare Lake Basin Disadvantaged Community Water Study

## Stakeholder Oversight Advisory Committee

---

### **Meeting Minutes December 2, 2013 Supplemental SOAC Meeting (Informational meeting)**

1. Welcome and Self Introductions: John Dutton-Welcomed everyone and opened up the meeting. Maria Herrera, of Community Water Center asked everyone present at this meeting to introduce themselves. Maria also mentioned that today's meeting was a supplemental SOAC meeting that Tulare County approved.
2. Additions/ Deletions from Agenda: Item # 6 Upper Kings DAC Pilot Study Outcomes Presentation will be removed from the agenda because Eric Osterling was not able to participate.
3. Maria also gave an overview of the agenda including the purpose and objectives of the meeting.
4. Update on the Progress of the Study (P&P): Maija Madec of Provost & Pritchard, passed out copies of her power point and provided an update on the progress of the Study, including the status of each pilot study, next steps and the roles of the SOAC. Ms. Madec reported that we are on task 4 of the study; the implementation of the Pilot Project Stakeholder process to develop studies and representative solutions to priority issues.

#### Next steps include:

- PSAG Meeting #1 for the Household Pilot 12/5
- Complete the Community review process and second PSAG review for Technical Solutions, New Sources and Individual Household pilots
- Develop recommendations for all pilots
- Seek approval by the SOAC and final report by August 2014.

#### Role of the SOAC:

- Provide feedback on draft reports and PSAG meetings
- Attend SOAC meetings
- Approve recommendations and final report.

For more information: go to <http://www.tularecounty.ca.gov.cao.index.cfm/tulare-lake-basin-disadvantaged-community-water-study/> or call 559.636.1166

# Tulare Lake Basin Disadvantaged Community Water Study

## Stakeholder Oversight Advisory Committee

---

Maria: reminded people that they can access the reports on the Tulare website

John Dutton: There are 4 pilot projects and also a final report. We are trying to structure each pilot report to be able to stand alone, but also come together as a final report. The final report will hopefully fill in the gaps that each of the individual pilots don't fill in.

Tom Frantz: asked if people want to make comments, can we make through the website? Maria said, you can access the report on the website. Those interested in commenting can e-mail John Dutton (jdutton@ppeng.com), Maija Madec (mmadec@ppeng.com) or Maria Herrera to get information, or directly email each of the lead engineers.

Mike Hickey: mentioned that Tulare County will get more data and therefore we need to come up with a way to maintain the data current. We should expect to get data in the next 3 months. In addition to doing the report, it is important to have current data. It is easier to maintain than to start something new. Need to create a data that serves the whole Tulare Lake Basin.

Sue Ruiz: asked who will be the custodian of the information? Will it be local counties or other departments?

John Dutton: responded and stated that by default it will be Tulare County.

Sue Ruiz: For Fresno County, who will help or how will the information be shared? Is there a conversation about that?

John Dutton: mentioned that conversations have started.

Chuck Lackey: for Kern it might be the Environmental Health Department

Maria: encouraged people to attend the PSAG meeting on Dec. 5<sup>th</sup> 3:30-5:30 at 2800 West Burrell.

5. Upper Kings DAC Pilot Study Outcomes Presentation: (Kings Basin Water Authority)- Eric was not able to attend the meeting), Maria reported the final report is available on the Kings River Conservation District's website: Report can also be emailed to participants. Those wanting a copy of the report may contact Maria.
6. New Funding Programs for DAC's (CDPH): Tricia Wathen provided an overview presentation on the Funding for Public Water Systems (she also provided a handout of the power point and a handout on most frequently asked questions).

# Tulare Lake Basin Disadvantaged Community Water Study

## Stakeholder Oversight Advisory Committee

---

Purpose of CDPH Drinking water funding programs is to provide funding to eligible public water systems to bring them into compliance with safe drinking water standards. This is based on risk to public health and each funding program has specific requirements, objectives and/or priorities.

Major Funding Sources include:

1. Drinking Water State Revolving Fund: Approximately, \$100M-\$150M annually: This includes~\$70 M from USEPA, \$17M from State match and \$40M from P & I. Low-interest loans and some grants.
2. Proposition 50 of 2002 (P50)- commitments sunset in June 2014. Authorized \$485M: grants (local assistance), State Operations and Match for DWSRF
3. Proposition 84 of 2006 (P84): Authorized \$300M: grants, (local assistance), state operations and match for DWSRF as well as 410M for emergency grants.

New Funding Programs:

Pre-Planning and Legal Entity:

CDPH has grant funds available under a new local assistance set-aside for a pilot program to assist with the formation of a legal entity with the necessary authority to enable access to the SDWSRFG project funding process for these communities. \$250K max grant per defined community.

Consolidation Incentive:

To promote consolidation as a cost-effective solution to water systems that don't meet safe drinking water standards, CDPH is providing an incentive to encourage larger systems to consolidate nearby noncompliant systems.

Prop 84 Grant Funding:

Initiative passed in 2006 but progress was stopped due to bond frees. \$300M, four key provisions (\$10million to fund emergency and urgent actions to ensure safe drinking water supplies- \$3M is remaining; \$180 Million in grant for small community drinking water system infrastructure improvements and related actions to meet safe drinking water standards; \$50 million for the Safe Drinking Water State revolving fund- state match and \$60 million for loans and grants for projects to prevent or reduce contamination of groundwater that serves as a source of drinking water.

Prop.84- Emergency Grants (new funding) Part 1

\$10M allocated and \$3 M remaining, \$2 Million of the \$10 million was set aside for interim water supplies.

# Tulare Lake Basin Disadvantaged Community Water Study

## Stakeholder Oversight Advisory Committee

---

### Prop. 84 – Emergency Grant (new funding) Part 2

\$10M allocated, \$3 M remaining for emergency= sudden unanticipated events such as earthquakes, fire, landslides etc. The cap is \$250K.

Some communities that have received this funding include: West Goshen to repair pump, Teviston CSD, Seville for Hydro tank,

Sue: stated that as a resident from a private well community, one of the big hurdles is to get individual people informed about the costs to go from an individual well to a public water system. She added that this type of funding helps with the education process to help the community make better and informed decisions.

Maria: asked how systems get notified of their potential to access the potential incentive. Does CDPH evaluate who has potential to consolidate and then notify relevant districts? And is this new incentive an ongoing opportunity?

Paul: mentioned that letters are usually sent out by headquarters.

Tricia: responded to Maria's question by stating that she was not sure because this funding program is currently a pilot project.

Karl Longley: Interested if this will continue? If not, what do we need to do to activate this (consolidation incentive program), for example Easton. He also noted that this type of incentive is needed to promote shared solutions and added the need for disincentives.

Sue Ruiz: stated that pre-planning funding is key for the education for the community to be educated on the choices.

Becky: shared that various communities have different perspectives on shared solutions and their benefits. She said some water districts are informed but simply don't want to help nearby by communities. She concluded by saying that it is very important to also educate district board members.

Maria: mentioned that the State Water Board (SWB) had allocated \$2million from its Clean UP and Abatement account to the interim water solutions funds. This new funding program had a total of \$4million available. The \$2 million awarded by the SWB can fund O & M. without a lease agreement as required with funding made available by Prop.84 (funding sources have different restrictions).

Maria: then noted that Kern County has a number of mobile home parks that may be eligible for this money. She also encouraged counties to apply. \$50K for 3 years and with the SBW if you have an Arsenic but was a Nitrate problem.

# Tulare Lake Basin Disadvantaged Community Water Study

## Stakeholder Oversight Advisory Committee

---

Paul: mentioned that seeking funding from the Interim water solutions program is simple because the application is straight forward and very few attachments are required. He added that the most challenging part is having the community identify how to use the \$50K for the next 3 years.

Karl Longley: asked if there were any updates on the Northern Tulare County Regional Surface Water project. Maria: noted that planning funded has been awarded. Tulare County is currently acting as the applicant and recipient of these funds and has applied and received planning funds through CDPH. The Oroquieta Public Utility District has hired Keller on the technical engineering analysis. Planning should be completed in 2014. Study will look into how much surface water is available and if it can serve the needs of the communities, CEQA, where the plant would be located. Tulare County has also applied for pre-planning funding to evaluate and address governance.

### 7. Administrative Matters

No comments

### 8. Committee Comments

Sue Ruiz: stated that she did not want to bring to Easton residents things that will not work, such as put in a system that will not work or be sustainable. She said there needs to be a better way to have O&M covered and noted that sometimes DAC residents don't know how to manage money.

Maria: then added that some communities have unaffordable water rates and are still unable to adequately fund O&M cost due to the lack of economy of scales in communities.

Karl Longley: concurred with Maria's statement and acknowledged the recent Accessing Water Affordability report, a report (authored by the CWC, Pacific Institute and Fresno State) which studies water affordability in the Tulare Lake Basin Region.

### 9. Future SOAC meetings

Maria: explained the difference between supplemental SOAC meetings and traditional SOAC meetings: supplemental meetings are funded by Tulare County and are held to continue to have this discussion and know what is going on in the region; traditional SOAC meetings require a quorum and held to seek advisory and formal committee decisions. She noted that the next supplemental meeting will be held sometime during March or April, on first Monday of the month and a formal SOAC meeting during May of 2014.

# Tulare Lake Basin Disadvantaged Community Water Study

## Stakeholder Oversight Advisory Committee

---

Karl Longley: asked to hold the upcoming SOAC meetings on the second Monday of the month.

Denise Akins: noted that the second Monday conflict with water commission meetings.

Maria: stated that the team will aim to hold the next Supplemental SOAC meeting on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Monday of the month and a formal SOAC around May. She reminded participants that the contract ends on November 2014.

Karl: recommends that Laurel provide an update on the efforts of the Governor's Drinking Water Stakeholders Group during one of the upcoming SOAC meeting.

Maria: will work with the Denis to circulate the Governor's report to the SOAC member before the next supplemental SOAC meeting.

Meeting concluded @ 6:15 PM