



Minutes

Location: San Geronio Pass Water Agency  
 1210 Beaumont Ave., Beaumont, CA 92223  
 January 29, 2009, 6:00 p.m.

Item	Discussion	Action
1. Committee Members Roll Call	<p>Present: John Covington, Mark Norton, John Watkins, Joe Aceto, Bruce Cash, Brian DeForge, Nancy Hall, and Luwana Ryan</p> <p>Absent: Cindy Li, Hal Marlow, Behrooz Mortazavi, Joe Zoba, Sarah Eberhardt, and Carl Workman</p>	
2. Approval of Minutes from 1/15/09	<p>After review, a motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes as revised.</p>	
3. Review/Discussion of Criteria and Scope of Committee's Review	<p>Mr. Bruce Cash reviewed the Submittal to the Board of Supervisors dated April 29, 2008, about the Groundwater Quality Evaluation Committee for the Beaumont/Cherry Valley Area.</p> <p>In a letter dated June 3, 2008, from the Riverside County Board of Supervisors, it states that the task of the committee is to review technical data presented by regional experts and make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors, the Cities of Beaumont and Banning, as well as the Board of the Beaumont/Cherry Valley Water District regarding the growing concerns of groundwater quality in the Beaumont water basin area.</p>	

<p>4. Review/Discussion of Presentations given at Previous Meetings.</p>	<p>In the meeting dated January 15, 2009, we concluded with the 3<sup>rd</sup> presentation which was given by Wildermuth Environmental. We diverted from the Wildermuth presentation to review AB 885 and proposed regulations with respect to septic systems in the State of California. Copies of CD's were made available at the last meeting for those who were here. Attendees at today's meeting were informed that that information is available on the web site.</p> <p>Bruce Cash – Referring to the matrix that was presented at the meeting of January 15, 2009, the primary component of the matrix included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Did the presentation support the U.S.G.S. study?</li> <li>2. Did it support the Wildermuth Report?</li> <li>3. Did the agency and/or entity take action?</li> <li>4. Did the agency and/or entity support the conventional septic tank prohibition ordinance?</li> <li>5. Did the agency and/or entity oppose the conventional septic tank prohibition ordinance?</li> </ol>	
<p>Discussion of October 16, 2008 meeting – Presentation given by Beaumont/Cherry Valley Water District</p>	<p>The 4<sup>th</sup> presentation was given by the Beaumont/Cherry Valley Water District on October 16, 2008.</p> <p>Bruce Cash – asked if there were any questions or comments in reference to this presentation.</p> <p>John Covington – I think one of the issues that came up at the last meeting was; "Why hasn't the State Health Department taken a proactive approach to the issue in Cherry Valley? Aren't they primary agency for Beaumont/Cherry Valley? I was taken aback when Mr. Butcher elluded to the fact that there never was any communication between them and the California Department of Health. It is my understanding that any water constituents that you are required to sample under Title 22, once you reach half the MCL, then your agency should be sending you a notice putting that issue on alert and requiring you to do quarterly or annual sampling. According to the water quality information that we did get from the California Department of Health, it does appear that they never gave the Beaumont/Cherry Valley Water District that order. What is apparent is that Beaumont/Cherry Valley took the initiative</p>	

themselves to do additional sampling of nitrates on wells 16, 4a, and well 21. It's shocking to me that the State of California's San Diego branch was not more proactive with this problem.

Another item that I had mentioned to Mr. Butcher was that if you look at the models that Wildermuth prepared for this report, a worse case scenario was made 90 years out, but three new wells that they drilled in conjunction with the City of Banning, quite frankly are in the path of this so called plume. It doesn't make sense to me that knowing this information that some of these high producing wells would have been put directly in the so called path of this plume. I believe that majority of their presentation really leaned toward a lot of their history; who they are; where they came from; where they're going, etc. Although I appreciate the information, my take on the presentation was that if you are involved in this issue to some degree we want to know how you weighed in on it and what the criteria was for that. I don't think that the Beaumont/Cherry Valley Water District report really expressed that well.

Brian DeForge – I was not here for that meeting, but I did hear some of the reports from the Beaumont/Cherry Valley Water District. When they spoke of installing those three wells with the plume model, did they have the Wildermuth report prior to starting these wells?

John Covington – I believe the last well was put in or located after the Wildermuth study had been published.

Brian DeForge – Does anyone on the panel remember if they used part of the U.S.G.S. report in the presentation or make any mention or even look at it?

Nancy Hall – They did not make any reference to U.S.G.S. at all.

Luwana Ryan – In August 2005, a committee was formed to investigate water quality in the Cherry Valley Community of interest. It started with a letter from Andy Schlange from STWMA to Gerard Thibeault at the Regional Water Quality Control Board, saying that they have become aware that there might be a nitrate problem and that they are going to investigate it. Date of the letter is August 10, 2005.

Bruce Cash – I do not believe that the letter is on the web site. We may want to get a copy.

Luwana Ryan – This was the start of the water quality investigation and it was also the start of the formation of the San Timoteo Watershed Management Authority Project Committee. I also have the agreement establishing the project committee and the first task order given to Mr. Wildermuth. I can make these items available to the committee if you like.

One of the things that I find very interesting is that it says that; “Beaumont/Cherry Valley Water District is the only major producer of wells located in the Beaumont Management Zone. Nitrate concentrations in the Beaumont/Cherry Valley Water District are usually low but have gradually increased over time.” I have the records of that and actually they were static for the whole time at one spike and then went down again to normal.

Bruce Cash – What I would be interested in knowing, if we can extract the data, is what the well results were for nitrates between the time that the Project I group was formed and the date that Wildermuth was commissioned to initiate a report. Secondly, what were those same trending results through the completion of the report that was submitted to this committee? We can work on extracting that information.

Mark Norton – They did make a statement that was based on the Wildermuth report that says; “The district in cooperation with the City of Beaumont has determined from the Wildermuth report that On Site Waste Disposal Systems in the Cherry Valley area are polluting the groundwater.”

Bruce Cash – Referring to the matrix, did the agency or entity take action with regard to the finding of that report? The indication in the meeting was yes, however, subsequent to that presentation we received a letter from a member of the board of that agency indicating that the official action had not been taken, that there was discussion but no official action. I will repeat what I said at the last meeting; “that I found it peculiar in my experience, that given the cost and the magnitude, that that particular agency did very little to consult with regulators prior to seeking a remedy that would be significant both in cost and

	<p>impact.” It is unique that they would take that approach in the record as to whether or not their board had ever authorized any specific action in support of that.</p> <p>The next question on the matrix is; did the agency or entity support the conventional septic tank prohibition ordinance? I believe that there is sufficient data in the record to suggest that they did. There is correspondence between that agency and the Regional Board, all of which has been provided to this committee and is available on the web site. I believe the answer is yes, in that particular instance.</p> <p>Are there any other comments or questions in reference to the Beaumont/Cherry Valley Water District Presentation? There being none, we will move on to the next presentation.</p>	
<p>Discussion of November 13, 2008 meeting – Presentation by San Gorgonio Pass Water Agency</p>	<p>The 5<sup>th</sup> presentation was given on November 13, 2008, by the San Gorgonio Pass Water Agency.</p> <p>Bruce Cash asked if anyone had any questions or comments pertaining to this presentation.</p> <p>Luwana Ryan – When the San Gorgonio Pass Water Agency were giving their presentation, they weren’t weighing in on the water quality issues. They were simply stating their prerogative and choice of basically using the U.S.G.S. report. They were being very diplomatic in not taking a side.</p> <p>Bruce Cash – I do recall that we asked if their board took any official action in support of the Wildermuth report. My recollection is that they did not.</p> <p>Mr. Cash asked if there were any other questions or comments about this presentation. There being none, the next presentation was discussed.</p>	

<p>Discussion of November 13, 2008 meeting – Presentation by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board</p>	<p>The 6<sup>th</sup> presentation was also given on November 13, 2008, by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board.</p> <p>Bruce Cash – My notes reflect that they answered definitively when asked if they found the Wildermuth report credible, and the answer was yes.</p> <p>The Regional Board was in support of the septic tank prohibition ordinance that was adopted by the County of Riverside. A staff person who is also a technical expert on this committee did an independent review of the Wildermuth report and also found it to be credible.</p> <p>Nancy Hall – I was not here for that presentation but I have a question. When someone reads a report and decides that it is credible, my understanding is that it has a lot to do with how the samples are taken, where they are taken from, what was going on in the area at the time the samples were taken and whether or not there was well head protection. If you're looking at the report you are only given whatever information is there. How do you make a determination that it is credible?</p> <p>Bruce Cash – Unfortunately the committee member who reviewed the report is not with us tonight, but that is a question that can be posed beyond the presentation that you all heard.</p> <p>Brian DeForge – How was the report reviewed?</p> <p>Bruce Cash – I'm thinking that they probably read the report as it was presented to them and put it under the parameters of their scientific or analytical thought process. In reading a report, established parameters are followed and you would come to a conclusion, but as you stated Ms. Hall, I don't know how they can support the findings of the report if they didn't actually go out and test those findings themselves.</p> <p>John Covington – There was one statement that struck me as odd. Before Mr. Thibeault began his presentation, he stated that "<i>I am not here to discuss the Wildermuth study.</i>" As far as I was concerned that was why we asked him to</p>	
---	---	--

come here. The ramifications that were on the heels of this study are huge. It wasn't just a water study that was going to get shelved for the next five years. It put Measure B in motion primarily on the backs of 2000 residents in Cherry Valley. I can only assume that some of these agencies that endorsed this report had an idea of what was coming next. If I worked for a governmental regulatory agency, I would ensure that it was reviewed, possibly even have a peer review. They touched on some of the items, but avoided more than they answered. Dr. Li was basing her thoughts of the study on the scientific methodology that they used. Did they use state of the art? Yes they did. Did they use what we would call independent laboratories? They used 3 of them that are well distinguished. Everything looks very good scientifically, but when you get down to the "nuts and bolts" and push all the scientific stuff aside, it seems to be lacking.

Mark Norton – Can you limit it down to three or four key points that you have disagreement with? I understand how the projections of increased development and how the number of people within the study area might affect when the maximum contamination might occur. I would like to know, was it the exact locations of there the testing was done that you have concerns with?

John Covington – I would like to know why those particular wells were chosen for the sampling. In reviewing the wells it was discovered that 60% of them are inactive. I've been in the business long enough to know that just because a well is inactive does not mean that it can not provide a viable source for testing. However, my concern is the methodology of the sampling. They used a Grundfos pump. The maximum output on that pump is 7½ gallons per minute under 100 feet of total dynamic head. The report states that they ran the pump for an average of 10 minutes. I don't think that was a fair exchange of water.

Luwana Ryan – In reading the Wildermuth report, the Beaumont Management zone and the Beaumont storage unit are very easily confused. What the report doesn't say is that 7 of these wells sometimes had a water level of only 65 feet as opposed to the Beaumont basin that has 650 feet. None of this is ever indicated in the report. Another thing. Although it states that some of the wells are inactive, it does not indicate how the sampling was done. The report is very large, but it doesn't say very much. It also doesn't tell you that some of

these wells are located in people's front yards right next to their septic tanks. So, when someone like Dr. Li reads this report and makes a judgment that the testing sounds logical and they followed protocol, that's all well and good, but you need the common sense factors of; Where was the well? Was the well inactive? Also absent from the report was the fact that a huge portion of Cherry Valley is upgrate of where the tested wells are. Hidden Meadows is a community above the testing area that has 480 houses. There were several areas that weren't looked at that may have had an impact on where the nitrates are coming from. The model for the addition of 8,800 homes is unrealistic. Homes in Cherry Valley are built on one-acre lots, whereas the models show four homes for every acre. They also didn't take into account any hillsides, canyons or roadways. What bothered me the most with the Wildermuth report is that they never mentioned the true condition of where the wells were and that the majority of them were inactive. These concerns as well as many others were brought up at several of the community meetings that were held. Ms. Crystal Fadke was the Wildermuth person who initially presented the report to us. She is no longer employed by Wildermuth, but at each presentation including the one made for this committee, they refused to take "technical" questions.

Bruce Cash – For the record, is it fair to say that these were community presentations to support proposed infrastructure?

Luwana Ryan – Yes. I have a timeline showing when each of the presentations took place. As soon as the Project Committee I was formed, they were immediate to start the study.

Bruce Cash – Just so that I am accurate in my understanding, you're saying that there was a proposed remedy before there was a finding?

Luwana Ryan – Yes. You could say that.

Bruce Cash – Are there any other questions or comments in reference to the presentation by the Regional Water Quality Control Board?

	<p>Brian DeForge to John Watkins – They mentioned Quail Valley as being placed on a building moratorium for OSWDS. What I would like to know is; What type of housing density did they have previously? Also, Did they do the same type of reporting anytime prior to that?</p> <p>John Watkins – There are many areas in Quail Valley that are on extremely small lots and it was sewage surfacing on the ground that brought this to the forefront.</p> <p>Luwana Ryan – I went to see Quail Valley after I heard about this. I thought that it was real similar.</p> <p>There being no further questions, the next presentation was discussed.</p>	
<p>Discussion of December 18, 2008 meeting – Presentation by the San Timoteo Watershed Management Authority</p>	<p>The 7<sup>th</sup> presentation was given on December 18, 2008, by the San Timoteo Watershed Management Authority.</p> <p>Brian DeForge – As I recall, this presentation was somewhat of a duplication of the Wildermuth report, basically following along the same lines of all the things that they said but just putting a different name on it with their PowerPoint.</p> <p>Bruce Cash – With respect to our Matrix, it is my recollection that they supported the Wildermuth report. I do not believe they considered the U.S.G.S. report. My notes reflect that they took no formal action as STWMA other than commissioning the report.</p> <p>Does anyone have any questions or comments in reference to this presentation?</p> <p>Luwana Ryan – This is one of those areas where there seems to be extreme overlap of the entities, which makes it difficult to remember who said what. The project was paid for by STWMA Project One, but the action was taken by the Beaumont/Cherry Valley Water District.</p>	

	<p>Bruce Cash – I am going to ask you to go back and look at Beaumont/Cherry Valley because during their presentation the presenter indicated that there was no additional information requested of them. However, when the Regional Board presented, they indicated that there was additional information requested. Subsequently we received a copy of a request for additional information and that information was provided not by STWMA, but by the Beaumont/Cherry Valley Water District through Wildermuth. What is missing for this committee is any response from the Regional Board about this information.</p> <p>There were no other questions or comments relating to this presentation.</p>	
<p>5. Correspondence Received</p>	<p>We have received 3 items of correspondence of which we have supplied to you.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Letter of response by the California Association of Realtors dated December 18, 2008. These are their comments on the proposed AB 885 Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems regulations and Draft Environmental Impact Report.</li> <li>2) Memorandum from the County of Riverside dated January 28, 2009, updating the status of Proposition 84 funding opportunities and status. The committee has asked about it in the past. The first sentence reads; <i>“Currently Proposition 84 and Proposition 1E funding has been suspended.”</i> The memo goes on to talk about Proposition 885’s proposed hearing in Sacramento on February 9. This information will also be made available on the web site.</li> <li>3) Article titled “Water Efficiency January-February 2009. Toilet to Tap: Once Again.”</li> </ol> <p>Bruce Cash to John Watkins – The committee members do not have the copy of the e-mail between Mike and yourself that I referred to on the Proposition 84 funding.</p>	

	<p>John Watkins – Time did not allow us to make copies prior to the meeting. It will however, be added to the web site.</p>	
<p>6. Future Presentations/ Agenda Items</p>	<p>Bruce Cash – I would like to take this opportunity to ask the committee, beyond the information that we have heard on January 15, 2009 and this evening, and pursuant to copies of the minutes from all of the meetings that you have before you, are you at a point in this process where you would like to make some additional recommendations to the Riverside County Board of Supervisors? If so, based on what you know, if there is outstanding information that you would like more detail on, this is the place to articulate that and bring our recommendations to a conclusion. My preference would be to have no more than one additional meeting unless there is an overwhelming need to do so or a presentation that needs to be scheduled.</p>	
<p>7. Committee Member Comments</p>	<p>Nancy Hall – At the last meeting you distributed copies of a new bill on septic systems that was going to take affect in 2010. Given the economy that we have right now and the budget cuts, I feel that it will be a while before the regulatory agency that will be enforcing it is going to be able to do anything about it. How does that bill affect this committee?</p> <p>Bruce Cash – What Ms. Hall is referring to is at the previous meeting we introduced information regarding AB 885 which was signed by Governor Davis back in 2000. The State was to have brought forward proposed regulations by January 1, 2004. These regulations are now just being proposed. Public hearings were held throughout the State earlier in January. The local hearing was held in Riverside on January 14. I attended and acquired a complete copy of that presentation. I brought copies and distributed them at the meeting held on January 15.</p> <p>Getting to your question in two parts: 1) There are no regulations adopted as we sit here tonight. Those are proposed to the California State Water Control Board and my understanding is that a hearing is scheduled for February 9<sup>th</sup> in Sacramento. How, or if this committee wants to take that issue into consideration within the scope of our charter is up to you. Given the fact that it has taken 9 years to get to this point, I'm not sure that we need to be overly</p>	

concerned about it. Never-the-less, if one reviews what is being proposed, it could have a profound economic impact on rural communities such as Cherry Valley. Any report that we submit to the Board of Supervisors, I believe, must make some reference to asking the County to monitor these proposed regulations and what, if any, will those regulations do to this situation and beyond the time and usefulness of this committee.

I'll ask John Watkins to answer the second half of your question.

John Watkins – You asked if there would be resources because of the budget for the bill to be implemented and enforced. With that type of process we have to wait for regulations to come forth. At that point it would be evaluated by each individual County and how they will approach it.

Nancy Hall – How would one go about suggesting that the County, over a long period of time, say thirty to forty years, make a nominal adjustment to property taxes in Cherry Valley for the installment of sewers at a later date?

Bruce Cash – Our scope is limited, but in our written recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, we can make any recommendation that we feel is prudent to the benefit of this issue or the community. The Board of Supervisors will take that information and decide whether or not any action should take place.

Nancy Hall – In light of the models that we have seen we don't need to worry about an impact to water quality for 25 to 30 years. If the residents of Cherry Valley were to pay a nominal amount extra on our property taxes, by the time the year comes when it is needed, that money could be used for installation of sewers in Cherry Valley.

Bruce Cash – The responsibility of this committee to make a finding as to whether or not we believe that septic systems in this community are the cause of ground water degradation. There are companies that specifically have expertise in evaluating options for rural communities. There is a company that I do business based in Sacramento whose entire business is focused on looking at scenarios like this. Typically it is the purveyor that would commission them to do an analysis before they start a campaign to build

infrastructure. If that organization makes a finding that the cost and options for a remedy is x amount, then you have something definitive that you can present. If this committee wants to make some kind of recommendation in whole or in part of our overall recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, that is entirely up to you.

Mark Norton – First of all, to put anything additional on the property tax would require a Nexus study which, I think you were trying to allude to. It would have to show that it is needed, which is premature at this point for what we are looking at. Secondly, in order to put an additional tax on the property owner, they would have to put it to a vote. They can't just add a tax.

Brian DeForge – I am finding it very difficult to say yeah or nay to whether we need septic systems or not, especially if we are looking at a report that lacks very crucial data. I have two issues on everything that we have looked at. First, there is the lack of crucial information. They didn't take everything into account before the report came out. Secondly, are the nitrate levels in those wells still rising? I believe that we have reports that show that they are not. To make any recommendation either way would not be very prudent on our part unless we have full, complete, credible data.

Bruce Cash – As I mentioned to the committee before, it is completely within your realm of authority to make a finding that the report is inconclusive and that further analysis should be done with well established protocols for this type of situation. That can be the extent of our recommendation if that is the consensus of the committee.

Mark Norton – I am not a voting member of the committee. Having read the report and based on the concerns that were laid out by the committee members, I too agree without a doubt that there is a great deal more data that could be collected and that further analysis be done from someone who has a better understanding of the true source of the contamination and has better merit. I do want to state however, that based on my reading, we need to get back to the questions of, is the degradation of the groundwater due to failing OSWDS? Based on the pharmaceutical analysis and evidence of the hormones that exist in animals, I think that it is fairly conclusive. In my evaluation you do see human impact from septic systems.

John Covington – What I read from the report is that well 16 was the heart of this whole study in that it was referenced numerous times. I have asked Mr. Wildermuth on more than one occasion, how is it possible that there were no pharmaceuticals in this well? I find it difficult to understand how that is possible. I also asked him, does it matter if a septic tank is five feet away or 500 feet away from a well, will you get the same results? I was not comfortable with the answer he gave which was; no, it makes no difference.

Mark Norton – In reference to bacterial obstruction through the ground layer, there is actually a treatment plant that exists and counts on that for the cleaning process. In my opinion, yes, it does have a big impact on proximity to those wells.

John Covington – Water quality is the heart of the study and I had concerns with the wells that were sampled. I am very familiar with those wells and I know that within 50 to 100 feet of three of these active wells there are active septic tanks. There is a reason why Riverside County requires a setback. I am on septic tank and I certainly wouldn't drill a well ten feet away from it.

When the committee talks about there not being enough information, a lot of that has to do with well location, what is surrounding the wells and the absence of sanitary seals. Only one of the wells has a sanitary seal. I suspect that these particular wells were chosen for the report because of their age and what was surrounding them. It would have been helpful to also have aerial views of the wells so that the committee could see what is surrounding them and how they could be negatively impacted. Well 21 has a septic tank that sits only 15 feet away and there is also a flood control channel 25 feet away from it.

Joe Aceto – During the Beaumont/Cherry Valley presentation a pollution control project was mentioned. The presenter said that it was implemented to naturally treat the water in an artificial wet land. He said that it would eliminate the flow through water from the Beaumont basins and the septic systems North of the Banning fault. The district developed the project to extract good water. What exactly is this project?

	<p>John Covington – They call it the Pollution Control Project which I suspect is being funded by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Beaumont/Cherry Valley Water District. The object is to pump the water up to someplace near Bogart Park and let the absorption of the foliage and plants create a wet land that will artificially reduce the nitrates. The water district then plans to bring the water down to the spreading basins on Cherry Valley Blvd.</p> <p>Luwana Ryan – It has conceptual wells so that all the funding would have to be found to drill these wells and pull out this tainted water and then pull the water out of Edgar Canyon and re-depositing it into the Beaumont basin.</p> <p>Bruce Cash – In attendance tonight are three of the many experts that are part of this committee. I would like to know if there is any additional input from the technical committee before we move forward with the voting members to determine if there is a consensus at this point in time on a direction that you would like to go.</p> <p>Bruce Cash speaking to John Watkins – Riverside County has adopted an ordinance. What is the basis for that ordinance being adopted?</p> <p>John Watkins – It was for the Wildermuth report as well as the Water Quality Control Board input.</p> <p>Bruce Cash to John Watkins – Although Riverside County did not make a presentation, they did review the Wildermuth report. Did the County find the report to be credible?</p> <p>John Watkins – Yes. It was reviewed by our Public Health Engineer in conjunction with the Water Board’s review that was done.</p> <p>Bruce Cash – I would remind the committee that half of the presentations that we heard found the Wildermuth report to be credible. As Riverside County Environmental Health reiterated tonight, they also found the report to be credible. They took decisive action by making a recommendation, I assume, to the Board of Supervisors, who adopted the ordinance.</p>	
--	---	--

John Watkins – Yes, we were asked to come forth with that ordinance.

Bruce Cash – I would like to remind the committee that the report specifically says that “*in the opinion of the researches the OSWDS were the root cause of groundwater degradation.*” When half of the presenters and some of our technical experts, Dr. Li, who is not here tonight, Mr. Norton, etc. find it credible, that was the net result of the reports work. When you cut through all the protocol, procedures and analysis that is the glaring finding of the report.

John Covington – Did the County come to support the Wildermuth report based on the letter dated March 11, 2003 by the Regional Board?

John Watkins – The review was done in conjunction with the State Water Board. Dr. Li and our Public Health Engineer spent considerable time.

Bruce Cash – Is the committee being remiss in not having the County’s Public Health Engineer weigh in on his findings?

John Watkins – He is no longer with the County. He is retired, but there would be nothing to add to what has already been reported. The county was asked to evaluate the report and this is what was provided.

Bruce Cash – If there is no further input from the technical experts, then I would like to ask the voting members your recommendation, if any on how to proceed and respond to the Board of Supervisors.

Brian DeForge – After going through everything and looking at our matrix, it shows that three supported the Wildermuth report, three who did not support it and one who remained neutral. Understanding that the three that did support the report also admitted that there is other data that needs to be explained appears, at least in my opinion to be a credible report. My feelings as a resident in the City of Beaumont, is that any time you can get waste into a captured area, controlling it and sending it to a treatment area, I think you are better off. However, knowing what it would cost to bring sewers in and not knowing for certain if this is what is causing the problem, I think it would be remiss of us to say that this report is credible and go forth with sewers. My personal opinion is that we need to have a new report that gives us more

conclusive data. We also need to continue with what Cherry Valley has always done, and that would be to build on minimum one-acre parcels. I think the moratorium should remain in place and new septic systems that come in should be the type that filter better and are more advanced. I could not go forward in good conscience and tell the County that they need to move forward and install sewers in Cherry Valley.

Bruce Cash – Let me re-cap what you just said so that I am sure I understand. In your opinion the report is inconclusive, that the moratorium should stay in place at this point in time and that an independent study is recommended.

Brian DeForge – Yes, that is correct.

John Watkins – I believe that was a recommendation at our last meeting from Ms. Hall. She asked if a new study would have to be done from scratch or if we can take some of the information that exists and add another consultant or firm to “fill in” where ever there is a hole.

Brian DeForge – My feelings are that the County of Riverside should pay for the study because the County approved that the septic systems go up there. If we are having a problem, that’s what we should be looking at.

John Watkins – That can go in as a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

Joe Aceto – I agree about the third party study. It would have to be funded by some other agency other than the Beaumont/Cherry Valley Water District. I believe that there are many unanswered questions in reference to the Wildermuth report.

Bruce Cash – To reiterate, you said that the report is inconclusive. Would you suggest that we support that with specific observations under that line item?

Joe Aceto – That is correct. I also have some concerns about the septic systems that are within the restricted perimeter of especially well 21. I think that we should recommend that any septic system that is near that perimeter

	<p>be either upgraded or replaced with a new, better filtering system. I think a density greater than one pump per half acre should be required to sewer the neighborhood.</p> <p>Bruce Cash – If there are additions to our recommendations or if you have any dissenting opinion than we want to make sure that it is reflected as well.</p> <p>Luwana Ryan – Let’s say that there is septic contamination here. It would be best to find out where it originated from. When Measure B came out it was a very small area of Cherry Valley that was going to be sewered with huge portions left out. There are some things that need to be considered. There is a convalescent home built in the 1950’s that is on septic right above well 4a. There are areas all the way up the canyon that have been on active septic systems for a long time going right into Edgar Canyon. Right above the spreading ponds there is a mobile home park with over 170 units that have been there since the 1950’s. The only area that was going to be sewered was below the Banning fault. If there is contamination I think we need to pin point it and see exactly where it’s coming from. There are areas in Cherry Valley that really need to be looked at by the County Health Department.</p> <p>John Watkins – I understand why you’re saying regarding the County Health Department, but that would be under the purview of the Water Quality Control Board for actual ground water conditions. I would recommend that you rephrase your recommendation if you’re stating that as such.</p> <p>Luwana Ryan – Another area of concern is that we still have active septic in the City of Beaumont that needs to be looked at. If we’re going to do a new report, lets broaden the scope.</p> <p>Bruce Cash – Ms. Ryan, I have taken all of your comments and considered those as footnotes under item one which is that the report is inconclusive and there are specific reasons why we think that is the case in recommendation for the following. Are you in support of the moratorium staying in place?</p> <p>Luwana Ryan – Yes.</p>	
--	---	--

Bruce Cash – Based on your earlier comment, you are in support of further studies from an independent source?

Luwana Ryan – Absolutely.

Bruce Cash – You are also in support of septic systems being evaluated within a defined radius of well 21, as well as the density being greater than a half acre requirement?

Luwana Ryan – Yes.

Brian DeForge – I think there are still some grandfathered parcels that are under that size. You will need to consider these properties.

Joe Aceto – There are a lot of parcels that have more than one house on them. I know people who have four houses on one lot.

John Watkins – As a possibility for the recommendation perhaps it could be stated that future land use decisions where parcels are less than half acre in size, that sewer would be recommended or necessary.

Brian DeForge - As the County approves the development of those smaller parcels they would have to put in some sort of CFD or something that would fund that infrastructure for the future, but would still have to put in the newer septic systems that have better filter systems.

Nancy Hall – I would concur with everything that the others have said.

Bruce Cash – You have no additions to the six recommendations that we spoke about?

Nancy Hall – No, I have no additions.

Bruce Cash – Let me go back to Brian DeForge. There were items added after your comments. Are you in support of these additional items.

<p>Brian DeForge – Yes I am.</p> <p>Bruce Cash – Mr. Aceto, do you support the additional items also?</p> <p>Joe Aceto – Yes.</p> <p>Bruce Cash – Even though the voting members will ultimately make the recommendations, we revere the technical experts who assisted us since July and would like to hear any input you may have.</p> <p>John Watkins – I would like to make some comments. I wanted to make sure that the committee is aware that we appreciate their interest, as well as the interest of our visitors on this topic. Sometimes these kinds of things are set up and they get no interest and no one does any research of their own. You can see that so many of your committee members have gone through and done a lot of research on their own and have spent many hours of their time on it. It is very commendable, this doesn't happen in a lot of communities. In reference to the recommendations, I believe I am comfortable with all of them, although I am having a little issue with the first one, and this is strictly semantics regarding the Wildermuth report as being inconclusive. My only suggestion would be a reconsideration of the word inconclusive. Some people might see it as being conclusive but they don't agree with the report's findings or the report's recommendations.</p> <p><u>NAME UNKNOWN</u> – I agree that the report was conclusive. I think the report was so focused in one area that it didn't adequately address the total problem. Maybe inconclusive may not be the proper term but maybe the scope of the study were too narrowly focused to give full and accurate accounting for the area that we are looking at.</p> <p>Bruce Cash – In your opinion the report did not provide sufficient data?</p> <p><u>NAME UNKNOWN</u> – If did not go far enough to address the issue that we are being asked to weigh in on. We have obviously found that there are areas that should have been considered that weren't and need to be if we are going to make any kind of recommendation.</p>	
--	--

Luwana Ryan – When Jaime Hurtado first contacted me about this, my words to him were, “*I would hate to see us sewer this little area of Cherry Valley only to find out that it does nothing to solve the problem.*” I think the scope was way to small, way to specific, focusing only on one area and that it did not cover the whole area. I don’t think it was studied sufficiently to give us the information that is necessary to see where the true source of contamination is and if it is really that bad. We need to find out exactly where it is coming from.

Ms. Eberhardt was on this committee and she has not come back since the very first meeting in July. She was a voting member and Cherry Valley resident. Would it be possible to have John Covington, one of our technical advisors, who is a Cherry Valley resident become part of the voting members?

John Watkins – My understanding with a Board appointed committee is that the item would have to go back to the Board for approval for the change in membership of the committee. If you wish I can check and see if that is indeed the case. I’m not saying that it can’t be done. It can be introduced as an item and if a Board member supports it then it can move forward. If that is something you would like me to explore, I would be willing to do it.

Bruce Cash – Is it necessary?

Luwana Ryan – No, I don’t think so as long as she can’t show up and vote without reviewing any of the information.

Mark Norton – As I review the conclusions and the recommendations of the report it strikes me that what the committee states is not necessarily in conflict with the report. You are more concerned about where the source of pollution or contamination is coming from and the amount of development that might be occurring. You indicate some bias about the report being inconclusive but no one has actually indicated what it is that you disagree with and what your conclusion is.

The conclusions are interesting in that they are vague as to where the source of the contamination is coming from other than to say that some production levels have been negatively impacted. That as nitrate concentrations of

simultaneous occurrences elevated with specific ions and pharmaceuticals associated with OSWDS can only be explained by discharge by these systems. Then it gives a scenario on a projection able model. I understand where the concerns are for the desire for more information about where the source of the septic contamination may be coming from and the need for additional studies to know where the boundaries might be, but no where is that discussed in the Wildermuth report. My recommendation to you is that unless you see a glaring error, looking at page 6-1 of the report, where you can say that this is wrong, I would suggest to the committee to review the mandate by the County on what they want us to investigate. My sense is that the question you are being asked is “are these septic systems the cause of the contamination?” and I think that it is conclusive that it is. I say this because the direction of the comments that are being made are not addressing, in my understanding, what has been indicated as the purpose of this committee.

Bruce Cash – In several publications these took specific regulatory action in response to this report and those actions have economic and other ramifications on the general public, so in my view, if there is something uncertain about the report then that has significant consequences to the community.

In review, the first concern that this committee has is that the report is inconclusive and then we provided some specific reasons why we thought so. That was later altered and the latest I have is that the district failed to adopt a scope of work that was meaningful in identifying a conclusive source of contamination and proposed remedies.

Mark Norton – We agreed that there is a source of conclusive evidence that water degradation may be caused by OSWDS. Does anyone disagree that might be the source?

Bruce Cash – Now we will consider the conclusions in the Wildermuth report as we try and capture the consensus of the committee and where there is a nexus, we will draw that out and point to that in our summary.

John Covington – I’m trying to understand why we would allow Ordinance 871 to stay in effect. The water quality data that was given to us by the California Department of Health Services, again as earlier alluded to is from 1996 to 2008. I know the regulators would be throwing darts at me right now about why I would make such a statement, but I’m not sure if the voting members have taken into consideration what impact you are asking people who develop an acre lot to take on when they’re told that they have to install an advanced septic system which costs more. It is a \$20,000 to \$30,000 system and in possibly five years there is going to be a sanitary sewer line in front of their house anyway. How is that going to be penciled out financially? I understand there are some pharmaceuticals in the water. Shortly after this report came out the Associated Press came out with a scare tactic that there are pharmaceuticals in our drinking water. You would have to consume huge amounts of water before they can actually do you any harm. If I was looking at the information that both the California Department of Health and the Beaumont/Cherry Valley Water District has given us, it doesn’t indicate that well 21, 16, 5 or 4a are in dire straits. I’m still surprised that Well 16 had no pharmaceuticals, maybe sometime down the road we’ll get an answer explaining that. I’m not sold on the fact that Ordinance 871 should stay in place. I know from a water regulatory standpoint they would like to get rid of all OSWDS for the obvious reasons that there are problems with them. I do not feel that in the Beaumont/Cherry Valley area that they are the sole contributors to our problems. The Wildermuth study, lacking the pharmaceuticals, made a small notation as to the agricultural or the chicken ranches that used to be scattered throughout all of Cherry Valley. There are a lot of factors that have been overlooked in the study that should have been at the very least part of it.

Bruce Cash – You’re saying that Ordinance 871 is contrary to the Department of Health data that indicates sustainable water quality?

John Covington – No, I wouldn’t say that because obviously the idea of having advanced septic systems is a great idea. The removal rate of what they do is phenomenal, but if I heard the County correctly, that Ordinance would not have come into play if the Wildermuth study hadn’t been done. The Regional Board is always going to say that OSWDS are a contributing factor to the degradation of ground water. They are! There’s no doubt about that, but to what levels?

	<p>Bruce Cash –So, you are recommending that Ordinance 871 was premature?</p> <p>John Covington – I would say yes to that. Until a more in depth study is done, I don't understand why it should be in place.</p> <p>Brian DeForge – In response to Mr. Covington, being a general contractor myself and knowing how much things cost to build, it's just one of those things that you have to do. I think using the latest technology is probably the best thing you can do. The rational being that when you build a house you build it to the best that you can. I don't think it hurts to put the best septic system in. There has been evidence that the current designs, according to the report do cause a problem. To what level, we have yet to figure that out. I think that the County, the Health Department and all those that looked at it would not have issued those if they did not believe in that report. Why exacerbate the problem by allowing the same system to come back in. Although they are more expensive, it's a cost as a contractor or developer you have to figure into your price, whether you're building for yourself or someone else.</p> <p>Bruce Cash – We will word diligently with County staff to memorialize all that we have heard tonight. We will do our best to disseminate that information to everyone in a timely manner.</p> <p>John Watkins – We can disseminate this information to you via e-mail so that you can review and look at it. It would not be appropriate under the Brown Act in keeping everything transparent for us to e-mail each other back and forth about changes that should or should not take place. Send back edits and changes to me and I will include them all and will show you all that I receive. We need to make sure we don't make a consensus opinion by the committee via e-mail.</p>	
<p>8. Public Comments</p>	<p>Patsy Reeley – The County has allowed over the years, density in Cherry Valley to increase far more than the recommended one-acre size for a septic tank. Recently four houses were placed on one acre and the County allowed it. We have 2 highly dense trailer parks. There are a couple of other communities that were developed a number of years ago, where they were four houses per acre and the County allowed this. If the density in Cherry Valley is causing the problem, it should not be on the backs of only a few. There has to be some</p>	

other solution. The build out issue can be resolved by keeping one house to one acre.

Niki MaGee – I would like to know why this committee did not process a reviewing Wildermuth report, drawing your own conclusions. Why didn't you request the work file or the data file for the model?

Bruce Cash – Members of the committee, particularly the technical members could have requested that information had they found it relevant to their evaluation. Apparently they did not and as a result no further review of documentation beyond specific items asked of the presenters was requested. I will tell you that all items that were requested were submitted and have been viewed by this committee. It was entirely up to the members of the committee to ask for additional data from the different presenters or to hear additional presenters.

John Halliwill – I'm the one who sent the e-mail with the article "From Toilet to Tap." Also in that e-mail I expressed that I did not have confidence in the Water District's report. With respect to your comment I think you asked the committee if there was an easy way to cure the Pharmaceutical problem. It is my understanding that that is a very difficult removal process and unless there is a specific treatment added at the treatment plant then it can not be removed. The pharmaceuticals that we experience are not what they are experiencing anywhere else right now. A recommendation was made that if Well 21 has a septic tank too close to it and if there are any other deficiencies, it should be corrected. During the discussion I also heard Mr. Covington say that Well 16 possibly does not have a proper well seal. I would respectfully request that the water system be improved to whatever the state minimum level is for well seals. My understanding is that all wells should have some sort of a sanitary seal. I would suggest that if we are going to talk about fixing the septic tanks, then it should be expanded to include sanitary seals for wells. I'm sure that there is someplace in the statutes that if a well is abandoned and is no longer being used that then the wells should be sealed. In closing I thought it was interesting that when they said that they didn't want to take technical questions, I think the reason that came up was because when the woman that was giving

	<p>the presentation was asked “do these wells have well head protection?” Her response was “What is well head protection?” I lost my confidence in her as a presenter when she didn’t know what well head protection was.</p> <p>Robert Newman – What concerns me is the tremendous amount of discussion concerning the Wildermuth report. There was no discussion about the credibility of the U.S.G.S. report. I asked Dr. Li about the scope of the study and where the inconsistencies were between the U.S.G.S. and the Wildermuth studies. Her response was very disappointing and I felt she was covering some issues in favor of the Wildermuth report. I understand that the U.S.G.S. report is much more global than the Wildermuth study which is much smaller. It was a study that was done for a specific reason. As you may recall when Mark Wildermuth was here I asked him about the complete reliability of the study and I asked about the possibility of doing another study. He thought that was an inappropriate questing and wanted to know why I asked it. No one bases a potentially expensive project for sewerage on one “slip shod” study. The methodology of the Wildermuth study is flawed in that the wells selected were not randomly selected. That is a serious flaw in any study. The sampling techniques were questionable as well. The description and condition of the history of the wells leaves a lot to be concerned about. It is troublesome to me that so much weight by the other entities has been placed on the Wildermuth study. I have heard the U.S.G.S. report twice and do not recall them making reference to detecting pharmaceuticals in the water in the test that they have done. Apparently U.S.G.S. did not detect that problem.</p> <p>One last comment. I think that this committee should go through the process of allowing one of the technical experts, John Covington, to become a voting member of this committee.</p> <p>Bruce Cash – We work under the conditions that the Board of Supervisors has granted to us. However, it has been my insistence that the technical members as well as voting members feel free and comfortable to supply input so that there is no absence of points of view and we have followed that since our first meeting in July. We value everyone’s input.</p>	
--	--	--

Frances Flanders – It seems that every time you come up with a conclusion that sounds correct, an advisor or someone from the County says no, what you really mean is this. One person says the report is conclusive and someone else says the report is inconclusive. Well there's no point in having a committee if everyone comes to their own conclusions to have one of the advisors or someone from the County say that you are not right. This has upset me while I have watched it.

Bruce Cash – I would like to assure the general public that as chairman of the committee that you will have a great deal of input on the recommendations and it is my duty to ensure that they reflect the input of the committee as a whole.

Vince Stahl – I have one observation. When the State of California drafted the proposed regulation in response to Proposition 885 they identified some geographic areas within the State that they thought were in critical condition from the ground water quality standpoint as a result of influence by septic systems. Cherry Valley is not on that list. Given the information that has been disseminated and all that this community has been through I found that to be unique. If it were in fact a significant problem it would have been identified as other key communities have in California that have similar problems. You can view that on the web site and do your own analysis, but I thought that was telling.

Pat Daugherty – Ms. Ryan said something that has bothered me and that is that the area that seems to be doing the most damage was not an area that was going to have sewers installed. It seemed to me that they were more concerned about getting our reclaimed water from the sewers. Why would they not want to sewer most of the affected areas?

Bruce Cash – No one has looked at the specific economics associated with potential remedies assuming there is a problem. Referring to AB 885, the State of California has announced that as of January 14, 2009, the cost of a new septic system that would meet the new standards is between forty-five and fifty thousand dollars per installation. That's the states estimate only. Others may have more information on the cost.

9. Next Meeting Date	The next meeting will take place at the San Gorgonio Pass Water Agency on Wednesday, February 25, 2009 at 6:00 p.m.	
----------------------	---	--