



Groundwater Quality Evaluation
Committee for the
Beaumont/Cherry Valley Area.

Minutes

Location: San Geronio Pass Water Agency
1210 Beaumont Ave., Beaumont, CA 92223
March 18, 2009, 6:00 p.m.

Item	Discussion	Action
1. Committee Members Roll Call	<p>Present: John Covington, Cindy Li, Behrooz Martazavi, John Watkins, Joe Aceto, Bruce Cash, Brian DeForge, Nancy Hall, and Luwana Ryan</p> <p>Absent: Hal Marlow, Mark Norton, Joe Zoba, Sarah Eberhardt, and Carl Workman</p>	
2. Approval of Minutes from 2/25/09	<p>There were two corrections to the minutes of February 25, 2009. On Page one the date of the meeting is missing and on page three, sixth line down, the sentence states that Cindy Li made the comment. It needs to change to say that Nancy Hall made that comment.</p> <p>The minutes of February 25, 2009 were approved with requested changes.</p>	The requested changes will be made.
3. Correspondence Received	Copies of a Press Enterprise newspaper article dated today (3/18/09) was distributed. The article title was "Water Districts' Payment to Firm is Questioned." The article discusses who is responsible for additional water testing done by Wildermuth Environmental at a cost of \$18,600.	
4. Review/Discussion of Draft Committee Report	<p>Mr. Cash opened the floor for discussion of the Draft Committee Report.</p> <p>John Covington – Stated that the Note on page 5 should be completely re-worded.</p>	

	<p>Nancy Hall – Referring to the Note on page 5, stated that that paragraph is not in agreement with what the committee has expressed.</p> <p>John Watkins – Stated that this paragraph was not intended to be part of the recommendations. Technical members imparted their knowledge and disagreed with recommendations numbers 1 and 2.</p> <p>Nancy Hall – Expressed concern that If anyone disagrees with the committee’s findings, then a separate letter should be sent to the Riverside County Board of Supervisors. It should not be included in the committee’s report.</p> <p>Joe Aceto – Concurred. The note minimizes the committee’s recommendations.</p> <p>Bruce Cash – The Board of Supervisors made the decision that it would be the resident committee members who would vote and decide on what the recommendations would be. However, there is also a clear provision to allow the technical members to provide a statement or findings that were meritorious or contrary to the findings and recommendations of the resident committee.</p> <p>Luwana Ryan – Under recommendations for the second findings the last sentence of the last paragraph on page 4 should be removed completely. This is not part of the recommendations that the voting members discussed. The committee recommended repealing Ord. 871.</p> <p>John Watkins – This sentence was not placed because of a decision made by the technical committee. It was information provided through correspondence from the California Regional Water Quality Board that stated that they would adopt an amendment to prohibit OSWDS if Ord. 871 was repealed.</p> <p>Luwana Ryan - What the Water Board plans on doing after the fact has no bearing on the recommendation made by this committee.</p> <p>John Watkins – I felt that the correspondence received from the Water Board would be pertinent to the recommendations made by the committee.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Bruce Cash – Would it be possible to see the correspondence from the Water Board?</p> <p>John Watkins – It was a letter included in an e-mail received today. I will ensure that you receive a copy of it.</p> <p>Luwana Ryan - Under the recommendations for the fourth findings on page 5, it appears that there is confusion between sanitary seals and well head protection.</p> <p>John Watkins – That recommendation was added by John Covington. It can be re-worded if he would like.</p> <p>John Covington – There is no enforcement mechanism to tell water purveyors whether sanitary seals are required.</p> <p>Brian DeForge – The second findings on page 4, the second sentence (referring to the Wildermuth Report) states; “It was based on a narrowly focused report...” Although for the committee’s purpose of focusing on the whole Beaumont Management Zone, it appeared to be narrowly focused, the Wildermuth Report covered the areas that they were asked to cover. This committee was asked to review a broader area than the Wildermuth Report covered. Therefore new studies are needed that will cover the whole Beaumont Management Zone in order to make an informed decision about the needs of the Beaumont/Cherry Valley area.</p> <p>Luwana Ryan – Asked about the status of Assembly Bill 885.</p> <p>Bruce Cash – I believe we reported at the last meeting that the State of California indicated that they have not proceeded with their initial recommendations.</p> <p>John Watkins – That is what we have been told, but have not actually seen it in writing. There is legislation that a new assembly bill, AB 237 may replace AB 885.</p>	
--	--	--

Bruce Cash – Suggested that committee members and County staff work closely together to refine the language of the report and to ensure that everyone has opportunity to give their input.

John Covington – Encouraged anyone with suggestions for changes to the Draft Report, provide them to the County staff.

John Watkins - Encouraged committee members to send their suggestions to him via e-mail so that they can be included in a new draft. This request was expressed at the previous meeting and the only two responses received were from Dr. Li and Mr. Covington.

Bruce – In reference to the “Note” on page 5, entertained a motion to remove it from its present location and add it as a footnote to the report.

Joe Aceto made the motion and Nancy Hall seconded. There was no opposition.

Bruce Cash – Referring to Ms. Ryan’s comment about AB 885, felt that the Water Board’s comment should be placed at a different location in the report.

Nancy Hall – Questioned the necessity of including this sentence in the report. It appears that it is only something that the Water Board “may do,” it seems out of place in our report.

Bruce Cash – I believe that it would be appropriate to include in the report. Any correspondence coming to us from a technical member should be included in an appropriate location.

Behrooz Mortazavi – I was one of the technical committee members that disagreed with the findings and recommendations for items one and two. The note was a collaboration of the technical members. I participated in this decision, not because I was against the committee’s recommendation, but because the committee made the recommendation on a technical finding. My suggestion for the committee’s consideration is to take that policy recommendation out of the recommendations for item two. You can still make

	<p>that policy recommendation as an overall conclusion and technical committee could not comment on it. The reason I commented on it was because it came as a recommendation on a technical finding. I would suggest that the committee make the recommendation with respect to technical finding two as a technical recommendation, then have a conclusion which would be an umbrella overlying all of your recommendations, then the technical committee would have no say in it.</p> <p>Cindy Li – Questioned that “because the technical advisors are not part of the committee, we can not make recommendations?”</p> <p>Bruce Cash – A recommendation can be made by the technical advisors, and we will listen to your recommendations. When it come down to the recommendations that are being proposed to the Board of Supervisors, we want to be clear that the seven voting members of the committee have clarity on the issues they want to bring to the Board of Supervisors. We will be mindful to include all of the responses from the technical committee members that differ so that there is a clear picture that this was not a unanimous decision on the part of all of the committee members combined. We want to hear your input and will find the appropriate spot to include that in the report. I have not seen any correspondence with respect to input from the technical committee.</p> <p>Brian DeForge – Stated that the “note” should be placed as a footnote in the report. In reviewing the statement, it is not something that was discussed at any of the previous meetings.</p> <p>Mr. Cash asked Mr. DeForge if he would like to make a motion to include the note as a footnote. Mr. DeForge said yes, it was seconded and accepted.</p>	
<p>5. Committee Member Comments</p>	<p>Mr. Cash opened the floor for committee member comments.</p> <p>John Covington – E-mailed to Mr. Watkins a review and some conclusions of the Wildermuth Report from his perspective. This was in turn distributed to the committee members for review. Mr. Covington then read the report and explained his conclusions.</p>	

	<p>Bruce Cash – Provided copies of a letter dated today (3/18/09) from the Executive Officer of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, that was addressed to Supervisor Marion Ashley. This letter will also be made available on the web site.</p> <p>John Watkins – There was an error made on the letter from the Water Board. It references Ord. 864.2 which only had a 120 day life and was replaced by Ord. 871.</p>	
<p>6. Public Comments</p>	<p><u>NAME UNKNOWN</u> – Female – Agreed that the 2 items mentioned previously in this meeting should be removed from the report.</p> <p>Steve Bayne – Felt that the committee should get a second opinion of the Wildermuth Report.</p> <p>Glen Dye – Has lived in Cherry Valley for over eleven years and has received reports from the Beaumont/Cherry Valley Water District. None of the poor water quality claims were in these reports. No excessive nitrates or anything else. Does not understand why we are being told now that we have poor water quality.</p> <p>John Halliwell – Agrees that the “note” should be removed from the committee report.</p> <p>Frances Flanders – Does not feel that the report is reflective of what the committee is trying to say. It should be re-written,</p>	
<p>7. Next Meeting Date</p>	<p>The next meeting will take place at the San Geronio Pass Water Agency on Wednesday, April 22, 2009 at 6:00 p.m.</p>	