

Summary of Water Subcommittee Meeting 5/25/2011

Attending Meeting: Regina Espinoza, Larry Ernst, Sean Spaeth, Antoinette Heberlein, Kathy Greenhalgh, Robert Strickland.

1. Larry provided graphs showing levels of arsenic, hexavalent chromium, and selenium for all Davis City wells and University of Davis wells. Well # 31, a deep well that is closest to North Davis Meadows, has no detectable selenium. Larry said that the trend observed in the data is for increasing nitrate levels, but stable levels of other contaminants. Nitrates aren't in the deep aquifer. There is no new source of arsenic and chromium. A summary of the data Larry provided is attached.
2. Larry explained the water capacity requirement. This requirement was previously reported in his report dated January 7, 2011. The maximum day requirement is 411gpm per source (this was reported at a community meeting on 9/30/10 and is based on a California Department of Public Health formula of average use). In addition to this, there is a state fire flow requirement of 875 gallons per minute for 120 minutes. This creates a total requirement of 1,286 gallons per minute.

The water capacity requirement can be met with different approaches, such as a 105,000 gallon tank, two 1286 gpm wells or with a combination of wells and tanks. Larry has proposed using a second storage tank, in addition to the two new proposed wells, to meet this need. The idea of using larger wells, as opposed to a second tank was discussed. Larry said that there can be issues with using a large well to feed a small supply, such as we see in our neighborhood in the winter. He also likes the idea of two tanks, as either tank can be taken out for maintenance providing flexibility in the system.
3. Larry was asked if redundancy could be met by fixing both wells, in addition to drilling one new well. He initially said no to this, but upon further questioning said that a steel storage tank of approximately 100,000 gallons could be added to the system. This tank would cost roughly \$200,000.
4. Regina and Larry were asked if a second site for drilling had been determined. Regina had previously mentioned that a variance would be required for a new well at the existing well #2 site, due to the proximity of an existing leach field. Regina provided a map showing which houses have septic systems and sewer with backup septic. Upon reviewing these maps, Larry stated that the well #2 site would not require a variance for drilling, if the well is 100 feet from the lot line for plot #11. He said that the well would have to also be 100 feet from the pond on the Corte property. Upon review, it appears that the north end of the retention pond, east of plot #10 could be used for the second site.
5. The issue of whether or not to co-locate two new wells was discussed. Larry continues to recommend this approach based on potential cost savings. Committee members have continued

concern about the risks that could be involved with having both wells at the same site. Larry was asked how much more it would cost to separate the wells. Use of the well #2 infrastructure would help reduce the cost of having separated wells. Larry will provide a list of pros/cons of co-locating/separating the wells and a cost analysis. One pro that was mentioned for co-location was that if treatment is ever needed, it would be more cost effective to have the wells at the same site.

6. Information was shared by Regina and Sean, regarding Assembly Bill No. 2515. At the last CSA meeting a neighbor said that the state was now allowing “point of use” treatment. A copy of the new regulation states that the bill allows for emergency regulations to “authorize the department to award a grant for point-of-entry and point-of-use treatment, in lieu of centralized treatment, by a public water system that serves a severely disadvantaged community.” This emergency regulation remains in effect until January 14, 2014. Regina said that this new regulation does not apply to North Davis Meadows and as previously reported to the community, there is no mechanism for regulating and monitoring point-of-entry/use treated water.
7. Regina shared information about the grant proposal for new wells. She said that based on information that has been requested, she feels that any aid from the state will be in the form of a loan, as opposed to a grant. She will be providing an update to CDPH regarding our progress towards remediating our nitrate problem, so that the deadline can be extended.
8. Regina will be on maternity leave from July until October. John Bencomo, director of Planning and Public Works, will be filling in for her.

Next Steps

1. Larry will provide the pros/cons and a cost analysis for separating the two proposed wells.
2. Larry will provide a cost analysis for drilling one new deep well, fixing two wells, and adding a 100,000 storage tank to meet fire flow code.
3. A CSA meeting will be held in June.
4. Robert Strickland has offered to summarize the water remediation options. These will be distributed to all neighbors following review by the CSA.
5. A community meeting will be held to review the possible options/costs.
6. An informal “straw poll” of the options has been proposed, following the community meeting. It has also been proposed that the CSA advisory board make a recommendation for which option they feel is best.