Meeting Date: Tuesday, August 29, 2023

Attendees: Advisory Committee Members

Steve Krai, Ben Carver, Josh Vieira, Louis Sun, Monte Hamamoto, Steven Garner, Jose Martinez, John Brady, Mike Maestas, Ian Tillery, Bryan Miller, Stacey Harrington, Dan DeMoss

**State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board)** 

Christine Gordon, Keisha Kelley, Julie Osborn, Valerie Gregory, Jaime Marotte, Sarah Miller, Tomas Eggers, Brian Elder, Jamie Johnson

**Public** 

Sue Mosburg, Norah Duffy, Yan Zhang, Stacy Preve, Larry Lyford, Christopher Tapia, Bill Cardinal, Tim Lewis, Octavio Navarrete, Richard Vierra, Steve Molina, Spencer Saks, David DeJesus, Jeremy Strickland, Rebekah Sorensen, Sue Murphy, Carla James, Ananda Ana

#### Item 1 - Introductions

 Keisha Kelley, Office of Operator Certification Program Manager, acted as moderator for this meeting. The meeting was held via Video/Teleconference and in person at the CalEPA building.

#### Item 2 - Agenda Review

 Keisha Kelley reviewed the agenda. There were no comments and the agenda proceeded as scheduled. It was explained that the meeting is being recorded and public comments will be limited to 3 minutes per speaker.

#### Item 3 - Public Comments

• There was a public comment that was cut-off because the comment was regarding specific test questions. which are confidential. Christine advised the commenter to direct the comment to the Office of Operator Certification.

#### Item 4 - Program Updates

- Keisha Kelley provided an update on the newly appointed Drinking Water Advisory Committee Members. They are welcomed and thanked in advance for their time, contribution, and partnership.
  - Stacey Harrington Statewide Organization Representing Local Primacy Agencies
  - Bryan Miller Member of an Organized Labor Union Representing Water Treatment and Distribution Operators
  - Ian Tillery Employee of a Water Recycling Treatment Plant
  - John Hamner Statewide Organization Representing Small Water Systems
  - Jose Martinez Educational Institution's School or Division of Engineering
  - Michael Maestas Statewide Organization Representing Medium to Large Water Systems
- March 2023 Customer Survey launched to gain insight on how Office of Operator Certification is doing in serving customers. Results will be on a semiannual basis, with the first coming in September.
- Online Application Portal launch is near. IT is wrapping things up this week and we are working through some unanticipated encryption requirements. We look forward to possibly launching in mid-September.
- Office of Operator Certification staffing update 5 vacancies, 3 clerical and 2 analyst positions. Recently promoted 2 clerical staff to 2 analyst positions and we are working on staffing the current vacancies. Bonnie Sutherland and Doug Wilson are retiring.

#### Item 5 – Drinking Water and Wastewater Operator Certification Programs Advisory Committee Sub Workgroup Recommendations

 Keisha Kelley and Christine Gordon presented the Sub-Workgroup Recommendations. See **Attachment 1** for recommendations presented. After presenting for each sub-workgroup, it was asked if there are any questions (see below).

#### **Guidelines on Reporting Drinking Water Operator Experience**

- Larry Lyford: Is there any way you can give us an example of the issues you find?
  - Christine Gordon: The guidance document listed experience credit earned by a chief operator and a shift operator allowed for the gaining of the same

experience in the 5 scenarios that were given. There needs to be more discussion on that to understand and clarify how we currently evaluate and what is in the guidance document based on looking at the level of responsibility in terms of the experience credit that's given. Look at the correlation between the scenarios provided and what is currently being done and clarify.

- Sue Mosberg: Might it be a discussion back to the sub-workgroup of the sections that did not have any questions and could move forward and holding the sections that did have questions or further work to be done holding those back?
  - Christine Gordon: I think that this will be a deeper discussion with the subworkgroups. Once we reconvene with the sub-workgroups and get that clarification, we can determine which ones to move forward with and which ones we need to make modifications to.
  - Sue Mosberg: Thank you, I understand regulatory changes don't happen overnight. I think there are some that the industry could use.
  - Julie Osborn: Some of the things that we need to change are little, such as I need a disclaimer. Things that will make it more consistent with Water Boards document requirements can take some time.
  - Sue Mosberg: Thank you for the clarity.
- Christine Gordon: I want to clarify, when you look at regulations in section 63830A4 requires an employer verification to have a signature of a chief operator or a shift operator. It looks as though this recommendation would require a signature from a chief operator, and the sub-work group will need to clarify. Is that something that we want to go forward with? If so, that will be a regulation change. Or if we are at a point where we have a consensus to keep as is but looking at best practices.

#### WW Operator In Training (OIT) Requirements and Experience

#### **One Water Regime**

- Sue Mosberg: Is the limit of the regulatory change considerations to certification and the certification program regulations or is it anticipated to hit other regulations?
  - Christine Gordon: We are focused on regulations for Office of Operator Certification regulations. Anything outside of those regulations, I cannot speak on. Any changes would only address Office of Operator Certification regulations.
  - Larry Lyford: Just to clarify on this, there was a presentation by staff at the Spring Conference which said they were looking into considering

- advanced treatment operators hours counting because of the level of disinfection required exceeds any that is in the current regulations. Has that been given further consideration or is it a total rewrite of regulations?
- Ohristine: I think we are in the early stage of this, I think we really need to go back to the sub-workgroups to really understand and clarify what we are looking at. Are we looking at defining the processes in our regulations clarifying some advanced treatment processes? I can't answer this because we are early in the process.
- Julie Osborn: Also, Larry, one of the things that might not have been known by the sub-workgroup at the time that you were working on this.
   Direct potable reuse: those facilities will be water treatment and they will only be allowed to have water treatment operators. There may be some changes in light of this.
- Larry: If I am hearing you correctly, the advanced treatment facilities will end up being permitted as a drinking water facility and not a wastewater facility?
- Julie: If it is a direct potable reuse facility.
- Larry: Yes, it does sound like we need to go back to the sub-workgroup to hash this out.
- o Christine: The DPR regulations have not been adopted by the board yet.
- Julie: They are under the comment period right now. They have a hearing next week.
- o Keisha: Any other questions or comments?

#### **Assembly Bill 1588**

- Jose Martinez: To understand, it sounds like there are still some outstanding questions and clarifications, so does that mean this is coming back to the subworkgroup soon? So that we can identify those and move the things that don't require regulatory changes?
  - Keisha: Correct. I will go over a preliminary timeline that we have developed which includes the sub-workgroups reconvening. Any other questions?
  - Steven Garner: Thankful for the clarity in your response and eager to reconvene and get at it.
- Steve Krai: A few of those you mentioned, you were in agreement with and will move forward with the regulation change. Are you going to discuss what the timeline would be for that regulation change?
  - Christine: Yes, Keisha will go over that next. More to come soon.

- Christine: I want to take the time to speak on behalf of the Office of Operator Certification. We truly appreciate all the time and commitment that you all have made to these sub-workgroups. You have made tremendous progress and we want to continue that. Thank you from the Office of Operator Certification for all this hard work that you are doing and have done. Thank you!
- Larry: Thank you for this opportunity. Would it be possible, or are you planning to
  post the minutes of this meeting of your recommendations so that folks can see it
  prior to these committees starting up again?
  - Christine: Yes, we will have the notes posted in the next 2 weeks and will make sure that we send those out to you all.
  - o Larry: Thank you so much.
- Sue: I want to say thank you. We spent a whole meeting weeks ago, when all of these were presented and there was a lot of work that went into that, and then to really have taken those recommendations and compared them against regulations, resource availability, that wasn't a small task for staff. In appreciation of that, I think everyone is looking forward to the opportunity to now get back to work. Thanks, and appreciation for the work that got us to the point of now there are some actionable items. Question, will we be regrouping the sub-workgroups now or is that in the timeline?
  - O Christine: I think the timeline is that we will be reconvening the same subworkgroups. I think what I'm hearing is that we would like to open it up to invite new members to the sub-workgroups? We will send this out to all the current sub-workgroup members, and to Advisory Committee members.
  - Steven Garner: Particularly because we have new Advisory Committee members and they might be able to share some good insights for us.
  - Ohristine: If you are interested in one of the sub-workgroups, we will send out some of the original purpose and objectives of the sub-workgroups and really where we are now. So, if you are interested in being one of the new Advisory Committee members, yes, we will have you join the group.
  - Sue: Thank you. That was my question, because some of the subworkgroups had Advisory Committee members on them that are no longer Advisory Committee members, so there will be some change. Thank you.
  - Christine: I also want to say that those that are no longer Advisory Committee members, I speak for the group when I say, they put a lot of work into this effort and if they can continue on these groups I think it would be very beneficial to not only the existing groups, but also to the new members that are joining to give their perspective. If those members

still have the commitment and time if they can remain on the subworkgroups.

- Keisha: I put together a very preliminary timeline for the sub-workgroups to reconvene and for preparing an update to our regulations. From September to December 2023, the sub-workgroups will reconvene to clarify and/or modify the applicable recommendations for a presentation to the Advisory Committee Members in meeting, email, etc. and inclusion in regulation packages if a regulation change is applicable. The sub-workgroups will submit a timeline for clarification/modifications to recommendations no later than October 31, 2023. Any recommendations that require a regulation change prior to implementation that have not been clarified or modified in time to be included in regulation scoping most likely will not be included in upcoming regulation packages. Items not included in upcoming regulation packages will be included in subsequent packages. From January to June 2024, the Office of Operator Certification will begin regulation scoping as separate packages for Wastewater and Drinking Water beginning in January 2024. Emergency Fee regulations will take place in the spring. There will be a Joint Advisory Committee Meeting in June 2024 to provide tentative regulation timelines for both the Wastewater and Drinking Water upcoming regulation packages. The tentative regulation timelines will consider not just the time to draft both Wastewater and Drinking Water regulation packages, but also for the supporting documents (e.g., experience guidance document) and meeting with the Advisory Committee and potentially other stakeholders prior to routing the packages internally and going to public notice. From here, the regulation process can take up to a year. The overall timeline is for the sub-workgroups to reconvene to clarify or modify as applicable. We would like a timeline for how long that would take no longer than October 31, 2023, that way we can begin scoping and plan for what will be done in time for both regulation packages. Anything that will not be done to be included in those packages will be included in the subsequent packages. Any questions?
  - Larry: What is an emergency regulation and what is the difference?
    - Christine: Emergency regulations are needed if we need to have any changes to our fees. Those regulations are separate and distinct from the regular regulation process.
    - Julie: We have a statutory provision in WW and DW statutes that declare it to be subject to the emergency regulations when it's a fee, and so because of that statutory exemption we don't have to go through the entire regulation process. We go through a 10-day process. It may be longer because we are a Board, but the Office of Administrative Law process is 10 days.

- Christine: I think I heard what you said Larry if this could be considered an emergency. These are different, so it has to go through the normal regulation change process, and the fact that we have some changes that need to be made, and that wouldn't be considered an emergency.
- Jule: It is very hard to consider anything an emergency.
- Larry: If we reversed these two, the government would be a lot better. Make it harder to get more money and easier to fix things.
- John Brady: I am trying to understand the timeline better. You are saying the sub-workgroups will reconvene and develop a timeline by October 31, 2023, and then present by June 2024 meeting. I am trying to understand. Are there milestones, deadlines that we need to meet in order to maybe help the sub-workgroups along?
  - Keisha: Sub-workgroups will reconvene beginning in September, and the goal would be to create a timeline for modifications or revised recommendations no later than October 31, 2023. That way we can consider that when we begin scoping to determine what recommendations, specifically the ones that require regulation changes are going to make it in the first regulation package. That being said, the sub-workgroups are going to continue to work for however long their timeline expands for. That could be January or longer, depending on if they are going to be done modifying the recommendations in time for the first regulation package. The Joint Advisory Committee meeting in June 2024 would be for us to provide a tentative timeline for regulations for both packages. We have received your timeline and completed scoping on our end and now we will have a better tentative timeline for how long regulation changes are going to take and implementation for the recommendations that have been considered.
  - John: Thank you, I think I'll begin to understand more once we begin to meet and determine what the real deliverables need to be.
  - Christine: In September we are expecting the sub-workgroups to meet again, but I don't know how frequently they are meeting. Let's say they are meeting every two weeks, so before October 31, 2023, they are going to determine how long it will take them to produce those changes or modifications. It may not take until June 2024; it really depends on the timeline that sub-group is going to determine to produce the clarifications or modifications and determine what's going to go forward for regulation changes. As a parallel, we have

from January to June 2024. Let's say for instance one of the subgroups says they are going to meet every two weeks, and by October 31st we have determined that by December we will have the clarifying recommendations that we have. We know that this is what we are going to have moving forward in terms of the package for regulation changes and they bring that over to the office. And so, the Office of Operator Certification, we have a better idea of what we are going to go forward with. This is what the package is going to look like. And then in June 2024, we will come forward to Advisory Committee Members, this is what we have from all the sub-workgroups. This is what the package is going to look like. There may also be some other things outside of what has come from sub workgroups that we are changing in that package. So, you will have more of a preliminary look at what we are moving forward with at that June 2024 meeting. So, it is not going to be only what is coming from the sub-workgroup, it will be what we have determined and what needs to change as well.

- John: I see, okay.
- Christine: I think you will have a clearer understanding when the sub-workgroups get back together to determine when they can produce those documents. If a sub-workgroup can only meet once a month, that may take longer. We do not want to set a timeline for the groups because we do not know what effort they can put in and how frequently they can meet. We want to make sure that we are aware of the time for the workgroup members as well.
- Julie: To be clear we are not asking for anyone to draft regulations. What we are looking for are concepts, and once we have all those different ideas, concepts, subject matters that people want to touch, we will decide what can go in this package; what is feasible. For those of you that remember the last wastewater regulation package, it was so big that it took a long time. Our hope is that if we piece it out into manageable pieces we can move forward at a faster rate.
- Christine: I think I mentioned that at the last meeting too. We want to make sure that we are identifying the priorities that we want to set forth. So, if we have experience and we know that is a priority for us to make changes and regulations, then that's the one that we will go forward with. Just identifying what the priorities are going to be in that package.

- John: Thank you.
- o Jose Martinez: Just to build on some of what you just said and thank you for the clarification that did answer some of my questions. So as a subcommittee we will reconvene in September, and the priority will be to develop a timeline and figure out when we can complete these clarifications. So, it sounds like essentially, we will have 3 different buckets and that's what we are going to work on as a subcommittee. Once we have clarified and solidified things it goes forward in three different manners. One without regulatory changes. Second being, this is worthwhile, and we would like to move forward with it. However, this may require regulatory changes and may have a little bit different timeline, but still moving forward. Third would be, maybe at this time isn't feasible and may get put on hold.
  - Christine: You have summed it up correctly Jose. And I think specifically for your workgroup there are a lot of clarifications, and you may come out of this after you reconvene, that maybe some of the things that you recommended may not need to move forward. We really want to focus on things that are a priority in terms of the regulation changes. And you may continue to meet even after December to flush out some of the things that could go in a subsequent package.
  - Jose: Thank you, yeah, I think we were already going four hours last time we presented.
  - Larry: Thank you very much. That clarified some of my questions as well. My question to staff and legal would be what do you think about the possibility of cross connection of the pamphlet guidebook? It is put up so that it is not in the regulations. Can we include parts of it in the operator experience guidebook? Is that a concept that can be considered.
    - Julie: We do not have the legal exemption to do that for this program.
    - Larry: We don't know, but if we could. Would that get any support from staff?
    - Julie: The Board cannot discuss any statutory potential changes with the public. We must get the Governor's Office approval on anything like that. We cannot discuss it publicly.
    - Larry: Okay, thank you. Maybe Jose and I can get together later.

- Sue Mosberg: One more clarifying question for me. Did I hear correctly that there were a couple of items that would require a statutory legislative change?
  - Julie: Depending on what happens with the AB 1588 workgroup and answering the question about certification and whether the U.S. certifies, and if it can fit somehow within the public health code provision on reciprocity, there may be an issue. We don't know enough to tell you that right now.
  - Sue: Okay, I thought I heard three items. Was there something to do with the guidance document?
  - Christine: No, it's more regulatory, not a legislative change.
  - Sue: Advanced Water Treatment?
  - Christine: No, that's a regulatory change.
  - Sue: So, the only legislative or statutory potential might be 1588.
  - Christine: Yes. We will send this to you.
  - Jose: Will you send this to us with the level of issues? That will help us as a sub-workgroup to understand what the potential concerns are.
  - Christine: Yes, we will.
- Steve Krai: At our last advisory meeting the committee members voted to move some of these proposals forward but with modifications, and I am wondering what the mechanism is for the members to vote again. Would that be at our June 2024 meeting, or would that be in our separate wastewater and drinking water meetings? To decide if we agreed with the modifications or not.
  - Christine: What you're saying is would there be another meeting or joint meeting to bring these modifications back to the committee to vote on? Is that what you're asking?
  - Steve: Yes, essentially to make sure we are in agreement with the modifications the sub-group came up with.
  - Christine: Okay, I think that if a meeting is warranted and we need it, we will. But I'm not sure and I think I'll have to warrant that over to Julie. I think notifying this group and the members of what the modified recommendations are; do we need to come back to a formal meeting?
  - Julie: I think it depends on which one. Some of these recommendations are far enough along that you may not want to see it again. If there is one that only affects drinking water, we bring it back to Drinking Water Advisory Committee meeting earlier than

June. Definitely, if there is any significant change, a desire by the members to meet and talk about it again. We want to let you meet and talk about it.

- Steve: Sounds good, thanks!
- Christine: Are there any other questions in terms of the timeline? We will kind of
  tie that down. We'll send you out the notes from this meeting. But then, also, I
  think we'll get more of a definitive timeline in terms of the sub-workgroups, and
  when they can produce the modifications or clarifications of the
  recommendations, so does that sound good to all? Okay we will move on.

#### Item 6 – Translation of Examinations

- Keisha: Moving on to last item of agenda for the day. In July of this year the SWRCB received a request from the City of Long Beach to provide our examinations in Spanish. With us today is Marina Perez and Alisha O'Loughlin from our Office of Public Participation to lead us in the discussion on this agenda topic.
- Marina Perez: I am a program manager with the language access program and with the Office of Public Participation (OPP).
- Alisha O'Loughlin: I am an engagement coordinator for the waterboards OPP.
- Adriana Renteria: Director of OPP, our office is within the waterboards communication office. We focus on four primary areas. First is safer drinking water program, where we work closely with our Department of Financial Assistance and Division of Drinking Water. Second is Tribal Affairs Program. Third, is public participation, environmental justice. And the fourth program is language access. Today's discussion is a combination of several of the programs within our office. Looking forward to hearing from you all.
- Alisha: Thank you again for having us today. We're here because the Water Boards has been asked to develop a Spanish version of the water operator certification exam. We'd like to explore that possibility today. And we'd like to hear from you about what some of the challenges and opportunities to offering that exam in Spanish may be.
  - We're committed to equity, and we diligently assess the racial equity implications of potential decisions. And that's again, what brings us here today. We're here to gain insight into what creating a multilingual operator certification program could entail.
- Marina: By expanding the Office of Operator Certification program through multilingual, we're removing the language access barrier and potentially enhancing opportunities for more individuals to join the drinking water and wastewater workforce. It's important to note the State Water Board sets a state

standard and what is expected of operators and systems and develops the tests. The State Water Board does not administer the exam or training, because we must remain impartial. To establish a fully multilingual program, we need to examine language needs at every step of the operator pipeline, including some of the following.

- o informational resources and marketing materials. For example, website content, instructional videos, guidance documents.
- o training programs and curriculums.
- o certification exam and exam taking experience.
- o career paths such as apprenticeships, internships, growth, retention
- o placement in districts where they could support multilingual employees.
- Translation of water system, manuals, and instructions.

There's a lot that needs to be considered. So, although the State Water Board does not lead or control most of the areas of the Operator Certification program. We would be interested in helping bring parties together, the right partners to help address this in a more holistic manner. To be clear, we have not taken on this project. There are several considerations that will need to be discussed and get your feedback on to inform our path forward.

- Sue Mosburg: The Water Boards does not administer the exam?
- Christine Gordon: Yes, we do administer the exam. Recently we switched to a computer-based test, but we are still the administrators of the exam.
  - Marina Perez: Thank you for the clarification.
- Steven Garner: One thing that was not mentioned in the broad spectrum of what would be included was standard operating procedures.
- Josh Vierra: Is there a big demand for this? Is it for different languages? What languages do you choose? At what cost to the state? Are they employable after they pass an exam?
- Larry Lyford: Every state and federal regulation, every technical manual would need to be translated. We may be better off putting the effort into classes to learn English, which is the issue. Rather than converting an entire industry.
- John Brady: Almost half of the population in CA speaks Spanish versus other languages. In the profession there is great importance in hands on experience. We may want to limit the impediments between a written test for those that might be very good operators but understand a written test better in Spanish. I think that's a fair thing to do to be more inclusive. I think the test is where it will need to stop.
- Marina: Questions to keep the conversation going are:
  - If a limited English proficiency speaker were to become certified and go into the water operator field. What would success look like for them?

- What may the language accessibility impact be on recruitment, apprenticeship, internships, crew, advancement, and retention?
- Do you foresee any specific challenges or opportunities in placing multilingual operators in districts that could support them?
- And what strategies could possibly be implemented to ensure their success?
  - Sue Mosburg: Success for the lower levels looks like getting an entry level position based on definitions and processes. There are opportunities at large level facilities that have the capacity to support an operator who English may be challenging. If we are setting up a workforce to move up to become managers over the years, we may be setting up for some serious challenges. In an emergency situation, to be able to dive into all available resources industry has to offer, web, regulations, industry, regulators, manuals, research papers. This is where someone would be set up for failure at those higher levels. We are looking at an opportunity to fill the pipeline. Learning the English language would allow for concepts to be understood rather than just the definitions. Currently the industry has Spanish classes to help with small system, entry level. Success today would be if the exams were converted to Spanish.
  - Steve Krai: First comment is multilingual is for someone who is fluent in multiple languages. This seems to be for someone to pass a test in Spanish because they are not fluent in English. Second is, English is the regulation standard. Does this plan to change in regulations? Third, setting industry up for failure unless planned out ahead of time. Communication in English in a state of emergency is very important.
  - Josh Vierra: Multilevel response in an emergency response, having one language is the way to go. There are a lot of possibilities for mistakes.
  - Larry Lyford: I am for getting more people in the industry. However, having one universal language is necessary for safety. How can we get people trained to be in the universal language?
- Alisha: If we were going to move forward with this, it would require a very holistic and collaborative approach. How could the water districts and organizations, you think, support this potential effort? And are there specific organizations or entities you think should be involved in developing a fully holistic multilingual program?

- Steve Garner: Institute for credentialing excellence currently offers exams in multiple languages and may have insight on how other industries transitioned.
- Michael Maestas: Does this go to Advisory Committee or maybe to subgroups for vetting this out?
- Christine: this is something we can discuss to see if we want to branch out to a sub-group. We are just meeting to get your thoughts and feedback on the topic.
- Louis Sun: I'd comment to look into universities and community colleges, even Sac State that already offers training. They would be a great partner because training books should be offered in the language that you are going to have the test in.
- Steve Krai: Does the state have funding available to provide to prospective operators?
  - Christine: We do not, currently, but that would be an internal conversation.
  - Adriana: Currently the workforce development board is looking at Operator Certification, so it could be they do have funding for a three-year pilot and training and education could be in the scope.
- Adriana: We have been brainstorming and we have had conversations with both workforce development boards, universities, community colleges and employee training and development programs. A lot of the concerns are the same as discussed today. Brainstorm focusing approach of a multilingual program on a D1 only due to some of the following concerns:
  - o Requirements for managers/supervisors
  - Emergency responding
  - Requirements of knowing all state regulations
  - If we begin with D1 only, it will address the target audience.
  - Through scoping, we have learned, that the target audience is limited English proficient speakers, meaning they do know some English, but it may not be their first language.
  - Vocational, English as a second language training program. Other workforce developments have been used.
  - Brings in industry terms and training along with English as a second language development.
  - Most D1 folks are already in the industry and speak English. However, they are more comfortable taking a test in their primary language in Spanish.

- Sue Mosburg: Has the relationship of the lower levels of certification and the complexities of a smaller facility been taken into consideration? Are there other industries that are public health focused that have incorporated ESL in their certification?
  - Adriana: Thank you, we will research more with that feedback.
- Walter Pease: I think changing the test is great without bringing in all the background. As long as they are functional in English.
   Technical terms can be difficult when translated.
- Christine: I want to clarify; we are looking at lower-level exams and training being translated in Spanish because it is more in demand. Technical terms, English and processes at the plant will need to be known. We will have to regroup and determine if we need a sub-workgroup focus on this area.
- Marina: Translations would be from a professional service for those purposes.
- Bryan Miller: How would we reach out to those communities for recruitment?
- Dan DeMoss: I've done training with a Spanish interpreter and that is challenging. We are now looking into putting out an apprenticeship program with Spanish translation. All the challenges are valid, but we must figure out how to move them forward. Starting at a smaller utility might be a better way to go, with even D2 levels. Possibly doing this on a regional level, possibly in the southern part of the state. We need more people in the industry and right now that is a challenge.
- Larry Lyford: Additional financial and staff resources required. Requirement of state regulations and plant permit is to have an operator manual available to the operator in the control room. This would be a huge lift.
- Christine: We have been talking about Drinking Water, how would this effect the Wastewater? Would there be any different barriers?
- Josh Vierra: Passing the test in a different language but they can still
  communicate, then it can be done. But communication is very important and one
  thing going wrong even at the entry level can cause extreme situations gone
  wrong.

#### Item 7 - Meeting Recap and Next Steps

- Keisha Kelley wrapped up the meeting, next steps are for meeting minutes to be sent out with the clarifications.
- Late October or early November via email we will determine if we need to meet again and schedule.

• Advisory Committee members can reach out to Keisha or Christine at any time to request a meeting.

#### <u>Attachment 1 - OOC Response to Sub Workgroup Recommendations</u>

				OOC FEEDBACK
G	uide	lines on Reporting Drinking Wa	ter Operator Experience	
	1.	Approve and adopt the Drinking Water Operator Experience Guidance as a supplemental document.		<ul> <li>with modifications.</li> <li>Document requires modifications and further discussion with the Sub Workgroup. The document has 6 sections, OOC will focus on one (1) section at a time with the Sub Workgroup.</li> <li>Document outlines experience credit for dual certificate holders. While the OOC does have some flexibility in this area under current regulations, formalizing experience credit as proposed would require regulation changes. Other</li> </ul>
		Requires regulation Change: YES	Further Discussion by Sub Workgroup: YES	issues regarding experience credit also have been raised in the past. Making significant changes to experience requirements in the regulations will require substantial effort, however, OOC recognizes the importance of experience credit to operators and wants to address these concerns in the first regulation package.

				OOC FEEDBACK  Development of the changes to
				experience credit requires further discussion with the Sub Workgroup.
2.	OOC to include links to the guidate  Requires regulation Change:	Further Discussion by Sub Workgroup:	•	Recommendation considered, contingent upon recommendation one (1).
	NO	NO		
3.	<ul> <li>Include the following additions to the Supervisor Letter:         <ul> <li>Chief Drinking Water (D/T) Operator authorization and information:</li> <li>Name, Position, Distribution/Treatment License Number(s), and Signature</li> </ul> </li> <li>Drinking Water System information:         <ul> <li>Classification and Number</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		•	Recommendation considered with modifications to be discussed further with the Sub Workgroup.  The DWOCP Regulations (63830(a)(4)) requires employer verification to have either the signature of the chief operator or supervisor of each employer. The OOC cannot require anything beyond the regulatory requirement.
	Requires regulation Change: ?	Further Discussion by Sub Workgroup: YES	•	Is there a desire to change the regulatory requirement to make it stricter or is this a best practice recommendation? Are there recommendations for any other change to this regulation?

				OOC FEEDBACK
4.	Adopt an annual review and approval of the Drinking Water Operator Certification Experience Guidance document.		•	Recommendation considered, with modifications. The guidance document shall be reviewed and updated as necessary when regulations are amended. The Advisory Committee and stakeholders may raise concerns about needing to update something in the
	Requires regulation Change: <b>NO</b>	Further Discussion by Sub Workgroup: <b>NO</b>		guidance document whenever needed.
14-		Deminerate Commission		
1.	Change the education requirement so that the six (6) education point be earned after the OIT certificate is obtained but before the certificate expiration date. This would allow three (3) years to earn the education and experience hours concurrently.  Requires regulation Change:  YES  Requirement & Experience  Solution (A) education point be earned after the OIT certificate is obtained but before the certificate expiration date. This would allow three (3) years to earn the education and experience hours concurrently.  Further Discussion by Sub Workging NO		•	Recommendation considered. Implementation is contingent upon the WW regulation timeline.
2.	, ,	the OIT certification requirement.  Further Discussion by Sub Workgroup:  NO	•	Recommendation not considered. Recommendation not fully developed and interest in this option appears limited. Recommendation would require regulatory changes and additional staffing resources to be implemented.

				OOC FEEDBACK
1.	§63800 that would allow certified requirements while working at factoric processes to meet regulatory star.  • "A certified operator may star experience requirements in working at treatment facilities (AWT) processes to meet in "Advanced Water Technology Membrane Filtration, Membrane Filtration, Membrane Removements and Manganese Removements and Manganese Removements in the second sec	ubstitute on a day-for-day basis the (c)(2) with experience gained while es that utilize Advanced Water Technology regulatory water quality standards." by Treatment processes include brane Desalination, Biological Filtration, by Membrane Bioreactors, Adsorption/	•	Recommendation considered with clarification/modifications. Recommendation would require regulatory changes. Development of these changes requires further discussion with the Sub Workgroup.
2.	1 2 2		•	Recommendation considered. Development of the meeting purpose, structure, frequency, and roles and responsibilities requires further discussion with the Sub Workgroup.

				OOC FEEDBACK	
3.	part of their regular process to c	Certification program commit to making it a conduct a Job Task Analysis of the very 5-7 years and publish "Need to Know"	•	Recommendation considered. OOC to determine if we have the ability and funding to contract this out and then include in the final scoping and implementation timeline.	
	Requires regulation Change: <b>NO</b>	Further Discussion by Sub Workgroup: <b>NO</b>			
_					
	mbly Bill 1588		_		
1.	Revised guidelines for application reviews.		•	Recommendations are not	
2.	Update to general operator application form and possibly a supplemental form for veterans.			developed enough for the OOC to consider. The Sub Workgroup	
3.	Coordination with the output from	m the other sub workgroup efforts.		shall reconvene to clarify the	
4.			_	recommendations or develop new recommendations keeping the current laws in mind. Work product shall be produced with any recommendations, as applicable. Regulatory/statutory changes	
5.	Continue using pilot experiences to evaluate recommended form and procedural adjustments.  • Develop tailored workflow for OOC staff		•		
6.	New forms and procedures will Disabilities Act (ADA).	be compliant with the Americans with		may be required:  DW: H&SC allows reciprocity under H&SC sec. 106897 – OOC may provide reciprocity to an individual with a comparable certificate issued	
7.	A standing agenda item for advi regulatory changes.	sory group meetings to address potential	pro		

		OOC FEEDBACK
8.	Message management processes to promote awareness of current wave and future shifts in forms/procedures.	by the U.S. Do individuals in the military have such a certificate?
9.	Sunset the AB 1588 Sub Workgroup and transition to work to the existing Advisory Groups (including military representative position).	WW: Section 3689 of the regulations allows for examination waiver but does not allow for the U.S. to be a certifying body.
10	. Advisory Groups meet more frequently, quarterly suggested.	Changes to applications would require regulatory changes and creating special applications for
11	Continue with Joint Advisory Group meetings.	

			OOC FEEDBACK
	Requires regulation Change: ?	Further Discussion by Sub Workgroup: <b>YES</b>	

#### **Preliminary Timeline**

#### **Sept. - Dec. 2023**

- Sub Workgroups to reconvene to clarify and/or modify the applicable recommendations for presnetation to the Advisory Committee members (meeting, email, etc.) and inclusion in regulation packages, if applicable.
- Sub Workgroups to develop and submit a timeline for clarifications and/or modifications no later than October 31, 2023\*.

#### Jan. - Jun. 2024

- OOC to begin regulation scoping of seperate packages for Wastewater and Drinking Water, January 2024.
- Joint Advisory Committee meeting, in June, to provide tentative regulation timelines for both the Wastewater and Drinking Water upcoming regulation packages\*\*.

- \*Any recommendations that require a regulation change prior to implementation that have not been clarified and/or modified in time to be included in regulation scoping, most likely will not be included in the upcoming regulation packages. Items not included in the upcoming regulation packages will be included in subsequent packages.
- \*\*The tentative regulation timelines will consider not just the time to draft both Wastewater and Drinking Water regulation packages but also the supporting documents (Ex. Experience Guidance Document), meeting with the Advisory Committees and potentially other stakeholders prior to routing the packages internally, and then going to public notice. From here the regulation process can take up to a year.