California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Central Valley Region
Katherine Hart, Chair

Linda S. Adams
Secretary for Environmental Protection

11020 Sun Center Drive #200, Rancho Cordova, California 95670-6114
Phone (916) 464-3291 • FAX (916) 464-4645
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley

Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

3 December 2010

Bruce Houdesheldt, Director, Regulatory Affairs
Northern California Water Association
Sacramento Valley Water Quality Coalition
455 Capitol Mall, Suite 335
Sacramento, CA 95814

SACRAMENTO VALLEY WATER QUALITY COALITION ANNUAL MANAGEMENT PLAN PROGRESS REPORT REVIEW

Thank you for submittal of the Sacramento Valley Water Quality Coalition (Coalition) Annual Management Plan Progress Report (MPPR), which was received on 3 May 2010. Staff has completed a review (enclosed with this letter) of the MPPR for compliance with Monitoring and Reporting Program Order R5-2009-0875 (MRP Order) and the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basin Plan for specific Total Maximum Daily Load (Basin Plan – TMDL) requirements. In general, the Coalition provided the necessary information to meet Management Plan reporting requirements. However, staff identified several omissions, which are discussed below and must be addressed by the Coalition.

Requirements for Management Plan Revisions or Amendments
I am greatly concerned with the significant and unilateral changes the Coalition made to its management plan monitoring program. The following summarizes those concerns and outlines the steps I expect the Coalition to take to ensure such changes are only implemented after Executive Officer approval.

As described in the enclosed Staff Review Memorandum, the Coalition determined that management plan monitoring was not needed for 31 management plan constituent/water body combinations during 2010 (see Enclosure, Table 1). However, the Coalition failed to communicate their decisions or provide an updated management plan and monitoring schedule to the Central Valley Water Board Executive Officer for approval prior to implementing those changes.

I understand the Coalition believes that since their management plan monitoring indicated "TBD (To Be Determined)" for 2010, there was no need to receive approval. This interpretation clearly conflicts with the spirit, if not the precise letter, of your MRP Order and my approval of your management plan. Any updates, revisions, modification, or amendments of your management plan (including decisions related to "TBD" items) must receive Executive Officer approval prior to their implementation.

For all management plans that have not been approved for completion by the EO, the Coalition must resume management plan monitoring, effective immediately. By

17 December 2010, the Coalition must submit for approval a constituent-specific monitoring schedule for 2011 for all such management plans. Thereafter, the Coalition must submit an annual management plan monitoring schedule by December 1st.

Incomplete Survey Response
Coalition members who receive management practice surveys are required to complete and return the surveys to their Coalition representatives. Based on the MPPR, ten surveys were not returned. The Coalition must obtain 100% of surveys requested and report completion to Staff by **31 December 2010** or provide staff with the names of the non-respondents. The non-respondents will receive a 13267 Order requiring the submittal of the information and/or have their enrollment under the Coalition Group waiver revoked.

TMDL Compliance Reporting
The Coalition is required to provide an annual report on the results of Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) compliance monitoring within their area. The Coalition described their approach to meet the requirements for Chlorpyrifos and Diazinon TMDLs in the Sacramento River, Feather River, and Delta. However, the Coalition did not conduct a data analysis or report on compliance with water quality objectives, loading capacity, and load allocation. The Coalition must provide a TMDL monitoring and compliance report for the 2009 monitoring period by **31 December 2010**.

Clear Lake Nutrient TMDL Addendum
The Coalition is required to provide written plans to address TMDLs that occur within their coalition boundaries. A plan has not been submitted for the Clear Lake Nutrient TMDL (Sections IV-37.04 and V-5.00, Basin Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins). The Coalition must prepare an addendum to their Management Plan that describes how they will meet the requirements of the Clear Lake Nutrient TMDL, as it applies to irrigated agriculture. The Clear Lake Nutrient TMDL Addendum shall be submitted by **17 January 2011**. The Addendum will require approval by the Central Valley Water Board Executive Officer.

Management Plan Performance Goals and Schedule
The current Management Plan establishes a minimum reporting of all progress annually. We find this is not sufficient for us to adequately evaluate progress. Therefore, we are requesting more frequent reporting as outlined below.

The Coalition's Management Plan document identifies a series of implementation tasks that address source identification, management practice implementation, and effectiveness evaluation for each management plan. Current reporting deliverables are limited to a Source Evaluation Report and the Annual Management Plan Progress Report.

To ensure the Central Valley Water Board is aware of progress on other management plan actions, the following additional key deliverables and schedules are needed.

1. For all management plans (water body / parameter combinations), the Coalition should submit a 2011 Schedule of Deliverables with due dates for approval by the Executive Officer. The deliverables should include a Source Evaluation Report, a Management

Practices Survey Results Report, and a Management Practices Implementation and Performance Goals document.

2. For all management plans being addressed in 2011, the Management Practices Implementation and Performance Goals document should include the following components:
   - a list of management practices that can be implemented to address the constituent(s) of concern being addressed by the management plan;
   - a management practices implementation schedule;
   - a description of management practice implementation performance goals with a schedule for achieving those goals;
   - a description of follow-up management practices surveys and reporting to track implementation progress; and
   - a process and schedule for evaluating and reporting management practice effectiveness.

We request that the Coalition submit the following by **24 January 2011**: 1) a Schedule of Deliverables; and 2) a Management Practices Implementation and Performance Goals document for 2011.

The Coalition will also need to propose revisions in their Management Plan Schedule of Tasks for 2011 (Appendix B) and submit a request with the proposed changes for Executive Officer approval. The Coalition should work with staff to develop the proposed schedule revisions.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Mark Cady at 916-464-4654, or by email at mcady@waterboards.ca.gov.

Original signed by
Pamela C. Creedon
Executive Officer

Enclosure: Review of 1 March 2010 Annual Management Plan Progress Report, SVWQC

Cc: David Guy, NCWA
Claus Suverkropp, LWA

California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Central Valley Region
Katherine Hart, Chair

Linda S. Adams
Secretary for Environmental Protection

11020 Sun Center Drive #200, Rancho Cordova, California 95670-6114
Phone (916) 464-3291 • FAX (916) 464-4645
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley

Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

TO: Susan Fregien
Senior Environmental Scientist
Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program

FROM: Mark Cady
Environmental Scientist
Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program

DATE: 26 October 2010

SIGNATURE: *Original Signed by Mark Cady*

REVIEW OF 1 MARCH 2010 ANNUAL MANAGEMENT PLAN PROGRESS REPORT SACRAMENTO VALLEY WATER QUALITY COALITION

On 30 April 2010, the Sacramento Valley Water Quality Coalition (Coalition) submitted the 2009 Annual Management Plan Progress Report (MPPR) to the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board Staff (Staff). The actions and results discussed in the MPPR cover the period of 1 January 2009 through 31 December 2009. This is the first MPPR required pursuant to the Monitoring and Reporting Program Order No. R5-2009-0875 (MRP Order) and the Management Plan approved by the Central Valley Water Board Executive Officer on 2 February 2009.

Staff comments are pursuant to the MRP Order and the Coalition's approved 2009 Management Plan. The section titles and item numbers of this review are the same as those used in the MPPR Checklist (see attached). Staff derived the MPPR Checklist directly from the MRP Order and the reporting description in the 2009 Management Plan (page 13). This Checklist was used to verify that the MPPR content met the minimum prescribed report requirements. Staff's review is organized into five major sections: MRP Order requirements, Management Plan components, TMDL compliance reporting, proposed Management Plan changes and report organization and format. Additional comments are provided in the MPPR Checklist (attachment), while some items that require more detailed explanation are included below.

A. MRP Order Requirements

Items 1-4, Part A of the attached checklist are being addressed through the Coalition's approved process and steps identified in the Management Plan. As indicated in the checklist comments, objectives and steps for Items 1-4 were adequately addressed.

Item 5. Management Plan monitoring for 2009 was identified in Appendix B of the Coalition's approved Management Plan. The 2009 MRP Plan also indicated that management plan monitoring for 2010 was to be determined. The Coalition conducted the planned monitoring in 2009 and determined that management plan monitoring would not be necessary during 2010 for 31 management plan constituent/water body combinations (see Table 1 below). However, the Coalition did not request water board concurrence or discuss this decision with staff.

Table 1. Management Plan Sites Omitted for Monitoring during 2010

Water Body	Constituent	Mgmt. Plan Completed?
Pine Creek	Chlorpyrifos	No
Butte Slough	Selenastrum	No
Wadsworth Canal	E. coli	No
Walker Creek	Chlorpyrifos	No
Walker Creek	Ceriodaphnia	No
Freshwater Creek	OC Pesticides	No
Logan Creek	E. coli	No
Lurline Creek	E. coli	No
Lurline Creek	OC pesticides	No
R&R Pumping Plant	E. coli	No
R&R Pumping Plant	OC pesticides	No
Stone Corral Creek	E. coli	No
Stony Creek	Hyalella	No
Coon Hollow Creek	Ceriodaphnia	No
North Canyon Creek	OC Pesticides	No
McGaugh Slough	E. coli	No
Capell Creek	E. coli	No
Coon Creek @ Striplin Rd	Chlorpyrifos	Yes
Laguna Creek	Ceriodaphnia	Yes
Dry Creek at Alta Mesa Rd	E. coli	No
Grand Island Drain	OC Pesticides	No
Cosumnes River @ Twin Cities Rd	Hyalella	No
Burch Creek	E. coli	No
Ulatis Creek	Selenastrum	No
Willow Slough Bypass	Ceriodaphnia	No
Willow Slough Bypass	Selenastrum	No
Willow Slough Bypass	OC Pesticides	No
Cache Creek at Capay Diversion Dam	Ceriodaphnia	No
Tule Canal at I-80	E. coli	No
Z-Drain	Hyalella	No
Z-Drain	E. coli	No

Items 6-8, Part A of the attached MPPR checklist are addressed through the approved Management Plan process and steps. As indicated in the checklist, Items 6-8 were adequately addressed.

B. Management Plan Report Components

1.0 Signed Transmittal letter. The most recent Notice of Intent is signed by David Guy and Ryan Broddrick who are authorized to represent and sign for the Coalition. In order to change or add authorized representatives, the Coalition should submit an amended Attachment D.1 to the Notice of Intent.

2.0 Title Page. All of the required title page elements are included.

3.0 Table of Contents. The Table of Contents is complete, however the document would be easier to navigate and reference if the sections and subsections were numbered.

4.0 Results of Monitoring. Monitoring results are summarized in Table 3 MPPR. However, a summary of the results for each category should appear in the narrative, including analysis of exceedances, reference to results (i.e. document, section, page) and description of next steps.

4.3. Legacy Pesticides. During 2009, the Coalition conducted a survey of organochlorine (OC) pesticides in sediments from water bodies with OC management plans. The purpose was to evaluate whether hot spots or spatial trends could be detected. It is not clear what pattern of OC concentrations in sediment would lead to the conclusion that contaminated sediment is being mobilized from an agricultural source. The report should clearly state the measured conditions which would have indicated either that agricultural operations do or do not contribute to OC pollution in the monitored waterways. Nonetheless, with the exception of Coon Hollow Creek, no spatial trends were revealed by this monitoring that could help focus management practice implementation.

Freshwater Creek. This location is not mentioned in the MPPR, although it is listed in the Management Plan (Appendix A, page 1; Appendix B, page 21). The MPPR should include data from this site, or a detailed explanation of why it is not included.

Coon Hollow Creek. The report appears to include inconsistent statements. Under “Coon Hollow Creek” on page 7 it is stated that “An agricultural source would result in a fairly consistent concentration in the creek sediments with no strong gradients.” Yet in the first paragraph on page 6 it states that it is “… ‘hot spots’ or trends that indicate that additional focus is needed to manage for control of legacy organochlorine pesticides.” This inconsistency makes it difficult to draw any conclusion from this monitoring study.

North Canyon Creek. The report states that “Concentrations were slightly elevated at the downstream location relative to the upstream sites.” In the future, conclusions should be supported with more precise descriptions and include the number of measurements and ranges of concentrations from which conclusions are drawn.

5.0 Results of Source Evaluations. Source Evaluations for pesticides and toxicity are described in the narrative, and results are summarized in MPPR tables 4 and 5. If the percentage of acreage operated by coalition members within each of the drainages is obtainable, it should be reported and if not, reasons should be given.

6.0 Outreach Documentation. Outreach is clearly documented in the report text and Appendix B, including a general description of the outreach program, descriptions of landowner meetings and direct mailings including numbers of attendees and pieces of mail sent. To improve upon the value of this program, outreach meetings should have clearly stated goals and include evaluation elements: end-of-meeting or after-meeting surveys, or some other measure to determine how well the meeting met its goals. Targeted outreach should be documented with copies of each unique advisory notice sent to landowners, and a description of the areas covered by mailings especially to show that drainages represented by the management plan drainage are receiving the same attention that is being applied to the management plan drainage.

7.0 Summary of completed baseline management practices inventories. In Figure 3 on page 10, the sum of surveys complete and outstanding for Ulatis Creek is not equal to the number of coalition members in the drainage. In addition, two surveys from Butte Slough and five surveys from Gilsizer Slough are outstanding. The Coalition is required to obtain surveys from 100% of members in the watershed.

Appendix D, the copy of the survey instrument, should be referenced in text.

8.0 Recommendations for Management Plan Monitoring. Monitoring recommendations for the current year appear in the source evaluation tables (Tables 4 and 5), however this should appear as a section in the narrative portion of the report including the rationale employed to arrive at the recommendations.

9.0 Evaluation of progress toward completion of Management Plans. An overarching analysis of Management Plan progress is not included in this report, but should be in future MPPRs. A suggested outline for including this component in future reports: 1) State the goals for the period, 2) Report whether or not these goals were attained, 3) Explain any discrepancies between stated goals and goals attained, 4) Identify changes that can be made to improve outcomes. After useful Management Plan changes are identified, a formal request must be submitted to the Regional Water Board's Executive Officer for approval before any changes take effect.

10.0 Proposed goals for additional implementation. This report does not include additional implementation goals. The Coalition will be required to develop performance goals and a schedule for implementation.

11.0 Updates to the list of required Management Plans. The tables of new management plans should show dates of the exceedances that triggered the new plans. There is no task that explicitly includes continued monitoring. Management Plan monitoring schedules are required in future Management Plan Progress Reports.

C. TMDL Compliance Reporting. The Coalition provided a general description of their approach to address Chlorpyrifos and Diazinon TMDLs (pgs. 14-15). However, this report should include an analysis of monitoring results and should address each of the seven Basin Plan elements for TMDL compliance monitoring.

D. Proposed Management Plan Changes. There are several Management Plan changes proposed in the Progress Report (pgs. 11-14). These changes will be addressed separately by the Water Board. Changes must be approved by the Executive Officer before being implemented.

E. Report Organization and Format. Staff has identified general comments that will improve the readability and usefulness of the report. These suggestions should be reflected in the MPPR that will be submitted in 2011.

1. This report should be organized with the headings used in the attached checklist,
2. Show all major categories, whether there is anything to report in that section or not, to have placeholders and consistency with future MPPR's.
3. When referring to information in other documents, the report should give page numbers, section names, etc. to make the information more accessible to the reader.
4. Do not use font sizes smaller than 9 point (see Table 2 in the MPPR).

Enclosure:

Attachment 1: SVWQC Management Plan Progress Report Review Checklist

SVWQC Management Plan Progress Report
Review Checklist

Report Name: SVWQC Management Plan Report			**Reviewer Name:** Mark Cady			
Submittal Date: 30 April 2010			**Review Date:** 21 October 2010			
		Review				
Item No.	**Management Plan Component Description**	Acceptable **A**	Unacceptable **U**	Incomplete **I**	**Page No. (Section No.)**	**Comments**
	A. MRP Order Requirements					
1	Identification of irrigated agriculture source -- general practice or specific location -- that may be the cause of the water quality problem, or a study design to determine the source.	X			Source Evaluation Reports, March 2010	Through source evaluation reports submitted separately from this report, the Coalition has either identified irrigated agricluture sources of contaminants or developed studies to identify potential agricultural sources of contaminants described in the 2009 Management Plan.
2	Identification of management practices to be implemented to address the exceedances.	X			Manage-ment Plan, 26 Jan. 2009, Appx. B	With one exception, noted immediately below, management practices identification will begin for "Registered Pesticides" and "Toxicity" categories in 2010, with practices for other categories in the following years.
3	Management practice implementation schedule. Implementation may occur through another Water Board regulatory program designed to address the specific exceedances.	X			Manage-ment Plan, 26 Jan. 2009, Appx. B	Management practice implementation schedules will be developed following management practices identification as noted above. The exception is the use of Chlorpyrifos in Yolo County where new restrictions on these materials were established by the Ag. Commissioner.
4	Management practice performance goals with a schedule.	X			Manage-ment Plan, 26 Jan. 2009, Pg. 6	The Coalition is currently tracking effectiveness of the associated changes in management measures in Yolo County. Management practice performance goals and schedule will be identified when management practices are identified (#2 above).
5	Waste-specific monitoring schedule.		X		Manage-ment Plan, 26 Jan. 2009, Appx. B	A monitoring schedule broken down by watershed, waterbody and analyte, was included in the 2009 Management Plan. However, the Coalition did not request approval for a different implemention schedule for the 2010 monitoring year.

		Review				
Item No.	Management Plan Component Description	Acceptable A	Unacceptable U	Incomplete I	Page No. (Section No.)	Comments
6	A process and schedule for evaluating management practice effectiveness.	X			Management Plan, 26 Jan. 2009, Appx. B	Effectiveness evaluation is a stated component of the 2009 Management Plan, and will be reported upon in future annual reports as individual management plans reach the implementation stage. The Coalition is required to develop specific goals and schedule to evaluate effectiveness of management practices.
7	Identification of the participants and Coalition Group(s) that will implement the Management Plan.	X			Management Plan, 26 Jan. 2009, Appx. B	Responsibilities are assigned to Coalition members and partners in the 2009 Management Plan. As performance goals are identified and individual management practices are scheduled, the responsible parties will be more precisely identified.
8	An identified routine schedule of reporting to the Regional Water Board.	X			Management Plan, 26 Jan. 2009, pg. 13	This Management Plan Progress Report represents the first scheduled annual report under the 2009 Management Plan. Reports will be submitted annually hereafter.
	B. Management Plan Report Components					
1.0	Signed Transmittal letter	X				Transmittal letter was provided, but should be signed by a SVWQC representative authorized in an Attachment or Amendment to the Coalition's Notice of Intent.
2.0	Title Page	X				Title Page is complete and adequate.
3.0	Table of Contents	X			Pg. 2	Sections and subsections should be numbered to help with navigation and referencing.
4.0	Results of monitoring	X			Pg. 2 & Table 3	Monitoring results are mentioned on page 2, paragraphs 3 and 4, and reported in Table 3.
4.1	Registered Pesticides	X			Tables 3, 4 & 5	Registered Pesticides and Toxicity management plan elements are reported in Tables 3, 4 and 5. However the status of these elements should be described in the narrative.
4.2	Toxicity	X				See above
4.3	Legacy Pesticides			X	Pgs 6-7	Data from one waterway is missing.
	Gilsizer Slough	X			Pg. 7	Include site codes for upstream sites on Gilsizer: GILHR, GILLR, GILOR.

SVWQC Management Plan Progress Report
Review Checklist

Item No.	Management Plan Component Description	Review: Acceptable (A)	Review: Unacceptable (U)	Review: Incomplete (I)	Page No. (Section No.)	Comments
	Freshwater Creek			X		Legacy pesticide monitoring data was not included for this water body. It is listed in Tables 1and 3 in this report and in the 2009 Management Plan, Appendix A and Appendix B, pages 18 and 21. Legacy pesticide monitoring results should be included in the text and tables, or reasons given for why these results were not obtained.
	Lurline Creek	X			Pg. 7	
	Sycamore Slough	X			Pg. 6	
	Coon Hollow Creek	X			Pg. 7	Incomplete sentence first paragraph of this element.
	North Canyon Creek	X			Pg. 8	Show range of values for sites.
	Grand Island	X			Pg. 7	Explain why elevated organochlorines in the W. Channel are not a "hotspot."
	Willow Slough Bypass	X			Pg. 6	Show range of values for sites.
4.4	Pathogen indicators	X				
	Coon Creek	X			Pg. 2	
4.5	Trace Metals	NA				Trace metal Management Plan tasks are scheduled to begin in 2011.
4.6	Salinity			X		Salinity Management Plan tasks are scheduled to begin in 2010, however continued monitoring of EC and TDS was scheduled for 2009 and should be described in this report.
4.7	DO and pH	X			Table 2	UFRW is the only area requiring DO & pH this year. Grant funding for an independent study was frozen in 2009. This report should state a new target date for completion. Monitoring of DO and pH was scheduled for 2009 and should be described in this report.
5.0	Results of Source Evaluations	X			Tables 4 & 5	Source Evaluation Report summaries are included in Tables 4 and 5 and in the more detailed Source Evaluation Reports submitted in March, 2010.
6.0	Outreach Documentation	X			Pg. 8 & Appx. B	Outreach is adequately documented.
7.0	Summary of completed baseline management practices inventories	X			Pgs. 9-10	Surveys were conducted, mostly completed, but no results presented. At a minimum, a schedule for reporting survey results should be given.
8.0	Recommendations for Management Plan monitoring			X	Tables 4 & 5	Water quality monitoring recommendations for 2010 appear in Tables 4 and 5, SER Outcomes, for registered pesticides and toxicity. This should be a section in the report narrative and provide detail on the reasoning behind the recommendations.

		Review				
Item No.	Management Plan Component Description	Acceptable A	Unacceptable U	Incomplete I	Page No. (Section No.)	Comments
9.0	Evaluation of progress toward completion of management plan elements.			X		An overall evaluation of progress should be presented in this report.
10.0	Proposed Goals for additional implementation			X		The Coalition is required to develop performance goals and a schedule for implementation of management practices.
11.0	Updates to the list of required management plans	X			Tables 6 & 7	Tables of new management plans with tasks and implementation dates are included.
12.0	Results of pesticide application reviews	X				Included in Source Evaluation Reports submitted in March, 2010.
	C. TMDL Compliance Reporting			X	Pgs. 14-15	A general overview of TMDL monitoring is provided, however this report should include analysis of monitoring results and should report on TMDL compliance.
	D. Proposed Management Plan Changes					The Regional Water Board will address the proposed changes separately from this review. Executive Officer approval is required before changes are implemented.
1	Pathogen indicator: Coordinate to implement Region-wide Source ID study				Pg. 13	UFRW--modify Management Plan to account for region-specific studies already implemented by UFRW group & UCCE.
2	Modifications of Pathogen Indicators Approach				Pgs. 12-13	A major change in the approach to this Management Plan category.
3	Addition of Nutrient Approach				Pg. 12	Initiates a new category of MP with elements and schedule listed in Table 7, following the general process that has been employed for other Management Plan elements. A monitoring schedule should be proposed as well.
4	Sediment Toxicity				Pg. 13	Stony Creek--make schedule consistent with other Toxicity Management Plans.