

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION**

28/29 NOVEMBER 2005

ITEM: 3

SUBJECT: Executive Officer's Report

DISCUSSION:

ENFORCEMENT

1. *Grizzly Creek Development LLC, Plumas County*

On 8 September 2005, the Executive Officer issued a \$600,000 ACL Complaint to Grizzly Creek Development LLC (Discharger) for violations of the General Construction Storm Water Permit. The Discharger is developing a 380 unit residential subdivision and golf course near Portola. Their failure to properly implement erosion and sediment control resulted in the discharge of approximately 1.7 million gallons of turbid and sediment laden storm water runoff to Big Grizzly Creek and its tributaries in March of 2005. Big Grizzly Creek is tributary to the Middle Fork of the Feather River, a federally designated wild and scenic river. The Discharger paid a \$575,000 liability (reduced slightly based upon staff's review of new facts) on 11 October 2005 and is currently working to stabilize the site to prevent further erosion and sediment problems. (RSD)

2. *Yakima Compost Company, Kern County*

From 1995 through the end of 2003, the Yakima Compost Company and various landowners held WDRs for discharge of biosolids on a combined 7,380 acres of agricultural land near the community of Buttonwillow in Kern County. Yakima was the site operator at each. The ACL Complaint named all parties. The parties failed to remit required annual fees and submitted very few of the requisite monitoring reports for over the eight years. The ACL Complaint required payment of all outstanding fees (\$94,712) and assessed a civil liability of \$50,000. On 13 October, Yakima waived its right to a hearing and agreed to pay the fee and the civil liability amounts. (JRL)

3. *Dole Fresh Vegetables and Wild Rose Vineyards, LLC, San Joaquin County*

Dole Fresh Vegetables operated the former Victor Fruit Facility, at which cherries were processed and wastewater was discharged to unlined evaporation/infiltration ponds. Operation of the ponds contaminated underlying soil and down-gradient groundwater with sulfate and chloride. The facility was closed in 1999, and the property sold to Wild Rose Vineyards, LLC. In January 2002, Dole submitted a closure plan for the ponds. However, Wild Rose objected to provisions of the plan and denied access to complete the closure. In August 2004, the Executive Officer issued a Cleanup and Abatement Order naming both Dole and Wild Rose as responsible parties and requiring closure of the ponds by 1 November 2004. The ponds were not closed as required and therefore on 6 May 2005 the Executive Officer issued an Administrative Civil Liability Complaint in the amount of \$40,000 to both parties. Dole subsequently met with staff and provided additional information that led to a settlement agreement. The ACLC has been settled with payment of \$20,000 and a time schedule to complete the pond closure and submit a closure report. As of 15 September, closure construction at the ponds was complete; the report should be submitted shortly. (RDA)

4. *Baker Commodities, Hanford Hide Skinning and Hide Curing Facility, Kings County*

On 21 October, a Cleanup and Abatement Order was issued to Baker Commodities' dead cow and calf skinning and hide curing facility near Hanford. The facility for several years discharged brine waste to three unlined ponds. The CAO requires Baker to investigate and remedy impacts from discharge of waste brine and hide skinning wastewater into unlined ponds. The CAO establishes a time schedule to construct lined lagoons and cease discharge to the unlined lagoons, determine the horizontal and vertical extent of impacted soil and groundwater, evaluate cleanup and abatement actions, and effectively mitigate impacted soil and groundwater. WDRs that authorize discharge to lined ponds are part of this agenda. (SJK)

5. *Chico Redevelopment Agency, Humboldt Road Burn Dump, Butte County*

On 19 October 2005, Redding staff issued two Notices of Violation to Chico Redevelopment Agency (CRDA). The first NOV was for failure to complete all construction activities associated with closure of the CRDA Humboldt Road Burn Dump waste consolidation unit by 15 October 2005. The unit is currently covered with a geosynthetic membrane, but lacks the drainage and vegetative layers. CRDA anticipates resolving issues related to the drainage layer and complete the unit construction by spring 2006. The second NOV was for failure to comply with the

Construction Storm Water (CSW) Permit. Since issuance of the NOV, CRDA has amended their SWPPP to reflect current site conditions and installed BMPs. Redding staff intends to inspect the HRBD throughout the winter to determine if CRDA, and the adjacent "Fogarty" disposal unit, are maintaining compliance with their WDRs and CSW permits. (KLC)

WASTE DISCHARGES TO LAND

6. *Burn Dump at Foxrun, Lake Almanor, Plumas County*

On 27 October 2005, Redding staff assisted Plumas County staff in investigating a burn dump county staff discovered at the Foxrun-Phase 2 Subdivision near Lake Almanor. The burn dump was unearthed during lot preparation and road construction at the subdivision. The construction contractor excavated over 1,500 cubic yards of wastes and overburden soil and transported them to two different areas in an adjacent subdivision (Fox Hollow-Phase 3). Wastes that were observed include; bottles, broken glass, burn ash, wood wastes, and miscellaneous metal wastes. Staff obtained samples from various locations at the burn dump and the waste stockpile areas. While sample results are pending, staff has initiated discussions with DTSC and IWMB staff and requested that Plumas County not record the subdivision map until the burn dump boundaries are delineated and wastes characterized. Staff is also preparing a Cleanup and Abatement Order requiring proper site cleanup. (DPS)

7. *City of Lincoln E Street Infrastructure Project, Placer County*

A City contractor recently discovered an old burn dump site while excavating a trench for a new sewer line crossing under Auburn Ravine. The site is on the north side of Auburn Ravine near Highway 65. Approximately 1,500 yards of lead contaminated soil mixed with debris were excavated from the trench. Sample results showed hazardous concentrations of total lead in about 40 cubic yards of the material, while the remainder appeared to be designated or inert wastes. In a meeting with staff from the Regional Board, the City of Lincoln, and Placer County Department of Health and Human Services, it was agreed that the hazardous and designated wastes would be removed for disposal at Class I and II landfills, as appropriate, while the remaining material (about 800 yards) could be used as backfill along with the clean soil after separating out debris. The debris will be taken to an authorized Class III facility. (JDM)

8. *City of Folsom Corporation Yard Landfill, Sacramento County*

City of Folsom representatives met recently with Regional Board staff to discuss plans for clean closure of the Corporation Yard landfill. The landfill was previously closed in 1997 with a low-permeability clay cover. Clean closure is now considered to be economically viable since the landfill is on valuable land adjacent to the American River. Clean closure is desirable for water quality protection because no waste will remain at the site. The City plans to remove all wastes including the underlying clay liner of the old wastewater ponds in which the landfill was sited. Wastes will be screened and sampled as necessary for offsite recycling or disposal. The City hopes to start the project in early 2006, which will require that revised closure WDRs be scheduled for the March 2006 Regional Board meeting. The City plans to submit a Joint Technical Document with specific project plans to the Regional Board, California Integrated Waste Management Board, and Local Enforcement Agency by 1 January 2006. The City is working on CEQA issues and will conduct public outreach regarding the project. (JDM)

9. *Jamestown Landfill Closure, Tuolumne County*

On 22 September 2005 California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) staff inspected the closed Jamestown Landfill and observed large desiccation cracks in the clay cover and landslides on the steep western slope. Board staff subsequently inspected the landfill on 19 October 2005 and measured desiccation cracks up to 2.5 inches wide and more than 2 feet deep. This desiccation of the cover will compromise its ability to prevent precipitation from moving through the cover into the underlying waste. Officials from Tuolumne County Public Works Department stated that the cracks would be filled with a bentonite paste. Staff also observed landslides on the steep western slope. These slides included mostly the top 2-4 inches of the cover, including a net to hold vegetation in place and the vegetation itself. Large parts of the slope lack a vegetative cover because of these slides. The vegetative cover is important to prevent or reduce erosion. Staff is very concerned about the integrity of this slope and whether the cover will remain in place. Because the Discharger has failed to submit the required report, staff has been unable to evaluate the cover installation construction quality assurance data. A Notice of Violation was issued requiring the Discharger to submit this information no later than 1 November 2005. (HFH)

10. *Port of Stockton Bulk Storage, San Joaquin County*

In March 2005, staff inspected the sulfur and coal bulk materials storage facilities at the Port of Stockton. Based on site conditions found during that inspection, on 2 June 2005, the Executive Officer sent a California Water Code Section 13267 request for a technical report to the Port of Stockton, Bay Sulfur, Metropolitan Stevedore and H.J. Baker. As of this date, the groundwater investigation workplan has been received and approved, as has the short-term sulfur management plans. The Discharger is beginning the groundwater investigation. The final groundwater

investigation report is due on 1 December, however, according to the consultant, the report will be late due to driller's scheduling conflicts. A formal written extension request is forthcoming. (MMW)

11. California Olive Growers, Madera County

On 27 September 2005, the United Security Bank of Fresno foreclosed on 59 acres of the former California Olive Growers, former TriValley Growers, and former Oberti Olive's olive production facility. The foreclosure included the olive production facilities, warehouse and offices, several million gallon tanks, wastewater treatment plant, and olive and tomato processing equipment. The foreclosure excluded two parcels that remain in the Oberti family, the 45-acre Process Ponds, and the 115-acre Remote Ponds. The 160 acres of ponds remain within the bankruptcy proceedings. The bank intends to sell the processing equipment, tanks, and eventually the property. There has been some local interest in discussing purchase of the ponds. Regional Board staff is working closely with California Olive Growers, the bank, and a Deputy Attorney General in resolving issues and answering questions. (SRG)

12. Sacramento County Boys Ranch, Sacramento County

On 28 October, Superior Court Judge Lloyd G. Connelly ruled in favor of the State and Central Valley Water Boards on a petition brought by Sacramento County. The petition had challenged waste discharge requirements (WDRs) adopted by Central Valley Water Board for the Carson Creek Boys Ranch, a youth correctional facility operated by the County and located in a rural area south of the City of Folsom. The wastewater treatment facility that serves the Boys Ranch consists of a gravity collection system and two raw sewage evaporation/percolation ponds. In 2001, the Central Valley Water Board issued updated WDRs. Sacramento County filed a petition for review with the State Water Board, contesting the groundwater limitations, groundwater monitoring, and a number of other requirements. The State Water Board largely upheld the WDRs, while remanding a few items back to the Central Valley Water Board. Sacramento County then petitioned Superior Court for a writ of mandate to overturn the orders of both boards. In 2004, the Central Valley Water Board adopted revised WDRs to address the remanded items. Sacramento County petitioned the revised WDRs to the State Water Board, which denied the petition.

The focus of the County's petition to Superior Court was the Central Valley Water Board's application of the water quality objective for groundwater, which reads "In ground waters used for domestic or municipal supply (MUN) the most probable number of coliform organisms over any seven-day period shall be less than 2.2/100 ml." The WDRs contained a groundwater limitation for total coliform organisms of less than 2.2 MPN/100 ml over any 7-day period. The County contended that the objective did not apply unless groundwater in the area of the facility is currently used for municipal or domestic supply. The nearest residence is 1.5 miles from the wastewater treatment facility and the Boys Ranch water supply well is 10,000 feet away. The Board's position is that the language introducing the groundwater objectives in the Basin Plan and the Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives in the implementation chapter both specify that water quality objectives apply to waters for which beneficial uses have been designated, regardless of current use. Judge Connelly agreed with the Board's position, noting that the objective must be read in the context of the Basin Plan, rather than in isolation. He said that it is clear from the Basin Plan and the Porter-Cologne Act that "use" means "designated beneficial use" and that there is no ambiguity in that context. "As a matter of law, use is equivalent to designated beneficial use." The County had also challenged the Board's denial of a mixing zone in groundwater. However, Judge Connelly ruled that the Board had discretion to not consider a mixing zone and that the County had supplied no technical information to support such consideration.

The water quality objective for bacteria in groundwater was also the subject of a non-substantive Basin Plan amendment, adopted by the Central Valley Water Board in January 2003. The amendment aimed to clarify the applicability of the objective by changing its language from "used for" to "designated for use as". In May 2004, the State Water Board held a workshop, in which Sacramento County and other dischargers contested the amendment as being a substantive change in the objective, using the same arguments presented to Superior Court. At their hearing later that month, the State Water Board tabled the Basin Plan amendment. A decision on the amendment is still pending. (JBM)

WATERSHED ACTIVITIES

13. Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP)

In early October 2005, SWAMP underwent external review by a Scientific Planning and Review Committee (SPARC). The SPARC, made up of seven scientists from across the nation, was assembled to review the current statewide SWAMP program structure and strategy. Draft comments assembled and discussed at the end of the conference indicated that while monitoring efforts conducted by the various Regional Boards showed good ability to leverage limited resources and answer regional questions, linkage between the regional efforts did not provide a clear statewide assessment strategy. A draft report from the SPARC should be available by the end of November. A subcommittee from the SPARC will work with SWAMP staff over the next six months to help them refine the statewide assessment component. The SWAMP program will undergo one more

technical review in February, with a final report of the SPARC's comments and recommendations available in March 2006. (JEC)

14. Stockton Sloughs Monitoring

Sloughs in the City of Stockton are on the Clean Water Act 303(d) list of impaired waters for pathogens and low dissolved oxygen. Staff is monitoring these Sloughs to determine the temporal and spatial extent of the impairments and the impacts of upstream loading. Baseline sampling is being conducted every three weeks prior to the winter storm season. Three storm events will be sampled before, during, and after rainfall events to confirm the link between dissolved oxygen, pathogens, and stormwater. Data will be analyzed and used to develop a Stockton Urban Sloughs TMDL. (JH)

15. CalSim II Peer Review

Staff is participating in the peer review of the CalSim II model. The model is used to simulate flow operations of the combined State and Federal Water Projects and water quality in the San Joaquin River. The CalSim II model review panel presented their initial findings and received additional public comment at a 30 September 2005 workshop held at the Resources Agency building in Sacramento. This was the second of three public meetings that are being held as part of the review. The CALFED Science Program and the California Water and Environmental Modeling Forum (CWEMF) directed the panel to comment on the merits of recent work compared to prior representations and improvements of the recent work with regard to Eastside hydrology and operations, Eastside water demands, and San Joaquin River salinity. Date of release of the peer review report and the date and location for the third and final public meeting have not yet been determined. Additional information on this review can be found at: http://science.calwater.ca.gov/workshop/calsim_05.shtml (LFG)

16. Annual CALFED Mercury Workshop

A workshop is scheduled for 29 November to 1 December 2005 at the Embassy Suites Hotel in Sacramento to review the status and progress of eight ongoing CALFED sponsored mercury projects. The public is invited on 29 November to presentations by Principal Investigators and again on the morning of 1 December to a synthesis of current findings. Water Board staff will make a presentation and have several posters. More information may be obtained at the following web site: http://calwater.ca.gov/Programs/EcosystemRestoration/Mercury_Project/Workshop/Invitation.pdf (CGF)

17. San Joaquin Valley Agricultural Commissioners

On 26 October 2005, staffs from the Regional Board and the Department of Pesticide Regulation made a joint presentation to the Sacramento Valley section of the County Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association. The purpose of the presentation was to make the Commissioners aware of Regional Board Basin Planning activities and complimentary efforts by DPR. Staff discussed TMDL/Basin Planning efforts to address diazinon and chlorpyrifos runoff, and the implementation of the Sacramento/Feather River diazinon Basin Plan Amendment. Staff also discussed future Basin Planning efforts to address other pesticides that pose a potential risk to surface water quality. DPR discussed the status of DPR's regulatory efforts to address diazinon and chlorpyrifos runoff, as well as DPR's pending dormant spray regulations. Staff from the Irrigated Lands Program also attended the meeting and addressed concerns raised by the Commissioners regarding the irrigated lands conditional waiver renewal. (JK)

18. Water Quality Objectives, South Delta, USBR and DWR Water Rights Hearings at SWRCB

The State Water Resources Control Board held a public hearing on 24 and 25 October 2005 to receive evidence relevant to determining whether to adopt draft cease and desist orders against the United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) and California Department of Water Resources (DWR). The State Water Board's, Draft CDO Nos. 262.31-16 and 262.31-177 against the USBR and DWR, respectively, are based, in part, on the USBR's and DWR's threatened violation of the conditions of their licenses and permits requiring them to meet the 0.7 EC objective at three locations in the South Delta between April and August, as required by revised Decision 1641. The USBR and DWR are jointly and severally responsible for meeting water quality objectives, including certain water salinity objectives in the southern Delta, as described in revised Decision 1641. Prior to the hearing, the USBR proposed a Settlement Agreement, the contents of which were not discussed at the hearing.

Central Valley Water Board staff is attending the hearing to hear testimony and evidence as it relates to the establishment of TMDLs for salt and boron, and dissolved oxygen in the San Joaquin River. The hearing will continue on 7 and 18 November, and additional days as necessary. More information on the draft cease and desist order can be found on the State Water Board website at: http://www.waterrights.ca.gov/hearings/usbr_dwr_cdo_hearing.html (EKB / LFG)

TMDLs

19. Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List Update

In September, the State Water Board released their proposed revisions to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List (303(d) List). The 303(d) List identifies surface waters that are not meeting water quality standards (narrative or numeric objectives and

beneficial uses). Identification of a water body and pollutant on the 303(d) List triggers an obligation on the part of the Regional Board to develop Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) and plans to implement those TMDLs.

The table below identifies the changes to the 303(d) list proposed for the Central Valley:

Proposed State Board Additions to the 303(d) List

| Water body | Pollutant | Water body | Pollutant |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| American River, South Fork | Mercury | Lower Bear River Reservoir | Copper |
| Bear River | Copper | Main Drainage Canal | Diazinon |
| Carson Creek | Aluminum Copper Manganese | Merced River, lower | Mercury |
| Clear Lake | Mercury | Morrison Creek | Chlorpyrifos |
| Cosumnes River | Exotic Species | Lake Natoma | Mercury |
| Deer Creek (Sac County) | Iron | Orestimba Creek (below Kilburn Rd) | Sediment Bioassays |
| Del Puerto Creek | Pyrethroid | Sacramento River (Keswick to Cottonwood Creek) | Cadmium Copper Zinc |
| Delta Waterways | Exotic Species | Sacramento River (Red Bluff to Knights Landing) | Mercury |
| Delta Waterways (northern) | DDT Mercury PCBs | Salt Slough | Selenium |
| Feather River, Lower | Chlorpyrifos | San Joaquin River (Friant Dam to Mendota Pool) | Exotic Species |
| Feather River, North Fork | Mercury Temperature | San Joaquin River (Merced River to Tuolumne River) | Selenium |
| Grassland Marshes | Selenium | Sugar Pine Creek | Copper |
| Grayson Drain | Sediment Bioassays | Wadsworth Canal | Diazinon |
| Ingram Creek | Pyrethroid | Willow Creek (Madera Co.) | Temperature |
| Kaweah Lake | Mercury | | |

The State Board proposes to remove the following water bodies from the 303(d) list for diazinon: lower Feather River, Morrison Creek, Sacramento River (Knights Landing to the Delta), and the Sutter Bypass.

Prior to the public release of the 303(d) List, Regional Board staff reviewed proposed changes to the List and provided feedback to State Board staff. The most significant remaining unresolved issues are the legal and technical bases for the proposed “exotic species” listings.

In a recent California District Court ruling (No. C 03-05760 SI), the Court ordered the U.S. EPA to remove an NPDES regulatory provision that exempted discharges from vessels. The Court specifically referred to invasive species discharged from ballast water as being pollutants. The State Board proposed listing would expand the applicability of this ruling to the 303(d) List.

The fundamental difference between the Court ruling and the identification of “exotic” species on the 303(d) List is that the State Board’s proposed listings are based on non-native species that are established in Central Valley waters - there is no ongoing “discharge” of these non-native species. The Regional Board does not have the authority to regulate the distribution and population of established non-native species.

The technical issue of concern is that the references used by State Board generally suggest that hydromodification and changes in the flow regime are primarily responsible for the decline in native fish species. An “exotic” species listing would, therefore, require the Regional Board to develop a plan to address “exotic” species when the root cause for declines in native fishes are likely due to other factors, which are also outside the jurisdiction of the Regional Board.

Regional Board staff will continue to work with State Board to address the proposed “exotic” species listings and other changes to the proposed 303(d) List. Staff plans to testify at the State Board’s December 1 workshop. More information on the 303(d) List update can be found at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_update.html. (JK)

20. *Monitoring in the Sacramento Valley and Delta*

TMDL program staff has been working with UC Davis to design a pesticide-monitoring program for 2006. Staff performed a screening level risk assessment of pesticides that may impact surface water. One objective of the monitoring effort is to determine whether those pesticides that are a potential high risk are present in surface waters during times of high use. A second objective is to continue trend monitoring of organo-phosphorus pesticides. In order to design an efficient sampling plan, TMDL staff has been coordinating with relevant units within the Sacramento office and with the Department of Pesticide Regulation. The proposed sampling design has also been discussed with the Sacramento Valley and Delta coalition groups. Sampling will consist of storm and irrigation season sampling throughout the Sacramento Valley and the Delta Study Area. (PL)

21. *San Joaquin River Dissolved Oxygen and Salt and Boron TMDLs*

The Central Valley Water Board adopted resolution number R5-2004-0108 to amend the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins for the Control of Salt and Boron Discharges into the Lower San Joaquin River on 10 September 2004. The Central Valley Water Board adopted resolution number R5-2005-0005 to amend the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins for the Control of Factors Contributing to the Dissolved Oxygen Impairment in the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel on 27 January 2005. These resolutions allow the Executive Officer to make minor, nonsubstantive corrections to the language of the amendment needed for clarity or consistency. Based on requests from the State Water Board, the following changes (added text shown in underline and deleted text in ~~strikeout~~) were made to the Basin Plan Amendment language.

Salt and Boron

Two changes were made per State Water Board staff requests to add clarity to the amendment language:

- The first full sentence on page 7 was modified to read “Additional waiver conditions will include use of Regional Board approved methods to measure and report flow and electrical conductivity”.
- The second sentence of item 4 on page 7 was modified to read “Entities operating under WDRs or that will be required to operate under WDRs in order to comply with other programs, may participate in a Regional Board approved real-time management program in lieu of additional WDRs for salinity if they meet the conditions specified in ~~a~~the waiver of WDRs for salinity management, as described in item 3.”

One additional change was made because the State Water Board neither needs to be nor should be a party to the Central Valley Water Board’s agreement with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. The first sentence of the second paragraph of item 8 on page 7 was modified to read “The Regional Board will attempt to enter into a Management Agency Agreement (MAA) with the ~~State Water Resources Control Board and~~ U.S. Bureau of Reclamation to address salt imports from the DMC to the LSJR watershed.”

Dissolved Oxygen

Two changes were made to correct dates in the amendment language:

- The second paragraph of item 7 on page 2 was modified to read “Any increase in the discharge of oxygen demanding substances or their precursors into waters tributary to the DWSC portion of the San Joaquin River is prohibited after [effective date of the amendment]~~28 January 2005~~.”
- The first sentence of the last paragraph of item 1 on page 4 was modified to read “A study plan describing how ongoing studies and future studies will address these information needs must be submitted to Regional Water Board staff by [60 days after the effective date of the amendment]~~31 July 2005~~.”

One additional change was made per State Water Board staff requests to add clarity to the amendment language. The last sentence in the second to last paragraph in column 1 of page 3 was modified to read “Those parties collectively responsible for each contributing factor must coordinate with those collectively responsible for the other factors to implement control measures addressing ENOD and MOS.”

The State Water Board held workshops on both Basin Plan Amendments on 5 October 2005. Both Basin Plan Amendments were considered for approval at the State Water Board’s 20 October 2005 Board meeting. The State Water Board continued these items to the 16 November 2005 Board meeting and allowed for public comment through 31 October 2005. Once the State Board approves the Basin Plan Amendments, they will be submitted to the Office of Administrative Law and the U.S. EPA for subsequent approvals. (MG / LFG)

DAIRIES**22. Dairy Industry Response to Board Request for Reports of Waste Discharge**

On 8 August 2005, staff requested all owners and operators of existing milk cow dairies in the Region to submit a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) by 17 October 2005. Through efforts of the California dairy industry associations and most especially the efforts of the California Dairy Quality Assurance Program (CDQAP), the response to our request has been excellent. Results from the counties that have been processed shows that 98% of the dairies filed by the 17 October deadline.

Staff expected that approximately 1,600 existing milk cow dairies would need to submit a ROWD. This is the first time that most of these facilities have been requested to submit a ROWD. To ensure that dairy producers received a consistent message on the need to submit a ROWD and to assist the dairy producers in completing the ROWD, the CDQAP hosted 23 workshops throughout the Region. These workshops were funded by the Dairy Community Alliance for Responsible Environmental Stewardship (Dairy CARES). Staff and dairy industry representatives from the California Dairy Campaign and Western United Dairymen provided assistance at each of these workshops, including interpreters for non-English speaking dairy operators. The dairy trade associations also helped in achieving the high rate of compliance by frequently noticing this requirement and its importance in trade magazines and newsletters. More than 500 dairy producers and their consultants attended the workshops.

The table below summarizes the ROWDs received from dairies in counties that have been processed. Staff will follow up with the facilities that did not file by the 17 October deadline. (PAL/CH/DAS)

| Regional Board Office | County | Number ROWDs Requested | Number ROWDs Received | % ROWDs Submitted |
|-----------------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Fresno | Tulare | 309 | 289 | 94 |
| | Kings | 153 | 148 | 97 |
| | Fresno | 110 | 108 | 98 |
| | Kern | 54 | 52 | 96 |
| | Madera | 48 | 48 | 100 |
| Sacramento | Merced | 396 | Being processed | |
| | Stanislaus | 327 | Being processed | |
| | San Joaquin | 141 | 134 | 90 |
| | Glenn | 51 | 50 | 98 |
| | Sacramento | 47 | 46 | 96 |
| | Solano | 4 | 4 | 100 |
| | Yuba | 4 | 4 | 100 |
| | Yolo | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| | Placer | 1 | 1 | 100 |
| | Sutter | 1 | 1 | 100 |
| Redding | Tehama | 17 | 35 | 206 |
| | Butte | 4 | 3 | 75 |
| | Shasta | 2 | 2 | 100 |

CEQA REPORTING**23. Tribal Environmental Impact Study, Twin Pine Casino and Hotel, Lake County**

On 9 October 2005, staff provided comments to a Tribal Environmental Impact Study (TEIS) for a proposed casino and hotel near the community of Middletown in Lake County. The TEIS identified two possible options for handling wastewater: either the facility would be served by Lake County Sanitation District's Middletown Wastewater Treatment Facility, or the Tribe would construct an onsite tertiary wastewater treatment plant. The TEIS also stated that if the Tribe constructed a wastewater treatment facility, the principal process unit would consist of a sequential batch reactor (SBR) treatment plant and that the reclaimed water would be delivered for reuse in landscaping, toilet flushing reuse, other non-potable water uses, and fire protection. Staff comments indicated that if tertiary treated effluent was discharged into surface drainages or creeks that flow off-site, or was discharged off-site to spray fields and/or drain fields or sold as reclaimed water off-site, then the discharge of such waste would be subject to permitting requirements of the Regional Board. (GJC)

24. Recreation Campground and Vehicle Park, Acampo, San Joaquin County

On 21 September 2005, staff provided comments to the San Joaquin County Community Development Department's Application Referral for a proposed recreation campground and recreational vehicle park at 4620 E. Woodbridge Road, Acampo. Although the disposal of domestic wastewater is not described in the Application Referral (with the

exception of a reference to “purchase plant with filter beds”), staff identified that if on-site wastewater disposal is planned, the project proponent should be aware that low permeability soils may be present on-site which may complicate disposal. Staff stated that if wastewater is generated and treated, stored, or disposed on site, other than in septic systems for which the Board has delegated oversight to the County, then Waste Discharge Requirements will be required. (TRO)

GRANTS & FUNDING

25. 2005-06 Consolidated Grants Program

The 2005-06 Consolidated Grants Program integrates and coordinates related grant programs for Watershed Protection, Water Management, Agricultural Water Quality, Drinking Water, Urban Storm Water, and Non-Point Source (NPS) Pollution Control. A total of approximately \$142 million will be made available from eight interrelated grant programs administered by the State Water Board's Division of Financial Assistance (DFA).

Staff continues to work with the DFA on the development of the 2005-06 Consolidated Grants Program. Staff is attending weekly meetings and reviewing and providing comments on drafts of the concept proposal questionnaire, concept proposal review criteria, full proposal evaluation criteria, and the grant program guidelines.

Draft Program Guidelines will be posted on the State Water Board website beginning in November 2005 for public comment. Following the public comment period the program guidelines will be presented at the January 2006 State Water Board meeting for adoption. Once the program guidelines have been adopted, the State Water Board will announce the request for “Concept Proposals” in January/February 2006. (PDB)

26. Small Community Groundwater Grants Program

This program has \$9.5 million available from Proposition 40 (California Clean Water, Clean Air, Safe Neighborhood Parks, and Coastal Protection Act of 2002). The program goal is to assist small communities with a financial hardship in either treating or replacing water supplies that exceed Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) for arsenic or nitrate. Funds may also be allocated for projects identified by the Department of Health Services (DHS) as having a priority to address the needs of small community water systems.

On July 8, 2005, State Water Board released a Solicitation Notice requesting pre-applications for the funds. Eligible applicants that were not funded in DHS' Proposition 50 Small Community Water System Facilities Grant Program were contacted and invited to apply for a Small Community Groundwater grant.

The State Water Board received 37 eligible pre-applications, requesting \$39,923,988 in funds from the Small Community Groundwater Grant Program. State Water Board and Department of Health Services staffs have reviewed the pre-applications, and projects have been placed into one of three ranks on the Competitive Project List (CPL). Upon adoption of the CPL, which will be presented at the November State Water Board meeting, applicants for projects in Rank 1 will be invited to submit detailed applications.

The Regional Boards have not been directly involved with this grant program. This item is being brought to the Central Valley Water Board's attention, however, because all of the applications on the CPL are within Region 5. The Grant Coordinator will continue to keep in contact with the State Water Board as this grant program moves toward funding. (PDB)

27. Integrated Regional Water Management Grant Program

The Integrated Regional Water Management Grant Program has two components: a Planning Grant and an Implementation Grant. The preliminary evaluation results for the Planning Grants were posted on the Department of Water Resources (DWR) and State Water Board websites on September 16th. The preliminary funding list was presented to the State Water Board during its 20 October 2005 meeting. For the Planning Grants there is approximately \$12 million available during this first funding cycle with a maximum funding limit per grant of \$500,000. The DWR Director is considering final approval of the Integrated Regional Water Management Planning grant funding list at this time. If approved there will be up to 11 Planning Grants awarded within Region 5 totaling approximately \$5 million.

Step 1 Implementation Grant proposals have gone through technical reviews and will now be going through senior level and management level reviews. A total of 18 grant applications were submitted within Region 5 for a total funding amount requested of \$64.6 million. Following the completion of the senior level and management level reviews, staff anticipates that DWR and State Water Board will be developing a preliminary callback list for the Step 2 full proposals in December 2005. (PDB)

28. Dairy Water Quality Grant Program

The Dairy Water Quality Grant Program provides grants for projects that reduce threats to, or impairment of, surface or ground waters from dairy operations. Priorities for funding will be regional and on-farm infrastructure projects. The program has \$5 million available from Proposition 50 (Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002). Applications for the grant program were due by 3 October 2005. Nineteen grant applications were received statewide requesting \$17.5 million in funding. Nine applications are within Region 5 with a funding request of approximately \$7.5 million. A Selection Panel has been formed that includes reviewers from California Food and Ag, University of California Cooperative Extension, CALFED, California Department of Pesticide Regulation, and Regional and State Water Board staff. The Selection Panel is expected to develop a "preliminary funding" list in mid December 2005 and anticipates presenting the list to the State Water Board at its January 2006 meeting. (PDB)

SPILLS**29. El Dorado Irrigation District, El Dorado County**

On 19 October 2005, El Dorado Irrigation District flushed portions of their potable water system to surface waters after discovering the system to be contaminated with Coal Fly Ash. Regional Board staff has received preliminary data showing elevated concentrations of aluminum, chromium, iron and zinc in this Coal Fly Ash. A complete analysis of the discharge has not yet been submitted, including flow rates and which receiving streams may have been impacted. That information is necessary for Regional Board staff to determine the impacts and determine if any further action is necessary. (RPM)

30. Markley Cove Resort, Napa County

In early 2005, a hiker discovered an apparent discharge of wastewater from the Coleman Spring, which is located about 1,000 feet downslope of the Markley Cove Resort (Discharger) wastewater ponds. The Discharger investigated, finding fecal coliform in the spring water, and later completing a dye test to confirm that wastewater is seeping from the unlined evaporation/percolation ponds and surfacing in the Coleman Spring. Shortly after discovery, the Discharger modified the spring to contain the water in a 15,000 gallon emergency containment pond lined with plastic sheeting. The wastewater is being pumped into a portable tank and hauled on a daily basis to a lift station within the Markley Cove collection system for disposal back into the ponds. However, before containment occurred, an estimated 14,197 gallons of mixed spring water and wastewater was allowed to discharge. This estimate is based on daily spring flows of 1,085 gallons per day (gpd) from 11 February to 24 February 2005. After a request for a formal spill report, staff issued a Notice of Violation (NOV) on 11 October 2005. Staff is also preparing a draft enforcement order to require the Discharger to make facility improvements to prevent wastewater from seeping into Coleman Spring. (GJC)

31. City of Sanger, Sewage Collection System, Fresno County

On the afternoon of 2 October, the City of Sanger Public Works Department estimated 700 gallons of raw sewage spilled from a sewer manhole due to a plug in the line. The spill washed into storm drain inlet which outfalls to a storm water basin approximately 0.6 miles away. Field observations by the Department indicate that the spill did not make it to the storm water basin. The spill area was disinfected with sodium hypochlorite and then washed with fresh water. Staff is not considering enforcement for this event. (SJK)

SITE CLEANUP**32. Uniform Site [Cleanup] Assessment Committee**

A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) was signed by the DTSC and the State and Regional Boards to address a single lead state agency providing oversight of site cleanup. This MOA commits these agencies to develop Uniform Site Assessment Procedures to assure a consistent outcome of cleanup, regardless of which agency provides oversight. Site Cleanup staff from Region 5 is taking the lead on the development of these Procedures and is collaborating with regions 2 and 4, DTSC and SWRCB staff. The main objective is to provide DTSC staff assurance that Water Board staffs are addressing human and biotic health issues in site assessments, and to provide Water Board staff assurance that DTSC staffs are addressing surface and groundwater issues in the site assessments they conduct. Draft Procedures should be ready for internal agency review by early spring 2006. (AST)

33. Former McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento County

On 18 April 2005, both the State, represented by the DTSC and the Water Board, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) together invoked formal dispute on the McClellan Basewide Volatile Organic Chemical (VOC) Groundwater Record of Decision (ROD). The State and the EPA agreed that the ROD was unacceptable and does not meet several provisions of State and Federal laws and regulations. The ROD addresses VOC contaminated groundwater and VOC contaminated soil that has impacted groundwater or poses threat to groundwater quality. The Air Force is proposing to contain the VOC plume at the former base boundaries due to the large expense and the questionable effectiveness of the remedy to clean up the entire aquifer. The Air Force would apply for a CERCLA Technical Impracticability (TI) Waiver and a State

Containment Zone to not have to cleanup the aquifer. The agencies, however, believe that the current pump & treat technology has been very effective in reducing the size of plumes and achieving cleanup.

On 24 August 2005, the dispute Senior Executive Committee (SEC) met and reached the following agreements that resolve for now the formal dispute at the SEC level: 1) the Air Force will defer the Draft Final VOC Groundwater ROD for some period of time; 2) the technical team members from the Air Force, EPA and State of California (both DTSC and Water Board) will conduct a technical analysis of the site data to develop a revised site conceptual model, identify data needs to justify a TI Waiver and a State Containment Zone or a groundwater Beneficial Use de-designation decision, and; 3) all parties will assist in preparing a joint press release that documents the resolution of the dispute.

Through the technical team discussions, it is anticipated that a consensus can be reached on the timeline for assessing the effectiveness of the interim groundwater extraction system to cleanup the plumes and to develop additional data to consider a TI waiver application and the follow-on final ROD for groundwater at the site. On 2 September 2005, the Air Force completed construction and startup of the third and final phase of the interim groundwater remedy pursuant to a 1995 Interim VOC Groundwater ROD. The Phase 3 project added 41 extraction wells to the previously installed 57 extraction wells in the groundwater extraction and treatment system. (JDT)

34. *Natomas Air Park, Sacramento County*

The Natomas Air Park was a general aviation airport from the 1945 to 2000 and consists of six separate parcels owned by three separate owners. Towne Development has removed and disposed of more than 20,000 cubic yards of soil contaminated with toxaphene and DDT from 14 acres that it owns. Beazer Homes installed a full-scale soil vapor extraction and treatment system that is volatilizing and removing fuel originating from an underground fuel tank release. The pilot-scale extraction system removed as much as 67,000 ppmv gasoline and 1,600 ppmv benzene. (AST)

35. *Cache Creek Abandoned Mercury Mines, Colusa County*

A draft Cleanup and Abatement Order was issued to the Bureau of Land Management for two abandoned mercury mines located in Colusa County. Water quality objectives for mercury are exceeded during storm runoff events. CAO objectives require a 95% load reduction to Cache Creek and its tributaries. This load reduction is required to meet the TMDL requirements for Cache Creek and its tributaries. BLM mines are Rathburn and Rathburn-Petray, which are located in the Bear Creek watershed. The BLM was given a due date of October 31, 2005 to comment on the draft Order. The BLM requested an additional 45 days to comment. Regional Board staff allowed an extension of 15 days, extending the comment period to November 15th. Comments from BLM will be addressed and a final CAO submitted to the EO for approval. (KDA)

36. *Ameripride Services, Inc., Sacramento County*

Ameripride Services, Inc. (Ameripride) owns and operates an industrial laundry located at 7620 Wilbur Way, in Sacramento. In April 2003, after a hearing, the Regional Board issued Cleanup and Abatement Order No. R5-2003-0059 ordering Ameripride to abate the effects of tetrachloroethylene (PCE) found in nearby water supply wells and to investigate and remediate the extent of pollution. After the hearing, Ameripride filed a petition for review with the State Board, which the State Board dismissed. In April 2004, Ameripride filed a lawsuit against the Water Board claiming they are an "innocent purchaser" or "innocent landowner" entitled to protection from the costs of cleanup under the Porter-Cologne Act. Secondly, Ameripride argued that the Water Board could not require Ameripride to provide replacement water to affected nearby landowners because replacement water was considered "damages" and not abatement.

The Attorney General's office, in defense of the Regional Board, filed legal briefs and after granting two extensions, a hearing was set for 4 November 2005. Ameripride withdrew its petition to the Court the day before the Hearing and agreed to propose remediation that will meet the CAO requirements, to provide replacement water to affected property owner. Board staff will amend the CAO with new dates for implementing cleanup and providing water replacement.

A tentative ruling was made by the court on the lawsuit filed by Ameripride. The tentative ruling concluded, in part ;

- 1) The Regional Board has the authority to issue Cleanup and Abatement Orders to a property owner because the property owner has the ability to remediate contamination, and, in failing to do so, permits the spread, or discharge of contamination and
- 2) The Regional Board has the authority to Order the Discharger to provide replacement water supplies to neighboring landowners with wells that are impacted or threatened by contamination because replacing the lost water supplies falls within the scope of "abating" the effect of the discharge. (CLC)

GENERAL

37. *Penn Mine, Calaveras County*

As reported to the Board at its October meeting, the Calaveras County tax collector offered the abandoned Penn Mine property for sale at public auction on 3 November 2005 due to delinquent property taxes. Following the auction, the

tax collector notified Board staff that there were no bids on the parcels, but that several people asked questions about them. The tax collector also informed Board staff that the resolution adopted by the Executive Officer objecting to the tax sale of the Penn Mine properties was read at the auction to further inform any potential buyers about the presence of the liens and the property's environmental issues. The tax collector also stated that there will not be another tax sale until November 2006. At that time, the Board will need to adopt another resolution objecting to the sale in order to protect its \$5.7 million lien on the properties. (WLB)

38. Penn Mine Cleanup and Abatement Account

As a result of litigation and a 309 Order from the USEPA, the Regional Board teamed with the East Bay Municipal Utilities District (District) in 1997 to conduct the Penn Mine Environmental Restoration Project. The goal was to reduce acid mine drainage into the Mokelumne River and Camanche Reservoir. Conducted during 1998 and 1999, the project involved landfill construction, mine waste excavation and disposal, landfill closure, monitoring well construction, site grading and vegetation, and construction of monitoring stations. Post-restoration monitoring and maintenance are ongoing at the site and include removal of leachate from the landfill, groundwater and surface water monitoring, and maintenance of vegetation over the closed areas.

The work resulted in a 99% reduction in copper and a 92% to 95% reduction in zinc discharged to Camanche Reservoir compared with pre-restoration averages. USEPA rescinded its 309 Order in 2003, stating that the work has been completed to satisfy each component of the Order.

During 2002, the District received funding from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for use at Penn Mine. The money is earmarked to pay post-restoration maintenance and monitoring, and any future remedial work at the site. Therefore, the District will not invoice the Regional Board per the cost sharing agreement for ongoing site costs during the foreseeable future. The cleanup and abatement account for the Penn Mine will now be closed so that the remaining funds (currently \$500,000) can be de-obligated and used for other projects. If additional funding is needed in the future for Penn Mine, the Regional Board can request a new cleanup and abatement account from the State Water Board. (WLB)

39. Cleanup and Abatement Account Survey

The Division of Financial Assistance at the State Water Board recently conducted its annual survey of Cleanup and Abatement Account (CAA) funds. DFA asked the Regions to report on the status and spending forecasts of various CAA projects managed by each region. CAA funds are maintained by State Water Board for use in a variety of ways to protect and improve water quality. The money comes into the account primarily from settlement agreements and administrative civil liabilities. The funds are generally distributed for specific projects after a request from a Regional Board. The funds are used mostly for contracting for cleanup work at specific sites, but other contracts and staff oversight costs are also included. Staff costs are generally a small portion of the funding, about \$100,000 per year.

Our Region has eight active CAA projects. Site-specific cleanup and abatement projects where we are responsible for cleanup activities include Walker Mine, and until recently, Penn Mine. CAA funds were used at these sites to abate significant water quality problems and pay on-going costs. Other CAA funding supports staff oversight on site cleanups by other responsible parties such as Iron Mountain Mine, Aerojet, and other sites. State Water Board also allocated \$5 million for the Irrigated Lands Program environmental impact report contract. CAA funds can also be used by public agencies to perform cleanups with Board oversight. Since 1999, State Water Board has approved over \$17 million in CAA funding for the Central Valley Region. (WLB/SER)

40. Timber Waiver Workshops

Redding and Sacramento staffs conducted two workshops (in Redding on November 3 and in Sacramento on November 4) to explain the Timber Waiver's Monitoring and Reporting Conditions and the new Monitoring and Reporting Program to Registered Professional Foresters and other agency representatives. Detailed monitoring was included in the Timber Waiver's renewal (April 2005) and the workshop was used to remind the professional foresters (who prepare timber harvest plans) that monitoring is required for all timber operations that are active or recently completed. Staff presented a detailed overview of the renewed Timber Waiver and monitoring requirements. The Regional Board's timber program will soon be augmented by three additional field staff (as the result of a redirection of staff from the North Coast Regional Board). (JCP)

FUTURE BOARD ACTIVITIES

The following are significant Board meeting actions anticipated for the next few months. This is not a complete listing of all Board meeting items. This listing is tentative and subject to change for many reasons. The listing is intended to give a longer-range view of planned Regional Board activities.

January 2006

- Irrigated Lands De Minimis Waiver Information Item
- San Joaquin River Salinity Standards Workshop
- Enforcement
 - Hilmar Cheese New WDRs and C&D, Merced County
 - Jesse M. Lange Distributors ACL Settlement Order
 - Linkside Place ACL Hearing
 - Malaga CSD MMP

March 2006

- Basin Plan Triennial Review

Waste Discharge Requirements Under Consideration

- Aerojet General Corporation, Sacramento Facility
- Alturas WWTP
- Atwater WWTP
- Barrel 10 Winery, San Joaquin County
- Bell Carter Olive Company Inc
- Biggs WWTP
- Brentwood WWTP
- Burney Forest Products, Burney Sawmill/Cogeneration
- Ca Dept Of Corrections-Jamestown Sierra Conservation Ctr-WWTP-2
- California Milk Producers, Inc., Tipton Plant
- Calmat Of Central California, Sanger Plant
- Canada Cove L.P., French Camp Golf & RV Park
- Cedar Ridge, Amador County
- Chevron Texaco Inc., Produced Water Reclamation Project
- City of Angles WWTP,
- Clear Creek CSD WTP
- Clovis WWTP
- Colfax STP
- Copper River Ranch
- Cutler-Orosi Joint WWTP
- Dark Horse WWTP, Nevada County
- Dunsmuir STP
- Euhlers Estate Winery, San Joaquin County
- French Camp Recreational Vehicle Park, San Joaquin County
- Galt WWTP
- Glenn Oaks Mobile Home Park, Placer County
- Grizzly Lake Resort Imp Dist, Dellecker WWTP
- Grizzly Ranch WWTP
- Hidden Valley Sand & Gravel, Lake County
- Indian Springs School District Geothermal Project
- Jackson WWTP
- Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, LP, Elmira Remediation Project
- Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, LP, Fox Rd Pipeline Release Site
- Klondike California Mining Corp, Klondike, Dutch & Telegraph
- Linda County Water District Wastewater Treatment Plant
- Lodi White Slough Water Pollution Control Plant
- Los Banos Milk Processing Facility
- Malaga CWD
- Manteca Pretreatment Program Approval, San Joaquin County
- Mariposa PUD WWTP
- Mirant Delta LLC, Contra Costa Power Plant
- Modesto WQCF
- New Chaparral Petroleum, Inc., Poso Creek Oil Field
- Oxy USA, Inc , Kern Front Field
- Pace Diversified Corporation, McVan Area, Poso Creek Oil Field
- Placer Co Facility Services 1 SMD No 3 WWTP
- Plumas County, Lake Davis WTP
- Port of Stockton Dredging WQ Certification, San Joaquin County

Addendum 1

**EXECUTIVE OFFICERS REPORT
PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATION
October – November 2005**

PERSONNEL

| <u>Total Positions</u> | <u>Vacancies</u> | <u>Gained</u> | <u>Lost</u> |
|------------------------|------------------|---------------|-------------|
| 258.3 | 40.5 | 2 | 2 |

Gains:

| | | |
|----------------|----|------------|
| Paul Hann | ES | Sacramento |
| Robert Solecki | ES | Sacramento |

Separations:

| | | |
|-------------------|------|------------|
| Kyle Wooldridge | WRCE | Sacramento |
| Julie Ann Langill | WRCE | Sacramento |

Internal Transfers:

| | | |
|----------------|----------|--------|
| Steven Klein | WRCE | Fresno |
| Pamela Bufford | Staff ES | Fresno |

Retirements: 0**RECRUITING**

Recruiting is on-going for the positions that the State Water Resources Control Board has approved for filling. We are working with State Board to try and expand our candidate pools. Given the current economic environment within California our current pay scale is not very competitive.

TRAINING

Course with Number of Attendees (Not Including Canceled Classes)
From 10/1/2005 thru 11/30/2005

| Course | Name | Date of Training | Number of Attendees |
|--|-------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| An Overview of Fluvial Geomorphology | | 10/02/2005 | 1 |
| CASQA 2005 Conference | | 10/03/2005 | 6 |
| State of the Estuary Conference | | 10/04/2005 | 2 |
| Science and Art of Leadership | | 10/05/2005 | 4 |
| The Work of Leadership | | 10/05/2005 | 1 |
| Science and Art of Leadership | | 10/06/2005 | 1 |
| Performance Appraisal (web based) | | 10/11/2005 | 2 |
| Project Assessment and Evaluation Plan | | 10/11/2005 | 7 |
| Introduction to Analytical Work | | 10/13/2005 | 1 |
| Applied Groundwater Statistics | | 10/18/2005 | 1 |
| Basic Inspector Training Course | | 10/18/2005 | 2 |
| NETI Basic Inspector Course | | 10/18/2005 | 1 |
| US EPA Basic Inspector Training Course | | 10/18/2005 | 2 |
| Watershed Partnerships Seminar | | 10/18/2005 | 1 |
| 25th Biennial Groundwater Conference | | 10/25/2005 | 4 |

| | | |
|--|------------|----|
| SRWP Annual Stakeholder's Meeting | 10/27/2005 | 1 |
| Watershed Partnerships Seminar | 10/27/2005 | 3 |
| Applied Environmental Statistics | 10/31/2005 | 3 |
| Environmental Statistics | 10/31/2005 | 1 |
| Bioassessment (Aquatic Ecological Assessment) | 11/01/2005 | 1 |
| CEQA Basics: A Step By Step Approach | 11/03/2005 | 1 |
| Haz Mat Technician/Specialist Refresher (HMSR5-01) | 11/03/2005 | 1 |
| Hazmat Workshop | 11/03/2005 | 1 |
| Project Assessment and Evaluation Plan | 11/05/2005 | 1 |
| 25th Biennial Groundwater Conference | 11/07/2005 | 1 |
| CA Non-Point Source Conference | 11/07/2005 | 14 |
| NonPoint Source Solutions | 11/07/2005 | 1 |
| Technical Writing- Being Clear and Concise | 11/08/2005 | 7 |
| Management Methods and Programs for Onsite | 11/10/2005 | 3 |
| Technical Report Writing # 625 | 11/16/2005 | 4 |
| Technical Writing- Being Clear and Concise | 11/16/2005 | 35 |
| Toxicity Testing Applications | 11/16/2005 | 1 |
| Public Land Management Conference | 11/30/2005 | 1 |

Addendum 2**COMPLETED SITE CLEANUPS****FRESNO OFFICE****Kern County**

Texaco Service Station, 2401 Oak Street, Bakersfield

Low concentrations of gasoline and diesel constituents were detected in soil and groundwater samples collected during a Shell Oil Product U.S. voluntary groundwater assessment program (GRASP) investigation conducted during January 2003. The fuel oxygenates MTBE and TBA was detected at concentrations generally less than 1 mg/kg. Low concentrations of diesel were also detected during additional soil investigation during February 2004. The diesel and gasoline UST systems were removed during April 2004. Low TPH-d and TPH-g concentrations were detected in soil samples collected beneath the USTs. Low to moderate TPH-d and TPH-g concentrations were detected beneath a fuel dispenser and product piping. Limited excavation was conducted beneath the dispenser and piping. Nine groundwater monitoring events were conducted from March 2003 to February 2005. Low to moderate TPH-g and MTBE were initially detected but were not detected during later events. Other fuel oxygenates and lead scavengers were not detected. Regional Board staff concluded that gasoline and diesel constituents detected in soil and groundwater was residual from an earlier remediated release and the more recent release at the dispenser island and piping. The residual fuel mass is small and unlikely to pose a significant risk to environmental receptors. The nearest identified water supply well was approximately 800 feet crossgradient.

REDDING OFFICE**Siskiyou County**

Cross Petroleum, 1012 North Mt. Shasta Blvd., Mt. Shasta – Between December 1998 and July 1999, three 12,000-gallon underground storage tanks were removed from the site and replaced with new fiberglass tanks. After the tanks were removed soil sampling identified petroleum impacts. Approximately 500 cubic yards of impacted soil was excavated and transported off site for disposal. During 2000, seven monitoring wells were installed to delineate the extent of soil and groundwater impacts. Groundwater monitoring continued through early 2004, and petroleum concentrations have decreased over time. A stratified sampling event identified 76 µg/L TPHd and 9.6 µg/L MtBE still remaining in groundwater at the site. No domestic supply wells or other sensitive receptors were identified within 2,000 feet downgradient of the site. The residual petroleum pollution poses little or no threat to water quality. A no further action letter was issued. (DPS)

SACRAMENTO OFFICE**Sutter County**

Former Meyers Roofing, 860 West Onstott Road, Yuba City - This site was formerly a roofing facility from 1962 to 1990. One 4,000-gallon gasoline underground storage tank (UST) was filled with cement slurry and closed in place in 1988. In September 2002, the UST was removed and the tank pit was excavated to a total depth of 9 feet bgs, soil staining and odors were observed in the pit. Over excavation of the former tank-pit in 2002 removed approximately 420 tons of impacted soil from the subject site. The only identified impact to groundwater came from a “grab” sample collected from the bottom of the tank pit during over excavation activities. Multiple soil and groundwater samples collected in February 2005 found no additional impacts from petroleum hydrocarbons beneath the subject site, and as such suggest that the single impacted “grab” water sample from the tank pit was the result of sloughing. Based upon review of our files a “No Further Action Required” letter is appropriate for the subject site. Sutter County staff concurs with our closure recommendation. (BK)

Stanislaus County

Banquet Foods in Turlock at 107 Kilroy Street removed an above ground diesel fuel tank in 1994 and in 2004 found groundwater containing total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) was limited to within 20 feet of the discharge pipe. TPH as motor was found at 1700 mg/l in 2003, and samples analyzed with silica gel cleanup in 2003 and in subsequent years show consistent, continuing decline in concentration. Although Regional Board staff do not accept silica gel cleanup as a legitimate test of water quality, the data did show a clear declining trend in concentrations, and concurred with Stanislaus County's recommendation for No Further Action. (AST)

Glenn County

In 1980's the Rice Growers Association facility at 6500 County Road 60 in Willows ceased discharging rinsewater containing copper fungicide to unlined ponds. A soil excavation and confirmation samples show that copper was removed to concentrations 100 times below the human health threshold, and no pesticides or herbicides were detected. Groundwater samples contained copper below the water quality objective and did not contain pesticides or herbicides. The site was issued No Further Action. (AST)

UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS (UST)

Following are sites where Board staff determined that investigation and remediation work may be discontinued and that no further action is required. Further, any residual hydrocarbons remaining do not pose a threat to human health and safety or anticipated future beneficial uses of water. This determination is based on site-specific information provided by the responsible party, and that the information provided was accurate and representative of site conditions. Article 11, Division 3, Chapter 16, Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations requires public notification when the Board determines that corrective actions have been completed and that no further action is required at a leaking underground storage tank site. This document serves to provide public notification.

For more information regarding a site, the appropriate office personnel should be contacted: Fresno (559) 445-5116, Redding (530) 224-4845, and Sacramento (916) 464-3291.

Local Agency UST Closures with Concurrence of Board Staff Review**Sacramento County**

Anrak Corporation, 5820 Mayhew Road, Sacramento
Caltrans/Fruitridge Maintenance Station, 5521 34th Street, Sacramento

Stanislaus County

DiMare Enterprises, 1406/1460 N Street, Newman

Local Agency UST Closures Independent of Board Staff Review**Fresno County**

*Consolidated Mosquito Abatement District, 16800 South Marks Ave., Caruthers
Certification of Response Action issued 7 October 2005*

Kern County

*Watts Trucking (Watts Family Trust), 1509 Durham Street, Arvin 93203
Kern County Environmental Health Division Remediation Completion Certificate dated 9/26/2005*

Madera County

*Ponderosa Telephone Service Center, 47671 Road 200, O'Neals
No Further Action letter sent 12 September 2004*

Merced County

*Royal Crown Mini Mart, 2689 N. Buhach Road, Atwater
Remedial Action Certification letter dated 8/31/05*

*Rancho Market, 6986 N. Santa Fe Drive, Winton
Remedial Action Certification letter dated 9/13/05*

*Ultramar Station #505, 3006 G Street, Merced
Remedial Action Certification letter dated 9/13/05*

Addendum 3**PUBLIC OUTREACH**

On 15 August, James Taylor participated in the Former McClellan Air Force Base Public Meeting for a Proposed Plan at the North Highlands Community Center in North Highlands. This is a public meeting to seek public comment on the selected remedies for soil cleanup at 23 Sites in the Initial Parcel #2 located on the former base. (JDT)

On 18 August, James Taylor participated in a former McClellan Air Force Base Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting at the Cherry Island Golf Course in Elverta. This is a public meeting where agencies inform the public of cleanup issues at Department of Defense facilities and enlist their comments. The main topic for the meeting was a presentation of the sampling data the Air Force currently has for Magpie and Don Julio creeks, and an outline of plans for future work. (JDT)

On 16 September, Gail Cismowski attended the Grassland Basin Drainers' monthly Steering Committee meeting.

On 19 September, Gail Cismowski attended the Merced River Stakeholders' monthly meeting.

On 22 September, Jim Martin, Eric Berntsen, and Les Grober attended a meeting of the San Joaquin River Water Quality Management Group in Sacramento. The group discussed the rollout of their recommended plan for achieving salt and dissolved oxygen objectives in the San Joaquin River, funding options, next steps, and the upcoming State Water Board hearings for the salt and dissolved oxygen TMDLs. They also discussed the on-going role of the group.

On 27 September, Jeanne Chilcott participated in the second meeting of the California Bay-Delta Authority (CBDA) Inter-agency Ecological Program's Comprehensive Water Quality Monitoring Committee. The meeting focused on a review of existing monitoring efforts within the Central Valley and Delta as well as the most effective mechanisms to coordinate the diverse studies in order to set the foundation for a comprehensive water quality monitoring program in the CBDA project area. Representatives were on hand from various departments within the CBDA, US EPA, Sacramento River Watershed Program, San Francisco Estuary Institute, Department of Water Resources, Department of Fish and Game, and the US Geological Survey.

On 27 September, Betty Yee attended the State Technical Advisory Committee meeting which provides input to the NRCS State Conservationist. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Farm Bill and the FFY2006 programs.

On 29 September, Catherine Graham and Eric Bernstein participated in the Cosumnes Watershed Council meeting. The council was interested in agency activities in the watershed. Catherine presented information on the Surface Water Monitoring Program for the San Joaquin River Watershed, the Rotational Basin branch of SWAMP that had been conducted in the Cosumnes Watershed, and the Consolidated Grant Process.

On 29 September, Eric Berntsen attended the quarterly meeting of the San Joaquin River Management Program (SJRMP) Advisory Council in Modesto. SJRMP is a California Department of Water Resources (DWR)-sponsored group that serves as a forum for various interests in the San Joaquin River basin. The SJRMP Advisory Council includes members from State and federal agencies; representatives from counties and cities in the San Joaquin River basin; water user interests; and environmental, fisheries, and wildlife groups. Presentations were made by

- Carolyn Yale (USEPA) - Overview of the Conceptual Restoration Plan for the Upper San Joaquin River
- Byron Buck (San Joaquin River Water Quality Management Group (SJRWQMG)) – SJWQMG Plan for achieving salinity/boron and dissolved oxygen Objectives
- Will Stringfellow (University of the Pacific) – Upstream studies for dissolved oxygen TMDL
- Sue Fry (US Bureau of Reclamation) – Update on P.L. 108-361, the 2004 CALFED Bay-Delta Authorization Act

On 4 October, Greg Marquis attended the Dredge Tailings Workgroup meeting. The meeting focused on mercury monitoring recommendations related to streambed gravel augmentation projects.

On 4 through 6 October, Stephanie Fong and Michelle Wood attended the State of the San Francisco Estuary Conference in Oakland. Session topics included landscape restoration, the role of science in restoration design, implementation, and management, current and future management plans and evaluations, the role of engineering and water planning, the pelagic organism decline, CALFED, case studies and stewardship activities. At the conference, Michelle Wood presented a poster entitled "The Delta Mercury TMDL: Reducing Methylmercury in Fish and Water" at the Seventh Biennial State of the Estuary Conference in Oakland. The poster presentation described the extent of mercury impairment in Delta fish, development of fish

tissue methylmercury targets, calculation of the mathematical linkage between water and fish methylmercury levels, identification and quantification of methyl and total mercury sources, and recommendations for implementation strategies.

On 5 October, Dennis Heiman attended the Day in the District put on by the Central Modoc Resource Conservation District.

On October 5-7, Chad Dibble, Robert Holmes, and Jeanne Chilcott participated in an external review of the Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) by a Scientific Planning and Review Committee (SPARC). A final report of the SPARC's comments and recommendations will be available in March of 2006.

On 11 October, Amanda Smith attended the Department of Pesticide Regulation's Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Innovator awards. The California Rice Commission was honored as an IPM Innovator for their work to address rice pesticides and efforts to support wildlife habitat.

On 11 October, Chris Foe made a presentation to the Delta Tributary Mercury Council on "Methyl mercury loads in the Yolo Bypass."

On 11 through 13 October, Karen Larsen participated in the Interagency Ecological Program meeting. Representatives from the Department of Water Resources, Department of Fish and Game, Bureau of Reclamation, and outside peer reviewers met to synthesize the data collected in 2005 to investigate the decline of pelagic organisms in the Delta. The synthesis document was then used to develop a workplan for studies beginning in 2006.

On 12 October, Holly Grover participated in the Non-Point Source Roundtable meeting. Topics discussed include NPS Grazing Policy, Central Coast Irrigated Agriculture Waiver Tracking Database, Management Measure Tracking and Effectiveness, 319(h) monies success stories, and the quarterly California Runoff Rundown publication. Participants include U.S. EPA, California Coastal Commission (CCC) and non-point source regional coordinators.

On 12 October and 19 October, Anthony Toto presented Laws and Regulations concerning Integrated on Farm Drainage Management. Westside Resource Conservation District as part of a 319h grant provided two workshops to present the Technical Advisor's Manual, Managing Agricultural Irrigation Drainage Water. A guide for developing Integrated On-Farm Drainage Management Systems.

On 13 October, Les Grober attended the initial meeting of San Joaquin River Upstream Storage Investigation Environmental Resources Group. This United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) sponsored group will inform the USBR on water quality and other environmental resource issues related to various upstream storage projects being considered.

On 13 October, Dennis Heiman attended the Board of Directors monthly meeting of the Cow Creek Watershed Management Group.

On 13 October, Antonia Vorster and James Taylor participated in the Sacramento Groundwater Authority (SGA) Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors in Citrus Heights to inform the Board on the outcome of the groundwater dispute at McClellan AFB. The Board of Directors of SGA includes representatives from local water districts and companies, Sacramento County, Cities of Sacramento, Citrus Heights and Folsom, and other interested parties. This is a regular meeting to update board members on regional contamination issues, and activities of the SGA to manage local groundwater and surface water resources. This meeting included an update by the Water Board and Air Force Real Property Agency staff on progress and issues regarding the groundwater dispute and cleanup at the former McClellan Air Force Base. (JDT)

On 14 October, Guy Chetelat attended the Western Shasta RCD "Day in the District" public showcase of their grant funded watershed activities in Shasta County.

On 18 October, Dennis Heiman attended the quarterly meeting of the Battle Creek Salmon and Steelhead Restoration Working Group.

On 18 October, Lori Webber attended the South Yuba River League's (SYRCL) conference on Citizen Monitoring in Nevada City. The conference brought citizen groups from the Nevada County and beyond to discuss water quality monitoring issues. Lori discussed the role of the state and citizen monitoring with conference participants.

On 19 October Lori Webber attended a meeting of the Yuba River Watershed Council in Grass Valley. The group discussed funding opportunities for watershed groups. Representatives from the State Board and the Department of Water Resources were also present at the meeting.

On 21 October, Betty Yee attended a meeting of the Watershed Subcommittee of the California Bay Delta Authority. The main topic of the meeting was the structure of a statewide watershed program.

On 25 October, Holly Grover attended the Non-Point Source Tracking and Monitoring Council. Attendees included other State and Regional Water Board members, USDA, CCC, OEHHA, and California Coast Keeper Alliance. The focus of this council is to collaborate across the board on monitoring efforts and data tracking.

On 26 and 31 October and 2 November, Jon Marshack of the Board's Enforcement, Compliance and Program Support Unit gave lectures on water supply, water quality and wastewater issues in the course Principles of Environmental Health Sciences at UC Davis. In Fall 2005, this core curriculum course for students in the Master of Public Health program is being coordinated by Dr. Deborah Bennett of the Department of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine. The course introduces the basic principles, methods, and issues related to environmental health sciences. The primary goal of Environmental Health programs is preventing disease and promoting human health. It involves recognizing, assessing, understanding and controlling the impacts of people on their environment and the impacts of the resulting environment on public health. This is the fourth year that Dr. Marshack has been asked to provide lectures in this course. (JBM)

On 27 October, Karen Larsen, Robert Holmes, Stephanie Fong, and Holly Grover attended the Sacramento River Watershed Conference and Sacramento River Watershed Program General Stakeholders' meeting. Conference session topics included CALFED, water quality, invasive weeds, wildlife conservation, and watershed group development and sustainability.

On 27 and 28 October, Dennis Heiman and Guy Chetelat attended the biannual Sacramento River Watershed Conference.

On 28 October, Patrick Morris toured the Boston Pit mine remediation project (in Nevada County, along Greenhorn Creek). The USBLM removed mercury from a sluice tunnel, sealed the tunnel floor with concrete, and repaired a bulkhead to minimize tunnel drainage.

On 1 November, Lonnie Wass participated as a panel speaker at the California American Planning Association conference. The subject was regulation and siting issues regarding dairies. Other panelists included Ted James of Kern County Planning and Dave Warner of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District.

On 3 November, Anthony Toto presented Oversight of Evaporation Basins in the Tulare Lake Basin as part of a discussion panel entitled Managing Selenium in California's San Joaquin Valley at the "Selenium Summit: Problems and Solutions for the West". Department of Water Resources and Water Education Foundation sponsored the Selenium Summit, cosponsors include US Bureau of Reclamation, US Fish and Wildlife Service and US Geological Survey

On 7, 8 and 9 November, Dennis Heiman and Guy Chetelat attended the California Non Point Source Pollution Conference in Sacramento.

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region

Fiscal Report Based on September Expenditures *(An average of 25% should have been expended to date)*

PERSONAL SERVICES

Our personal services budget was \$21.3 million. We have spent 23% of our personal service budget. We continue to recruit for all vacant positions.

OPERATING EXPENSES

As of August we spent 30% of our operating expense budget.

FUND ISSUES

| Key Fund Sources | Percent Expended |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| General Fund | 22.6% |
| Federal Funds | 34.46% |
| Waste Discharge Permit Fund | 26.8% |
| Prop 13, 40 & 50 Bond | 12.0% |

FY 05/06 UPDATE

- Several of the loaned Timber Harvest positions have been returned from Region 1. We are in the process of recruiting for those positions.
- Contract negotiations resulted in our Engineers receiving a 7% raise that was effective 7/1/05. Additional funds to cover this increase will be provided later in the fiscal year.

 ORGANIZATION -- Region 5

| PERSONAL SERVICES | POSITIONS/PYS | ----- \$ EXPENDITURES ----- | | | |
|---|---------------|-----------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| | BUDGETED | \$ BUDGETED | EXPENDED | BALANCE | % EXPENDED |
| Authorized Positions | | | | | |
| Permanent Positions | 255.6 | 16,799,856 | 3,744,930 | 13,054,926 | 22 % |
| Temporary Help | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 % |
| Overtime | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 % |
| Board Stipend | | 12,000 | 500 | 11,500 | 4 % |
| Total Authorized Positions | 255.6 | 16,811,856 | | | |
| Salary Increases | | 0 | | | |
| Workload & Admin. Charges | 0.0 | 0 | | | |
| Proposed New Positions | 0.0 | 0 | | | |
| Partial Year Positions | 0.0 | 0 | | | |
| Total Adjustments | 0.0 | 0 | | | |
| Total Salaries | 255.6 | 16,811,856 | | | |
| Salary Savings | (13.2) | (768,103) | | | |
| Net Total Salaries | 242.4 | 16,043,753 | | | |
| Staff Benefits | | 5,225,350 | 1,208,591 | 4,016,759 | 23 % |
| TOTAL PERSONAL SERVICES(PS) | 242.4 | 21,269,103 | 4,954,021 | 16,315,082 | 23 % |
| LINE ITEM OPERATING EXPENSES & EQUIPMENT DETAIL | | | | | |
| General Expense | | 270,755 | 52,867 | 217,888 | 20 % |
| Printing | | 47,421 | 27,706 | 19,715 | 58 % |
| Communications | | 159,729 | 17,937 | 141,792 | 11 % |
| Postage | | 26,935 | 7,731 | 19,204 | 29 % |
| Travel In-State | | 237,566 | 5,700 | 231,866 | 2 % |
| Travel Out-Of-State | | 3,160 | 0 | 3,160 | 0 % |
| Training | | 97,653 | 4,610 | 93,043 | 5 % |
| Facilities Operations | | 1,246,231 | 325,489 | 920,742 | 26 % |
| Utilities | | 226,578 | 22,537 | 204,041 | 10 % |
| Contracts - Internal | | 668,630 | 66,000 | 602,630 | 10 % |
| Contracts - External | | 4,655,042 | 1,758,576 | 2,896,466 | 38 % |
| Consolidated Data Center | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 % |
| Central Adm.Serv. - Prorata | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 % |
| Central Adm.Serv. - SWCAP | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 % |
| Equipment | | 38,500 | 0 | 38,500 | 0 % |
| Other | | 12,500 | 19,584 | (7,084) | 157 % |
| TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSE & EQUIPMENT(OEE) | | 7,690,700 | 2,308,737 | 5,381,963 | 30 % |
| TOTAL PS & OEE | | 28,959,803 | 7,262,758 | 21,697,045 | 25 % |
| Indirect | | 5,582,160 | 1,220,789 | 4,361,371 | 22 % |
| GRAND TOTAL | | 34,541,963 | 8,483,547 | 26,058,416 | 25 % |

10/27/05 11:04:03

Expenditure Organization Summary

1

Organization - Region 5

for the month ending September 05/06

| Fund Source | \$ Allotment | \$ Expenditures | % Expended |
|---|--------------|-----------------|------------|
| NPS Pollution Contral Program-Prop 13 -- (00BOND-NPSC) | = 445,887 | 41,172 | 9.2 |
| Watershed Protection Program -- (00BOND-WPP) | = 285,443 | 59,097 | 20.7 |
| Cleanup & Abatement Account-Management -- (CAA) | = 6,016,506 | 1,402,536 | 23.3 |
| F(104B3) -- (F(104B3)) | = 0 | 20,344 | 0.0 |
| Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) -- (F(104MERC)) | = 141,948 | 0 | 0.0 |
| NPDES -- (F(106)) | = 667,709 | 283,574 | 42.5 |
| Non-Point Source -- (F(319H)) | = 872,940 | 254,898 | 29.2 |
| DoD Cost Recovery -- (F(DOD-CR)) | = 91,955 | 15,221 | 16.6 |
| Lawrence Livermore - Site 300 -- (F(LL300)) | = 112,625 | 20,248 | 18.0 |
| Sacramento River Toxic Program -- (F(SRTP)) | = 73,088 | 81,375 | 111.3 |
| General -- (G) | = 4,258,724 | 962,065 | 22.6 |
| Indirect Distributed Cost -- (IDC) | = 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| -- (IDC-D) | = 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Integrated Waste Mngmt Acct (AB 1220) -- (IWMA) | = 1,673,899 | 364,721 | 21.8 |
| Proposition 50 -- (PROP 50) | = 518,737 | 57,394 | 11.1 |
| Proposition 40/2002 -- (PROP40) | = 205,352 | 41,488 | 20.2 |
| Aerojet Gen Corp Oversight of Cleanup -- (R(AEROJET)) | = 188,409 | 32,037 | 17.0 |
| Basin Plan Amendments - Drinking Water -- (R(BASIN-DW)) | = 244,807 | 15,183 | 6.2 |
| DTSC Brownfield Coordination -- (R(BROWNFIELDS)) | = 21,013 | 0 | 0.0 |
| CALFED Cooperative Program -- (R(CALFED)) | = 944,645 | 227,931 | 24.1 |
| Redevelopment Agency Reimbursements -- (R(REDEVEL)) | = 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| R (Dept of Defense Cleanup Oversight) -- (R(SLCDOD)) | = 1,148,738 | 236,885 | 20.6 |
| Westley and Tracy Tire Facilities -- (R(WESTLEY)) | = 295,889 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Surface Impoundment Assessment Account -- (SIAA) | = 185,162 | 37,852 | 20.4 |
| State/Federal Revolving Fund-Federal -- (SRFFED) | = 11,409 | 740 | 6.5 |
| Tobacco Tax -- (TBT) | = 148,457 | 27,952 | 18.8 |
| Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Fund -- (UTSCF) | = 2,434,275 | 671,084 | 27.6 |
| Waste Discharge Permit Fund -- (WDPF) | = 13,554,389 | 3,629,748 | 26.8 |
| TOTAL | 34,542,006 | 8,483,545 | 24.6 % |

28, 29 November 2005 Executive Officer report updates

Item 21: *San Joaquin River Dissolved Oxygen and Salt and Boron TMDLs*

The State Water Resources Control Board approved the two San Joaquin River TMDLs on 16 November. Resolution No. 2005-0086 approved an Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins (Basin Plan) to Control Factors Contributing to Dissolved Oxygen Impairment in the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel. The resolution can be found at:

<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/resdec/resltn/2005/rs2005-0087.pdf>

Resolution No. 2005-0087 approved an Amendment to the Basin Plan to incorporate a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for the Control of Salt and Boron Discharges into the Lower San Joaquin River. The following direction to the Regional Board was added to the draft resolution in response to oral comments:

“The Central Valley Water Board shall adopt water quality objectives for salinity and boron for the lower San Joaquin River from Mendota Dam to the Airport Way Bridge near Vernalis by September 2006.”

Staff is assessing resource issues and developing a revised workplan to comply with this State Water Board direction. The resolution can be found at:

<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/resdec/resltn/2005/rs2005-0087.pdf>

Item 15: *CalSim II Peer Review*

A draft report of CalSim II model peer review, sponsored by the CALFED Science Program and the California Water and Environmental Modeling Forum (CWEMF), has been completed. The report is available at:

http://science.calwater.ca.gov/workshop/calsim_docs_review.shtml

Item 18: *Water Quality Objectives, South Delta, USBR and DWR Water Rights Hearings at SWRCB*

Direct testimony and cross examination for the public hearing to determine whether to adopt draft cease and desist orders against the United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) and California Department of Water Resources (DWR) were completed 21 November. Closing briefs are due by 3 p.m. on Monday, December 12, 2005.

Regional Board Program Chart

During the discussion of Regional Board priorities at the October 2005 meeting, a listing of all Regional Board programs was requested. The attached chart was prepared listing major Regional Board functions, the activities within each function, and the current funding and associated staff levels for each activity as of November 2005.

**Summary Of Central Valley Water Board Programs, Funding Sources and Resources
November 2005**

| <u>Program</u> | <u>Program Description</u> | <u>Fund Source(s)</u> | <u>Approx. \$'s & PY's</u> |
|---|--|--|------------------------------------|
| | Total Funding | | \$34,380,044 |
| | Total Staffing | | 242.2 |
| <u>Regulatory Programs</u> | | | |
| Programs which deal with ongoing discharge activities | | | |
| NPDES | Regulation of municipal and industrial discharges to surface water under Clean Water Act and California Water Code | Discharger Fees USEPA Grant | \$2,882,680 20.4 |
| Stormwater | Regulation of stormwater Runoff in urban areas, and at industrial and construction sites | Discharger Fees USEPA Grant | \$1,626,984 10.3 |
| Non15 WDRs | Regulation of wastes discharged to land | Discharger Fees | \$3,689,267 25.6 |
| Non15 Irrigated Lands | Regulation of non-point source discharges from irrigated agricultural lands | Discharger Fees | \$720,559 5.0 |
| Title 27 Landfills | Regulation of landfills, waste ponds and other wastes requiring special containment to protect groundwater (regulations are in Title 27) | Discharger Fees Landfill Tipping Fees | \$3,712,109 26.9 |
| Irrigated Lands Waiver | Regulation of non-point source discharges from irrigated ag lands operating under the conditions ag waivers | Discharger Fees | \$1,089,409 9.0 |
| Solar Evaporators | Study water quality issues and possible regulations of solar evaporation of ag runoff | Special Account | \$185,162 1.3 |
| Forest Activities | Regulation of forest activities, primarily timber harvest plans through conditional waiver | Discharger Fees | \$1,039,300 8.3 |
| Dairy Regulatory Program | Regulation of dairies and other confined animal facilities | Discharger Fees | \$1,064,606 7.6 |
| Water Quality Certification | Regulation of work in stream channels and lakes requiring Section 404 Permit from Corps of Engineers. Dredging, filling, wetlands. | Discharger Fees | \$347,102 3.0 |
| Enforcement | Funding dedicated to coordinate and conduct enforcement in any program. | Discharger Fees | \$485,198 3.6 |

**Summary Of Central Valley Water Board Programs, Funding Sources and Resources
November 2005**

| <u>Program</u> | <u>Program Description</u> | <u>Fund Source(s)</u> | <u>Approx. \$'s & PY's</u> |
|--|--|---|------------------------------------|
| <u>Policy and Non-Point Source Programs</u> | | | |
| Watershed Management | | Tobacco Tax | \$148,457 1.1 |
| Sacramento River Monitoring | Grant from Sacramento River Watershed Group for studies on Sacramento River | Sacramento Regional CSD | \$73,088 1.1 |
| Trend & Ambient Monitoring | | General Funds | \$271,408 2.0 |
| TMDLs | Develop and adopt TMDLs and Implementation Plans for water bodies on 303(d) list | General Funds USEPA Grant 319(h) Grant 104(b)3 Grant | \$2,069,542 16.7 |
| Basin Planning | Review and updating of Water Quality Control Plan | General Funds | \$244,807 1.0 |
| Water Quality Control Planning | Various studies and monitoring supporting planning efforts; Agricultural drainage regulation | General Funds | \$1,059,715 7.8 |
| CalFED Implementation | Funding to support Regional Board participation in CalFED Bay-Delta work | General Funds CalFED Grants | \$1,364,611 6.4 |
| <u>Cleanup Programs</u> | | | |
| Programs that deal with cleanup of soil and groundwater from past activities | | | |
| Aerojet | Reimbursement of staff work on Aerojet | Aerojet | \$188,409 1.0 |
| SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigation & Cleanup) | Program to investigate and cleanup existing soil and groundwater pollution | General Fund Redevelopment Cost Recovery | \$2,502,058 14.8 |
| Department of Defense | Program to investigate and cleanup existing soil and groundwater pollution on military sites. Particularly involved in cleanup of closed bases to facilitate civilian use. | Federal Grant & Cost Recovery | \$1,148,738 7.4 |

**Summary Of Central Valley Water Board Programs, Funding Sources and Resources
November 2005**

| <u>Program</u> | <u>Program Description</u> | <u>Fund Source(s)</u> | <u>Approx. \$'s & PY's</u> |
|---|---|--|---|
| Lawrence Livermore Labs | Program to investigate and cleanup existing soil and groundwater pollution at Department of Energy research facility near Tracy | Federal Grant | \$112,625 .2 |
| Westley Tire Fire | Program to investigate and cleanup existing soil and groundwater pollution at major tire fire in Stanislaus County near Westley | Reimbursement | \$295,889 .1 |
| Underground Storage Tanks | Program to investigate and cleanup existing soil and groundwater pollution associated with underground fuel storage tanks | General Funds UST Cleanup Funds | \$1,456,249 10.5 |
| MTBE | Program to work on MTBE cleanups | UST Cleanup Fund | \$978,026 7.2 |
| Cleanup and Abatement | Oversight of cleanup for sites without other funding sources | Cleanup and Abatement Funds | \$175,617 1.3 |
| <u>Grant Administration</u> | | | |
| Administration of State Water Board grants | | | |
| Prop 40 | Solicit, review, and prioritize grant applications, and administer awarded grants | Prop 40 | \$205,352 1.6 |
| Prop 50 | Solicit, review, and prioritize grant applications, and administer awarded grants | Prop 50 | \$518,737 4.3 |
| Prop 13 | Solicit, review, and prioritize grant applications, and administer awarded grants | Prop 13 | \$731,330 6.6 |
| SRF | Develop priority list for State Board State Revolving Fund (SRF) that provides loans for sewer system upgrades | SRF Bond | \$13,690 .1 |
| | | | |
| <u>Administration Management Other</u> | Funds to run overall Regional Board operations not attributable to specific programs | Overhead levied against all program accounts | \$3,979,320 30.2 |