

Attachment 2. Appendix A – Water Body Categorization Report Template

APPENDIX A—WATER BODY CATEGORIZATION REPORT TEMPLATE

Information needed to characterize Ag Dominated Water Bodies

(to be used in conjunction with Water Body Categorization Flow Chart 1 and completed in partnership with the entity that manages/operates the Water Bodies evaluated within this document)

Commented [A1]: Comments are provided below from the Sacramento River Source Water Protection Program (SRSWPP).

Commented [A2]: The entity that manages/operates the waterbodies proposed for de/re-designation should be the applicant.

A. Water Body Categorization Information

I. General

1. Applicant name, mailing address, and date of establishment (include website address, if applicable):

Managing/operating entity (if different from above):

2. Contact Person (include phone and email):
3. Total number of water bodies under consideration and approximate total length (in miles).
4. Location and total surrounding land area containing the water bodies under consideration (will be referenced as study area) in acres or square miles.
5. Complete the information needed in Table 1 as provided, with a separate record for each water body to be evaluated. Provide 1992 Inland Surface Water Plan (ISWP) information (water body name, Ag dominated water body category, and type of construction) if it is both available and reflective of current conditions and operations of the water body to be evaluated.

Commented [A3]: Please consider clarifying the level of detail of information needed to complete Table 1, and consider if additional information may be needed in case minimal information is provided in the report submitted, or if the system has more complex considerations.

Table 1 Water Body Information

Name of Primary Water Body or System	Name of All Individual Water Bodies that Make Up the Primary Water Body System	1992 Inland Surface Water Plan (ISWP)			National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) Water Body Feature Type	Type of Water Body (natural, modified or constructed)	Ag Dominated Water Body Category (from Flow Chart 1)	For Constructed or Modified			Length of Water Body Segment (miles)	Primary Water Type (e.g. Supply Water only, Ag return flows, subsurface tile drainage water, municipal or industrial wastewater, stormwater)	Flow Characteristics		Water Body Maintenance Activities and Frequency
		Water Body	Ag Dominated Water Body Category	Type of Construction				Type of Construction or Modification (e.g. earthlined, concrete)	Year of Construction or Modification	Purpose(s) of Construction or Modification			Non-irrigation Season	Irrigation Season	

Commented [A4]: How is ag dominated determined from this information collected?

Commented [A5]: Please add note that additional information may be provided in comments following the table.

DRAFT

6. List sources, documents, reports or references used for making the Water Body Category (Flow Chart 1) determination provided in Table 1 for the study area under consideration. *Links to websites can also be provided if applicable.*
7. Provide a map showing boundaries of the study area (USGS Quad or other map. (If Geographical Information System (GIS) shape files are available, include as an attachment)
8. List source(s) of water for the study area.

II. Inflows and Outflows to Water Bodies

1. Provide a brief general description of the overall study area management.
2. Provide a map(s) or schematic showing the key components of the surface water supply and drainage in the study area. The figure should include inflows and outflows of the district and include (if applicable) the following:
 - a. Location of surface water supply (intake) points to the study area.
 - b. Location of groundwater supply points in the study area (This should only include wells which pump directly into canals or drains or wells used to supply water outside the landowners' control).
 - c. Location of operation spills from the study area.
 - d. _____
3. Describe and indicate on a map the predominant te direction of water flow through the study area.

Commented [A6]: Need to identify what receiving waters the proposed de/re-designated water bodies discharge to.

Commented [A7]: Please clarify what this means. Spills typically has a connotation of an unintended discharge that may contain contaminants.

Commented [A8]: An item should be added to identify RB permitted discharges, e.g., WDRs, industrial discharges, and POTWs

B. MUN Beneficial Use Evaluation

I. Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN) use

1. List any known State Water Rights information pertaining to the municipal and/or domestic supply use in or immediately downstream of the study area, even if the right has never been exercised (if applicable).

For more information on State Water Rights information and the use of database search and mapping tools, visit the following website:
http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/ewrims/

2. Describe other municipal and/or domestic supply use of the surface water system on or after November 28, 1975 (*if applicable*).
3. Provide a map(s) showing any diversion points in or downstream of the study area where water is used for municipal and/or domestic supply or is designated for MUN use.

Commented [A9]: It is important to not limit the identification of downstream MUN to immediately downstream. The language of item 1 should be in agreement with item 3, which includes downstream of the study area.

It is also important to consider the tributary watersheds for surface water treatment intakes.

Commented [A10]: Does this address waterbodies with designated MUN use?

C. Water Quality Monitoring Program

I. Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program (ILRP)

1. Is the study area covered by water quality monitoring under the Central Valley Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program or any other monitoring program?
2. If the study area is covered by the ILRP, provide information for questions 2a-c. *Website links may be provided in lieu of answering these questions.*
 - a. What ILRP coalition is the Applicant a member of?
 - b. List any Management Plans previously developed or currently under development.
 - c. List and show location of ILRP representative monitoring sites that are located in or downstream from the study area boundary. Provide a summary of historical and current monitoring activities for each site.
3. For areas not covered by ILRP, list any known or suspected water quality concerns including elevated background concentrations in surface or groundwater supplies. *Website links may be provided in lieu of answering this question.*

Commented [A11]: This should also include period of record, number of samples, sampling season, and identification of any known water quality concerns other than management plans.

II. Applicant Monitoring

If the Applicant has a water quality monitoring program (aside from ILRP), provide information for questions 1-3. *Website links may be provided in lieu of answering these questions.*

1. Summarize existing monitoring locations with identifying number or name; parameters measured; frequency period of anticipated sampling (e.g. 2014-2016; ongoing; etc.); purpose or goal of monitoring (e.g. inlets, outlets, etc.); and the location of resulting data (if available).
2. Provide a map(s) showing the monitoring locations with identifying label (number or name) of all current and proposed water quality and/or flow monitoring points.
3. Summarize available historical monitoring data including monitoring locations, parameters measured, number of analyses, inclusive dates of sampling, and location of data.

Commented [A12]: Will applicants be allowed to submit water quality data other than ILRP or their own monitoring program? If so, how is that included in this report template? Will the Regional Board staff consider monitoring data other than that submitted by the applicant in their review and consideration of de-/re-designation, as well as surveillance and monitoring requirements/needs?

III. Cost of Drainage Water Management Programs

1. Estimates of the cost of participating in ILRP, if applicable.
2. Estimates of the cost of ongoing water quality monitoring programs.
3. Estimated cost of this report.

Commented [A13]: Costs for the ILRP and monitoring programs should be specific to the de-/re-designated waterbodies not all the overall compliance costs for the applicant.

Commented [A14]: Please clarify if this is regarding only the water quality monitoring addressed in item C.II, above.

D. References