# Meeting will begin shortly

Please use the rename feature to designate your name and affiliation

Water Boards

#### Note: this meeting will be recorded

# CEQA Scoping Meeting & Public Workshop

Delta Mercury Control Program & Total Maximum Daily Load Review

Water Boards

#### 24 February 2021

## **Zoom Logistics**

#### Virtual Meeting Logistics:

- Online meeting only due to COVID-19 pandemic and current state restrictions for public gatherings
- Comments & Questions taken at end of presentation
- If calling into this meeting and wanting to verbally comment, please:
  - \*9 to raise your hand
  - Wait for facilitator to call on you
  - \*6 to unmute
- Chat function has been disabled
- Email <u>RB5S-MercuryComments@waterboards.ca.gov</u> with any technical issues during the presentation

### Agenda

- Introduction
- Regulatory context
- Purpose and scope
- Project description
- Delta Mercury Control Program (DMCP) Review topics and scoping potential project alternatives
- Next steps
- Comments and/or questions
  - Email <u>RB5S-MercuryComments@waterboards.ca.gov</u> by 5:00 PM on 26 February 2021 (Extended to 5 March 2021) to submit written questions/comments

### Introduction

#### Goals of Meeting:

- Seek input from public agencies & members of the public on
  - Range of project actions and alternatives
  - Reasonably foreseeable methods of compliance
  - Potential significant and cumulative impacts
  - Mitigation measures
- Fulfill regulatory requirements and responsibilities

Note that no action will be made at this meeting

### **Regulatory Context**

- Water Boards
  - State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board)
  - 9 Regional Water Quality Control Boards
    - Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board)
  - Mandated to protect beneficial uses of all surface and groundwater
- Regional Authority
  - Federal Clean Water Act
  - State Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act

- Clean Water Act
  - Designate beneficial uses of surface water
  - Establish water quality criteria to protect those uses
- Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act
  - Establishes Regional Water Boards responsibility for protecting surface and groundwater quality
  - Boards establish Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans) that include beneficial uses of surface and groundwater

- Basin Plans
  - Sacramento San Joaquin River Basins & Tulare Lake Basin
  - Beneficial Uses
  - Water Quality Objectives
  - Implementation Plans
  - Monitoring & Surveillance Programs
  - State Policies
- Basin Plan Amendments (BPA) required for changes to Basin Plan

8

- Basin Plan Amendment Process
  - Tribal Consultation

9

- Public Participation
- Central Valley Water Board adoption through Public Hearing
- State Water Board approval
- Office of Administrative Law approval
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) approval

- Public Participation
  - California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Scoping Meeting
  - Stakeholder Meetings and Workshops, as necessary
  - Potential Board Workshops
  - Public Comment Periods
  - Response to Comments Received
  - Central Valley Water Board Hearings

### **Purpose and Scope**

- CEQA requires an environmental analysis of any proposed Basin Plan Amendment
- CEQA Scoping Meetings provide an opportunity for the public to give input on:
  - Potential environmental impacts
  - Possible mitigation measures
  - Possible project alternatives

### Purpose and Scope (continued)

- Solicit comments and suggestions from the public regarding a proposal to:
  - Possibly revise the Sacramento San Joaquin Basin Plan Amendment (Resolution No. R5-2010-0043)
  - Discuss potential options for
    - Phase 2 of the Delta Mercury Control Program
    - Continued mercury exposure reduction initiative
    - Mercury offset strategy

### **Project Description**

- Mercury and Methylmercury sources and concerns
- Conceptual Model
- Maps of areas affected
- DMCP and TMDL
  - Timeline
  - Phase 1
  - Phase 2



- Total Mercury (THg) Sources
  - Gold mining
  - Mercury mining
  - Urban and industrial runoff
  - Atmospheric deposition
  - Agriculture, wetlands, and dredging discharges
  - Other tributary inputs
- Methylmercury (MeHg) concerns
  - Bioaccumulates in food web
    - Developmental neurotoxin
    - Harmful for human and wildlife



Image source: <u>Delta Biogeochemistry Group</u>

Map of Sacramento – San Joaquin River Delta Estuary and Yolo Bypass



Map of North Yolo Bypass and Cache Creek Settling Basin



Map of Delta Waterways (North Panel)



Map of Delta Waterways (South Panel)



- Delta Mercury Control Program Timeline
  - April 2010 Central Valley Water Board adopted Delta Mercury Control Program and TMDL Basin Plan Amendment
  - October 2011 USEPA approval, Delta Mercury Control Program became effective, and Phase 1 began
  - Currently Board staff reviewal of Phase 1 and TMDL, possible revision of DMCP
  - October 2022 Phase 2 begins, if no revision of TMDL, current load and waste load allocations become effective with compliance date of 2030

#### Phase 1

- Control studies and pilot projects conducted to research:
  - Management practices to control MeHg
  - MeHg source control methods
  - Feasibility of dischargers attaining load and waste load allocation
- Provisions for:
  - Pollution minimization programs
  - Interim mass limits for inorganic THg point sources
  - Controlling sediment-bound mercury
  - Reducing total Hg loading to San Francisco Bay
- Language for the development of:
  - Mercury exposure reduction program for human consumption
  - Future upstream Hg control programs for major tributaries
  - Mercury offset program

- Phase 1 (continued)
  - Control Studies now complete and being reviewed
  - Ends with Central Valley Water Board:
    - Reviewing Phase 1 requirements
    - Consider
      - Revising the Program and future requirements before starting Phase 2
      - Modifying MeHg goals, objectives, allocations, and/or final compliance date
      - Adopting a mercury offset program
      - Potential public and environmental benefits and adverse impacts
    - Re-evaluate
      - Fish tissue objectives
      - Linkage analysis
      - Attainability of allocations

#### Phase 2

- Begins after review of Phase 1 or October 2022, whichever occurs first
- Dischargers would
  - Implement MeHg control programs to meet allocations
  - Continue inorganic mercury reduction programs
- Conduct compliance monitoring
- Implement upstream control programs
- Ends in 2030 unless Board modifies implementation schedule and Final Compliance Date

Current step: End of Phase 1

- Board staff will review and <u>consider</u>
  - Modification of:
    - Methylmercury goals
    - Site-specific water quality objectives
    - Linkage analysis
  - Potential public and environmental benefits and impacts of attaining allocations
  - Final compliance date
  - Implementation practices and schedules
  - Requirements and schedules for implementing MeHg management practices
  - Creation of a Mercury Offset Program

### **Project Alternatives**

- Evaluation Considerations for Alternatives
  - Policies/Regulation
  - Beneficial Uses
  - Water Quality Objectives
  - Implementation/Monitoring Plans
  - Potential Economic Impacts
  - Potential Environmental Impacts (CEQA Checklist)

- CEQA Environmental Checklist
  - Appendix G (2020)
    - Aesthetics
    - Agriculture and Forestry Resources
    - Air Quality
    - Biological Resources
    - Cultural Resources
    - Energy
    - Geology and Soils
    - Greenhouse Gas Emissions
    - Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreations
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Wildfire

#### **No Action Alternative**

Phase 2 will automatically go into effect in October 2022

- Uses the current load and waste load allocations found in the TMDL
- Dischargers will need to:
  - Implement MeHg control programs
  - Continue inorganic total mercury reduction programs
  - Reach compliance by 2030
  - Continue compliance monitoring
  - Implement upstream control programs
- Water Boards to develop tributary mercury load reduction strategies

#### **Action Alternatives**

- Modification of:
  - MeHg goals
  - Site-specific water quality objectives
  - Linkage analysis
  - Load and wasteload allocations
  - Requirements and schedules for implementing MeHg management practices
  - Potential public and Environmental Benefits/Impacts
  - Final compliance date
- <u>Creation of:</u>
  - Mercury Offset Program



### Linkage Reevaluation

### Terminology



#### Hg Fish Tissue Targets

Calculated Hg fish tissue concentrations

Hg concentrations expected to be safe for consumption by humans and wildlife

#### Hg Water Quality Objectives

Most protective Hg Fish Tissue Targets

2010 Delta Mercury Control Program Hg Implementation Goals

Std. 350mm Largemouth Bass (LMB) Hg Implementation Goal (0.24 mg/kg)

Aqueous MeHg Implementation Goal (0.06 ng/L)

### Fish Tissue Targets

Trophic Level (TL) Group	Consumer of TL Group	Hg Fish Tissue Target (mg/kg)
TL4 Fish (150-500 mm)	Bald eagle	0.31
TL4 Fish (150-500 mm)	Human	0.24
TL4 Fish (150-350 mm)	Osprey	0.26
TL4 Fish (150-350 mm)	River otter	0.36
TL3 Fish (150-500 mm)	Bald eagle	0.11
TL3 Fish (150-500 mm)	Human	0.08
TL3 Fish (150-350 mm)	Osprey & Common merganser	0.09
TL3 Fish (150-350 mm)	Western grebe	0.08
TL3 Fish (50-150 mm)	Double-crested cormorant	0.09
TL3 Fish (50-150 mm)	Kingfisher	0.05
TL3 Fish (50-150 mm)	Mink	0.08
TL3 Fish (50-150 mm)	River otter	0.04
TL3 Fish (<50 mm)	California least tern	0.03
TL3 Fish (<50 mm)	Western snowy plover	0.10

### Fish Tissue Targets & Water Quality Objectives

29

Trophic Level (TL) Group	Consumer of TL Group	Hg Fish Tissue Target (mg/kg)	Equivalent TL4 Fish 150-500mm Hg Concentration (mg/kg)
TL4 Fish (150-500 mm)	Bald eagle	0.31	0.31
TL4 Fish (150-500 mm)	Human	0.24	0.24
TL4 Fish (150-350 mm)	Osprey	0.26	0.33
TL4 Fish (150-350 mm)	River otter	0.36	0.45
TL3 Fish (150-500 mm)	Bald eagle	0.11	0.37
TL3 Fish (150-500 mm)	Human	0.08	0.24
TL3 Fish (150-350 mm)	Osprey & Common merganser	0.09	0.35
TL3 Fish (150-350 mm)	Western grebe	0.08	0.30
TL3 Fish (50-150 mm)	Double-crested cormorant	0.09	0.96
TL3 Fish (50-150 mm)	Kingfisher	0.05	0.62
TL3 Fish (50-150 mm)	Mink	0.08	0.90
TL3 Fish (50-150 mm)	River otter	0.04	0.50
TL3 Fish (<50 mm)	California least tern	0.03	0.38
TL3 Fish (<50 mm)	Western snowy plover	0.10	1.12

## Fish Tissue Targets & LMB Implementation Goal

Trophic Level (TL) Group	Consumer of TL Group	Hg Fish Tissue Target (mg/kg)	Equivalent Standard 350mm LMB Hg Concentration (mg/kg)
TL4 Fish (150-500 mm)	Bald eagle	0.31	0.36
TL4 Fish (150-500 mm)	Human	0.24	0.28
TL4 Fish (150-350 mm)	Osprey	0.26	0.36
TL4 Fish (150-350 mm)	River otter	0.36	0.57
TL3 Fish (150-500 mm)	Bald eagle	0.11	0.43
TL3 Fish (150-500 mm)	Human	0.08	0.24
TL3 Fish (150-350 mm)	Osprey & Common merganser	0.09	0.38
TL3 Fish (150-350 mm)	Western grebe	0.08	0.31
TL3 Fish (50-150 mm)	Double-crested cormorant	0.09	1.15
TL3 Fish (50-150 mm)	Kingfisher	0.05	0.73
TL3 Fish (50-150 mm)	Mink	0.08	1.06
TL3 Fish (50-150 mm)	River otter	0.04	0.57
TL3 Fish (<50 mm)	California least tern	0.03	0.42
TL3 Fish (<50 mm)	Western snowy plover	0.10	1.34

### **Original Linkage Analysis**

- Regression model based on
  - Average aqueous MeHg concentration (x-axis)
  - Standard 350mm LMB Hg concentration (y-axis)



#### Original Linkage Analysis (continued)

 0.24 mg/kg LMB Implementation Goal

32

 Predicted 0.066 ng/L avg. aqueous safe MeHg concentration



### Linkage Analysis Summary

Hg Fish Tissue Targets Trophic Level (TL) Group	Hg Fish Tissue Targets Water Quality Objective (mg/kg)	Standard 350 LMB Hg Equivalent Concentrations (mg/kg)	Standard 350 LMB Hg Implementation Goal (mg/kg)	Aqueous MeHg Predicted Concentration (ng/L)	Aqueous MeHg Implementation Goal (ng/L)
TL4 150- 500mm	0.24	0.28			
TL3 150- 500mm	0.08	0.24	0.24	0.066	0.06
TL3 < 50mm	0.03	0.42			

### Original Linkage Data

34



### **Original Linkage Analysis Data**

Monthly Averages of Aqueous [MeHg] & LMB [Hg] from Original Linkage [2000]



### **Available Data After Merging Data Sources**



36

### Linkage Alternatives

#### **Original Linkage Methodology**

- One data point for each subarea
- Linkage for entire Delta

#### **Potential Modifications**

- Multiple years of data for each subarea
- Linkage by Subarea or entire Delta
- Implementation Goals & Allocations
- Statistical analysis tools and methodologies

#### **Potential Sources**

- Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s)
- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Facilities
- Dredge Material Disposal
- Agricultural
- Wetlands

- Open Channels
- Soils in Agricultural, Wetland & Other Land Use Areas with Responsible Parties
- Atmospheric Deposition
- Cache Creek Settling Basin
- Delta Tributary Point Sources
- Delta Tributary Nonpoint Sources

#### Reduce THg Loads



### Reduce MeHg loads

#### Reduce exposure to fish eating public





Delta Mercury Control Program Phase 1 Methylmercury Control Studies Independent Scientific Review

A report to the Delta Science Program

Prepared by:	
Dr. B. Branfireun, Professor.	Dept. of Biology, University of Western Ontario, London ON.
Dr. C. Gilmour, Senior Scientist.	Smithsonian Environmental Research Center, Edgewater, MD.
Dr. C. Knightes, Research Scientist.	US Environmental Protection Agency, Narragansett, RI.
Dr. R. Mason, Professor.	Dept. of Marine Sciences & Chemistry, University of Connecticut, Groton, CT.
Dr. C. Mitchell, Assoc. Professor.	Dept. of Physical & Environmental Science, Univ. of Toronto Scarborough, Toronto, ON.





39

Mercury and Methylmercury Load Reductions

**Point Sources** 

During Phase 2, dischargers shall meet final effluent limitations and implement methylmercury control programs and continue inorganic (total) mercury reduction programs

- NPDES Permitted Facilities
- NPDES Permitted Urban Runoff Discharges

**Nonpoint Sources** 

Implement reasonable, feasible actions to reduce sediment in runoff with the goal of reducing inorganic mercury loading

Current load allocations for: agricultural drainage, atmospheric wet deposition, open water, tributaries, urban nonpoint, wetlands

### **Control Studies**

Methylmercury Control Studies and key findings from Review Panels 1 & 2 will be used to evaluate effective implementation options.

### Mercury Exposure Reduction Program

- Stakeholder advisory group
- Outreach and education projects
- Developing and posting signs
- Creating multilingual educational materials

Program not currently funded



### Tribal Beneficial Uses (TBUs)

#### **Tribal Traditional and Culture (CUL)**

Uses of water that support the cultural, spiritual, ceremonial, or traditional rights or lifeways of California Native American Tribes, including, but not limited to: navigation, ceremonies, or fishing, gathering, or consumption of natural aquatic resources, including fish, shellfish, vegetation, and materials.

#### **Tribal Subsistence Fishing (T-SUB)**

Uses of water involving the non-commercial catching or gathering of natural aquatic resources, including fish and shellfish, for consumption by individuals, households, or communities of California Native American Tribes to meet needs for sustenance.

Separate process to add definitions to Basin Plans

Separate process to consider TBU designations

Stay current on processes via <u>Central Valley Water Board's website and Lyris</u> <u>Listserv</u>

### Offset Program

- Provide flexible ways of meeting regulatory requirements while also improving the environment
- Encourage earlier and larger load reductions to the Delta
- Be based on the 6 key principles outlined in the DMCP
- Alternatives to direct load credits may be developed
- Not a substitute for reasonable actions to address local impacts

### **Offset Program - Questions Under Consideration**

- Is there a need for an Offset Program (e.g. will load and wasteload allocations be achieved)?
- Where would the offset program be applicable?
- Where can an offset project be located with respect to the proponent of the offset project?
- What forms of mercury in discharges can be used for an offset?
- How much offset credit will be generated from the completion of an offset project?
- Will there be a disparate or disproportionate pollution burden as a result of an offset project?

### Potential Public and Environmental Benefits/Impacts

- Habitat restoration projects
- Flood protection
- Water supply

### Attainability of Targets and Allocations

Attainability of the allocations will be re-evaluated based on the findings of Phase 1 control studies and other information.

### **Final Compliance Date**

Methylmercury load and waste load allocations for dischargers in the Delta and Yolo Bypass shall be met as soon as possible, but no later than 2030, unless the Regional Water Board modifies the implementation schedule and Final Compliance Date.

### **Next Steps**

#### **CEQA Scoping**

- Tribal Consultation (Completed)
  Public CEQA Scoping Meeting
  Public CEQA Scoping Comment Period

Control Program and TMDL staff report Development

Scientific Peer Review (Health and Safety Code § 57004)

**Release SED** 

**Public Comment Period** 

**Regional Board Hearing and Adoption** 

State Board Hearing and Approval

Office of Administrative Law Approval

**USEPA Approval (Notice of Determination)** 

Public Participation and Agency Coordination

### **Comments and/or Questions**

Oral Comments:

Zoom – use 'Raise Hand' function

Phone – \*9 to raise and lower your hand Wait for facilitator to call on you \*6 to unmute and mute after comment

Submit <u>written comments</u> via email by 5:00 PM on Friday, February 26, 2021 (Extended to March 5, 2021) to: <u>RB5S-</u> <u>MercuryComments@waterboards.ca.gov</u>

Project Website and Lyris List