Biological Objectives Implementation

Guidelines for Preparing Draft Program Implementation Proposals

Background

At the April Regulatory and Stakeholder Advisory Group meetings, Regional Water Board staff and stakeholder representatives were assigned the task of drafting proposals for implementing biological objectives in the Water Boards' regulatory programs. The proposals will be discussed during the next round of advisory group meetings on May 24 and 25 at SCCWRP. Below is the list of staff and stakeholders assigned to each program area.

Program	Water Board Staff	Stakeholder Representative
NPDES Stormwater	Lilian Busse, Region 9	Chris Sommers, CASQA Karen Ashby, Larry Walker Associates
NPDES Wastewater	Rebecca Veiga-Nascimento, Region 4	Phil Markle, LACSD
401 Water Quality Certifications	Ben Livsey, Region 2	Dave Boland/Mark Rentz?, ACWA
Irrigated Agriculture	Ben Letton, Region 5 Karen Worcester, Region 3	Tess Dunham, Pyrethroid Working Group Parry Klassen, CURES
Timber Harvest	Jonathan Warmerdam, Region 1	Ed Struffenegger, CA Forestry Assoc.
Enforcement	Matthew Buffleben, State Water Board	

Guidance for Developing Proposals

- Proposals should be 1-2 pages and may include a flow chart if appropriate.
- Focus the proposal on applying anti-degradation policies to ensure that streams do no degrade below baseline condition.
- Identify how baseline condition will be established. Focus on who will do the monitoring and how the information should be reported to the Regional Water Board. You do not need to include specifics such as where and how frequent monitoring should be conducted.
- Monitoring & Reporting

- What monitoring and reporting requirements should be included in the permit or order?
- How should monitoring be conducted (i.e., individual discharger monitoring or regional, multi-agency monitoring)?
- If multi-agency monitoring is proposed, how will dischargers be compelled to participate and how will it be enforced?

- Permit Conditions
  - What will dischargers be required to do when biological degradation (i.e., biological condition degrading below established baseline condition) is observed?
  - Should new discharges have more stringent conditions? If so, how?
  - Under what circumstances should an application be denied?
  - If degradation is deemed necessary for the benefit of the state, then will compensatory mitigation be required?

- Compliance and Enforcement
  - Recognizing that biological degradation can have multiple possible causes, who should conduct/fund the causal assessment when degradation occurs?
  - Should more aggressive enforcement be taken on degradation of good quality streams?
  - Will participation in causal assessment studies be considered compliance with permit conditions? What minimum effort would be required?