

1 Michael R. Lozeau
2 LOZEAU DRURY LLP
3 410 12th Street, Suite 250
4 Oakland, California 94607
5 Tel: (510) 836-4200
6 Fax: (510) 836-4205
7 E-mail: michael@lozeaudrury.com

8 Attorneys for Petitioners CALIFORNIA SPORTFISHING
9 PROTECTION ALLIANCE and CALIFORNIA
10 WATER IMPACT NETWORK

11 BEFORE THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

12 IN RE: PETITION OF CALIFORNIA) Petition To Review California Regional
13 SPORTFISHING PROTECTION ALLIANCE and) Water Quality Control Board, Central
14 CALIFORNIA WATER IMPACT NETWORK FOR) Valley Region’s Order R5-2014-0029
15 REVIEW OF ACTIONS BY CALIFORNIA)
16 REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL)
17 BOARD, CENTRAL VALLEY REGION)
18 APPROVING THE WASTE DISCHARGE)
19 REQUIREMENTS GENERAL ORDER FOR)
20 GROWERS WITHIN THE SAN JOAQUIN)
21 COUNTY AND DELTA AREA THAT ARE)
22 MEMBERS OF A THIRD-PARTY GROUP)

23 Pursuant to Water Code § 13320, California Sportfishing Protection Alliance and the
24 California Water Impact Network (collectively “CSPA”) hereby petition the State Water
25 Resources Control Board (“State Board”) to review the California Regional Water Quality
26 Control Board, Central Valley Region’s (“Regional Board”) March 12, 2014 approval of Waste
27 Discharge Requirements General Order for Growers Within the San Joaquin County and Delta
28 Area That are Members of a Third-Party Group,” Order R5-2014-0029 (“Delta Area WDRs”).

As pointed out in CSPA’s lengthy comments to the Regional Board on the Delta Area
WDRs, continuing the existing Coalition-based irrigated lands discharge program is inconsistent
with applicable law and State Board policies, including the State of California’s antidegradation
policy or “Statement of Policy With Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in
California,” Resolution 68-16 (Oct. 28, 1968) (“Antidegradation Policy”) and the State Board’s
Policy for Implementation and Enforcement of the Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program

1 (May 20, 2004) (“NPS Policy”). *See* CSPA’s January 17, 2014 Comment Letter and
2 accompanying exhibits. CSPA requests that the State Board issue an order vacating Order R5-
3 2014-0029 and its attachments or otherwise amending the order to address each of the following
4 shortcomings.

5 **I. NAME AND CONTACT INFORMATION OF PETITIONERS.**

6 California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
7 3536 Rainier Avenue
8 Stockton, California 95204
9 Tel: (209) 464-5067
10 Attention: Bill Jennings, Executive Director

11 California Water Impact Network
12 808 Romero Canyon Road
13 Santa Barbara, CA 93108
14 Tel: (805) 969-0824
15 Attention: Carolee Krieger, President

16 **II. REGIONAL BOARD AND STATE BOARD ACTIONS BEING PETITIONED.**

17 This petition seeks review of the Regional Board’s Order R5-2014-0029. A true and
18 correct copy of Order R5-2014-0029 is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

19 **III. THE DATE THE REGIONAL BOARD ACTED.**

20 The Regional Board adopted the Delta Area WDRs on March 12, 2014.

21 **IV. STATEMENT OF REASONS THE REGIONAL BOARD’S ACTION WAS
22 INAPPROPRIATE OR IMPROPER.**

23 The Regional Board’s approval of the Delta Area WDRs is inconsistent with State Board
24 policies, the Water Code, and is an abuse of discretion for the following numerous reasons.

25 **A. The Delta Area WDRs Do Not Waive The Filing Of Reports Of Waste
26 Discharge By All Dischargers Within The WDR Area And Every Discharger
27 Must Still File An RWD.**

28 If the intent is for the Regional Board to maintain the waiver of reports of waste
discharge (“RWD”), the Regional Board must comply with Water Code Section 13269,
including circulating a proposed waiver to the public for review and comment and making sure
the Board has sufficient evidence to make the requisite findings. Although the Regional Board
“may prescribe requirements although no discharge report has been filed[,]” that provision does

1 not exempt any discharger from submitting the report of waste discharge mandated by Water
2 Code § 13260. Water Code § 13263(d).

3 The requirement to file a report of waste discharge is comprehensive:

4 (a) Each of the following persons shall file with the appropriate regional board a
5 report of the discharge, containing the information that may be required by the
6 regional board: (1) A person discharging waste, or proposing to discharge waste,
within any region that could affect the quality of the waters of the state, other than
into a community sewer system.

7 Water Code § 13260(a)(1). The only exception to submitting a RWD for a person discharging
8 waste is if the Regional Board issues a conditional waiver pursuant to Water Code § 13269:

9 (b) No report of waste discharge need be filed pursuant to subdivision (a) if the
10 requirement is waived pursuant to Section 13269.

11 Water Code § 13260(b). The Regional Board assumes that by issuing the Delta Area WDRs, the
12 dischargers within the covered area need not file the RWD required by Section 13260. Water
13 Code § 13263(d) provides no such exemption. Indeed, by its plain terms, it merely emphasizes
14 that the RWD requirement applicable to each discharger is separate and distinct from the WDR
15 requirement applicable to the Regional Board. The distinctness of the two provisions is
16 demonstrated by the waste discharge prohibitions set forth in Water Code § 13264. Section
17 13264 provides that:

18 (a) No person shall initiate any new discharge of waste or make any material
19 changes in any discharge, or initiate a discharge to, make any material changes in
20 a discharge to, or construct, an injection well, prior to the filing of the report
required by Section 13260 and no person shall take any of these actions after
filing the report but before whichever of the following occurs first:

21 (1) The issuance of waste discharge requirements pursuant to Section 13263.

22 (2) The expiration of 140 days after compliance with Section 13260 if the waste
to be discharged does not create or threaten to create a condition of pollution or
23 nuisance and any of the following applies: [describing various CEQA scenarios
and associated timelines...]

24 (3) The issuance of a waiver pursuant to Section 13269.

25 Water Code § 13264(a). Thus, it is clear that filing a RWD is a separate and distinct duty from
26 the Board's issuance of WDRs. Indeed, the discharge prohibition is complete prior to the filing
27 of an RWD even where a WDR is issued. Second, the only way to avoid the discharge
28

1 prohibitions *after the filing of a RWD* is the issuance of WDRs or a waiver. Given this
2 requirement, WDRs cannot be read to exempt RWDs.

3 The only exemption to the RWD requirement is the issuance of a waiver pursuant to
4 Water Code § 13269. Because Order R5-2014-0029 does not issue a waiver of the Section
5 13260 RWDs for any of the irrigated lands dischargers in the WDR Area, every discharger must
6 still file an RWD, including the monitoring and other information required to be submitted as
7 part of a RWD. CSPA believes that RWDs would go a long way toward curing the farm-specific
8 data gap that the Delta Area WDRs maintain.

9 **B. The Regional Board Has No Authority To Deputize Third-Parties To Hold**
10 **Section 13267 Reports For The Regional Board And Insulate The Reports**
11 **From Public Disclosure.**

12 Despite the availability of electronic reporting and other efficient methods of handling
13 large numbers of reports and data, the Delta Area WDRs once again allow irrigated lands
14 dischargers to keep their management practices to themselves and the third-party coalition, rather
15 than the Regional Board and the rest of the interested public. Order R5-2014-0029, p. 26.

16 The Farm Evaluation Reports (“FERs”) are one of the reports required by Order R5-
17 2014-0029 pursuant to Section 13267 authority. *Id.*, p. 9. Water Code § 13267 does not
18 authorize the Regional Board to order reports to be submitted to any entity other than the Board.
19 Nor is there any authority in the Water Code authorizing the Regional Board to designate third
20 parties to manage 13267 reports on behalf of the Regional Board. Section 13267 authorizes the
21 Regional Board to require that dischargers “*shall furnish*, under penalty of perjury, technical or
22 monitoring program reports which the regional board requires.” Water Code § 13267(b)(1)
23 (emphasis added). “In requiring those reports, the regional board shall provide the person with a
24 written explanation with regard to the need for the reports, and shall identify the evidence that
25 supports requiring that person *to provide the reports.*” *Id.*, § 13267(b)(1) (emphasis added).
26 Lastly, Section 13267 expressly preserves dischargers’ trade secrets when providing the reports
27 to the Regional Board, emphasizing however, that “these portions of a report shall be available
28 for use by the state or any state agency in judicial review or enforcement proceedings involving
the person *furnishing the report.*” *Id.*, § 13267(b)(2) (emphasis added).

1 Nothing in Section 13267's provisions suggests or implies that the Regional Board can
2 order a discharger to provide a report to a third-party, either for safe-keeping or any other reason.
3 It is untenable that "furnishing" or providing a report under 13267 is intended to be to any other
4 entity but a regional board. Perhaps most obviously, the language regarding trade secrets would
5 hardly be relevant if Section 13267 anticipated that the authorized reports would be furnished to
6 a private entity rather than a public agency, *i.e.* the relevant regional board. More importantly,
7 by deputizing third-parties to retain 13267 reports like the FERs, Order R5-2014-0029 frustrates
8 Section 13267's plain intent to have the reports, even their trade secrets, available to the state or
9 any state agency for enforcement. For these reasons, the FERs and other plans and reports
10 earmarked for storage at the third-party coalition's office must be provided directly to the
11 Regional Board and, with the exception of legitimate trade secrets, be accessible to the public.

12 **C. The Regional Board Abused Its Discretion and Proceeded in a Manner**
13 **Inconsistent With the Law By Making Unsupported Findings Under the**
14 **High Quality Waters Policy to Allow Degradation in Both Surface and**
15 **Ground Waters Throughout The 582,000 Acre WDR Area.**

16 In adopting Order R5-2014-0029, the Regional Board continued its unprecedented
17 actions of authorizing degradation of an entire area of the Central Valley spanning several
18 watersheds based on little more than a hope that 5,865 dischargers, about 1,818 of which consist
19 of very large, generally very profitable farms spanning 94% of irrigated acres – will effectively
20 volunteer to do the right things to protect water quality. And that degradation decision is based
21 on evidence that is yet to be collected and, in the case of discharge data or meaningful receiving
22 water data, may never be collected.

23 The Regional Board's decisions must be based on the weight of the evidence. That
24 means, the Regional Board had to gather in a preponderance of evidence in order to support its
25 decisions implementing the High Quality Waters Policy. The Regional Board turned this
26 standard on its head by making a determination to allow every high quality water in the San
27 Joaquin and Delta area to be degraded without any evidence at all.

28 The Regional Board and their staff tried to convince themselves that a pollution discharge
from an irrigated field is unique to the world of pollution regulation. It is not. The Regional

1 Board surmised, “Very little guidance has been provided in state or federal law with respect to
2 applying the antidegradation policy to a program or general permit where multiple water bodies
3 are affected by various discharges, some of which may be high quality waters and some of which
4 may, by contrast, have constituents at levels that already exceed water quality objectives.” Delta
5 Area WDRs, Attachment A, p. 48. However, every waterbody in the state is affected by
6 multiple dischargers. And, despite staff’s effort to contrive complexity where none exists, no
7 one discharger is emitting pollutants from any particular field to multiple waterbodies. Whether
8 the Regional Board likes it or not, the high quality water policy, indeed the entire Porter-Cologne
9 Act, applies to each discharge. Just because there are numerous discharges releasing large
10 quantities of pollution to waterways, does not mean the high quality waters policy is complicated
11 for any single discharger.

12 State Board Resolution No. 68-16 provides:

13 Whenever the existing quality of water is better than the quality established in policies as
14 of the date on which such policies become effective, such existing high quality will be
15 maintained until it has been demonstrated to the State that any change will be consistent
16 with maximum benefit to the people of the State, will not unreasonably affect present and
17 anticipated beneficial use of such water and will not result in water quality less than that
18 prescribed in the policies.

19 The findings necessary to allow degradation under the Policy are stringent:

20 When the state’s antidegradation policy is triggered, as here, Resolution No. 68-
21 16 provides that the Regional Board is authorized to allow the discharge of waste
22 into high quality waters only if it makes specified findings. The State Board has
23 described these findings as a two-step process. “The first step is if a discharge will
24 degrade high quality water, the discharge may be allowed if any change in water
25 quality (1) will be consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State, (2)
26 will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial use of such water,
27 and (3) will not result in water quality less than that prescribed in state policies
28 (e.g. water quality objectives in Water Quality Control Plans). The second step is
that any activities that result in discharges to such high quality waters are required
to use the best practicable treatment or control of the discharge necessary to avoid
a pollution or nuisance and to maintain the highest water quality consistent
with the maximum benefit to the people of the State.”

29 *Asociacion de Gente Unida por el Agua v. Central Valley Regional Water Quality*
30 *Control Bd.* (2012) 210 Cal.App.4th 1255, 1278-1279, citing (State Bd., Guidance Mem.
(Feb. 16, 1995) p. 2.).

1 Applying the Policy for any given discharge requires that (1) data going back to 1968
2 from the receiving water be reviewed to determine whether it is a high quality water for the
3 pollutants likely to be discharged; (2) data regarding the levels, presumably concentration levels
4 that can be compared to the best receiving water concentrations, of pollutants being discharged
5 by the farm; (3) identification for that farm of the levels of control, treatment, or management
6 practices which would comply with the high quality water levels; (4) identification for that farm
7 of the levels of control, treatment, or management practices which would comply with the
8 applicable water quality standards for those pollutants; (5) the relative cost difference, if any,
9 between those actions, and (6) a determination whether the cost of maintaining the high quality
10 water level is so disproportionate to the mandatory cost of achieving standards that the
11 discharger should be allowed to degrade the receiving water down to, but not lower than, the
12 applicable standards because that would be consistent with the “maximum benefit to the people
13 of the State.” This outline is how the Policy has been applied for four decades to individual
14 dischargers. The Policy does not provide an exception to a category of dischargers simply
15 because there are thousands of them. If anything, that fact warrants much more allegiance by the
16 Regional Board to the Policy’s requirements, not, as the Regional Board adopted in Order R5-
17 2014-0029, a dilution of those requirements to a meaningless self-fulfilling prophecy – we hope
18 the dischargers will do the right thing, hence there won’t be degradation or, if there is, giving that
19 particular discharge a break assumes a maximized benefit to the people of the State will result.

20 The only legal way to apply these mandatory criteria to farm dischargers in the WDR
21 area is to require each farmer to submit a detailed farm evaluation report which contains
22 sufficient monitoring of the farm’s discharges, representative monitoring of their local receiving
23 water quality, and details about their existing and proposed discharge pollution controls and
24 management practices, and the costs of such controls. If either existing data already in the
25 Regional Board’s database or the submitted receiving water data establish water quality higher
26 than standards for any pollutant being discharged, the Regional Board would then be in a
27 position to decide whether the measures in place or being proposed will protect the highest
28 quality of water in the farm’s receiving waters and, if not, whether the costs to that particular

1 farmer of maintaining that highest water quality are not to the maximum benefit of the people of
2 the State.

3 **1. The Regional Board cannot allow degradation under the High Quality**
4 **Waters Policy prior to identifying the high priority waters in the**
5 **WDRs' geographic area.**

6 In order to make a rational decision to allow degradation of a high quality water, the
7 Regional Board had to first identify which of the waters within the WDR area are high quality
8 waters. Neither the Board nor its staff reviewed the available irrigated lands program data and
9 determined which of the waterbodies within the watershed are high quality waters, *i.e.*, what is
10 the highest water quality that has been achieved in any given stretch of water since 1968. Nor
11 did they seek monitoring data from other agencies, like the U.S. Geological Survey, U.S. Fish
12 and Wildlife Service or U.S. Bureau of Reclamation that, over many years, have been collecting
13 water quality data in the subject area. This is despite the Regional Board's acknowledgement
14 that plenty of data exists – much of which would identify that perhaps every waterbody within
15 the Watershed is high quality waters. *Asociacion de Gente Unida por el Agua v. Central Valley*
16 *Regional Water Quality Control Bd.* (2012) 210 Cal.App.4th 1255, 1271 (although data more
17 recent than 1968 may not demonstrate a water body is not high quality, such data can
18 demonstrate a water body is high quality). But the Regional Board does not determine whether
19 that is the case because, despite years of presumably reviewing all of that data and claiming to
20 have designed an effective water monitoring program in the watershed, for purposes of the
21 WDRs and the High Quality water policy, the Regional Board made no effort to review the data
22 for the waterbodies at issue. Delta Area WDRs, Attachment A, pp. 48-49. It is a simple task that
23 could have been accomplished in the last three to four years, for a staff person to run a simple
24 search of the data to determine the best water quality for every water segment in the watershed.
25 Without knowing what level of water quality is necessary to protect high quality waters, it is an
26 abuse of discretion for the Regional Board to claim that it has considered the costs of achieving
27 those concentrations by each of the relevant upstream dischargers, whether they can feasibly be
28 achieved, and evaluated the cost to the public of not achieving them.

1 If staff claims it does not have the data for a particular waterbody or reach of a
2 waterbody, then obviously the Board's past monitoring program and any proposed monitoring
3 based on that effort are deficient and, thus, in violation of the Policy. This is particularly true for
4 the vast stretches of waterbodies that lie upstream of the relatively few monitoring locations
5 sampled by the Coalition or agencies over the years. If the Board cannot determine whether or
6 not a water or a relevant stretch is high quality or not for lack of any data, than the Board is not
7 in any position to make a finding that degradation in that waterbody is authorized consistent with
8 the Policy. As CSPA's experts point out, this is the norm for most of the waters included in the
9 WDR area. Bond Comments, Comments of Richard McHenry (Jan. 16, 2014). That means
10 many miles of that creek drainage may or may not be high quality and may or may not be being
11 degraded. That data gap is not evidence that the Board can even begin to apply the High Quality
12 Waters Policy's criteria and make the prerequisite findings. In order to apply the Policy based
13 on the weight of evidence, the Board must first gather some relevant evidence by requiring the
14 discharger(s) it is considering authorizing to degrade water quality to gather in the necessary data
15 – whether collected in the past or anew – to determine whether the water is high quality or not
16 and what costs might be associated to both the discharger(s) and the public by allowing
17 degradation their receiving waters.

18 The Court of Appeal has spelled out the necessity of comparing the actual pollutant-
19 specific, baseline water quality of a particular waterbody as compared to the applicable water
20 quality standard as the first step in applying the High Quality Waters Policy:

21 When undertaking an antidegradation analysis, the Regional Board must compare
22 the baseline water quality (the best quality that has existed since 1968) to the
23 water quality objectives. If the baseline water quality is equal to or less than the
24 objectives, the objectives set forth the water quality that must be maintained or
25 achieved. In that case the antidegradation policy is not triggered. However, if the
26 baseline water quality is better than the water quality objectives, the baseline
27 water quality must be maintained in the absence of findings required by the
28 antidegradation policy.

26 *Asociacion de Gente Unida por el Agua*, 210 Cal.App.4th at 1270. The Court of Appeal found
27 that even a single water sample from the receiving water that is above the applicable standard
28 was sufficient to establish that a waterbody is a high quality water. *Id.*, 210 Cal.App.4th at 1271.

1 Likewise, the Regional Board was obligated to identify which constituents qualify the water as
2 high quality in order to rationally apply the Policy. *Id.* (“Water can be considered high quality
3 for purposes of the antidegradation policy if it is determined to be so for any one constituent,
4 because the determination is made on a constituent by constituent basis”). *See* Delta Area
5 WDRs, Attachment A, p. 48 (“The determination of a high quality water within the meaning of
6 the antidegradation policies is water body and constituent-specific”).

7 Because the Regional Board does not know which waters are high quality waters, the
8 Board has no idea which farm or farms are discharging into those high quality waters. As a
9 result, the Board has none of the requisite information necessary to apply the High Quality
10 Waters Policy’s balancing test. The Regional Board does not know what the economic situation
11 is for the discharging farmer or any affected users. The Regional Board does not know what
12 additional measures may be available to prevent the degradation it has now authorized pursuant
13 to the challenged WDRs. There is no information about what incremental cost might be required
14 for any given farmer to achieve the highest quality water versus having to comply with
15 standards. *See Asociacion de Gente Unida por el Agua*, 210 Cal.App.4th at 1270 (“The baseline
16 quality of the receiving water determines the level of water quality protection”). Thus, there is
17 no evidence – nevermind a preponderance – to establish that relieving that farmer or many
18 farmers of that incremental cost somehow maximizes benefit to all Californians.

19 The Regional Board’s information sheet attempts to expand the data required to assess
20 the presence of high quality waters or otherwise apply the Policy. The information sheet,
21 Appendix A, states that:

22 There is no comprehensive, waste constituent-specific information available for
23 all surface waters and groundwater aquifers accepting irrigated agricultural wastes
24 that would allow site-specific assessment of current conditions. Likewise, there
are no comprehensive historic data.

25 Delta Area WDRs, Attachment A, p. 48. First, the Court of Appeal has rejected the need for
26 “comprehensive” data or assessments to determine whether the Policy applies. 210 Cal.App.4th
27 at 1270-71. There is plainly ample data to determine whether at least some water segments
28 within the WDR area are high quality and whether they are already being degraded by numerous

1 unidentified farm dischargers. Second, there is likely available monitoring data collected by
2 other agencies over the years that could be evaluated if the Regional Board would only endeavor
3 to review it. Third, by conceding that the Regional Board does not have data, which is indeed
4 true for many of the waterbody segments within the WDR area, that concession admits that the
5 Board cannot support any finding that degradation by every discharger in those unmonitored
6 areas of the WDR area is warranted.

7 **2. The Regional Board purports to authorize degradation even for**
8 **parameters and waterbody reaches that, although high quality,**
9 **discharges are not currently degrading.**

10 To the extent the farm discharges covered by Order R5-2014-0029 are not degrading
11 waters at least for a few pollutants where monitoring stations are located, there is obviously no
12 legitimate rationale for the Regional Board to authorize degradation.¹ Yet that is precisely what
13 staff proposes the Board do. The WDRs include a blanket authorization for farms in the WDR
14 area to degrade waters even for pollutants at the monitoring locations that they cannot show any
15 reason degradation is necessary for the public benefit or any other reason. Yet a review of the
16 data, even for a few of the core monitoring locations, shows that, at least for a few pollutants at
17 those locations, although the waters are high quality, there is no degradation observed at those
18 locations. Where there is no discernable discharge degrading water or any information on a
19 discharger's potential costs available to compare to the general public benefit, there is no
20 evidence on which to base an approval of future discharges causing degradation. This type of
21 advance authority to degrade for any pollutant is entirely inconsistent with the Policy.

22 **3. The Regional Board does not have sufficient evidence to establish that**
23 **any given discharger's degradation of surface and ground waters**
24 **throughout the WDR area will maximize benefits to the people of**
25 **California.**

26 In order to authorize any degradation from high quality down to the applicable water
27 quality objective, the Regional Board had to be presented with evidence that a discharge's
28

27 ¹ Because the only data is at the downstream monitoring locations, the fact that no
28 degradation for several pollutants is observed at those locations does not preclude the presence of
extensive degradation from pollution discharges well upstream.

1 degradation of high quality water will be consistent with maximum benefit to the people of
2 California. “The first step is if a discharge will degrade high quality water, the discharge may be
3 allowed if any change in water quality (1) will be consistent with maximum benefit to the people
4 of the State. *Asociacion de Gente Unida por el Agua*, 210 Cal.App.4th at 1278. The State Board
5 has provided guidance, endorsed by the Court of Appeal, which makes clear that evaluating
6 maximum benefit must be done for a specific discharge, not based on Central Valley wide
7 generalities:

8 The State Board’s guidance memorandum defines the term “maximum benefit to
9 the people of the State” as follows: “Before **a discharge** to high quality water may
10 be allowed, it must be demonstrated that any change in water quality ‘will be
11 consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the state.’ This determination
12 is made on a **case-by-case basis** and is based on considerations of reasonableness
13 under the circumstances **at the site**.

14 *Id.* (emphasis added) (quoting State Board, Guidance Mem. (Feb. 16, 1995) pp. 4–5). The State
15 Board guidance lays out factors, making clear that they must be considered for a specific
16 discharge, not thousands of discharges at once:

17 Factors to be considered include (1) past, present, and probable beneficial uses of
18 the water (specified in Water Quality Control Plans); (2) economic and social costs,
19 tangible and intangible, of **the proposed discharge** compared to the benefits, (3)
20 environmental aspects of **the proposed discharge**; and (4) the implementation of
21 feasible alternative treatment or control methods. With reference to economic
22 costs, both costs to **the discharger** and the affected public must be considered.
23 ‘Cost savings to **the discharger**, standing alone, absent a demonstration of how
24 these savings are necessary to accommodate “important social and economic
25 development” are not adequate justification’ for allowing degradation. See [State
26 Board] Order No. WQ 86-17, at 22, n. 10.

27 *Id.* (emphasis added). The Information Sheet acknowledges this fundamental aspect of the High
28 Quality Waters Policy – “The determination of a high quality water within the meaning of the
antidegradation policies is water body and constituent-specific.” Delta Area WDRs, Attachment
A, p. 48. Despite that understanding, the Regional Board did not evaluate any particular farm,
any specific waterbody, or any given discharge within the WDR area to determine what
improvements are necessary to its management practices (assuming it has any such practices),
the costs of such improvements, or the extent of that farm’s pollution contribution to any

1 degradation measured far downstream. Only close to a year after the Regional Board authorizes
2 degradation, does the Regional Board propose any Farm Evaluation Reports be submitted, and
3 then only to the third-party Coalition. Order R5-2014-0029 does not indicate what such reports
4 will contain, so whether at that time they will provide the information relevant to applying the
5 Policy is anybody's guess. And, as the above highlighted text makes clear, the degradation
6 evaluation is to be done on a site-specific, or in this case, farm-specific basis.

7 Likewise, the Regional Board did not provide any data whatsoever about what any
8 specific farm operation may be discharging to groundwater. Although such discharges are
9 clearly occurring, the Board is not yet in any evidentiary position to apply the factors relevant to
10 maximum public benefit and to declare any degradation acceptable under the High Quality
11 Waters Policy.

12 The economic impact analysis conducted on a region-wide basis does not provide any
13 evidence relevant to whether authorizing a discharge from any particular farm in the WDR area
14 will be consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of California. The Regional Board
15 relied upon the 2010 *Draft Technical Memorandum Concerning the Economic Analysis of the*
16 *Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program* prepared for the PEIR. See Delta Area WDRs, p. 12.
17 Although that cost analysis may be sufficient to comply with Water Code § 13141, it is not
18 sufficient to conduct a site-specific degradation analysis applying the High Quality Waters
19 Policy. Indeed, Order R5-2014-0029 expressly disavows any applicability of its Section 13141
20 region-wide economic analysis to any individual farmers' costs or management measure
21 decisions:

22 Any costs for water quality management practices will be based on a market
23 transaction between Members and those vendors or individuals providing services
or equipment and not based on an estimate of those costs provided by the board.

24 Delta Area WDRs, p. 12; *Id.*, Attachment A, p. 57. Thus, the Section 13141 economic analysis
25 does not reflect "costs to the discharger" required to be considered by the High Quality Waters
26 Policy.

27 The Regional Board's rationales for authorizing wholesale degradation of water quality
28 in the WDR area identified two generic assertions. One, that "Central Valley communities

1 depend on irrigated agriculture for employment,” and two, “[t]he state and nation depend on
2 Central Valley agriculture for food....” Delta Area WDRs, Attachment A, p. 56. These generic
3 assertions neither resemble the site specific factors identified by the State Board’s Guidance and
4 endorsed by the Court of Appeal nor allow for any coherent comparison of costs to specific
5 dischargers and any cogent reason why they should be authorized to degrade high quality waters
6 based on maximum benefit to all Californians. *Asociacion de Gente Unida por el Agua*, 210
7 Cal.App.4th at 1278. Any reasonable review of the actual economic conditions prevalent in the
8 area to be governed by the WDRs would show that farms, and in particular the larger farms
9 operating within that area, are economically robust, forming a significant portion of a multi-
10 billion dollar industry in the region. *See* Comments of Bill Jennings. Because the Regional
11 Board did not have any evidence of the covered dischargers’ ability to pay for individual
12 monitoring and management practices necessary to determine compliance with the WDRs and
13 the Water Code, the Board is unable to make a determination of maximum benefit to the people
14 of California.

15 Lastly, whether looking at surface water or ground water, Order R5-2014-0029’s
16 monitoring is so far removed from any specific source, the monitoring will not be capable of
17 discerning any change in water quality from hundreds, perhaps thousands of farms in the WDR
18 area. McHenry Comments, Bond Comments. Because the WDRs do not include any monitoring
19 that would detect any changes in water quality from a discharge, the Regional Board will not
20 know what degree of change is or may occur and, hence, cannot make any rational finding that
21 allowing such change is consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State. *Asociacion*
22 *de Gente Unida por el Agua*, 210 Cal.App.4th at 1280 (where monitoring plan inadequate to
23 detect degradation of waters, cannot make finding that such degradation will be of maximum
24 benefit to the people of California).

25 It is clear that the Regional Board’s record is devoid of evidence necessary for it to
26 consider whether any one discharger, nevermind thousands of dischargers, can be authorized en
27 masse to degrade waters throughout a 582,000 acre swath of the Central Valley.

1 **4. The Regional Board could not authorize degradation of all waters**
2 **within the WDR area because the proposed WDR conditions, even if**
3 **complied with, will only further demonstrate that the authorized**
4 **discharges will result in water quality less than the Basin Plan’s water**
5 **quality objectives.**

6 The current coalition program in the west San Joaquin has been in place since 2003.
7 Despite ten years of implementing the program continued by the proposed WDRs, no discernable
8 improvement is evident:

9 As is documented in Table 4 of the *SJCDWQC April 30, 2013 Management Plan*
10 *Update Report*, sampling conducted in the area from 2004 through 2012 shows
11 routine exceedance of water quality standards for: dissolved oxygen, pH, EC, TDS,
12 ammonia, nitrate, e-coli, arsenic, boron, copper, lead, molybdenum, nickel,
13 Azinphos methyl, carbofuran, chlorpyrifos, cypermethrin, DDD, DDE, Diazinon,
14 Dieldrin, disulfoton, Diuron, endrin, HCH delta, linuron, Malathion, methidathion,
15 methomyl, methyl parathion, paraquat dichloride, permethrin, thiobencarb,
16 Simazine, and toxicity to ceriodaphnia dubia and capricornutum. Clearly, water
17 bodies accepting discharges from numerous represented irrigated lands are not
18 meeting water quality objectives and existing high quality waters are not being
19 maintained.

20 McHenry Comments. “Since many of the water bodies in the area have been designated as
21 impaired and sampling shows routine exceedences of water quality standards, the represented
22 agricultural practices have been shown to be not protective of water quality.” *Id.* The few
23 tweaks to the program included in Order R5-2014-0029 will not dramatically change these
24 results. Indeed, given the proposed 10-year compliance schedules for addressing the few
25 pollutants that may be included in a SWMP, the WDRs are guaranteed to allow discharges to
26 continue violating water quality objectives for the foreseeable future. As a result, the Regional
27 Board could not make the required finding that the irrigated lands discharges in the WDR area
28 “will not result in water quality less than that prescribed in state policies (e.g. water quality
 objectives in Water Quality Control Plans),” as required to authorize degradation down to
 standards.

 Although Order R5-2014-0029 may begin breaking down the barrier to identifying
 management practices and pollution sources on specific farms by providing for a Farm
 Evaluation Report (albeit the proposal does not disclose what information will be requested in
 the FERs and, thus, it was impossible to evaluate whether the FERs will provide sufficient

1 information), the WDRs rely for the most part on continuing the coalition group program that has
2 been in place for the WDR area since 2003. Thus, although the SWMP appears to provide some
3 additional discretion to the Executive Officer that may be applied at some point in the future, the
4 SWMP continues to rely on regional monitoring coupled with a management planning process
5 mirroring the previous waiver program. This monitoring scheme does not detect violations of
6 water quality objectives for large expanses of the watersheds upstream of the monitoring
7 stations. *See* Bond Comments; McHenry Comments. And it will continue to detect violations
8 of the objectives at the stations if individual farmers' discharges are not meaningfully monitored.
9 *Id.* "To the extent that the Order allows historic practices to continue without change,
10 degradation will continue." *Asociacion de Gente Unida por el Agua*, 210 Cal.App.4th at 1273.

11 Likewise, although groundwater is included in the WDRs, the process to address
12 discharges to groundwater relies on existing monitoring wells that will not pick up degradation.
13 This program will neither detect nor prevent violations of the nitrate objective for the foreseeable
14 future. *See Asociacion de Gente Unida por el Agua*, 210 Cal.App.4th at 1273. Order R5-2014-
15 0029 only triggers ponderous, multi-year management plans and more generalized receiving
16 water monitoring upon multiple exceedances of a water quality objective and or a trend in
17 degradation. This is not evidence that the Board can rely on to find that discharges will not
18 violate objectives.

19 Order R5-2014-0002 allows 10-year long compliance schedules once a SWMP or
20 Groundwater Quality Management Plan is triggered or requested. Delta Area WDRs, p. 37. It is
21 again entirely inconsistent with the High Quality Waters Policy for the Board to presume to
22 allow degradation for dischargers who are not even complying with water quality objectives.
23 The discharges will automatically result in water quality less than objectives, precluding any
24 finding by the Regional Board to the contrary. Likewise, such discharges are and will continue
25 to "unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial use of such water." Accordingly, the
26 Regional Board could not make a finding to the contrary, as is also required to allow degradation
27 under the Policy.
28

1 The fact that, as designed, Order R5-2014-0029 will not ensure compliance with
2 applicable objectives, also is inconsistent with the Water Code’s basic WDR requirements.
3 WDRs “shall implement any relevant water quality control plans that have been adopted, and
4 shall take into consideration the beneficial uses to be protected, [and] the water quality objectives
5 reasonably required for that purpose,....” Water Code § 13263(a). Because the WDRs replicate
6 existing waivers that have not implemented the applicable objectives, Order R5-2014-0029 fails
7 to implement objectives.

8 **5. The Regional Board does not have sufficient evidence to establish that**
9 **all dischargers within the WDR area are implementing the Best**
10 **Practical Treatment Controls for discharges to surface waters and**
11 **ground water.**

12 Resolution No. 68-16 requires specific steps to protect high quality waters, including
13 mandating the use of WDRs through specified technology-based effluent limitations. The High
14 Quality Waters Policy provides, in relevant part, that:

15 Any activity which produces or may produce a waste or increased volume or
16 concentration of waste and which discharges or proposes to discharge to existing
17 high quality waters will be required to meet waste discharge requirements which
18 will result in the best practicable treatment or control [“BPTC”] of the discharge
19 necessary to assure that (a) a pollution or nuisance will not occur and (b) the
20 highest water quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State
21 will be maintained.

22 To comply with Resolution No. 68-16’s BPTC mandate, the Regional Board must require the
23 discharger to demonstrate that the proposed manner of compliance constitutes BPTC.

24 *Asociacion*, 210 Cal.App.4th at 1282 (“The second step of Resolution No. 68-16’s two-step
25 process for determining whether a discharge into high quality waters is permitted, is a finding
26 that the discharge will be required to undergo the “best practicable treatment or control ...
27 necessary to assure that (a) a pollution or nuisance will not occur and (b) the highest water
28 quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State will be maintained”). “In
determining BPTC, the discharger should compare the proposed method to existing proven
technology; evaluate performance data (through treatability studies), compare alternative

1 methods of treatment or control, and consider the method currently used by the discharger or
2 similarly situated dischargers.” *See* SWRCB Order No. WQ 2000-07.

3 Since the inception in 2003 of the current irrigated lands coalition-based efforts, the
4 Regional Board has not gathered any evidence of what any particular discharger within the WDR
5 area is actually discharging to surface or ground waters. Instead of obtaining evidence of what
6 practices are currently in place for the current members of the Westside San Joaquin River
7 Watershed Coalition, the Regional Board relied upon future Farm Evaluation Reports based on
8 templates the contents of which have not yet even been proposed. It will not be until at least a
9 year after issuance of Order R5-2014-0029 and the Regional Board’s authorization of
10 degradation, before any information about individual farms starts to flow into the third party’s
11 files, never mind the Regional Board. Delta Area WDRs, p. 26. Without existing information
12 about what each discharger within the WDRs area is implementing for management practices
13 and data regarding the practices’ effectiveness to control pollutants, there is no evidence upon
14 which the Regional Board could base its finding that each discharger is implementing BPTC.

15 There is no evidence in the record that a farm entity, especially a large farm, is any less
16 economically capable of taking a few representative discharge samples as any small industrial
17 business currently regulated by the State Board’s industrial storm water permit. CSPA does not
18 believe that any evidence has been presented that demonstrates there is a valid economic reason
19 for not requiring every farmer to collect some water quality samples, expend funds necessary to
20 have a pollution control plan, and expend funds to implement the necessary measures to assure
21 that particular farm’s pollution will neither degrade water quality nor violate standards. *See*
22 Jennings Memorandum.

23 Order R5-2014-0029’s inclusion of “Farm Management Performance Standards” did not
24 provide the Regional Board with evidence justifying a determination to authorize degradation
25 throughout the western San Joaquin watershed. *See* Delta Area WDRs, p. 22. Even assuming
26 the performance standards somehow provide more guidance than already is apparent on the face
27 of the Basin Plan or the prior waiver, the Regional Board still could not meaningfully evaluate or
28 apply the High Quality Waters Policy as it applies to any given discharger in the Watershed by

1 having them submit information after the decision to allow degradation is made and without any
2 information about the actual pollution that farm is discharging or even which river or channel it
3 is discharging to and the quality of that receiving water.

4 **D. In Addition To Relying On Unsupported Findings To Authorize**
5 **Degradation, The Degradation And Violations Of Water Quality Objectives**
6 **That Will Result From Order R5-2014-0029 Is Inconsistent With The High**
7 **Quality Waters Policy.**

8 **1. Order R5-2014-0029 Will Continue to Degrade Water.**

9 By abandoning any effort to avoid degradation of high quality waters, the Regional Board
10 concedes that a program based on regional monitoring and third-party outreach to actual
11 dischargers does not assure that waters will not be degraded. Because the Board cannot make
12 the requisite findings to support a decision authorizing degradation, Order R5-2014-0029 will
13 degrade high quality waters in violation of the High Quality Waters Policy.

14 Additionally, repeating the flaw in the previous renewed waiver that was rejected by the
15 Sacramento Superior Court, Order R5-2014-0029 again does not bother to link even the general
16 management practice responses to degradation. Instead, in regard to both surface and ground
17 water pollution, Order R5-2014-0029 triggers the general management responses by the third
18 party when objectives are exceeded or where the Regional Board's Executive Officer determines
19 that "irrigated agriculture is causing or contributing to a trend of degradation of surface water
20 that may threaten applicable Basin Plan beneficial uses." Delta Area WDRs, pp. 33-34.
21 Moreover, even this possibility is made less likely by the very next provision which says the
22 Executive Officer may relieve the third party of a SQMP or GQMP when members only meet the
23 applicable water quality objectives. *Id.*, p. 34. Order R5-2014-0029 does not comply with the
24 obvious flaw found by Judge Frawley that the requirements are not geared to address
25 degradation, but rather exceedances of other water quality measures including the same
26 objectives rejected by Judge Frawley and unidentified "trends" in degradation. Sacramento
27 Superior Court Order, p. 19 (May 21, 2013). The High Quality Waters Policy does not merely
28 guard against adverse trends in degradation, but any degradation. Because once again Order R5-

1 2014-0029 fails to fully implement the Policy, Order R5-2014-0029 suffers from the same error
2 as that found by Judge Frawley for the previous renewed waiver.

3 In addition, the Court of Appeal also has rejected a similar process attempted in the
4 general dairy WDRs leaving future potential compliance with the degradation restrictions to the
5 Executive Officer at his/her discretion. Thus, in addressing the Regional Board's contention in
6 the General Dairy WDRs that water would not be degraded because the Executive Officer had
7 authority to order additional monitoring, the Court of Appeal did not agree future action by the
8 EO applying his/her discretion was, by itself, sufficient to prevent degradation. *Asociacion de*
9 *Gente Unida por el Agua*, 210 Cal.App.4th at 1277. This was due, first, to the fact that such
10 discretion was not applied to all dischargers governed by the general WDRs but "required only at
11 the discretion of the executive officer." *Id.* Second, the Court rejected open-ended discretion as
12 a stand-in for assurances that degradation would not occur because "there are no mandatory
13 standards governing the exercise of the executive officer's discretion." *Id.* Lastly, the Court
14 rejected mere discretion by the EO, because it was triggered by monitoring that, by its nature,
15 already established that degradation had occurred. *Id.* The same is true with the monitoring
16 triggers included in Order R5-2014-0029, which await exceedances of objectives and "trends" in
17 degradation before the EO may act and, even then, the EO may choose not to require even the
18 broad management plans.

19 For these reasons, Order R5-2014-0029 allows degradation and, absent adequate findings
20 by the Board authorizing degradation down to standards, no such degradation is allowed.

21 **2. Monitoring surface or ground waters many miles downstream of**
22 **pollution sources will neither detect nor prevent degradation or**
23 **upstream exceedances of water quality objectives.**

24 Although Judge Frawley did not choose to rule on whether the regional monitoring
25 stations that were implemented pursuant to the renewed waiver were sufficient to comply with
26 the High Quality Waters Policy, the Court did state:

27 It also is questionable whether the Renewed Waiver is sufficient to comply with
28 the Antidegradation Policy since it is not clear that the Board has an adequate
means of identifying and taking actions against dischargers who are violating
water quality objectives when water quality objectives are being exceeded, or of

1 ensuring that BPTC is being implemented when high quality water is being
2 degraded.

3 Superior Court Order, p. 19. The same inadequacies are present in Order R5-2014-0029. The
4 monitoring stations anticipated by Order R5-2014-0029 are essentially the same as those present
5 pursuant to the previous renewed waiver. Those stations cannot and will not detect violations of
6 water quality objectives or degradation more than a short distance upstream. McHenry
7 Comments; Bond Comments. As a result, numerous upstream violations will go undetected.
8 Even where the stations confirm a standard violation or serious degradation, the Board will not
9 know which upstream farms are responsible. *Id.* Nor will a simple, at the time undefined FER
10 indicate whether or not BPTC is in place for every upstream farmer. The Board's reliance on
11 regional monitoring in an effort to spare individual farmers the burden of making sure they are
12 not degrading the State's waters will never be sufficient to detect pollution and degradation or
13 violations of objectives occurring some significant distance upstream. As a result, Order R5-
14 2014-0029 is inconsistent with the High Quality Waters Policy as well as Water Code § 13263(a)
15 (WDRs "shall implement any relevant water quality control plans that have been adopted, and
16 shall take into consideration the beneficial uses to be protected, [and] the water quality objectives
17 reasonably required for that purpose,...").

18 In the past, Regional Board staff has admitted that general discharge requirements relying
19 on regional monitoring will not produce monitoring able to detect violations of water quality
20 standards for large expanses of upstream waters. Former Regional Board Program Manager for
21 the Irrigated Lands Program, Bill Croyle, has testified that "main stem, downgradient monitoring
22 ... is going to tell us a very limited amount of information with regards to what is going on
23 upstream in the watershed." Testimony of Bill Croyle (March 5, 2003) (AR2776).

24 Watershed- or regional-based monitoring cannot detect water quality levels miles
25 upstream. Previous expert testimony from three former Regional Board staff and two other
26 experts has been presented to the Regional Board clarifying this basic point. Former Regional
27 Board staff engineers and managers Steve Bond, Joanne Kip and Richard McHenry each testified
28 both orally and in writing that the renewed regional monitoring scheme would not detect most of

1 the site-specific or area-specific water quality problems occurring in the Central Valley.
2 Comments of Steven Bond, PG, CEG, CHG (Sept. 27, 2010); Written Testimony of Steven Bond
3 (April 7, 2011); Written Testimony of Richard McHenry (April 7, 2011); Written Testimony of
4 Jo Anne Kipps (April 7, 2011); Oral Testimony of Steven Bond, Jo Anne Kipps & Richard
5 McHenry (April 7, 2011); Comments of G. Fred Lee, Ph.D. (Sept. 25, 2010); Comments of Matt
6 Hagemann (Sept. 10, 2010). As Mr. Bond, a certified geologist and hydrogeologist, explained in
7 2010 during the proceedings on the previous renewed waiver:

8 You asked if the downstream water quality of a complex watershed composed of
9 multiple sub- watersheds, is a valid measure of the water quality in any or all of
10 the individual sub-watersheds. My answer is no. While gross average conditions
11 may be observed downstream, the conditions of individual upstream sub-
12 watersheds will remain unknown. Between the downstream monitoring station
13 and the various upstream watersheds, mixing and dilution occurs and the
14 conditions at any upstream point are obscure to the downstream location.

15 Comments of Steven Bond, PG, CEG, CHG (Sept. 27, 2010). See also Written Testimony of
16 Steven Bond (April 7, 2011) (“My professional opinion is that in a complex watershed composed
17 of multiple sub- watersheds, water samples from distant downstream locations, such as most of
18 the monitoring locations in this program, are not valid representations of the water quality in any
19 or all of the individual sub-watersheds”); Oral Testimony of Steven Bond (April 7, 2011)
20 (AR3029.227-3029.228). Mr. Bond has prepared additional testimony specific to Order R5-
21 2014-0029 and confirmed that the WDRs’ continuation of regional monitoring will not be
22 sufficient to detect violations of objectives and degradation at any significant distance upstream.
23 Bond Comments.

24 Richard McHenry, former supervisor of the Regional Board’s Sacramento Valley
25 NPDES permitting unit, explained that regional impacts could be caused “by any number of
26 upstream dischargers or circumstances, and cannot be directly linked to any specific discharge
27 point” by sampling at a regional location. Oral Testimony of Richard McHenry (April 7, 2011)
28 (AR3029.231). “Based on the regional monitoring that is being proposed, I cannot see any
reasonable means of taking enforcement against individual dischargers to effectively protect
water quality.” *Id.* Mr. McHenry has prepared additional testimony specific to Order R5-2014-

1 0029 describing the inadequacy of the WDRs' continued regional monitoring to detect violations
2 of objectives and degradation for most parts of the 582,000-acre WDR area.

3 Jo Anne Kipps, a 12-year veteran of the Regional Board's waste discharge regulatory
4 program, also noted during the renewed waiver proceeding that the waiver "relies on an
5 inadequate regional monitoring scheme that cannot and will not provide information to this
6 Board necessary to characterize current conditions, let alone, monitor the effectiveness of best
7 management practices as these are implemented." Oral Testimony of Jo Anne Kipps (April 7,
8 2011) (AR3029.230-.231). Dr. G. Fred Lee, Ph.D., provided a thorough explanation of the
9 monitoring gap extended into Order R5-2014-0002:

10 In our previous comments we stressed the need for monitoring at the edge-of-the-
11 field and in nearby state waters to define the worst-case impacts of toxic and other
12 chemicals discharged from agricultural activities. In some waterbodies the worst
13 case impacts could be detrimental to fish spawning/rearing areas that would not
14 be detected by the current downstream at a single monitoring location as practiced
15 in the current monitoring program. This type of monitoring is also essential to
16 evaluate the effectiveness of management practices to control WQO violations in
17 the states waters.

18 Comments of G. Fred Lee, Ph.D. (Sept. 25, 2010). Dr. Lee explained further:

19 The Lee and Jones-Lee April 13, 2007 comments focused on the unreliable
20 approach that the staff had proposed for the basic monitoring approach of
21 allowing the coalitions to satisfy the MRP requirements based on one grab sample
22 per month at a downstream location. As Lee and Jones-Lee discuss; this
23 monitoring approach cannot reliably provide the data needed to meet the MRP
24 stated objective of detecting violations of CVRWQCB Basin Plan objective by
25 agricultural runoff/discharges. Such a monitoring approach could readily fail to
26 detect upstream adverse impacts of agricultural discharges that are not detected at
27 downstream monitoring locations.

28 *Id.* Driving the point home even further, hydrogeologist Matt Hagemann commented during the
waiver process that, "[b]ecause of the reliance on current management practices and because
only regional monitoring is to be used, Alternative I [the Renewed Waiver] would not result in
measureable improvement to water quality and in fact foster further degradation of water
quality." Comments of Matt Hagemann (Sept. 10, 2010).

Likewise, Regional Board staff also explained during the waiver proceeding that,
If the selected ILRP alternative's monitoring program is regional in nature (i.e.,
individual field effects on receiving waters are not monitored), it is not possible to

1 determine whether and how much each operation is contributing to the problem –
2 water quality assessment and feedback mechanisms are based on the watershed-
3 scale for multiple sources. Therefore, the ILRP requires that operations that
4 potentially contribute sources to the problem implement management practices
5 designed to minimize their contribution.

6 Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program FEIR, p. 3.2-39 (March 2011). Only if a specific farm opts
7 to exclude itself from a coalition program would the Regional Board proceed to issue an order
8 that assures that a particular farm would achieve water quality standards and comply with the
9 Antidegradation Policy:

10 Agricultural operations that do not wish to participate in implementing practices
11 under the ILRP have the option to file a report of waste discharge and obtain
12 individual waste discharge requirements. These requirements would specify
13 individual monitoring of effluent and/or receiving waters designed to ensure that
14 the operations waste discharge does not cause or contribute to an exceedance of
15 water quality objectives and that BPTC is implemented where there is degradation
16 of a high quality water.

17 *Id.* If the regional monitoring scheme of the Renewed Waiver or Order R5-2014-0029 were truly
18 sufficient to protect receiving waters adjacent to non-coalition farms, no such site-specific
19 WDRs would be necessary.

20 The significant divide between Order R5-2014-0029’s regional monitoring locations and
21 the miles of waterways and the hundreds of sources upstream of the monitoring locations is an
22 example of the same faulty monitoring scheme recently rejected by the Court of Appeal in
23 *Asociacion de Gente Unida por el Agua* as violating the antidegradation policy:

24 The crucial question of fact in this case is whether the monitoring system
25 prescribed in the Order is adequate to ensure the Order’s directive that no further
26 degradation of groundwater shall occur. Appellants point to evidence in the
27 record indicating the Order’s monitoring method is inadequate. Regional Board
28 cites no contrary evidence. Thus, there are no facts from which any court could
determine the monitoring system is adequate to detect and prevent further
groundwater degradation. The interpretation of the antidegradation policy and the
Order are generally matters of law.

210 Cal.App.4th at 1267. Like the supply wells required to be monitored by the Regional Board
in the general permit issued for dairy discharges that were located a significant distance from the
source of the potential degradation (manure ponds), Order R5-2014-0029’s regional monitoring
locations are “ineffective to accomplish the timely detection of a change in [water] quality.” 210

1 Cal.App.4th at 1260. Like the rejected dairy WDRs, additional upstream monitoring of any sort
2 is not required unless the regional, *i.e.* distant, monitoring sites already show an adverse impact.
3 *Id.* The fact that follow-up management plans may be triggered does not cure the fact that the
4 prescribed monitoring locations will not monitor localized areas that feel the full brunt of one or
5 more irrigated land dischargers' pollution. Like the dairy WDRs, follow-up management plans
6 by the coalition are only triggered after multiple violations of water quality objectives already are
7 detected or a "trend" in degradation, far downstream of most sources. Like the dairy WDRs
8 management plan triggers, that triggering event already establishes that water quality objectives
9 are being violated and beneficial uses unreasonably affected. *See* 210 Cal.App.4th at 1276-77.
10 Thus, whatever discretion the Regional Board staff may have to require or review management
11 plans by the coalitions does not "ensure ... that no further degradation of [Central Valley waters]
12 shall occur." *Id.*

13 A Regional Board order does not comply with the antidegradation policy where it relies
14 on monitoring requirements that "are inadequate to detect ... degradation, much less prevent it."
15 *Id.* at 1272-73. Like the monitoring locations in the dairy WDRs, expert testimony in the record
16 for the renewed Waiver and Order R5-2014-0029 discloses that regional monitoring locations far
17 downstream from almost all of the irrigated lands' pollution sources "are not located in the
18 proper areas to detect degradation," or violations of objectives and, even after a decade of
19 implementation, have not shown pollution during that time for any localized areas upstream,
20 even if those areas exceed standards. *Id.* at 1275. Because Order R5-2014-0029's monitoring
21 provisions "do[] not provide either an accurate or a timely indication of [water] degradation" or
22 violations of objectives, the Regional Board could not find, based on the weight of the evidence,
23 that Order R5-2014-0029 complies with the antidegradation policy or Water Code § 13263(a) for
24 all, indeed, the vast majority, of waters it presumes to protect. *Id.*

25 **E. Order R5-2014-0029 Does Not Comply With the Nonpoint Source Policy.**

26 Order R5-2014-0029 is inconsistent with the Regional Board's duty to comply with the
27 Nonpoint Source Policy adopted by the State Board in 2004. Water Code § 13146, 13247;
28 Policy For Implementation and Enforcement of the Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program

1 (May 20, 2004). The Nonpoint Source Policy includes five key elements with which any
2 nonpoint source program adopted by a Regional Board must abide. “Prior to developing an NPS
3 control implementation program or recognizing an implementation program developed by
4 dischargers or third-parties as sufficient to meet RWQCB obligations to protect water quality, a
5 RWQCB shall ensure that the program meets the requirements of the five key structural
6 elements....” Nonpoint Source Policy, p. 11. Order R5-2014-0029 is inconsistent with at least
7 three of the five key elements.

8 **1. Order R5-2014-0029 fails to rely on the weight of the evidence that the**
9 **WDRs are consistent with Key Element 1 of the NPS Policy.**

10 The Nonpoint Policy’s Key Element 1 states that “[a]n NPS control implementation
11 program’s ultimate purpose shall be explicitly stated. Implementation programs must, at a
12 minimum, address NPS [nonpoint source] pollution in a manner that achieves and maintains
13 water quality objectives and beneficial uses, including any applicable antidegradation
14 requirements.” Nonpoint Source Policy, pp. 11-12. “Before approving or endorsing a specific
15 NPS pollution control implementation program, a RWQCB must determine that there is a *high*
16 *likelihood* the implementation program will attain the RWQCB’s stated water quality
17 objectives.” *Id.*, p.11 (emphasis added).

18 An NPS control implementation program must be specific as to the water quality
19 requirements it is designed to meet. For example, if the program relies upon
20 dischargers’ use of MPs, there should be a strong correlation between the specific
21 MPs implemented and the relevant water quality requirements. The program also
22 should provide other information as required by the RWQCB, including but not
23 limited to the identification of participant dischargers. The RWQCB must be able
24 to ensure that all the significant sources of the NPS discharges of concern are
25 addressed.

26 *Id.*, p.12 (emphasis added).

27 Reviewing the previous Coalition-based waiver, the Superior Court found that its general
28 requirements were inconsistent with the High Quality Waters Policy and, thus, also violated Key
Element 1. Superior Court Order, p. 20. Because Order R5-2014-0029 also runs afoul of the
High Quality Waters Policy and does not assure compliance with objectives, it also is
inconsistent with Key Element 1. As the Court explained:

1 Key Element 1 states that a nonpoint source control implementation program
2 must, at a minimum, address nonpoint source pollution in a manner that achieves
3 and maintains water quality objectives and beneficial uses, including any
4 applicable antidegradation requirements. [citations omitted.] For the reasons
described above, the Court finds that the Renewed Waiver is inconsistent with
applicable antidegradation requirements. Accordingly, the Renewed Waiver is
inconsistent with Key Element 1 of the Nonpoint Source Policy.

5 Order, p. 20.

6 As discussed above, the weight of the evidence does not demonstrate that Order R5-
7 2014-0029 addresses irrigated lands discharges within the WDR area in a manner that achieves
8 and maintains water quality objectives and beneficial uses and complies with the High Quality
9 Waters Policy. The Regional Board did not and, depending on the contents of the FERs, may not
10 know the “specific MPs [management practices] implemented” anywhere in the WDR area. *See*
11 *supra*. Indeed, the FERs will not include any maps of the respective dischargers. This alone will
12 render the FER largely an exercise in paperwork rather than a stepping-stone to effective
13 management practices or water quality protection.

14 Moreover, the regional-based water quality monitoring does not allow the Regional
15 Board to correlate “the specific MPs implemented and the relevant water quality requirements.”
16 Nonpoint Source Policy, p. 12. Only within a portion of the WDR area in which water quality
17 standards are violated in the downstream waters will there be any effort by third-parties to
18 correlate some MPs on some farms to those exceedances. Even in an impaired watershed, under
19 Order R5-2014-0029, the coalition need not disclose to the Regional Board which specific farms
20 and specific MPs on those farms are at issue. And because the water quality is only measured
21 downstream in a given watershed or sub-watershed, numerous upstream waters that may be in
22 violation of standards from irrigated lands discharges will go undetected, allowing for no
23 correlation whatsoever with MPs. Thus, Order R5-2014-0029 does not come close to addressing
24 all of the significant irrigated lands pollution sources in the WDR area, as required by Key
25 Element 1.

26 ///

27 ///

1 **2. Order R5-2014-0029 fails to rely on the weight of the evidence that**
2 **Order R5-2014-0029 is consistent with Key Element 2 of the NPS**
3 **Policy.**

4 Key Element 2 of the NPS Policy provides that: “[a] nonpoint-source control
5 implementation program must include a description of the management practices and other
6 program elements that are expected to be implemented to ensure attainment of the
7 implementation program’s stated purpose, the process to be used to select or develop
8 management practices, and the process to be used to ensure and verify proper management
9 practice implementation.” Nonpoint Source Policy, p. 12. “A RWQCB must be convinced there
10 is a high likelihood the MP will be successful.” *Id.* “MPs must be tailored to a specific site and
11 circumstances, and justification for the use of a particular category or type of MP must show that
12 the MP has been successfully used in comparable circumstances. If an MP has not previously
13 been used, documentation to substantiate its efficacy must be provided by the discharger.” *Id.*

14 If the evidence available to the Regional Board demonstrates anything, it is the opposite
15 of what Key Element 2 requires – the current MPs used by irrigated lands dischargers within the
16 WDR area have been unsuccessful in preventing violations of water quality standards. The
17 Regional Board assumes that every discharger in the WDR area has some sort of management
18 practices in place. According to the record, a large percentage of rivers, streams and channels in
19 the WDR area are impaired by pollutants discharged by irrigated lands. Bond Comment;
20 McHenry Comment. The Delta and San Joaquin coalition’s regional monitoring, even with the
21 benefit of commingling with other waters, confirms that large quantities of pollutants are
22 violating water quality standards throughout the coalition area. *Id.* And, at least in those places
23 where downstream violations have been detected, the coalition has surveyed for existing
24 management practices and asked their members to perhaps employ additional management
25 practices. However, there is no evidence, and certainly no “high likelihood,” that more of the
26 same management practices will achieve compliance with standards, either at the downstream
27 monitoring sites and certainly not in the local receiving waters. Because there is effectively no
28 monitoring of receiving waters adjacent to where the farms are discharging, the water quality
 standard violations occurring in those waters will remain undetected and the Regional Board will

1 continue to proceed with no evidence demonstrating any likelihood that any current management
2 practices will achieve standards in those waters. Even at the downstream monitoring sites, the
3 record is clear that neither the Board nor the coalition can say whether the management practices
4 will work.

5 Nothing in the available evidence suggests that Order R5-2014-0029's regional
6 monitoring requirement can detect violations of water quality standards in all upstream waters or
7 evaluate the effectiveness of BMPs to prevent such violations well upstream of the regional
8 monitoring locations. By omitting any measurements of what is happening in local waters
9 adjacent to discharge locations, Order R5-2014-0029 cannot evaluate whether management
10 practices are "tailored to a specific site and circumstances." Nor is there any evidence upon
11 which the Regional Board could determine that implemented management practices are "highly
12 likely" to be successful and attain standards in those upstream waters. There is no evidence of
13 any studies or data demonstrating the effectiveness of any management practices in the Central
14 Valley to achieve discharges that comply with water quality standards. By avoiding any edge of
15 field or BMP monitoring until some undefined moment at the EO's discretion in the indefinite
16 future, Order R5-2014-0029 assures the continuation of this information gap.

17 **3. Order R5-2014-0029 fails to rely on the weight of the evidence that the**
18 **Order R5-2014-0029 is consistent with Key Element 4 of the NPS**
19 **Policy.**

20 Key element 4 of the NPS Policy requires that "[a]n NPS pollution control
21 implementation program must include sufficient feedback mechanisms so that the Regional
22 Water Board, dischargers, and the public can determine whether the program is achieving its
23 stated purpose, or whether additional or different management practices or other actions are
24 required." Nonpoint Source Policy, p. 13. "In all cases the NPS control implementation
25 program should describe the measures, protocols, and associated frequencies that will be used to
26 verify the degree to which the MPs [management practices] are being properly implemented and
27 are achieving the program's objectives, and/or to provide feedback for use in adaptive
28 management." *Id.* "[I]f the program relies upon dischargers' use of MPs, there should be a

1 strong correlation between the specific MPs implemented and the relevant water quality
2 requirements.” *Id.*, p. 12.

3 The Superior Court ruled that the existing waiver failed to achieve Key Element 4 for
4 failing to include sufficient feedback mechanisms to protect both groundwater and high quality
5 waters. Superior Court Order, p. 21. There are no confirmed feedback mechanisms in the
6 WDRs either. No mechanisms exist to either detect or react to violations of water quality
7 objectives many miles upstream of the coalition’s relatively few monitoring stations. Every
8 potential future action by a discharger is first qualified by action by the executive officer only
9 after trends in monitoring are detected (even a violation of a standard does not assure this trigger
10 is met). Nor is it clear how many violations must accrue before there is a “trend.” Nor is there
11 any effort yet for the Regional Board to determine what the existing water quality is and identify
12 the high quality water that has been achieved any time in the past.

13 As previously discussed, expert evidence shows that Order R5-2014-0029’s regional
14 monitoring requirements are indeed incapable of identifying the effectiveness of upstream
15 management practices. Bond Comments; McHenry Comments. And the fact that, even after
16 eight years of implementation, the San Joaquin County and Delta Coalition has not produced any
17 information describing the locations of management practices actually in place in the coalition’s
18 area and the effectiveness of such practices, roundly demonstrates that Order R5-2014-0029 has
19 no feedback mechanism to evaluate MPs, especially one designed to establish “a strong
20 correlation between the specific MPs implemented and the relevant water quality requirements.”

21 Nor do the truncated FERs included in Order R5-2014-0029 inform either the Regional
22 Board or the public about the effectiveness of those management practices. No maps will
23 certainly be provided of any specific farm and its discharges. The FERs will remain sequestered
24 in the third-party’s files unless and until the Regional Board staff chooses at its discretion to
25 obtain a copy. Nor will those reports indicate any useful information about whether MPs are
26 being properly implemented. Nonpoint Source Policy, p. 13. Thus, Order R5-2014-0029 does
27 not contain feedback mechanisms by which either the Regional Board or the public could
28

1 “determine whether the program is achieving its stated purpose, or whether additional or
2 different management practices or other actions are required.” *Id.*

3 **F. Various Plans and Reports Identified As Subject Only to Review and**
4 **Approval by the Executive Director Should Be Presented to the Regional**
5 **Board for Review and Approval**

6 Order R5-2014-0029 delegates considerable discretion to the Executive Director to
7 review and approve third-parties and various plans.

8 These include the initial approval of one or more third-parties to implement the WDRs
9 (Delta Area WDRs, p. 29 (¶ VIII.A), Sediment and Erosion Control Plans (*Id.*, pp. 26-27 (¶
10 VII.C)), Nitrogen Management Plans (*Id.*, p. 27 (¶ VII.D), Surface Water Quality Management
11 Plans (“SQMP”) (*Id.*, p. 32 (¶ VIII.H.1), and Groundwater Quality Management Plans
12 (“GQMP”) (*Id.*). The Delta Area WDRs also would authorize the Executive Officer to waive the
13 preparation of a SQMP or GQMP. *Id.*, p. 34 (¶ VIII.H.3). Each of these plans and approvals
14 involve the election of waste discharge requirements and, as a result, cannot be delegated to the
15 Executive Officer but must instead be reviewed and approved by the Regional Board itself.

16 Water Code § 13223(a) provides that “[e]ach regional board may delegate any of its
17 powers and duties vested in it by this division to its executive officer excepting only the
18 following: ... (2) the issuance, modification, or revocation of any ... waste discharge
19 requirement....” Water Code § 13223(a)(2).

20 SQMPs and GQMPs plainly constitute waste discharge requirements. The Plans’
21 requirements including establishing time schedule, performance goals, and monitoring locations,
22 which are the types of requirements included in WDRs. *See* Delta Area WDRs, Attachment B.
23 In particular, there can be no dispute that time schedules are waste discharge requirements
24 specifically identified by Section 13263(c): “The requirements may contain a time schedule,
25 subject to revision in the discretion of the board.” *See also, e.g.* 33 U.S.C. § 1362(11) (in
26 NPDES permits, WDRs also serve as effluent limitations which are defined as “any restriction
27 established by a State or the Administrator on quantities, rates, and concentrations of chemical,
28 physical, biological, and other constituents..., including schedules of compliance”). Because the
SQMP and GQMP both propose to incorporate compliance schedules set forth in the WDRs,

1 both of those plans constitute WDRs that cannot be delegated by the Board to the Executive
2 Officer.

3 Because the SQMP and GQMP are both WDRs, any decision to waive those
4 requirements also cannot be delegated to the Executive Officer. That proposed provision must
5 be brought to the Regional Board for action. *See* Delta Area WDRs, p. 34 ((¶ VIII.H.3).

6 What sediment and erosion control measures may be applied and who may apply them is
7 left to individual farms, or, more likely, the as yet to be identified third party. *Id.*, pp. 28, 32 (¶
8 VII.C, VIII.E)). This provision effectively delegates all WDRs associated with sediment
9 discharges to the dischargers' representative, subject only to the approval of the Executive
10 officer. These sediment and erosion WDRs must be reviewed and approved or disapproved by
11 the Regional Board. Water Code § 13223(a)(2).

12 The Nitrogen Management Plan and Nitrogen Management Plan Summary Report plainly
13 include WDRs that cannot be delegated to the Executive Officer. These are the primary
14 mechanisms relied upon by the WDRs to control nitrate discharges to groundwater. The WDRs
15 do not bother to adopt a template, instead leaving that to the Executive Officer. The plans
16 themselves ask the individual farms to self-regulate subject only to the approval of the Executive
17 Officer. These substantive discharge requirements must be reviewed and approved by the
18 Regional Board using their public decision-making process.

19 Consistency with Water Code § 13223(a)(2) is not achieved by merely authorizing
20 discretionary review by the Regional Board of Executive Officer decisions that cannot be
21 delegated to that staff person in the first place. Discretionary review that need not be exercised
22 by the Regional Board for any or no reason still improperly delegates the above WDR decisions
23 to the Executive Officer. All of the above identified decisions must be made by the Regional
24 Board itself.

25 **V. PETITIONERS ARE AGGRIEVED.**

26 Petitioners CSPA and C-WIN are non-profit, environmental organizations that have a
27 direct interest in reducing pollution to the waters of the Central Valley and, in particular, the San
28 Joaquin River and the Delta. CSPA's and C-WIN's members benefit directly from the waters in

1 the form of recreational hiking, photography, fishing, swimming, hunting, bird watching,
2 boating, consumption of drinking water and scientific investigation. Additionally, these waters
3 are an important resource for recreational and commercial fisheries. The San Joaquin River and
4 the Delta provide significant wildlife values important to the mission and purpose of the
5 Petitioners. This wildlife value includes critical nesting and feeding grounds for resident water
6 birds, essential habitat for endangered species and other plants and animals, nursery areas for fish
7 and shellfish and their aquatic food organisms, and numerous city and county parks and open
8 space areas. CSPA's and C-WIN's members reside in communities whose economic prosperity
9 depends, in part, upon the quality of water. CSPA and C-WIN have actively promoted the
10 protection of fisheries and water quality throughout California before state and federal agencies,
11 the State Legislature and Congress and regularly participates in administrative and judicial
12 proceedings on behalf of its members to protect, enhance, and restore declining aquatic
13 resources. CSPA and C-WIN member's health, interests and pocketbooks are directly harmed
14 by the failure of the Regional Board to develop an effective and legally defensible program
15 addressing discharges of excessive amounts of pollution from the Central Valley's irrigated lands
16 to waters of the state and nation.

17 **VI. REQUESTED STATE BOARD ACTION.**

18 Petitioners request that the State Board issue an order vacating Order R5-2014-0029 and
19 its various attachments.

20 **VII. STATEMENT OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES.**

21 CSPA's arguments and points of authority are adequately detailed in the above
22 comments. Should the State Board have additional questions regarding the issues raised in this
23 Petition, CSPA will provide additional briefing on any such questions. The petitioners believe
24 that an evidentiary hearing before the State Board is necessary to resolve the issues raised in this
25 Petition. CSPA welcomes the opportunity to present oral argument and respond to any questions
26 the State Board may have regarding this Petition.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **VIII. STATEMENT OF COPIES SENT TO THE REGIONAL BOARD AND**
2 **DISCHARGERS.**

3 Copies of this petition and the accompanying attachments are being sent to the Regional
4 Board at the following e-mail addresses. Although they are not dischargers, a printed copy of the
5 petition also is being sent First Class mail to the representative of the current coalition group in
6 the area of the WDRs – the San Joaquin County Delta Water Quality Coalition. Petitioners are
7 unaware of the existence of any list of the current contacts and e-mail addresses of actual
8 dischargers under the existing waivers.

9 Pamela Creedon, Executive Officer
10 Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region
11 11020 Sun Center Drive, #200
12 Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
13 pcreedon@waterboards.ca.gov

14 Alex Mayer, Regional Counsel
15 Office of Chief Counsel
16 State Water Resources Control Board
17 P.O. Box 100
18 Sacramento, CA 95812-0100
19 amayer@waterboards.ca.gov

20 Mike Wackman
21 San Joaquin County and Delta Water Quality Coalition
22 c/o San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District
23 3422 W. Hammer Lane, Suite A
24 Stockton, California 95219

25 **IX. ISSUES RAISED BEFORE REGIONAL BOARD.**

26 CSPA and C-WIN presented the issues addressed in this petition in written comments
27 that were timely submitted to the Regional Board.

28 Dated: April 11, 2014

Respectfully submitted,


Michael R. Lozau
Lozau Drury LLP
Attorneys for Petitioners California
Sportfishing Protection Alliance and
California Water Impact Network

EXHIBIT 1

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

ORDER R5-2014-0029

**WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS GENERAL ORDER
FOR
GROWERS WITHIN THE SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY AND DELTA AREA
THAT ARE MEMBERS OF A THIRD-PARTY GROUP**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Findings	1
I. Coverage	18
II. Prohibitions	18
III. Receiving Water Limitations.....	19
A. Surface Water Limitations.....	19
B. Groundwater Limitations	19
C. Compliance with Receiving Water Limitations	19
IV. Provisions	19
A. General Specifications	19
B. Requirements for Members of the Third-Party Group.....	20
C. Requirements for the Third-Party Group.....	22
V. Effective Dates.....	23
VI. Permit Reopening, Revision, Transfer, Revocation, Termination, and Reissuance	24
VII. Required Reports and Notices – Member.....	24
A. Notice of Confirmation / Notice of Intent / Membership Application	25
B. Farm Evaluation.....	26
C. Sediment and Erosion Control Plan	26
D. Nitrogen Management Plan	27
E. Mitigation Monitoring.....	28
F. Notice of Termination.....	28
VIII. Required Reports and Notices – Third-Party	29
A. Application to Serve as a Third-Party Representing Members.....	29
B. Membership (Participant) List	30
C. Templates	30
D. Groundwater Quality Assessment Report and Evaluation/Monitoring Workplans.....	30
E. Sediment Discharge and Erosion Assessment Report	32
F. Surface Water Exceedance Reports.....	32
G. Monitoring Report	32
H. Surface Water/Groundwater Quality Management Plan (SQMP/GQMP)	32
I. Technical Reports	34
J. Notice of Termination.....	35
K. Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Requirements	35
L. Basin Plan Amendment Workplan	35
IX. Reporting Provisions	35
X. Record-keeping Requirements	36

XI. Annual Fees.....36
XII. Time Schedule for Compliance37
Table 1: Summary of third-party and grower deliverables, required timelines, and approximate due date based on the anticipated adoption of the Waste Discharge Requirements for growers within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area on 12 March 2014.....39
Figure 1. Map of the San Joaquin County and Delta Area.....40
Attachment A: Information Sheet
Attachment B: Monitoring and Reporting Program Order (contains appendices)
Attachment C: CEQA Mitigation Measures
Attachment D: Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Consideration
Attachment E: Definitions, Acronyms, and Abbreviations

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

Order R5-2014-0029

**WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS GENERAL ORDER
FOR
GROWERS IN THE SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY AND DELTA AREA
THAT ARE MEMBERS OF A THIRD-PARTY GROUP**

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (hereafter, Central Valley Water Board or board), finds that:

Findings

SCOPE AND COVERAGE OF THIS ORDER

- 1 This Order serves as general waste discharge requirements (WDRs) for waste discharges from irrigated lands (or “discharges”) that could affect ground and/or surface waters of the state. The discharges result from runoff or leaching of irrigation water and/or stormwater from irrigated lands. Discharges can reach waters of the state directly or indirectly.¹
- 2 This Order applies to owners and operators of irrigated lands within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area. Either the owner or operator may enroll an irrigated lands parcel under this Order. The owners or operators that enroll the respective irrigated lands parcels are considered members of a third-party representing all or a portion of this area (hereafter “Members”). The Member is required to provide written notice to the non-Member owner or operator that the parcel has been enrolled under the Order. Enforcement action by the board for non-compliance related to an enrolled irrigated lands parcel may be taken against both the owner and operator. Although a third-party representative has not yet been selected, this Order contains eligibility requirements for a third-party representative and describes the process by which the Executive Officer may approve a request for third-party representation. This Order applies throughout the San Joaquin County and Delta Area, within which one or more third parties may represent Members based on geographic area. If multiple third-parties apply to serve different portions of the San Joaquin County and Delta Area, the applications, along with the proposed boundaries of third-party responsibility, shall be coordinated to ensure that all areas within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area may be represented by a third-party.
- 3 The San Joaquin County and Delta Area is a combination of county lines and hydrological units² of area named subbasins and watersheds within San Joaquin County, parts of the Contra Costa, Amador, Calaveras, Alpine, Alameda, and Stanislaus counties. The general

¹ Definitions for “waste discharges from irrigated lands,” “waste,” “groundwater,” “surface water,” “stormwater runoff,” and “irrigation runoff,” as well as all other definitions, can be found in Attachment E to this Order. It is important to note that irrigation water, the act of irrigating cropland, and the discharge of irrigation water unto itself is not “waste” as defined by California the Water Code, but that irrigation water may contain constituents that are considered to be a “waste” as defined by California Water Code section 13050(d).

² Hydrological units are United State Geological Survey hierarchical terms used to delineate surface areas ranked from larges to smallest: region, subregion, basin, subbasin, watershed, and subwatershed. In general, the terms subbasins and watersheds delineate surface drainage within each unit that converges to a single discharge point.
March 2014

boundary is defined by the San Joaquin Delta subbasin to the west, the Sacramento and San Joaquin County line until the intersection of Sacramento and San Joaquin and Amador County lines, the Lower Mokelumne River watershed, the Upper Mokelumne subwatershed, the Lower North Fork Mokelumne River watershed, the Lower North Fork Mokelumne River watershed to the Alpine County line to the north, to the crest of the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range to the east, the Upper Mokelumne subbasin to the Upper Calaveras California subbasin, the Upper Calaveras California subbasin, the Rock Creek-French Camp Slough subbasin to the Stanislaus County line in the south. For purposes of this Order, the San Joaquin County and Delta Area does not include portions of Del Puerto Water District, West Stanislaus Irrigation District, and the San Joaquin River National Wildlife Refuge that are within the above described general boundary. This area is referred to as the "Order watershed area" or "third-party area" in this Order. See Figure 1 for a map of the third-party area.

There are some locations within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area where it may be more effective for owners and operators of irrigated lands that are not "Members" to enroll under an irrigated lands regulatory program (ILRP) Order that recognizes a different third-party representative. For example, growers within the Del Puerto, West Stanislaus water districts, and San Joaquin River National Wildlife Refuge within the third-party area may be enrolled under a different third-party. Growers are only required to obtain coverage under one ILRP order.

- 4 "Irrigated lands" means land irrigated to produce crops or pasture used for commercial purposes including lands that are planted for commercial crops that are not yet marketable (e.g., vineyards and tree crops). Irrigated lands also include nurseries, and privately and publicly managed wetlands (excluding the non-irrigated upland habitat associated with managed wetlands).
- 5 This Order is not intended to regulate water quality as it travels through or remains on the surface of a Member's agricultural fields or the water quality of soil pore liquid within the root zone.³
- 6 This Order does not apply to discharges of waste that are regulated under other Central Valley Water Board issued WDRs or conditional waiver of WDRs (waiver). If the other Central Valley Water Board WDRs/waiver only regulates some of the waste discharge activities (e.g., application of treated wastewater to crop land) at the regulated site, the owner/operator of the irrigated lands must obtain regulatory coverage for any discharges of waste that are not regulated by the other WDRs/waiver. Such regulatory coverage may be sought through enrollment under this Order or by obtaining appropriate changes in the owner/operator's existing WDRs or waiver.
- 7 This Order implements the long-term Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program (ILRP) in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area. The long-term ILRP has been conceived as a range of potential alternatives and evaluated in a programmatic environmental impact report (PEIR).⁴ The PEIR was certified by the Central Valley Water Board on 7 April 2011; however, the PEIR did not specify any single program alternative. The regulatory requirements contained within this Order fall within the range of alternatives evaluated in the PEIR. This Order, along with other orders to be adopted for irrigated lands within the Central Valley, will constitute the long-

³ Water that travels through or remains on the surface of a Member's agricultural fields includes ditches and other structures (e.g., ponds, basins) that are used to convey supply or drainage water within that Member's parcel or between contiguous parcels owned or operated by that Member.

⁴ ICF International. 2011. *Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, Program Environmental Impact Report*. Final and Draft. March. (ICF 05508.05.) Sacramento, CA. Prepared for: Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Sacramento, CA

term ILRP. Upon adoption of this Order, Order R5-2006-0053, Coalition Group Conditional Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges from Irrigated Lands (Coalition Group Conditional Waiver), is rescinded as applied to irrigated lands within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area. Existing Members that had previously enrolled under the Coalition Group Conditional Waiver will be enrolled under this Order upon timely submittal of a Notice of Confirmation (see section VII.A of this Order).

GROWERS REGULATED UNDER THIS ORDER

- 8 This Order regulates both landowners and operators of irrigated lands from which there are discharges of waste that could affect the quality of any waters of the state. In order to be covered by this Order, the landowners or operators must be Members. Because this Order regulates both landowners and operators, but does not require enrollment of both parties, the provisions of this Order require that the Member provide notification to the non-Member responsible party of enrollment under this Order. A third-party group representing Members will assist its members in complying with the requirements of this Order. Both the landowner and operator are ultimately responsible for complying with the terms and conditions of this Order.
- 9 A third-party entity proposing to represent Members in the San Joaquin County and Delta area, or a portion thereof, (the third-party) is required to submit to the Central Valley Water Board an application to represent growers within this Order's coverage area or identify the area the third-party proposes to cover. The third-party representation will become effective upon Central Valley Water Board Executive Officer approval of the third party's application. If a third-party proposes to cover a portion of the Order's coverage area, the Executive Officer will determine and identify the geographic area covered by the third-party in the Notice of Applicability. The San Joaquin County and Delta Water Quality Coalition served as the third-party group representing owners and operators of irrigated lands within portions of the Order watershed area during the interim irrigated lands regulatory program, Order R5-2006-0053 (Coalition Group Conditional Waiver).
- 10 The third-party will be responsible for fulfilling the regional requirements and conditions (e.g., surface water and groundwater monitoring, regional management plan development and tracking) of this Order and associated Monitoring and Reporting Program Order R5-2014-0029 (MRP). By retaining its third-party membership or establishing a new membership, a Member is agreeing to be represented by the third-party for the purposes of this Order. Any requirements or conditions not fulfilled by the third-party are the responsibility of the individual Member. The Member and non-Member owners and operators are responsible for conduct of operations on the Member's enrolled property.
- 11 To apply for coverage under this Order, a grower that is not a current Member in the third-party group will have different application requirements depending on the timing of its request for regulatory coverage (see section VII.A of this Order for specific requirements). Growers that enroll by 15 June 2014 will enroll under this Order by obtaining membership in the applicable third-party group. This will streamline the initial enrollment process for the bulk of the irrigated agricultural operations within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area. Growers who do not enroll by 15 June 2014, or whom are prompted to apply by Central Valley Water Board enforcement or inspection, are required to submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) to comply with the terms and conditions of this Order to the Central Valley Water Board and obtain membership with the third-party group. This additional step for late enrollees is intended to provide incentive for landowners and operators to enroll promptly. There will be an administrative fee for submitting an NOI to the board. The fee will help recover costs for board efforts to conduct

outreach to ensure landowners and operators subject to this Order enroll or submit reports of waste discharge.

REASON FOR THE CENTRAL VALLEY WATER BOARD ISSUING THIS ORDER

- 12 The San Joaquin County and Delta Area has approximately 618,000 acres of cropland under irrigation⁵ and approximately 6,000 growers⁶ with “waste discharges from irrigated lands,” as defined in Attachment E to this Order. Currently, approximately 36,000 acres are regulated under the Water Board’s General Order for Existing Milk Cow Dairies (R5-2007-0035) and 464,000 acres are regulated under the Coalition Group Conditional Waiver. Approximately 5,865 growers (not including dairy owners) and 582,000 associated irrigated acres including managed wetlands will require regulatory coverage under this Order or other WDRs or conditional waivers of WDRs.
- 13 The San Joaquin County and Delta Area region contains all or portions of three groundwater sub basins and has approximately 5,000 linear miles of surface water courses (including 480 linear miles of named surface water courses) that are, or could be, affected by discharges of waste from irrigated lands. This does not include surface water courses in the foothill and mountainous regions of the third-party area, where there are few irrigated lands operations. Discharges of waste from irrigated lands could adversely affect the quality of the “waters of the state,” as defined in Attachment E to this Order.
- 14 Within the third-party area, there are approximately 128,000 acres of irrigated lands within Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) Groundwater Protection Areas (GWPA)s. DPR identifies these areas as vulnerable to groundwater contamination from the agricultural use of certain pesticides, based upon either pesticide detections in groundwater or upon the presence of certain soil types (leaching and/or runoff area) and a depth to groundwater shallower than 70 feet. Of the 128,000 acres, approximately 92,000 acres of the irrigated lands are within DPR GWPA)s that are characterized as vulnerable to leaching of pesticides (leaching areas), approximately 22,000 acres are within GWPA)s that are characterized as vulnerable to movement of pesticides to groundwater by runoff from fields to areas were they may move to groundwater (runoff areas), and 14,000 acres of irrigated lands are characterized as both leaching and runoff areas. For leaching areas, certain water soluble pesticides are carried mainly with excess irrigation water or rainwater through the soil profile and potentially to the underlying aquifer. For runoff areas, certain water soluble pesticides are carried mainly with runoff over the land surface to potential conduits to groundwater. However, DPR has not established or analyzed the GWPA)s with fertilizers and nitrate in mind, and its GWPA)s are established based upon detections of certain pesticides, many of which are of lower solubility. Solubility is one factor that can lead to groundwater contamination. Depending on the frequency of application and amount applied, certain water soluble constituents, such as nitrate, may share common pathways to groundwater with soluble pesticides. This Order includes consideration of DPR’s vulnerability factors and GWPA)s by the third-party in the determination of high vulnerability areas for nitrate.

⁵ Irrigated acres calculated from the CA Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Geographic Information System data.

⁶ For the purposes of this estimate, the number of farms in counties: Alameda, Amador, Alpine, Calaveras, Contra Costa, San Joaquin, and Stanislaus, as reported in the United States Department of Agriculture, 2007, *Census of Agriculture*, has been used to approximate the number of growers - also see the Information Sheet for how the number of growers was estimated.

- 15 The Central Valley Water Board's *Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program Existing Conditions Report* (ECR)⁷ identifies waters of the state with impaired water quality attributable to or influenced by irrigated agriculture, including within the third-party area. The *Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program Environmental Impact Report* (PEIR) describes that "[f]rom a programmatic standpoint, irrigated land waste discharges have the potential to cause degradation of surface and groundwater...."
- 16 Approximately 44 named water bodies, encompassing 1,715 linear miles of surface water courses and 262,159 surface water acres, have been listed as impaired pursuant to Clean Water Act section 303(d)⁸ within the third-party area. Agriculture is identified as the potential source of impairment for approximately 19 of the 303(d)-listed water bodies. The majority of the listed water bodies are within the legal Delta.
- 17 Elevated levels of nitrates in drinking water can have significant negative health effects on sensitive individuals. The Basin Plan contains a water quality objective for nitrate to protect the drinking water uses. The water quality objective for nitrate is the maximum contaminant level (MCL) of 10 mg/L for nitrate plus nitrite as nitrogen (or 45 mg/L of nitrate as nitrate) established by the California Department of Public Health (22 CCR § 64431) that has been set at a level to protect the most at risk groups – infants under six months old and pregnant women.⁹

In some areas, nitrate from both agricultural and non-agricultural sources has resulted in degradation and/or pollution of groundwater beneath agricultural areas in the Central Valley.¹⁰ Available data (see Information Sheet and the PEIR) indicate that there are wells within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area that have exceeded the MCL for nitrate. Groundwater in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area has been designated for drinking water uses; therefore, the water quality objective of 10 mg/L for nitrate plus nitrite (as nitrogen) applies to groundwater in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area. Where nitrate groundwater quality data are not available, information on the hydrogeological characteristics of the area suggest that portions of the San Joaquin County and Delta Area may be vulnerable to nitrate contamination. Sources of nitrate in groundwater may include leaching of excess fertilizer, confined animal feeding operations, septic systems, discharge to land of wastewater, food processor waste, unprotected well heads, improperly abandoned wells, and lack of backflow prevention on wells.

- 18 The Central Valley Water Board's authority to regulate waste discharges that could affect the quality of the waters of the state, which includes both surface water and groundwater, is found in the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (California Water Code Division 7).
- 19 California Water Code section 13263 requires the Central Valley Water Board to prescribe WDRs, or waive WDRs, for proposed, existing, or material changes in discharges of waste that could affect water quality. The board may prescribe waste discharge requirements although no discharge report under California Water Code section 13260 has been filed. The WDRs must implement relevant water quality control plans and the California Water Code. The Central Valley Water Board may prescribe general waste discharge requirements for a category of discharges if all the following criteria apply to the discharges in that category:

⁷ California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, and Jones and Stokes. 2008. *Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program Existing Conditions Report*. Sacramento, CA.

⁸ 2008-2010 303(d) List.

⁹ See, for example, the California Department of Public Health Nitrate Fact Sheet:

<http://www.cdph.ca.gov/certlic/drinkingwater/Documents/Nitrate/FactSheet-Nitrate-05-23-2012.pdf>.

¹⁰ PEIR, Appendix A

- a. The discharges are produced by the same or similar operations.
- b. The discharges involve the same or similar types of waste.
- c. The discharges require the same or similar treatment standards.
- d. The discharges are more appropriately regulated under general requirements than individual requirements.

The rationale for developing general waste discharge requirements for irrigated agricultural lands in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area includes: (a) discharges are produced by similar operations (irrigated agriculture), (b) waste discharges under this Order involve similar types of wastes (wastes associated with farming), (c) water quality management practices are similar for irrigated agricultural operations, (d) due to the large number of operations and their contiguous location, these types of operations are more appropriately regulated under general rather than individual requirements, and (e) the geology and the climate are similar, which will tend to result in similar types of water quality problems¹¹ and similar types of solutions.

- 20 Whether an individual discharge of waste from irrigated lands may affect the quality of the waters of the state depends on the quantity of the discharge, quantity of the waste, the quality of the waste, the extent of treatment, soil characteristics, distance to surface water, depth to groundwater, crop type, management practices and other site-specific factors. These individual discharges may also have a cumulative effect on waters of the state. Waste discharges from some irrigated lands have impaired or degraded and will likely continue to impair or degrade the quality of the waters of the state within the Central Valley Region if not subject to regulation pursuant to the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (codified in California Water Code Division 7).
- 21 California Water Code section 13267(b)(1) states: *“(1) In conducting an investigation specified in subdivision (a), the regional board may require that any person who has discharged, discharges, or is suspected of having discharged or discharging, or who proposes to discharge waste within its region, or any citizen or domiciliary, or political agency or entity of this state who has discharged, discharges, or is suspected of having discharged or discharging, or who proposes to discharge, waste outside of its region that could affect the quality of waters within its region shall furnish, under penalty of perjury, technical or monitoring program reports which the regional board requires. The burden, including costs, of these reports shall bear a reasonable relationship to the need for the report and the benefits to be obtained from the reports. In requiring those reports, the regional board shall provide the person with a written explanation with regard to the need for the reports, and shall identify the evidence that supports requiring that person to provide the reports. (2) When requested by the person furnishing a report, the portions of a report that might disclose trade secrets or secret processes may not be made available for inspection by the public but shall be made available to governmental agencies for use in making studies. However, these portions of a report shall be available for use by the state or any state agency in judicial review or enforcement proceedings involving the person furnishing the report.”*
- 22 Technical reports are necessary to evaluate Member compliance with the terms and conditions of this Order and to assure protection of waters of the state. Consistent with California Water Code section 13267, this Order requires the implementation of a monitoring and reporting program (MRP) that is intended to determine the effects of Member waste discharges on water quality, to verify the adequacy and effectiveness of the Order’s conditions, and to evaluate Member compliance with the terms and conditions of the Order. The requirements for reports and monitoring specified in this Order and attached MRP are based in part on whether an operation is within a high or low vulnerability area. The third-party

¹¹ “Water quality problem” is defined in Attachment E.

is tasked with describing high and low vulnerability areas based on definitions provided in Attachment E to this Order and guidance provided in the MRP for development of the Groundwater Quality Assessment Report. The Executive Officer will review third-party proposed high and low vulnerability area designations and make the final determination of vulnerability. High and low vulnerability areas will be reviewed and updated throughout the implementation of this Order. A Member who is covered under this Order must comply with MRP Order R5-2014-0029 which is part of this Order, and future revisions thereto by the Executive Officer or board.

- 23 The water quality monitoring under this Order is representative in nature and does not measure individual field discharge. The benefits of representative monitoring include the ability to determine whether water bodies accepting discharges from numerous irrigated lands are meeting water quality objectives, and to determine if existing high quality waters are being maintained. Further, representative monitoring allows the board to determine whether represented practices are protective of water quality. There is a cost savings with representative monitoring, since all surface waters or all groundwater aquifers that receive irrigated agricultural discharges do not need to be monitored. Surface water and groundwater monitoring sites are selected to represent areas with similar conditions (e.g., crops grown, soil type).

Through the Management Practices Evaluation Program and the Surface Water Quality Management Plans and Groundwater Quality Management Plans, the third-party must evaluate the effectiveness of management practices in protecting water quality. In addition, Members must report the practices they are implementing to protect water quality.

Where required monitoring, evaluations, and reporting do not allow the Central Valley Water Board to determine potential sources of water quality problems or identify whether management practices are effective, the Executive Officer may require the third-party or individual Members to provide technical reports. Such technical reports are needed when monitoring or other available information is not sufficient to determine the effects of irrigated agricultural waste discharges on state waters. It may also be necessary for the Central Valley Water Board to conduct investigations by obtaining information directly from Members to assess individual compliance.

The Board recognizes that representative monitoring data in and of itself will not allow the Board to determine the specific source or sources of water quality problems; however, subsequent actions, assessments and reporting required of the third party will result in the identification of the source(s) and causes of the water quality problem, the identification of actions implemented by Members to ensure water quality is protected, and the reporting of water quality data to demonstrate the water quality problem has been resolved. Therefore, representative monitoring in conjunction with other requirements in this Order and the board's compliance and enforcement activities will also allow the board to determine whether Members are complying with this Order.

- 24 The Central Valley Water Board's *Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins* (hereafter Basin Plan) and the State Water Resources Control Boards *Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary* (hereafter Bay-Delta Plan) designate beneficial uses, establish water quality objectives, contain programs of implementation needed to achieve water quality objectives, and reference the plans and policies adopted by the State Water Board. The water quality objectives are developed to protect the beneficial uses of waters of the state. Compliance with water quality objectives will protect the beneficial uses listed in Findings 26 and 27.

- 25 This Order implements the Basin Plan, the Bay-Delta Plan and applicable State policies by requiring the implementation of management practices that are considered to constitute best practicable treatment or control where applicable, that achieve compliance with applicable water quality objectives and that prevent nuisance. The Order requires implementation of a monitoring and reporting program to determine effects of discharges on water quality and the effectiveness of management practices designed to comply with applicable water quality objectives.

- 26 Pursuant to the Basin Plan, the Bay-Delta Plan and State Water Board plans and policies, including State Water Board Resolution 88-63, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary, and consistent with the federal Clean Water Act, the existing and potential beneficial uses of surface waters in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area may include:
 - a. Municipal and Domestic Supply
 - b. Agricultural Supply
 - c. Industrial Service Supply
 - d. Industrial Process Supply
 - e. Hydropower Generation
 - f. Water Contact Recreation
 - g. Non-Contact Water Recreation
 - h. Warm Freshwater Habitat
 - i. Cold Freshwater Habitat
 - j. Migration of Aquatic Organisms
 - k. Spawning, Reproduction and/or Early Development
 - l. Wildlife Habitat
 - m. Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species
 - n. Freshwater Replenishment
 - o. Groundwater recharge
 - p. Navigation
 - q. Shell Fish Harvesting
 - r. Commercial Sport Fishing
 - s. Estuarine Habitat

- 27 Pursuant to the Basin Plan and State Water Board plans and policies including State Water Board Resolution 88-63, all ground waters in the region are considered as suitable or potentially suitable at a minimum, for:
 - a. Municipal and Domestic Supply
 - b. Agricultural Supply
 - c. Industrial Service Supply
 - d. Industrial Process Supply.

- 28 The board recognizes that some areas within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area overlie groundwater containing naturally occurring constituents, including salts, that may exceed water quality objectives for specific beneficial use designations. In such cases, the use may be unattainable, even in the absence of any waste discharge, and de-designation or modification of the designated use may be appropriate. It is reasonable, under circumstances described below, to delay the imposition of monitoring and reporting associated with high vulnerability areas in these circumstances. This Order allows, with Executive Officer approval, portions of the high vulnerability areas identified within the Groundwater Quality Assessment Report (GAR) to temporarily operate under reduced monitoring and reporting requirements when

1) a third-party, board, or other group is actively pursuing a basin plan amendment to de-designate or modify the beneficial use; and 2) the third-party provides the required information indicating that it is reasonably likely that the beneficial use is not appropriate in the area of the proposed de-designation. The requirements for pursuing reduced monitoring and reporting as a condition of a basin plan amendment are described in section VIII.M of this Order and section V.E of the MRP.

- 29 In May 2004, the State Water Board adopted the *Policy for Implementation and Enforcement of the Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program* (NPS Policy). The purpose of the NPS Policy is to improve the state's ability to effectively manage NPS pollution and conform to the requirements of the Federal Clean Water Act and the Federal Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments of 1990. The NPS Policy requires, among other key elements, an NPS control implementation program's ultimate purpose to be explicitly stated. It also requires implementation programs to, at a minimum, address NPS pollution in a manner that achieves and maintains water quality objectives and beneficial uses, including any applicable antidegradation requirements.
- 30 This Order constitutes an NPS Implementation Program for the discharges regulated by the Order. The ultimate purpose of this program is expressly stated in the goals and objectives for the ILRP, described in the PEIR and Attachment A to this Order. Attachment A, Information Sheet, describes the five key elements required by the NPS Policy and provides justification that the requirements of this Order meet the requirements of the NPS Policy. This Order is consistent with the NPS Policy.
- 31 The United States Environmental Protection Agency adopted the National Toxics Rule (NTR) on 5 February 1993 and the California Toxics Rule (CTR) on 18 May 2000, which was modified on 13 February 2001. The NTR and CTR contain water quality criteria which, when combined with beneficial use designations in the Basin Plans, constitute enforceable water quality standards for priority toxic pollutants in California surface waters.
- 32 It is the policy of the State of California that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes. This order promotes that policy by, among other things, utilizing a tiered system that imposes more stringent requirements in areas deemed "high vulnerability" based on threat to surface water or groundwater quality, requiring surface water and groundwater monitoring and management plans, an identification and evaluation of management practices that are protective of surface water and groundwater quality, and requiring discharges to meet applicable water quality objectives, which include maximum contaminant levels designed to protect human health and ensure that water is safe for domestic uses. Protection of the beneficial uses of surface water and groundwater is described throughout this Order, including the discussion in Attachment A to this Order of State Water Board Resolution 68-16 *Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality Waters in California*.

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

- 33 For purposes of adoption of this Order, the Central Valley Water Board is the lead agency pursuant to CEQA (Public Resources Code sections 21100 et seq.). Pursuant to board direction in Resolutions R5-2006-0053 and R5-2006-0054, a Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) was prepared. In accordance with CEQA, the Central Valley Water Board, acting as the lead agency adopted Resolution R5-2011-0017 on 7 April 2011, certifying the PEIR for the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program.

- 34 This Order relies on the environmental impact analysis contained in the PEIR to satisfy the requirements of CEQA. Although the Order is not identical to any of the PEIR alternatives, the Order is comprised entirely of elements of the PEIR's wide range of alternatives. Therefore, the PEIR identified, disclosed, and analyzed the potential environmental impacts of the Order. The potential compliance activities undertaken by the regulated Members in response to this Order fall within the range of compliance activities identified and analyzed in the PEIR. Therefore, all potentially adverse environmental impacts of this Order have been identified, disclosed, and analyzed in the PEIR. If it is determined that a grower filing for coverage under this Order could create impacts not identified in the PEIR, individual WDRs would be prepared for that grower and additional CEQA analysis performed, which would likely tier off the PEIR as necessary. (see Title 14, CCR § 15152).
- 35 The requirements of this Order are based on elements of Alternatives 2 through 6 of the PEIR. The PEIR concludes that implementation of some of these elements has the potential to cause significant adverse environmental impacts. Such impacts are associated, directly and indirectly, with specific compliance activities growers may conduct in response to the Order's regulatory requirements. Such activities are expected to include implementation of water quality management practices and monitoring well installation and operation. Attachment A of this Order describes example water quality management practices that may be implemented as a result of this Order and that monitoring wells may be installed as a result of this Order. The types and degrees of implementation will be similar to those described in the PEIR for Alternatives 2 through 6. Also, because the cost of this Order is expected to fall within the range of costs described for Alternatives 2 through 6, significant impacts to agriculture resources under this Order will be similar to those described in the PEIR. Because of these similarities, this Order relies on the PEIR for its CEQA analysis. A listing of potential environmental impacts, the written findings regarding those impacts consistent with § 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines, and the explanation for each finding are contained in a separate Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations document (Attachment D), which is incorporated by reference into this Order.
- 36 Where potentially significant environmental impacts identified in Attachment D may occur as a result of Members' compliance activities, this Order requires that Members either avoid the impacts where feasible or implement identified mitigation measures, if any, to reduce the potential impacts to a less than significant level. Where avoidance or implementation of identified mitigation is not feasible, use of this Order is prohibited and individual WDRs would be required. The Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Order, Attachment B, includes a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to track the implementation of mitigation measures.
- 37 The PEIR finds that none of the program alternatives will cause significant adverse impacts to water quality. Consistent with alternatives in the PEIR, this Order contains measures needed to achieve and maintain water quality objectives and beneficial uses, reduce current pollutant loading rates, and minimize further degradation of water quality. As such, this Order will not cause significant adverse impacts to water quality.

STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD RESOLUTION 68-16

- 38 State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) Resolution 68-16 *Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California* (Resolution 68-16 or "antidegradation policy") requires that a Regional Water Quality Control Board maintain high quality waters of the state unless the board determines that any authorized degradation is consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the state, will not unreasonably affect beneficial uses, and will not result in water quality less than that described in a Regional Water

Quality Control Board's policies (e.g., quality that exceeds applicable water quality objectives). The board must also assure that any authorized degradation of existing high quality waters is subject to waste discharge requirements which will result in the best practicable treatment or control (BPTC) of the discharge necessary to assure that pollution, or nuisance will not occur and the highest water quality consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the state will be maintained.

- 39 The Central Valley Water Board has information in its records that has been collected by the Central Valley Water Board, growers, educational institutions, and others that demonstrates that many water bodies within the Central Valley Region are impaired for various constituents, including pesticides, nitrates, and salts. Many water bodies have been listed as impaired pursuant to Clean Water Act section 303(d).

Appendix A to the PEIR for the Irrigated Lands Program describes that "*there may be cases where irrigated agricultural waste discharges threaten to degrade high quality waters.*" For discharges to water bodies that are high quality waters, this Order is consistent with Resolution 68-16. Attachment A to this Order summarizes applicable antidegradation requirements and provides detailed rationale demonstrating how this Order is consistent with Resolution 68-16. As indicated in the summary, this Order authorizes degradation of high quality waters, not to exceed water quality objectives, threaten beneficial uses, or cause a condition of pollution or nuisance. The Order will also result in the implementation of BPTC by those discharging to high quality waters and assure that any change in water quality will be consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the state.

As authorized by Water Code section 13263(c), achievement of these requirements is in accordance with the Order's time schedules. Time schedules are necessary because not all growers covered by the Order can immediately comply with the Order's requirements. Using time schedules to implement antidegradation requirements was explicitly recognized and endorsed by the California Court of Appeal, who wrote with respect to the Central Valley Water Board's Dairy Waste Discharge Requirements that "[a] phased approach... is reasonable, and is authorized by section 13263, which allows the requirements of a regional water quality control board to contain a time schedule." *AGUA v. Central Valley Water Board*, 210 Cal.App.4th 1255, 1277.

CALIFORNIA WATER CODE SECTIONS 13141 AND 13241

- 40 California Water Code section 13141 states that "*prior to implementation of any agricultural water quality control program, an estimate of the total cost of such a program, together with an identification of potential sources of financing, shall be indicated in any regional water quality control plan.*" Section 13141 concerns approvals or revisions to a water quality control plan and does not necessarily apply in a context where an agricultural water quality control program is being developed through waivers and waste discharge requirements rather than basin planning. However, the Basin Plan includes an estimate of potential costs and sources of financing for the long-term irrigated lands program. The estimated costs were derived by analyzing the six alternatives evaluated in the PEIR. This Order, which implements the long-term ILRP within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area, is based on Alternatives 2-6 of the PEIR; therefore, estimated costs of this Order fall within the Basin Plan cost range.¹² The total average annual estimated cost of compliance with this Order, e.g., summation of costs for administration, monitoring, reporting, tracking, implementation of management practices, is

¹² When compared on a per irrigated acre basis; as the Basin Plan cost range is an estimate for all irrigated lands in the Central Valley versus this Order's applicability to a portion thereof (irrigated lands in San Joaquin County and Delta Area).

expected to be approximately \$6.09 per acre greater than the current surface water only protection program under the Coalition Group Conditional Waiver. The total estimated average cost of compliance of continuation of the previous Coalition Group Conditional Waiver within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area is expected to be approximately 68 million dollars per year (\$117.48 per acre annually). The total estimated cost of compliance with this Order is expected to be approximately 72 million dollars per year (\$123.56 per acre annually).

Approximately \$115.69 of the estimated \$123.56 per acre average annual cost of the Order is associated with implementation of management practices. This Order does not require that Members implement specific water quality management practices.¹³ Many of the management practices that have water quality benefits can have other economic and environmental benefits (e.g., improved irrigation can reduce water and energy consumption, as well as reduce runoff). Management practice selection will be based on decisions by individual Members in consideration of the unique conditions of their irrigated agricultural lands; water quality concerns; and other benefits expected from implementation of the practice. As such, the cost estimate is an estimate of potential, not required costs of implementing specific practices. Any costs for water quality management practices will be based on a market transaction between Members and those vendors or individuals providing services or equipment and not based on an estimate of those costs provided by the board. The cost estimates include estimated fees the third-party may charge to prepare the required reports and conduct the required monitoring, as well as annual permit fees that are charged to permitted dischargers for permit coverage. In accordance with the State Water Board's Fee Regulations, the current annual permit fee charged to Members covered by this Order is \$0.75/acre. The combined total estimated average administrative costs that include third-party and state fees are estimated to be \$6.04 /acre annually or less than 5% of the total estimated average cost of \$123.56 per acre. These costs have been estimated using the same study used to develop the Basin Plan cost estimate, which applies to the whole ILRP being overseen by the Central Valley Water Board. The basis for these estimates is provided in the *Draft Technical Memorandum Concerning the Economic Analysis of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program*.¹⁴ Attachment A includes further discussion regarding the cost estimate for this Order.

- 41 California Water Code section 13263 requires that the Central Valley Water Board consider the following factors, found in section 13241, when considering adoption of waste discharge requirements.
- (a) Past, present, and probable future beneficial uses of water.
 - (b) Environmental characteristics of the hydrographic unit under consideration, including the quality of water available thereto.
 - (c) Water quality conditions that could reasonably be achieved through the coordinated control of all factors which affect water quality in the area.
 - (d) Economic considerations.
 - (e) The need for developing housing within the region.
 - (f) The need to develop and use recycled water.

These factors have been considered in the development of this Order. Attachment A, Information Sheet, provides further discussion on the consideration of section 13241 factors.

¹³ Per California Water Code section 13360, the Central Valley Water Board may not specify the manner in which a Member complies with water quality requirements.

¹⁴ ICF International. 2010. *Draft Technical Memorandum Concerning the Economic Analysis of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program*. Draft. July. (ICF 05508.05.) Sacramento, CA. Prepared for: Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Sacramento, CA

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ONGOING WATER QUALITY EFFORTS

- 42 Other water quality efforts conducted pursuant to state and federal law directly or indirectly serve to reduce waste discharges from irrigated lands to waters of the state. Those efforts will continue, and will be supported by implementation of this Order.
- 43 The Central Valley Salinity Alternatives for Long-Term Sustainability (CV-SALTS) initiative has the goal of developing sustainable solutions to the increasing salt and nitrate concentrations that threaten the achievement of water quality objectives in Central Valley surface water and groundwater. This Order requires actions that will reduce nitrate discharges and should result in practices that reduce salt loading. The board intends to coordinate all such actions with the CV-SALTS initiative. CV-SALTS may identify additional actions that need to be taken by irrigated agriculture and others to address these constituents. This Order can be amended in the future to implement any policies or requirements established by the Central Valley Water Board resulting from the CV-SALTS process. This Order includes provisions to promote coordination with CV-SALTS and to support the development of information needed for the CV-SALTS process.
- 44 Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) are established for surface waters that have been placed on the State Water Board's 303(d) list of Water Quality Limited Segments for failure to meet applicable water quality standards. A TMDL, which may be adopted by the Central Valley Water Board as Basin Plan amendments, is the sum of allowable loads of a single pollutant from all contributing point sources and nonpoint sources. The Central Valley Water Board is currently developing a pesticide TMDL and organochlorine pesticide TMDL, among other TMDLs in development. This Order will implement these and other future TMDLs to the extent there are established requirements that pertain to irrigated agriculture, as well as the following approved TMDLs: San Joaquin River Deep Water Ship Channel dissolved oxygen; San Joaquin River salt, boron, and selenium, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta diazinon and chlorpyrifos, and Delta methyl-mercury.
- 45 The General Order for Existing Milk Cow Dairies (R5-2007-0035) and NPDES Dairy General Permit CAG015001 (Dairy General Orders) regulate discharges of waste to surface waters and groundwater from existing milk cow dairies in the Central Valley. Discharges from irrigated agricultural parcels are regulated by the Dairy General Orders if the owner or operator of the parcel applies dairy waste from its dairy operation. Irrigated agricultural parcels that receive dairy or other confined animal facility¹⁵ waste from external sources must obtain regulatory coverage for their discharge under this Order or waste discharge requirements that apply to individual growers. The Central Valley Water Board encourages the dairy industry and the third-party to coordinate the surface water and groundwater quality monitoring required of the two orders and coordinate their response to identified water quality problems.
- 46 The Executive Officer approved the San Joaquin County and Delta Water Quality Coalition Management Plan on 23 January 2009 and subsequently six approved High Priority Management Plans. The approved plans (along with updates and modifications approved by the Executive Officer) will continue to be implemented under this Order to address the surface water quality problems identified therein, unless and until such time the Executive Officer requires modification of the plan or deems it to be complete, as described in this Order. Management Plans required based on data gathered under the Conditional Waiver, which have not been approved by the date the Order is adopted, will be completed in accordance

¹⁵ "Confined animal facility" is defined in Title 27 CCR section 20164 as "... any place where cattle, calves, sheep, swine, horses, mules, goats, fowl, or other domestic animals are corralled, penned, tethered, or otherwise enclosed or held and where feeding is by means other than grazing."

with the requirements of Appendix MRP-1 of this Order. Any request to consider management plans approved under the Conditional Waiver complete will be evaluated in accordance with this Order.

- 47 The Delta Regional Monitoring Program (Delta RMP) is a comprehensive program currently being developed by the Central Valley Regional Water Board in collaboration with Delta dischargers and other organizations. The goal of the Delta RMP is to develop a comprehensive and coordinated monitoring program across the many entities that currently conduct monitoring in the Delta, including the agricultural coalitions. Based on the success of similar programs, it is anticipated that this effort will lead to opportunities to fill data gaps related to contaminants, water quality impairment, and aquatic health and reduce redundant monitoring efforts and costs. This Order can be amended in the future to address changes in monitoring strategy that may result from the Delta RMP.

COORDINATION AND COOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES

- 48 Integrated Regional Water Management Plans: Pursuant to part 2.75 of Division 6 of the California Water Code (commencing with section 10750), local agencies are authorized to adopt and implement groundwater management plans (hereinafter "local groundwater management plans"), including integrated regional water management plans. The legislation provides recommended components to the plans such as control of saline water intrusion, regulation of the migration of contaminated water, monitoring of groundwater levels and storage, and the development of relationships with regulatory agencies. The information collected through implementation of groundwater management plans can support or supplement efforts to evaluate potential impacts of irrigated agricultural discharges on groundwater. This Order requires the third-party to develop regional groundwater monitoring workplans and, where necessary, groundwater quality management plans (GQMPs). The third-party is encouraged to coordinate with local groundwater management plans and integrated regional water management plans, where applicable, when developing regional groundwater monitoring workplans and GQMPs.
- 49 California Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR): DPR has developed a Groundwater Protection Program under the authority of the Pesticide Contamination Prevention Act (PCPA) (commencing with Food and Agriculture Code section 13142). The program is intended to prevent contamination of groundwater from the legal application of pesticides. In addition to activities mandated by the PCPA, DPR's program has incorporated approaches to identify areas vulnerable to pesticide movement, develop mitigation measures to prevent pesticide contamination, and monitor domestic drinking water wells located in groundwater protection areas. The Groundwater Protection Program can provide valuable information on potential impacts to groundwater from agricultural pesticides. If necessary, DPR and the county agricultural commissioners can use their regulatory authorities to address any identified impacts to groundwater or surface water attributable to pesticide discharges from agricultural fields.
- 50 California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA): The CDFA Fertilizer Research and Education Program (FREP) coordinates research to advance the environmentally safe and agronomically sound use and handling of fertilizer materials. Currently, CDFA is developing nitrogen management training programs for farmers and Certified Crop Advisors (CCA). Among other certification options available for nitrogen management plans, the CDFA training programs will be recognized as providing the training necessary for a farmer or CCA to certify nitrogen management plans in high vulnerability groundwater areas. This Order leverages CDFA's work and expertise with respect to nitrogen management training and technical

support to the professionals and third-parties that will be developing nitrogen management plans for individual Members.

- 51 *Nitrogen Management and Control* – CDFA, in coordination with the Water Boards, is convening a Task Force to identify intended outcomes and expected benefits of a nitrogen mass balance tracking system in nitrate high-risk areas. The CDFA Task Force may identify appropriate nitrogen tracking and reporting systems, and potential alternatives, that would provide meaningful and high quality data to help better protect groundwater quality.

In the Report to the Legislature¹⁶, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) has committed to convene a panel of experts from a broad spectrum of relevant disciplines (Expert Panel) to assess existing agricultural nitrate control programs and develop recommendations, as needed, to ensure that ongoing efforts are protective of groundwater quality. The Expert Panel will evaluate ongoing agricultural control measures that address nitrate in groundwater, and will propose new measures, if necessary. In its assessment of existing agricultural nitrate control programs and development of recommendations for possible improvements in the regulatory approaches being used, the Expert Panel will consider groundwater monitoring, mandatory adoption of best management practices, tracking and reporting of nitrogen fertilizer application, estimates of nitrogen use efficiency or a similar metric, and farm-specific nutrient management plans as source control measures and regulatory tools.

The deadlines for preparation of a nitrogen management plan and associated reporting allow the board to make any necessary adjustments to this Order based on the findings and recommendations of the CDFA Task Force and the SWRCB Expert Panel and prior to the established compliance dates.

- 52 *The United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)* administers a number of programs related to water quality. NRCS can provide technical assistance to growers and has identified practices that are protective of the environment and are feasible in an agricultural setting. The NRCS Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) provides cost share assistance for management practice installation. The NRCS has also provided assistance with research of management practice effectiveness. The third-party and its Members are encouraged to utilize the information and resources available through the NRCS to meet the requirements of this Order.
- 53 The Central Valley Water Board will continue to work cooperatively with the other local, State, and federal agencies to identify and leverage their efforts.

ENFORCEMENT FOR NONCOMPLIANCE WITH THIS ORDER

- 54 California Water Code section 13350 provides that any person who violates Waste Discharge Requirements may be: 1) subject to administrative civil liability imposed by the Central Valley Water Board or State Water Board in an amount of up to \$5,000 per day of violation, or \$10 per gallon of waste discharged; or 2) be subject to civil liability imposed by a court in an amount of up to \$15,000 per day of violation, or \$20 per gallon of waste discharged. The actual calculation and determination of administrative civil penalties must be set forth in a manner that is consistent with the State Water Board's Water Quality Enforcement Policy.

¹⁶ State Water Board Resources Control Board. 2013. Report to the Legislature, Recommendations Addressing Nitrate in Groundwater <http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/nitrate_project/docs/nitrate_rpt.pdf> March 2014

- 55 The State Water Board's Water Quality Enforcement Policy (Enforcement Policy) endorses progressive enforcement action for violations of waste discharge requirements when appropriate, but recommends formal enforcement as a first response to more significant violations. Progressive enforcement is an escalating series of actions that allows for the efficient and effective use of enforcement resources to: 1) assist cooperative Members in achieving compliance; 2) compel compliance for repeat violations and recalcitrant violators; and 3) provide a disincentive for noncompliance. Progressive enforcement actions may begin with informal enforcement actions such as a verbal, written, or electronic communication between the Central Valley Water Board and a Member. The purpose of an informal enforcement action is to quickly bring the violation to the Member's attention and to give the Member an opportunity to return to compliance as soon as possible. The highest level of informal enforcement is a Notice of Violation.

The Enforcement Policy recommends formal enforcement actions for the highest priority violations, chronic violations, and/or threatened violations. Violations of this Order that will be considered a priority include, but are not limited to:

- a) Failure to obtain required regulatory coverage.
 - b) Failure to meet receiving water limitations, unless the Member is implementing a Central Valley Water Board approved SQMP or GQMP in accordance with the time schedule provisions of this Order (section XII).¹⁷
 - c) The discharge of waste to lands not owned, leased, or controlled by the Member without written permission from the landowner.
 - d) Failure to prevent future exceedances of water quality objectives once made aware of an exceedance.
 - e) Falsifying information or intentionally withholding information required by applicable laws, regulations or an enforcement order.
 - f) Failure to implement a SQMP/GQMP.
 - g) Failure to pay annual fees, penalties, or liabilities.
 - h) Failure to monitor or provide information to the third-party as required.
 - i) Failure to submit required reports on time.
 - j) Failure to implement the applicable management practices, or equivalent practices, identified as protective of groundwater in the Management Practices Evaluation Report.
- 56 Under this Order, the third-party is tasked with developing monitoring plans, conducting monitoring, developing water quality management plans, and informing Members of requirements. It is intended that the following progressive enforcement steps will generally be taken in the event that the third-party fails to comply with the terms and conditions of this Order or attached MRP:
- a) First notification of noncompliance to the third-party. The Central Valley Water Board intends to notify the third-party of the non-compliance and allow a period of time for the third-party to come back into compliance. This notification may be in the form of a verbal notice, letter, or written notice of violation, depending on the severity of the noncompliance.
 - b) Second notification of noncompliance to the third-party. If the third-party fails to adequately respond to the first notification, the board intends to provide written notice to the third-party and potentially affected Members of the failure to address the first notice.

¹⁷ A Member participating in a Management Practices Evaluation Program study (i.e., the study is taking place on the Member's farm) where data indicate the discharge from the study area is not meeting receiving water limitations will not be a priority for enforcement, if the Member is implementing a Central Valley Water Board approved SQMP or GQMP in accordance with the time schedule provisions of this Order (section XII).

- c) Failure of the third-party to adequately respond to the second notification. Failure to adequately respond to the second notification may result in partial (e.g., affected areas or Members) or full disapproval of the third-party to act as a lead entity, depending on the severity of noncompliance. Growers that were Members affected by a partial or full third-party disapproval would be required to obtain coverage for their waste discharge under other applicable general waste discharge requirements or submit a Report of Waste Discharge to the Central Valley Water Board.

GENERAL FINDINGS

- 57 This Order does not authorize violation of any federal, state, or local law or regulation.
- 58 This Order does not authorize any act that results in the taking of a threatened or endangered species or any act that is now prohibited, or becomes prohibited in the future, under either the California Endangered Species Act (Fish and Game Code sections 2050 to 2097) or the Federal Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C.A. sections 1531 to 1544). If a "take" will result from any action authorized under this Order, the Member shall obtain authorization for an incidental take prior to construction or operation of the project. The Member shall be responsible for meeting all requirements of the applicable Endangered Species Act.
- 59 This Order does not supersede the Central Valley Water Board's Basin Plans and policies, or the State Water Board's Bay-Delta Plan, including prohibitions (e.g., pesticides) and implementation plans (e.g., Total Maximum Daily Loads), or the State Water Board's plans and policies.
- 60 As stated in California Water Code section 13263(g), the discharge of waste into waters of the state is a privilege, not a right, and regulatory coverage under this Order does not create a vested right to continue the discharge of waste. Failure to prevent conditions that create or threaten to create pollution or nuisance will be sufficient reason to modify, revoke, or enforce this Order, as well as prohibit further discharge.
- 61 This Order requires Members to provide the third-party with contact information of the person(s) authorized to provide access to the enrolled property for inspections. This requirement provides a procedure to enable board staff to contact grower representatives so that it may more efficiently monitor compliance with the provisions of this Order.
- 62 Any instance of noncompliance with this Order constitutes a violation of the California Water Code and its regulations. Such noncompliance is grounds for enforcement action, and/or termination of coverage for waste discharges under this Order, subjecting the discharger to enforcement under the California Water Code for further discharges of waste to surface water or groundwater.
- 63 All discharges from the irrigated agricultural operation are expected to comply with the lawful requirements of municipalities, counties, drainage districts, and other local agencies regarding discharges to storm drain systems or to other courses under their jurisdiction.
- 64 The fact that it would have been necessary to halt or reduce the discharge in order to maintain compliance with this Order shall not be a defense for violations of the Order by the Member.
- 65 This Order is not a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit issued pursuant to the Federal Clean Water Act. Coverage under this Order does not exempt a facility from the

Clean Water Act. Any facility required to obtain such a permit must notify the Central Valley Water Board.

- 66 California Water Code section 13260(d)(1)(A) requires persons subject to waste discharge requirements to pay an annual fee established by the State Water Board.
- 67 The Findings of this Order, supplemental information and details in the attached Information Sheet (Attachment A), and the administrative record of the Central Valley Water Board relevant to the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, were considered in establishing these waste discharge requirements.
- 68 The Central Valley Water Board has notified interested agencies and persons of its intent to adopt this Order for discharges of waste from irrigated lands within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area, and has provided them with an opportunity for a public hearing and an opportunity to submit comments.
- 69 The Central Valley Water Board, in a public meeting, heard and considered all comments pertaining to this Order.
- 70 Any person affected by this action of the Central Valley Water Board may petition the State Water Board to review this action. The State Water Board must receive the petition within 30 days of the date on which the Central Valley Water Board adopted this Order. Copies of the law and regulations applicable to filing petitions will be provided upon request.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, pursuant to California Water Code sections 13260, 13263, and 13267 and in order to meet the provisions contained in Division 7 of the California Water Code and regulations and policies adopted there under; all Members of a third-party group¹⁸, their agents, successors, and assigns shall comply with the following:

I. Coverage

1. Order R5-2006-0053, Coalition Group Conditional Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges from Irrigated Lands (Coalition Group Conditional Waiver), is hereby rescinded as it applied to Members of the San Joaquin County and Delta Water Quality Coalition in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area.
2. The area to be covered by a third-party group will be identified in its Notice of Applicability (NOA). A third-party group receiving an NOA under this Order is responsible for all third-party group requirements within the geographic area identified in its NOA

II. Prohibitions

1. The discharge of waste to waters of the state, from irrigated agricultural operations other than those defined in the Findings of this Order, is prohibited.
2. The discharge of hazardous waste, as defined in California Water Code section 13173 and Title 23 CCR section 2521(a), respectively, is prohibited.
3. The discharge of wastes (e.g., fertilizers, fumigants, pesticides) into groundwater via backflow through a water supply well is prohibited.

¹⁸ References to “the third-party group” in this Order apply to each of the entities (if more than one) that are approved as a third-party group under this Order.

4. The discharge of any wastes (e.g., fertilizers, fumigants, pesticides) down a groundwater well casing is prohibited.

III. Receiving Water Limitations

A. Surface Water Limitations

1. Wastes discharged from Member operations shall not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable water quality objectives in surface water or a trend of degradation that may threaten applicable Basin Plan beneficial uses, unreasonably affect applicable beneficial uses, or cause or contribute to a condition of pollution or nuisance.

B. Groundwater Limitations

1. Wastes discharged from Member operations shall not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable water quality objectives in the underlying groundwater or a trend of degradation that may threaten applicable Basin Plan beneficial uses, unreasonably affect applicable beneficial uses, or cause or contribute to a condition of pollution or nuisance.

C. Compliance with Receiving Water Limitations

1. If the discharge of wastes from Member operations does not meet the limitations in **III.A Surface Water Limitations** or **III.B. Groundwater Limitations**, the Member is in compliance with this Order relative to sections III.A or III.B for a specific waste parameter provided:
 - a. The third-party has submitted a Surface Water Quality Management Plan or Groundwater Quality Management Plan for that waste parameter in accordance with Section VIII.H of this Order, and such plan is pending action by the Executive Officer or board; or
 - b. The Executive Officer or board has approved the applicable Surface Water Quality Management Plan or Groundwater Quality Management Plan for that waste parameter, and
 - i. The Member is implementing or has a documented schedule to implement improved management practices consistent with the approved plan to achieve compliance with **III.A or III.B**, as applicable, and
 - ii. The Member is in compliance with **Section XII. Time Schedule for Compliance** of this Order.

IV. Provisions

A. General Specifications

1. The third-party will assist its Members in complying with the relevant terms and provisions of this Order, including required monitoring and reporting as described in MRP Order R5-2014-0029. However, individual Members of the third-party group continue to bear ultimate responsibility for complying with this Order.
2. Irrigated lands owners or operators with waste discharges to state waters (or "Dischargers") that are not Members of the third-party group, or whose property is not enrolled by a Member of the third-party group, shall not be subject to coverage provided by the terms of this Order. Such Dischargers shall be required to obtain coverage for their waste discharge under individual waste discharge requirements or any applicable general waste discharge requirements that apply to individuals that are not represented by a third-party.
3. Members who are subject to this Order shall implement water quality management practices, as necessary, to protect water quality. Water quality management practices can be instituted on an individual basis, or implemented to serve multiple growers discharging to a single location.

4. Installation of groundwater monitoring wells or implementation of management practices to meet the conditions of this Order at a location or in a manner that could cause an adverse environmental impact as identified in the *Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, Final Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR)*¹⁹ shall be mitigated in accordance with the mitigation measures provided in Attachment C of this Order.
5. The provisions of this Order are severable. If any provision of the Order is held invalid, the remainder of the Order shall not be affected.

B. Requirements for Members of the Third-Party Group

1. Members shall comply with all applicable provisions of the California Water Code, the *Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins*, and State Water Board plans and policies.
2. All Members shall comply with the attached Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) R5-2014-0029, and future revisions thereto.
3. Members who are covered under this Order shall comply with the terms and conditions contained in this Order.
4. Each Member or their Designee²⁰ shall participate in at least one third-party approved outreach event annually, if any of the Member's parcels are in a designated "high vulnerability" area or governed by a SQMP/GQMP. The Member or Designee may participate in person or through a web-based program. The Member shall review outreach materials to become informed of any water quality problems to address and the management practices that are available to address those issues. The Member shall provide annual confirmation to the third-party that the Member has attended an outreach event during the previous year and reviewed the applicable outreach materials by acknowledging attendance on the annual membership renewal form.
5. All Members shall provide the third-party with information requested for compliance with this Order.
6. All Members shall implement water quality management practices as necessary to protect water quality and to achieve compliance with surface water and groundwater receiving water limitations of this Order (sections III.A and B).
7. All Members shall implement effective sediment discharge and erosion prevention practices to minimize or eliminate the discharge of sediment above background levels. Members with the potential to cause erosion and discharge sediment that may degrade surface waters, as identified by the Member in their Farm Evaluation, by the third-party in the Sediment Discharge and Erosion Assessment Report, or by the Executive Officer shall prepare and implement a Sediment and Erosion Control Plan as specified in section VII.C below.
8. All Members shall implement practices that minimize excess nutrient application relative to crop consumption. Members shall prepare and implement a farm-specific nitrogen management plan as required by section VII.D of this Order.

¹⁹ On 7 April 2011, the Central Valley Water Board adopted Resolution R5-2011-0017, certifying the PEIR for the long-term irrigated lands regulatory program.

²⁰ A non-Member Designee must be a person with responsibility for decisions related to management practices associated with farming operation.

9. In addition to the reports identified in section VII of this Order, the Executive Officer may require the Member to submit additional technical reports pursuant to California Water Code section 13267.
10. The requirements prescribed in this Order do not authorize the commission of any act causing injury to the property of another, or protect the Member from liabilities under other federal, state, county, or local laws. However, enrollment under this Order does protect the Member from liability alleged for failing to comply with California Water Code section 13260.
11. This Order does not convey any property rights or exclusive privileges.
12. This Order shall not create a vested right, and all such discharges of waste shall be considered a privilege, as provided for in California Water Code section 13263.
13. The Member understands that the Central Valley Water Board or its authorized representatives, may, at reasonable hours, inspect the facilities²¹ and irrigated lands of persons subject to this Order to ascertain whether the purposes of the Porter-Cologne Act are being met and whether the Member is complying with the conditions of this Order. To the extent required by California Water Code section 13267(c) or other applicable law, the inspection shall be made with the consent of the Member, owner or authorized representative, or if consent is withheld, with a duly issued warrant pursuant to the procedure set forth in Title 13 Code of Civil Procedure Part 3 (commencing with section 1822.50). In the event of an emergency affecting the public health and safety, an inspection may be performed without the consent or the issuance of a warrant.
14. The Member shall provide the third-party with the phone number(s) of the individual(s) with authority to provide consent to access its facilities as described in provision IV.B.12 above.
15. The Member shall properly operate and maintain in good working order any facility, unit, system, or monitoring device installed to achieve compliance with the Order.
16. Settling ponds, basins, and tailwater recovery systems shall be constructed, maintained, and operated to prevent groundwater degradation, erosion, slope failure, and minimize the discharge of sediment. The construction and operation must be consistent with the applicable Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) conservation practice standard, an NRCS or University of California Cooperative Extension recommendation, or an equivalent alternative standard.
17. Where applicable, the Member shall follow state, county or local agency standards with respect to water wells and groundwater quality when constructing new wells, modifying existing wells, or destroying wells. Absent such standards, at a minimum, the Member shall follow the standards and guidelines described in the California Department of Water Resources' *Water Well Standards (Bulletins 74-81 & 74-90 combined)*.
18. The Member shall maintain a copy of this Order, either in hard copy or electronic format, at the primary place of business, or the Member's farming operations headquarters. The Member shall also maintain excerpts of the Order's Member requirements that have been provided by the Executive Officer, so as to be available at all times to operations personnel. The Member and his/her designee shall be familiar with the content of this Order.

²¹ The inspection of Member's facilities and irrigated lands does not include the Member's private residence.

19. The Member, or the third-party on its Member's behalf as applicable, shall submit all required documents in accordance with section IX of this Order.
20. Members shall, at a minimum, implement water quality management practices that meet the following farm management performance standards:
 - a. Minimize waste discharge offsite in surface water,
 - b. Minimize percolation of waste to groundwater,
 - c. Protect wellheads from surface water intrusion.
21. Members shall implement the applicable management practices, or equivalent practices, identified as protective of groundwater in the Management Practices Evaluation Report.

C. Requirements for the Third-Party Group

In order to remain eligible to serve as a third-party representative to Members, the third-party shall perform the following:

1. Provide the Central Valley Water Board documentation of its organizational or management structure. The documentation shall identify persons responsible for ensuring that program requirements are fulfilled. The documentation shall be made readily available to Members.
2. Prepare annual summaries of expenditures of fees and revenue used to comply with this Order. The summaries shall be provided to or made readily available to Members.
3. If the third-party group receives a notice of violation (NOV) from the Central Valley Water Board, the third-party must provide to Members in the area addressed by the NOV appropriate information regarding the reason(s) for the violation. The notification must be provided to all Members within the area affected by the NOV within thirty (30) days of receiving the NOV from the board. The third-party group must provide confirmation to the board of each notification. A summary of all notices of violation received by the third-party group must be provided to all Members annually. The annual NOV summary may be part of a written or electronic communication to Members.
4. Develop and implement plans to track and evaluate the effectiveness of water quality management practices, pursuant to approved Surface Water Quality Management Plans and Groundwater Quality Management Plans.
5. Provide timely and complete submittal of any plans or reports required by this Order.
6. Conduct required water quality monitoring and assessments in conformance with quality assurance/quality control requirements.
7. Within 30 days of receiving an NOA from the Central Valley Water Board (as described in section VIII.A), inform Members of this Order's requirements by providing a notice of confirmation form to be completed by each Member.
8. Conduct education and outreach activities to inform Members of program requirements and water quality problems, including exceedances of water quality objectives or degradation of water quality, identified by the third-party or Central Valley Water Board. The third-party shall:
 - a. Maintain attendance lists for third-party outreach events, provide Members with information on water quality management practices that will address water quality problems and minimize the discharge of wastes from irrigated lands, and provide informational materials on potential environmental impacts of water quality management practices to the extent known by the third-party group.
 - b. Provide an annual summary of education and outreach activities to the Central Valley

Water Board. The annual summary shall include copies of the educational and management practice information provided to the growers. The annual summary must report the total number of growers who attended the outreach events and describe how growers could obtain copies of the materials presented at these events.

9. Work cooperatively with the Central Valley Water Board to ensure that all Members are providing required information and taking necessary steps to address exceedances or degradation identified by the third-party or board. As part of the Membership List submittal required in section VIII.B., identify the growers known by the third-party who have: (1) failed to implement improved water quality management practices within the timeframe specified by an applicable SQMP/GQMP; (2) failed to respond to an information request from the third-party associated with any applicable SQMP/GQMP or other provisions of this Order; (3) failed to participate as requested in third-party studies for which the third-party is the lead; or (4) failed to provide confirmation of participation in an outreach event (per section IV.B.4 of this Order.
10. Ensure that any activities conducted on behalf of the third-party by other groups meet the requirements of this Order. The third-party is responsible for any activities conducted on its behalf.
11. Collect any fees from Members required by the State Water Board pursuant to the fee schedule contained in Title 23 CCR. Such fees shall then be submitted to the State Water Board. The fees invoiced by the State Water Board will be based on the Membership List submitted by the third-party group. The third-party group is responsible for management of fee collection and payment of the State Water Board fees.

V. Effective Dates

1. This Order is effective upon adoption by the Central Valley Water Board on 12 March 2014 and remains in effect unless rescinded or revised by the Central Valley Water Board.
2. Regulatory coverage under this Order for discharges of waste from Member parcels already enrolled under Order R5-2006-0053 is effective upon adoption of this Order by the Central Valley Water Board. Regulatory coverage under this Order is automatically terminated, if a Notice of Confirmation (NOC) is not received by the third-party from the currently enrolled Member by 15 June 2014 or, if the third-party group application for the area in which the Member has irrigated lands is denied, or if the Central Valley Water Board revokes the approval of the third-party representing the Member's area.
3. Regulatory coverage for Dischargers not already enrolled under Order R5-2006-0053 as of the date of adoption of this Order can be obtained directly through obtaining membership in the third-party group within 120 days of Executive Officer issuance of a Notice of Applicability (NOA) to the third-party. Regulatory coverage is effective when the third-party notifies the Central Valley Water Board that the Discharger's application for membership has been accepted.
4. For Dischargers who are not members of the third-party under section V.2 or V.3, regulatory coverage is effective upon notification by the Central Valley Water Board that this Order applies to the Discharger through the issuance of an NOA. The Central Valley Water Board shall only issue an NOA after it has received a Notice of Intent (NOI) as required by section VII.A, and after the Central Valley Water Board has received notification from the third-party that the Discharger is a Member. The Discharger must pay any applicable State Water Board administrative fees associated with the filing of NOIs.

VI. Permit Reopening, Revision, Transfer, Revocation, Termination, and Reissuance

1. This Order may be reopened to address any changes in state statutes, regulations, plans, or policies that would affect the water quality requirements for the discharges, including, but not limited to, the Central Valley Water Board *Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins* or the State Water Board *Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary* (Bay-Delta Plan).
2. The filing of a request by the third-party on behalf of its Members for modification, revocation and re-issuance, or termination of the Order, or notification of planned changes or anticipated noncompliance, does not stay any condition of the Order.
3. The third-party, on behalf of its Members, shall provide to the Executive Officer any information which the Executive Officer may request to determine whether cause exists for modifying, revoking and re-issuing, or terminating the Order, or to determine compliance with the requirements of this Order that apply directly to the third-party. Members shall provide to the Executive Officer, any information which the Executive Officer may request to determine whether cause exists for modifying, revoking and re-issuing, or terminating the Order as applied to the individual Member, or to determine compliance with the provisions of this Order that apply directly to the Member.
4. After notice and opportunity for a hearing, the Order may be terminated or modified for cause as applied to individual Members identified by the Central Valley Water Board. Cause for such termination or modification, includes, but is not limited to:
 - a. Violation of any term or condition contained in the Order;
 - b. Obtaining Order coverage by misrepresentation; or
 - c. Failure to fully disclose all relevant facts.

A Member's regulatory coverage shall be automatically revoked if the NOC is not timely submitted (see section VII.A).

5. After notice and opportunity for a hearing, the approval of the third-party to act as a lead entity representing Members may be partially (e.g., affected areas or Members) or fully revoked. Cause for such termination or modification includes, but is not limited to consideration of the factors in Finding 56 of this Order, and/or:
 - a. Violation of any term or condition contained in the Order that applies directly to the third-party;
 - b. Third-party misrepresentation;
 - c. Failure by the third-party to fully disclose all known relevant facts; or
 - d. A change in any condition that results in the third-party's inability to properly function as the third-party entity representing Member interests or in facilitating Member compliance with the terms and conditions of this Order.
6. The Central Valley Water Board will review this Order periodically and may revise this Order when necessary.

VII. Required Reports and Notices – Member

The Central Valley Water Board or the Executive Officer may require any of the following reports and notices to be submitted electronically as long as the electronic format is reasonably available to the Member, and only to the extent that the Member has access to the equipment that allows for them to submit the information electronically. If the Member does not have such access, reports

and notices must be submitted by mail. Reports and notices shall be submitted in accordance with section IX, Reporting Provisions, as well as MRP Order R5-2014-0029. Due dates for Member required reports are summarized in Table 1. at the end of this Order. Members must prepare and maintain the following reports as instructed below, and shall submit or make available such reports to the third-party or the Central Valley Water Board as identified below.

A. Notice of Confirmation / Notice of Intent / Membership Application

1. To confirm coverage under this Order, growers that are enrolled under Order R5-2006-0053 as Members of the San Joaquin County and Delta Water Quality Coalition, as of the effective date of this Order, must submit a completed notice of confirmation (NOC) to the third-party by 15 June 2014 (as provided by issuance of an NOA to the third-party, see section VIII.A of this Order). The third-party will provide a notice of the requirements and process to complete NOC forms to Members within 30 days of receiving an NOA (see section VIII.A) from the Central Valley Water Board. As part of the NOC, Members must provide certification that they have provided written notice to any responsible non-Member parties of the Member's enrollment under this Order and of the requirements of this Order (a responsible non-Member is a landowner whose parcel has been enrolled by an operator-Member under this Order or an operator who farms a parcel that has been enrolled by a landowner-Member). If the Member is a landowner that leases their land, the Member must provide the name and contact information of the lessee and provide updated information to the third-party should the lessee change. If the Member is the lessee, the Member must provide the name and contact information of the landowner and provide updated information to the third-party should the landowner change.
2. Within 120 days of Executive Officer issuance of an NOA to the third-party, all other growers within this Order's boundaries must become Members of the third-party to avoid additional fees and administrative requirements (see section VII.A.3 below). To obtain membership, a grower must submit a completed third-party Membership application to the third-party group. As part of the membership application, growers must provide certification that they have provided written notice to any responsible non-Member parties of the Member's enrollment under this Order and of the requirements of this Order. Upon submittal of a complete application, the third-party group may confirm membership, after which the Member will be considered covered under this Order.
3. Beginning 121 days after Executive Officer issuance of an NOA to the third-party, any growers within this Order's boundaries that are not Members of the third-party or another irrigated lands third-party group governed by other WDRs or waiver of WDRs must submit (1) a completed Notice of Intent (NOI) to the Central Valley Water Board to comply with the conditions of this Order, (2) any required State Water Board administrative processing fee for the NOI, and (3) a Membership application to the third-party group. Upon submittal of a complete NOI, and after receiving confirmation from the third-party group that the grower is now a Member, the Central Valley Water Board Executive Officer may then issue a Notice of Applicability (NOA), after which the Member will be considered covered under this Order. In lieu of issuing an NOA, the Executive Officer may deny the NOI and require the submittal of a report of waste discharge or issue an NOA for regulatory coverage under any applicable general waste discharge requirements for individual dischargers not represented by a third-party.
4. As an alternative to receiving regulatory coverage under this Order, a discharger may submit a report of waste discharge in accordance with the California Water Code section 13260 or a Notice of Intent for regulatory coverage under any applicable general waste discharge requirements for individual dischargers not represented by a third-party.

B. Farm Evaluation

Members shall complete a Farm Evaluation and submit a copy of the completed Farm Evaluation to the third-party group according to the schedule below.²² The Member must use the Farm Evaluation Template approved by the Executive Officer (see section VIII.C below). A copy of the Farm Evaluation shall be maintained at the Member's farming operations headquarters or primary place of business, and must be produced upon request by Central Valley Water Board staff. In addition, Members shall comply with the following requirements where applicable:

1. Members in Low Vulnerability Areas

a. All Members

By 15 June 2015, all Members must prepare their Farm Evaluation and submit it to the third-party. An updated Farm Evaluation must be prepared and submitted to the third-party every 5 years by 15 June.

All Members in High Vulnerability Areas (Surface/Groundwater)

By 15 June 2015, all Members within a high vulnerability area must prepare their Farm Evaluation and submit it to the third-party. An updated Farm Evaluation must be prepared and submitted to the third-party by 15 June and annually thereafter. As part of the Farm Evaluation, the Member shall provide information on any outreach events attended in accordance with section IV.B.3 of this Order. After 15 June 2017, the Executive Officer may approve reduction in the frequency of updates and submission of Farm Evaluations, if the third-party demonstrates that year to year changes in Farm Evaluation updates are minimal and the Executive Officer concurs that the practices identified in the Farm Evaluations are consistent with practices that, when properly implemented, will achieve receiving water limitations and, where applicable achieve best practicable treatment or control.

C. Sediment and Erosion Control Plan

The requirements and deadlines of this section apply as specified to Members that are required to develop a Sediment and Erosion Control Plan per section IV.B.7 of this Order. The Member must use the Sediment and Erosion Control Plan Template provided by the Executive Officer (see section VIII.C below), or equivalent. The Sediment and Erosion Control Plan must be prepared in one of the following ways:

- The Sediment and Erosion Control Plan must adhere to the site-specific recommendation from the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), NRCS technical service provider, the University of California Cooperative Extension, the local Resource Conservation District; or conform to a local county ordinance applicable to erosion and sediment control on agricultural lands. The Member must retain written documentation of the recommendation provided and certify that they are implementing the recommendation; or
- The Sediment and Erosion Control Plan must be prepared and self-certified by the Member, who has completed a training program that the Executive Officer concurs provides necessary training for sediment and erosion control plan development; or
- The Sediment and Erosion Control Plan must be written, amended, and certified by a qualified professional possessing one of the following registrations or certifications, and appropriate experience with erosion issues on irrigated agricultural lands: California registered professional civil engineer, geologist, engineering geologist, landscape architect; NRCS Certified

²² Any farm map or information on the location of wells on the farm does not need to be provided to the third-party group

Conservation Planner, professional hydrologist registered through the American Institute of Hydrology; certified soil scientist registered through the American Society of Agronomy; Certified Professional in Erosion and Sediment Control (CPSEC)TM/Certified Professional in Storm Water Quality (CPSWQ)TM registered through EnviroCert International, Inc.; professional in erosion and sediment control registered through the National Institute for Certification in Engineering Technologies (NICET); or

- The Sediment and Erosion Control Plan must be prepared and certified in an alternative manner approved by the Executive Officer. Such approval will be provided based on the Executive Officer's determination that the alternative method for preparing the Sediment and Erosion Control Plan meets the objectives and requirements of this Order.

The plan shall be maintained and updated as conditions change. A copy of the Sediment and Erosion Control Plan shall be maintained at the farming operations headquarters or primary place of business; and must be produced by the Member, if requested, should Central Valley Water Board staff, or an authorized representative, conduct an inspection of the Member's irrigated lands operation.

1. *Deadline for all Members in High Vulnerability areas*

Within 180 days of the Executive Officer approving the third party's Sediment Discharge and Erosion Assessment Report, all Members in High Vulnerability areas must complete and implement a Sediment and Erosion Control Plan. A Sediment and Erosion Control Plan is not required in Low Vulnerability areas unless directed by the Executive Officer.

D. Nitrogen Management Plan²³

Members must prepare and implement a Nitrogen Management Plan and submit the Nitrogen Management Plan Summary Report for the previous crop year as described below. The Member must use the Nitrogen Management Plan Template provided by the Executive Officer (see section VIII.C below). The Nitrogen Management Plan and Nitrogen Management Plan Summary Report shall be maintained at the Member's farming operations headquarters or primary place of business. The Member must provide the Nitrogen Management Plan and Summary Report to board staff, if requested or, should board staff or an authorized representative conduct an inspection of the Member's irrigated agricultural operation. In addition, Members shall comply with the following requirements where applicable:

1. *All Members within a High Vulnerability Groundwater Area*

For Members located within a high vulnerability groundwater area, for which nitrate is identified as a constituent of concern, the Member must prepare and implement a certified Nitrogen Management Plan. The plan must be certified in one of the following ways:

- Self-certified by the Member who attends a California Department of Food and Agriculture or other Executive Officer approved training program for nitrogen plan certification. The Member must retain written documentation of their attendance in the training program; or
- Self-certified by the Member that the plan adheres to a site-specific recommendation from the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) or the University of California Cooperative Extension. The Member must retain written documentation of the recommendation provided; or

²³ The requirement for a Nitrogen Management Plan does not apply to parcels that are operated exclusively as a managed wetland.

- Certified by a nitrogen management plan specialist as defined in Attachment E of this Order. Such specialists include Professional Soil Scientists, Professional Agronomists, Crop Advisors²⁴ certified by the American Society of Agronomy, or Technical Service Providers certified in nutrient management in California by the NRCS; or
- Certified in an alternative manner approved by the Executive Officer. Such approval will be provided based on the Executive Officer's determination that the alternative method for preparing the Nitrogen Management Plan meets the objectives and requirements of this Order.

a. Deadlines for all Members

By 15 June 2015, Members shall prepare, and update by 15 June annually thereafter, a Nitrogen Management Plan. By 15 June 2016, and by 15 June annually, thereafter Members shall submit to the third-party the Nitrogen Management Plan Summary Report for the previous year.

b. Deadlines for Members re-designated from Low Vulnerability to High Vulnerability Groundwater Areas

Members with parcel(s) re-designated from low vulnerability to high vulnerability groundwater areas where nitrate is identified as a constituent of concern must prepare a Nitrogen Management Plan in compliance with this section (VII.D.1).²⁵ The schedule for certifying the Nitrogen Management Plan and submitting the initial Nitrogen Management Plan Summary Report will be established by the Executive Officer.

After 15 June 2018, the Executive Officer may approve reduction in the frequency of submission of Nitrogen Management Plan Summary Reports, if the third-party demonstrates that year to year changes in Nitrogen Management Summary Reports are minimal and the Executive Officer concurs that the implemented practices are achieving the performance standard.

2. Members within a Nitrate Low Vulnerability Groundwater Area

By 15 June 2017, all Members within low vulnerability areas, or within a high vulnerability groundwater areas for which nitrate is not identified as a constituent of concern, shall prepare, and update by 15 June every annually thereafter, a Nitrogen Management Plan. The Member must use the Nitrogen Management Plan Template provided by the Executive Officer (see section VIII.C below), or equivalent. Certification of the Nitrogen Management Plan and submittal of a Nitrogen Management Plan Summary Report are not required.

E. Mitigation Monitoring

As specified in this Order, certain Members are required to implement the mitigation measures included in Attachment C. Such Members shall submit mitigation monitoring by 15 June of each year to the third-party. Mitigation monitoring shall include information on the implementation of CEQA mitigation measures, including the mitigation measure implemented, potential environmental impact the mitigation measure addressed, location of the mitigation measure [parcel number, county], and any steps taken to monitor the ongoing success of the measure.

F. Notice of Termination

If the Member wishes to terminate coverage under this Order and withdraw its membership from the third-party, the Member shall submit a complete notice of termination (NOT) to the Central Valley

²⁴ Should the California Department of Food and Agriculture and the California Certified Crop Adviser's establish a specific nitrogen management certification, any Certified Crop Adviser who certifies a nitrogen management plan must have a nitrogen management certification.

²⁵ The designation of the vulnerability area may change based on updates to the Groundwater Quality Assessment Report (see the MRP – Attachment B).

Water Board and the third-party. Termination of regulatory coverage will occur on the date specified in the NOT, unless the Central Valley Water Board specifies otherwise. All discharges of waste to surface water and groundwater shall cease before the date of termination, and any discharges on or after this date shall be considered in violation of the California Water Code, unless other WDRs or waivers of WDRs regulate the discharge.

VIII. Required Reports and Notices – Third-Party

The Central Valley Water Board or the Executive Officer may require any of the reports and notices to be submitted electronically, as long as the electronic format is reasonably available to the third-party. The third-party shall submit reports and notices in accordance with section IX, Reporting Provisions. Due dates for third-party required reports are summarized in Table 1 at the end of this Order. The third-party must prepare the following reports:

A. Application to Serve as a Third-Party Representing Members

Within 30 days of the effective date of this Order, any group wishing to serve as a third-party must submit a letter to the Executive Officer requesting to serve as a third-party representing Members to carry out the third-party responsibilities. The NOA issued by the Executive Officer will identify the third-party geographic boundaries if the third-party requests to serve as a third-party for a portion of this Order's coverage area. The Executive Officer will consider the following factors in determining whether to approve the request by issuing a Notice of Applicability (NOA) to the third-party:

1. Ability of the third-party to carry out the third-party responsibilities identified in this Order, whether the third-party has clearly identified the geographic area proposed to be covered by the third-party, and should a third-party request to serve as a third-party for only a portion of this Order's coverage area, the reasonableness of the proposed boundaries.
2. Whether the third-party is a legally defined entity (i.e., non-profit corporation; local or state government; Joint Powers Authority) or has a binding agreement among multiple entities that clearly describes the mechanisms in place to ensure accountability to its Members.
3. Whether the third-party has binding agreements with any subsidiary group (e.g., subwatershed group) to ensure any third-party responsibilities carried out by the subsidiary group, including the collection of fees, are done so transparently and with accountability to the third-party and its Members. If the third-party will not rely on any subsidiary group to carry out any of its responsibilities, the third-party must state that in its application letter.
4. Whether the third-party has a governance structure that includes a governing board of directors composed in whole or in part of Members, or otherwise provides Members with a mechanism to direct or influence the governance of the third-party through appropriate by-laws.
5. Should the Central Valley Water Board terminate an organization's role as a third-party or should the third-party submit a notice of termination, the Executive Officer will apply the above factors in evaluating the request of any successor organization to serve as a third-party and determining whether to approve the request by issuing an NOA.
6. A new third party may form to represent growers in an existing third party area, or part of that area, after a NOA has been issued to the existing third-party. The Executive Officer will consider the factors in VIII.A.1-4 above in determining whether to approve the request by issuing an NOA to the new third-party. Prior to acting on the NOA, the Executive Officer will provide the existing third-party with an opportunity to comment on the application by the new third-party group. The new third-party and its Members must take all actions and submit subsequent reports required by the Order on the timeline originally established by the issuance of the NOA to the original third-party group for the area. The proposed new third party must

demonstrate that it can comply with the original time schedule as part of its application to serve as a third-party representing Members. Any required report not submitted by the existing third-party, and due prior to application of the new third-party, must be submitted as part of the application package of the new third-party.

B. Membership (Participant) List

The third-party shall submit a list of its Members to the Central Valley Water Board annually by 31 July of each year. The membership list shall identify Members. The list shall also identify growers that have had their membership revoked and Members that are pending revocation. The membership list shall contain, at a minimum, the following information for each member: all parcel numbers covered under the membership, the county of each parcel, the section, township, and range associated with each parcel, the number of irrigated acres²⁶ for each parcel, the Member's name, mailing address, the contact name and phone number of the individuals authorized to provide access to the enrolled parcels, the name of the farm operator for each parcel, if different from the Member. In lieu of providing Members' phone numbers as part of the membership list, the third-party may provide the office contact name(s) and phone number(s) of a representative of the third-party. Any listed third-party office contact must be available for Central Valley Water Board staff to contact Monday through Friday (except established state holidays) from 8 AM to 5 PM.

C. Templates

The Executive Officer will provide templates to the third-party to distribute to its Members. The templates must be used to comply with the requirements of this Order, where applicable. Prior to providing the third-party with the templates, the Executive Officer will provide the third-party and other interested parties with thirty (30) days to comment on proposed templates. The following templates will be provided; Farm Evaluation; Nitrogen Management Plan; Nitrogen Management Plan Summary Report; Sediment and Erosion Control Plan.

The templates must be used by Members to comply with the requirements of this Order, with the exception of managed wetlands if a template specific to managed wetlands is approved by the Executive Officer. The third-party may submit a written request to the Executive Officer for approval of a Managed Wetland Evaluation Template, within 60 days of issuance of an NOA to the third-party, and a wetland-specific Sediment and Erosion Control Plan Template within 60 days of Executive Officer approval of the Sediment Discharge and Erosion Assessment Report. The Managed Wetland Evaluation Template must include an evaluation of management practices associated with managed wetlands that could affect the quality of surface water or groundwater.

D. Groundwater Quality Assessment Report and Evaluation/Monitoring Workplans

This Order's strategy for evaluating groundwater quality and protection consists of 1) a Groundwater Quality Assessment Report, 2) a Management Practices Evaluation Program, and 3) a Groundwater Quality Trend Monitoring Program. Each of these elements has its own specific objectives briefly described below, with more detail provided in the attached MRP.

1. Groundwater Quality Assessment Report

The Groundwater Quality Assessment Report (GAR) provides the foundational information necessary for design of the Management Practices Evaluation Program, the Groundwater Quality Trend Monitoring Program, and the Groundwater Quality Management Plan. To accomplish this purpose, the GAR must include the following:

²⁶ In the case of seasonal or permanent wetlands, irrigated acres do not include non-irrigated upland habitat areas.

- Assessment of all available, applicable and relevant data and information to determine the high and low vulnerability areas where discharges from irrigated lands may result in groundwater quality degradation,
- Establish priorities for implementation of monitoring and studies within high vulnerability areas;
- Provide a basis for establishing workplans to assess groundwater quality trends;
- Provide a basis for establishing workplans and priorities to evaluate the effectiveness of agricultural management practices to protect groundwater quality; and
- Provide a basis for establishing groundwater quality management plans in high vulnerability areas and priorities for implementation of those plans.

The GAR shall include the elements described in MRP section IV. The GAR may be divided into two phases with the first phase to address groundwater conditions in the region exclusive of the Delta and the second phase to address groundwater conditions underlying the Delta. The first phase of the GAR shall be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board and Central Valley Salinity Coalition within one (1) year of receiving an NOA from the Executive Officer and the second phase of the GAR shall be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board and Central Valley Salinity Coalition within two (2) years of receiving an NOA from the Executive Officer. The phased approach for the GAR does not affect the deadlines for preparation of the farm evaluation or nitrogen management plan summary reports for high vulnerability areas. If the GAR is prepared in two phases, the first phase of the GAR must include a preliminary identification of high vulnerability areas within the designated Delta area to be covered by the second phase of the GAR.

2. Management Practice Evaluation Program Workplan

Upon Executive Officer approval of the GAR, the third-party shall develop, either solely, or as a coordinated effort (see group option below), a Management Practice Evaluation Program Workplan. The workplan must meet the goals, objectives, and other requirements described in section IV of the attached MRP. The overall goal of the Management Practice Evaluation Program (MPEP) is to determine the effects, if any, irrigated agricultural practices have on groundwater under different conditions that could affect the discharge of waste from irrigated lands to groundwater (e.g., soil type, depth to groundwater, irrigation practice, crop type, nutrient management practice). A MPEP must address the conditions relevant to high vulnerability groundwater areas. The third-party may develop the workplan in accordance with one of the options described below.

a. Management Practices Evaluation Program Group Option

The third-party may fulfill its requirements as part of a Management Practices Evaluation Program Group. A Management Practices Evaluation Program (MPEP) Group refers to an entity that is formed to develop and carry out the management practices effectiveness evaluations required of this and other Orders applicable to the irrigated lands in the Central Valley.

At the time the GAR is submitted, the third-party must submit a copy of the agreement of the parties included in the MPEP Group. The agreement must include a description of the roles and responsibilities of each of the organizations in the MPEP Group; identification of the technical experts who will prepare and implement the workplans, along with their qualifications; the person(s) responsible for the timely completion of the workplans and reports required by this Order; and an organizational chart showing the reporting relationships and responsibilities of the participants in the group.

The MPEP Group Workplan shall be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board within one (1) year after written approval of the GAR by the Executive Officer. Alternatively, the third-party may indicate, as part of its GAR submittal, that the third-party is participating in an MPEP Group

whose Workplan will be submitted in accordance with the time frame of another Order applicable to irrigated lands in the Central Valley.

The third-party may use the group option if approved by the Executive Officer. The Executive Officer may disapprove the use of the group option, if 1) the group fails to meet required deadlines or implement the approved workplans, 2) the agreement submitted is not complete, or 3) the agreement submitted is deficient.

b. Third-party Only Management Practices Evaluation Program

Under this option, the third-party MPEP Workplans shall be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board within one (1) year after written approval of each phase of the GAR by the Executive Officer.

3. Groundwater Quality Trend Monitoring Workplan

Upon Executive Officer approval of the GAR, the third-party shall develop a Groundwater Quality Trend Monitoring Workplan. The workplan must meet the goals, objectives, and other requirements described in section IV of the attached MRP. The overall objectives of groundwater trend monitoring are to determine current water quality conditions of groundwater relevant to irrigated agriculture and develop long-term groundwater quality information that can be used to evaluate the regional effects of irrigated agricultural practices. The workplan shall be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board within one (1) year after written approval of each phase of the GAR by the Executive Officer.

E. Sediment Discharge and Erosion Assessment Report

The Sediment Discharge and Erosion Assessment Report shall be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board within one (1) year of receiving an NOA from the Executive Officer. Within 30 days of written acceptance of the Sediment Discharge and Erosion Assessment Report, the third-party shall inform those Members with parcels in areas identified in the report of their obligation to prepare a Sediment and Erosion Control Plan. The Sediment Discharge and Erosion Assessment Report shall include the elements described in MRP section VI.

F. Surface Water Exceedance Reports

The third-party shall provide exceedance reports if surface water monitoring results show exceedances of adopted numeric water quality objectives or trigger limits, which are based on interpretations of narrative water quality objectives. Surface water exceedance reports shall be submitted in accordance with the requirements described in section V.D of the MRP.

G. Monitoring Report

The third-party shall submit the Monitoring Report to the Central Valley Water Board in accordance with the requirements in section V.C of the MRP.

H. Surface Water/Groundwater Quality Management Plan (SQMP/GQMP)

1. SQMP/GQMP General Requirements

SQMP/GQMPs submitted by the third-party shall conform to the requirements provided in the MRP, Appendix MRP-1. Existing SQMPs that were developed and approved under the Coalition Group Conditional Waiver (Conditional Waiver Order R5-2006-0053) continue to apply under this Order and shall be implemented as previously approved. Changes to any management plan may be implemented by the third-party only after approval by the Executive Officer. The Executive Officer may require changes to a management plan if the current management plan approach is

not making adequate progress towards addressing the water quality problem or if the information reported by the third-party does not allow the Central Valley Water Board to determine the effectiveness of the management plan. Members shall comply with the revised management plans once they are approved by the Executive Officer. SQMPs triggered by data gathered under Conditional Waiver Order R5-2006-0053 that were not completed or approved by the Executive Officer prior to adoption of this Order shall be implemented in accordance with MRP-1 of this Order.

For newly triggered SQMP/GQMPs, the third-party shall submit a SQMP/GQMP to the Central Valley Water Board within sixty (60) days. For any SQMP or GQMP that addresses salt or nitrates, the SQMP or GQMP shall also be submitted to the Chair of the CV-SALTS Executive Committee. This 60-day period begins the first business day after the third party's receipt of the field or laboratory results that reported the triggering exceedance. The Central Valley Water Board will post the proposed SQMP/GQMP for a public review and comment period. Stakeholder comments will be considered by Central Valley Water Board staff to determine if additional revisions are appropriate. The third-party may, at its discretion, implement outreach or monitoring contained in a proposed management plan before approval.

The third-party shall ensure continued implementation of SQMP/GQMPs until approved as completed by the Executive Officer pursuant to the provisions contained in the attached MRP, Appendix MRP-1, section III. The third-party shall submit a progress report in compliance with the provisions contained in the attached MRP, Appendix MRP-1, section I.F.

2. Conditions Requiring Preparation of SQMP/GQMP

Surface Water Quality Management Plan (SQMP)

A SQMP shall be developed by the third-party where: (1) an applicable water quality objective or applicable water quality trigger limit is exceeded (considering applicable averaging periods²⁷) twice in a three year period for the same constituent at a monitoring location (trigger limits are described in section VII of the MRP) and irrigated agriculture may cause or contribute to the exceedances; (2) the Basin Plan or Bay-Delta Plan require development of a surface water quality management plan for a constituent or constituents discharged by irrigated agriculture, or (3) the Executive Officer determines that irrigated agriculture may be causing or contributing to a trend of degradation of surface water that may threaten applicable Basin Plan or Bay-Delta Plan beneficial uses.

Groundwater Quality Management Plan (GQMP)

A GQMP shall be developed by the third-party where: (1) there is a confirmed exceedance²⁸ (considering applicable averaging periods) of a water quality objective or applicable water quality trigger limit (trigger limits are described in section VII of the MRP) in a groundwater well and irrigated agriculture may cause or contribute to the exceedance; (2) in high vulnerability groundwater areas to be determined as part of the Groundwater Assessment Report process

²⁷ Exceedances of water quality objectives or water quality triggers will be determined based on available data and application of the appropriate averaging period. The averaging period is typically defined in in the Basin Plan as part of the water quality standard established by the USEPA, or as part of the criteria being used to interpret narrative objectives. If averaging periods are not defined in the Basin Plan, USEPA standard, or criteria, or approved water quality trigger, the Central Valley Water Board will use the best available information to determine an appropriate averaging period.

²⁸ A "confirmed exceedance of a water quality objective in a groundwater well" means that the monitoring data are determined to be of the appropriate quality and quantity necessary to verify that an exceedance has occurred.

(see MRP section IV); (3) the Basin Plan requires development of a groundwater quality management plan for a constituent or constituents discharged by irrigated agriculture; or (4) the Executive Officer determines that irrigated agriculture may be causing or contributing to a trend of degradation of groundwater that may threaten applicable Basin Plan beneficial uses.

If the extent of Member contribution to a water quality exceedance(s) or degradation trend is unknown, the third-party may propose activities to be conducted to determine the cause, or eliminate irrigated agriculture as a potential source instead of initiating a management plan. Requirements for source identification studies are set forth in the MRP, Appendix MRP-1, section I.G.

3. SQMP/GQMP Not Required

At the request of the third-party or upon recommendation by Central Valley Water Board staff, the Executive Officer may determine that the development of a SQMP/GQMP is not required. Such a determination may be issued if there is sufficient evidence indicating that Members discharging waste to the affected surface water or groundwater are meeting the receiving water limitations given in section III of this Order (e.g., evidence indicates that irrigated agriculture does not cause or contribute to the water quality problem).

4. Comprehensive Groundwater Quality Management Plan

In lieu of submitting separate groundwater quality management plans in the timeframe identified in section VIII.H.1, the third-party may submit a Comprehensive Groundwater Quality Management Plan along with its Groundwater Quality Assessment Report. With the exception of the timeframe identified in section VIII.H.1, all other provisions applicable to groundwater quality management plans in this Order and the associated MRP apply to the Comprehensive Groundwater Quality Management Plan. The Comprehensive Groundwater Quality Management Plan must be updated at the same time as the Management Plan Progress Report (see attached MRP, Appendix MRP-1, section I.F) to address any constituents and areas that would have otherwise required submittal of a Groundwater Quality Management Plan.

5. Comprehensive Surface Water Quality Management Plan

In lieu of submitting separate surface water quality management plans in the timeframe identified in section VIII.H.1, the third-party may submit a Comprehensive Surface Water Quality Management Plan or update the Surface Water Quality Management Plan approved under the Coalition Group Conditional Waiver to conform to this Order and MRP. With the exception of the timeframe identified in section VIII.H.1, all other provisions applicable to surface water quality management plans in this Order and the associated MRP apply to the Comprehensive Surface Water Quality Management Plan or an updated Surface Water Quality Management Plan approved under the Coalition Group Conditional Waiver. The Comprehensive Surface Water Quality Management Plan must be updated at the same time as the Management Plan Progress Report (see attached MRP, Appendix MRP-1, section I.F) to address any constituents and areas that would have otherwise required submittal of a Surface Water Quality Management Plan.

I. Technical Reports

Where monitoring required by this Order is not effective in allowing the board to determine the effects of irrigated agricultural waste discharge on state waters or the effectiveness of water quality management practices being implemented, the Executive Officer may require technical reports be provided to determine the effects of irrigated agricultural operations or implemented management practices on surface water or groundwater quality.

J. Notice of Termination

If the third-party wishes to terminate its role in carrying out the third-party responsibilities set forth in section VIII of this Order and other applicable provisions, the third-party shall submit a notice of termination letter to the Central Valley Water Board and all of its Members. Termination of the third-party will occur 30-days from submittal of the notice of termination letter, unless otherwise specified in the letter. With its notice of termination sent to its Members, the third-party shall inform its Members of their obligation to obtain coverage under other WDRs or a waiver of WDRs for their discharges, or inform such Members that they shall cease all discharges of waste to surface water and groundwater.

K. Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Requirements

Approved TMDLs in the Basin Plan that apply to water bodies within the third-party's geographic area and have allocations for irrigated agriculture shall be implemented in accordance with the applicable Basin Plan provisions. Where required, the third-party shall coordinate with Central Valley Water Board staff to develop a monitoring design and strategy for TMDL implementation. Where applicable, SQMPs shall address TMDL requirements.

L. Basin Plan Amendment Workplan

In its Groundwater Quality Assessment Report, the third-party may identify high vulnerability areas that do not meet water quality objectives and where groundwater quality likely would not support a designated beneficial use even in the absence of the discharge of waste. In such cases, the third-party has the option of pursuing a basin plan amendment (or identifying an existing basin plan amendment process) to address the appropriateness of the beneficial use. Should the third-party pursue this option, the third-party shall submit a Basin Plan Amendment Workplan (BPAW) to the Central Valley Water Board within 120 days of the approval of the Groundwater Quality Assessment Report. The BPAW must include a demonstration that the groundwater proposed for de-designation meets any criteria set forth in the Basin Plan that the Board considers in making exceptions to beneficial use designations. The BPAW must be prepared in accordance with the requirements in section V.E of the MRP.

IX. Reporting Provisions

1. Members and the third-party must submit required reports and notices in accordance with the requirements in this Order and attached Monitoring and Reporting Program Order R5-2014-0029, unless otherwise requested by the Executive Officer.
2. All reports shall be accompanied by a cover letter containing the certification specified in section IX.3 below. The cover letter shall be signed by a person duly authorized under California law to bind the party submitting the report.
3. Each person signing a report required by this Order or other information requested by the Central Valley Water Board shall make the following certification:

"I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel or represented Members properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for knowingly submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for violations."

4. All reports prepared and submitted to the Executive Officer in accordance with the terms of this Order will be made available for public inspection at the offices of the Central Valley Water Board, except for reports, or portions of such reports, subject to an exemption from public disclosure in accordance with California law and regulations, including the Public Records Act, California Water Code section 13267(b)(2), and the California Food and Agriculture Code. If the third-party or a Member of the third-party asserts that all or a portion of a report is subject to an exemption from public disclosure, it must clearly indicate on the cover of the report that it asserts that all or a portion of the report is exempt from public disclosure. The complete report must be submitted with those portions that are asserted to be exempt in redacted form, along with separately-bound unredacted pages (to be maintained separately by staff). The Member/third-party shall identify the basis for the exemption. If the Executive Officer cannot identify a reasonable basis for treating the information as exempt from disclosure, the Executive Officer will notify the Member/third-party that the information will be placed in the public file unless the Central Valley Water Board receives, within 10 calendar days, a satisfactory explanation supporting the claimed exemption. Data on waste discharges, water quality, meteorology, geology, and hydrogeology shall not be considered confidential. NOIs shall generally not be considered exempt from disclosure.
5. To the extent feasible, when the Executive Officer directs a Member to submit a report directly to the board, the report shall be submitted electronically to irrlands@waterboards.ca.gov, unless the Member is unable to submit the report electronically. If unable to submit the report electronically, the grower shall mail or personally deliver the report to the Central Valley Water Board. All reports from the third-party shall be submitted electronically to its Central Valley Water Board-assigned staff liaison. Upon notification by the Central Valley Water Board, all reports shall be submitted directly into an online reporting system, to the extent feasible.

X. Record-keeping Requirements

The Member and the third-party shall maintain any reports or records required by this Order for five years. Records maintained by the third-party include reports and plans submitted by Members to the third-party for purposes of complying with this Order. Individual Member information used by the third-party to prepare required reports must be maintained electronically and associated with the Member submitting the information. The maintained reports or records, including electronic information, shall be made available to the Central Valley Water Board upon written request of the Executive Officer. This includes all monitoring information, calibration and maintenance records of sampling equipment, copies of reports required by this Order, and records of all data used to complete the reports. Records shall be maintained for a minimum of five years from the date of sample, measurement, report, or application. This five-year period shall be extended during the course of any unresolved litigation regarding the discharge or when requested in writing by the Executive Officer.

XI. Annual Fees

1. California Water Code section 13260(d)(1)(A) requires persons subject to waste discharge requirements to pay an annual fee established by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board).
2. Members shall pay an annual fee to the State Water Board in compliance with the Waste Discharge Requirement fee schedule set forth at 23 CCR section 2200. The third-party is responsible for collecting these fees from Members and submitting them to the State Water Board on behalf of Members.

XII. Time Schedule for Compliance

When a SQMP or GQMP is required pursuant to the provisions in section VIII.H, the following time schedules shall apply as appropriate in order to allow Members sufficient time to achieve compliance with the surface water and groundwater receiving water limitations described in section III of this Order. The Central Valley Water Board may modify these schedules based on evidence that meeting the compliance date is technically or economically infeasible, or when evidence shows that compliance by an earlier date is feasible (modifications will be made per the requirements in section VI of this Order). Any applicable time schedules for compliance established in the Basin Plan supersedes the schedules given below (e.g., time schedules for compliance with salinity standards that may be established in future Basin Plan amendments through the CV-SALTS process, or time schedules for compliance with water quality objectives subject to an approved TMDL).

Surface water: The time schedule identified in the SQMP for addressing the water quality problem triggering its preparation must be as short as practicable, but may not exceed 10 years from the date the SQMP is submitted for approval by the Executive Officer. The proposed time schedule in the SQMP must be supported with appropriate technical or economic justification as to why the proposed schedule is as short as practicable.

Groundwater: The time schedule identified in a GQMP for addressing the water quality problem triggering its preparation must be as short as practicable, but may not exceed 10 years from the date the GQMP is submitted for approval by the Executive Officer. The proposed time schedules in the GQMP must be supported with appropriate technical or economic justification as to why the proposed schedules are as short as practicable.

This Order becomes effective on 12 March 2014 and remains in effect unless rescinded or revised by the Central Valley Water Board.

I, PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer, do hereby certify the foregoing is a full and correct copy of an Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region on 12 March 2014.

Original signed by Kenneth D. Landau for:

PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer

12 March 2014


Date

Table 1: Summary of third-party and grower deliverables, required timelines, and approximate due date based on the anticipated adoption of the Waste Discharge Requirements for growers within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area on 12 March 2014.

Third-party Requirements		Relative Due Date	Approximate Due Date
Notice of Intent		30 days after WDR's adoption	11 April 2014
<i>EO will issue Notice of Applicability (NOA) to the third-party</i>			
Management Practices Evaluation Program (MPEP) Group Agreement		1 year after NOA	15 April 2015
Provide notice of requirements and Notice of Confirmation to members		30 days after NOA	15 May 2014
Template modification proposal		30 days after EO provides templates	TBD
Groundwater Quality Assessment Report (GAR) outline		90 days after NOA	14 July 2014
List of third-party Members		each year	31-July
Sediment Discharge and Erosion Assessment Report		1 year after NOA	15 April 2015
Comprehensive Groundwater Quality Management Plan		1 year after NOA	15 April 2015
Groundwater Quality Assessment Report (GAR): Phase 1		1 year after NOA; Update every 5 years	15 April 2015
Groundwater Quality Assessment Report (GAR): Phase 2		2 years after NOA; Update every 5 years	15 April 2016
<i>*EO will review Groundwater Assessment Report (GAR) and Sediment Discharge and Erosion Assessment Report</i>			
Monitoring Plan Update		each year/ by 1 August in which monitoring begins	1-August
Management Plan Status Report		each year	1-April
Annual Monitoring Report (with summary of grower reports)		each year	1-May
Membership List		each year	31-July
Inform members required to prepare Sediment Plans		30 days from Sediment & Erosion Report approval	14 July 2015
Management Practices Evaluation Program (MPEP) Group Workplan		1 year from GAR approval	15 July 2016
Groundwater QAPP		1 year from GAR approval	15 July 2016
Groundwater Quality Trend Monitoring Workplan: Phase 1		1 year from GAR approval	15 July 2016
Groundwater Quality Trend Monitoring Workplan: Phase 2		2 years from GAR approval	15 July 2017
Management Practices Evaluation Report		6 years after each phase of MPEP implementation	15 July 2022
Grower Requirements			Approximate Due Date
Enrollment	Members (complete Notice of Confirmation)		15 June 2014
	Non-members (sign up)	120 days after NOA	13 August 2014
Farm Evaluations	Low Vulnerability Areas	updated every 5 years on 15 June	15 June 2015
	High Vulnerability Areas	updated 15 June 2016; annually thereafter	15 June 2015
Nitrogen Management Plan	High Vulnerability Areas	each year	15 June 2015
	Low Vulnerability Areas	each year	15 June 2017
NMP Summary Report	High Vulnerability Areas	each year	15 June 2016
	Low Vulnerability Areas	not required	-
Sediment Plans	High Vulnerability Areas	180 days from Sediment Report approval	11 December 2015
	Low Vulnerability Areas	not required	-

*Approximate review time for approving the Sediment and Erosion Control Report and Groundwater Assessment Report is 60 days and 90 days, respectively.

Figure 1. Map of the San Joaquin County and Delta Area.



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

**ATTACHMENT A TO ORDER R5-2014-0029
INFORMATION SHEET**

**WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS GENERAL ORDER
FOR
GROWERS WITHIN THE SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY AND DELTA AREA
THAT ARE MEMBERS OF A THIRD-PARTY GROUP**

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	1
I. Overview.....	2
II. Introduction.....	2
A. Goals and Objectives of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program.....	3
B. Description of Waste Discharges from Irrigated Lands that may affect Water Quality.....	4
III. Generalized Description of the San Joaquin County and Delta Area.....	4
IV. San Joaquin County and Delta Water Quality Coalition (SJCDWQC) Organization.....	9
A. Grower Participation under the Conditional Waiver and Compliance/Enforcement Activities....	10
B. Grower Enrollment Process.....	10
V. Vulnerability.....	11
A. Groundwater Quality Vulnerability.....	11
VI. Surface Water and Groundwater Monitoring.....	12
A. Surface Water Quality Monitoring.....	12
1. Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program (ILRP) – Surface Water Quality Monitoring.....	12
2. Surface Water Management Plans.....	14
3. Summary of Implemented Management Plans.....	17
B. Groundwater Quality.....	23
1. Groundwater Monitoring Advisory Workgroup.....	23
2. Groundwater Quality Monitoring and Management Practice Assessment, and Evaluation Requirements.....	24
3. Data Summary, Pesticides.....	26
4. Data Summary Nitrates – GeoTracker GAMA.....	27
5. Hydrogeologically Vulnerable Areas.....	28
6. Groundwater Quality Management Plans (GQMPs).....	28
VII. Member Reports.....	29
A. Farm Evaluations.....	30
B. Nitrogen Management Plans.....	31
1. Spatial Resolution of Nitrogen Management Plan and Farm Evaluation Information.....	32
C. Sediment and Erosion Control Plans.....	33
D. Templates for Farm Evaluation, Nitrogen Management Plan, Nitrogen Management Plan Summary Report, and Sediment and Erosion Control Plans.....	34
1. Managed Wetlands.....	34
E. Small Farming Operations.....	36
VIII. Technical Reports.....	36
IX. Reports and Plans.....	37
X. Approach to Implementation and Compliance and Enforcement.....	37
XI. Water Quality Objectives.....	39
A. Implementation of Water Quality Objectives.....	40
XII. Non-Point Source (NPS) Program.....	40
XIII. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).....	42
A. Mitigation Measures.....	43

XIV. Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality Waters in California (State Water Board Resolution 68-16)	43
A. Background	44
B. Application of Resolution 68-16 Requirements to this Order	48
C. Consistency with BPTC and the “Best Efforts” Approach	49
D. Summary	54
XV. California Water Code Sections 13141 and 13241	57
XVI. California Water Code Section 13263.....	59

I. Overview

This attachment to Waste Discharge Requirements General Order for Growers within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area that are Members of a Third-Party group, Order R5-2014-0029 (referred to as the “Order”) is intended to provide information regarding the rationale for the Order, general information on surface and groundwater monitoring that has been conducted, and a discussion of this Order’s elements that meet required state policy.

II. Introduction

There are numerous irrigated agricultural operations within the boundaries of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board) on over 7 million acres. Common to all types of these operations is the use of water to sustain crops. Depending on irrigation method, water use, geography, geology, climate, and the constituents (e.g., nutrients, pesticides, pathogens) present or used at a site, water discharged from the site may carry these constituents as waste off site and into groundwater or surface waters.

The Central Valley Water Board’s Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program (ILRP) was initiated in 2003 with the adoption of a conditional waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) for discharges from irrigated lands. The 2003 conditional waiver was renewed in 2006, and again in 2011. The conditional waiver’s requirements are designed to reduce wastes discharged from irrigated agricultural sites (e.g., tailwater, runoff from fields, subsurface drains) to Central Valley surface waters ([Central Valley Water Board 2011](#)).

In addition to providing conditions, or requirements, for discharge of waste from irrigated agricultural lands to surface waters, the Central Valley Water Board’s conditional waiver included direction to Central Valley Water Board staff to develop an environmental impact report for a long-term ILRP that would protect waters of the state (groundwater and surface water) from discharges of waste from irrigated lands. Although the requirements of the conditional waiver are aimed to protect surface water bodies, the directive to develop a long-term ILRP and environmental impact report is not as limited, as waters of the State include ground and surface waters within the State of California (California Water Code ([CWC](#)), Section 13050[e]).

The Central Valley Water Board completed an [Existing Conditions Report](#) (ECR) for Central Valley irrigated agricultural operations in December 2008. The ECR was developed to establish baseline conditions for estimating potential environmental and economic effects of long-term ILRP alternatives in a program environmental impact report (PEIR) and other associated analyses.

In fall 2008, the Central Valley Water Board convened the Long-Term ILRP Stakeholder Advisory Workgroup (Workgroup). The Workgroup included a range of stakeholder interests representing local government, industry, agricultural coalitions, and environmental/environmental justice groups throughout the Central Valley. The main goal of the Workgroup was to provide Central Valley Water Board staff with input on the development of the long-term ILRP. Central Valley Water Board staff and the Workgroup developed long-term program goals and objectives and a range of proposed alternatives for consideration in a PEIR and corresponding economic analysis. In August 2009 the Workgroup generally
March 2014

approved the goals, objectives, and range of proposed alternatives for the long-term ILRP. The Workgroup did not come to consensus on a preferred alternative.

The Central Valley Water Board's contractor, ICF International, developed the Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR)¹ and Economics Report² for consideration by the board. The PEIR analyzed the range of proposed alternatives developed by the Workgroup. The Draft PEIR was released in July 2010, and the Final PEIR was certified by the board in April 2011 (referred to throughout as "PEIR"). In June 2011, the board directed Central Valley Water Board staff to begin developing waste discharge requirements (orders) that would implement the long-term ILRP to protect surface and groundwater quality. During 2011, the board reconvened the Stakeholder Advisory Workgroup to provide additional input in the development of the orders. Also, during the same time, the board worked with the Groundwater Monitoring Advisory Workgroup to develop an approach for groundwater monitoring in the ILRP.

The board's intent is to develop seven geographic and one commodity-specific general waste discharge requirements (general orders) within the Central Valley region for irrigated lands owners/operators that are part of a third-party group. The first of these orders was adopted in December 2012 for the Eastern San Joaquin River Watershed. The board also adopted a general order for irrigated lands owners/operators that are not part of a third-party group in July 2013, and a third-party group general order for the Tulare Lake Basin in September 2013.

The geographic/commodity-based orders will allow for tailoring of implementation requirements based on the specific conditions within each geographic area. At the same time, the board intends to maintain consistency in the general regulatory approach across the orders through the use of templates for grower reporting, as well as in the focus on high vulnerability areas and areas with known water quality issues. The Order includes provisions to reduce the reporting requirements for areas of low vulnerability.

A. Goals and Objectives of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program

The goals and objectives of this Order, which implements the long term ILRP in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area, are described below. These are the goals described in the PEIR for the ILRP.³

"Understanding that irrigated agriculture in the Central Valley provides valuable food and fiber products to communities worldwide, the overall goals of the ILRP are to (1) restore and/or maintain the highest reasonable quality of state waters considering all the demands being placed on the water; (2) minimize waste discharge from irrigated agricultural lands that could degrade the quality of state waters; (3) maintain the economic viability of agriculture in California's Central Valley; and (4) ensure that irrigated agricultural discharges do not impair access by Central Valley communities and residents to safe and reliable drinking water. In accordance with these goals, the objectives of the ILRP are to:

- *Restore and/or maintain appropriate beneficial uses established in Central Valley Water Board water quality control plans by ensuring that all state waters meet applicable water quality objectives.*
- *Encourage implementation of management practices that improve water quality in keeping with the first objective, without jeopardizing the economic viability for all sizes of irrigated agricultural operations in the Central Valley or placing an undue burden on rural communities to provide safe drinking water.*

¹ ICF International. 2011. Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, Program Environmental Impact Report. Draft and Final. March. (ICF 05508.05.) Sacramento, CA. Prepared for Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Sacramento, CA.

² ICF International. 2010. Draft Technical Memorandum Concerning the Economic Analysis of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program) (Economics Report).

³ PEIR, page 2-6

- *Provide incentives for agricultural operations to minimize waste discharge to state waters from their operations.*
- *Coordinate with other Central Valley Water Board programs, such as the Grasslands Bypass Project WDRs for agricultural lands total maximum daily load development, CV-SALTS, and WDRs for dairies.*
- *Promote coordination with other regulatory and non-regulatory programs associated with agricultural operations (e.g., DPR, the California Department of Public Health [DPH] Drinking Water Program, the California Air Resources Board [ARB], the California Department of Food and Agriculture, Resource Conservation Districts [RCDs], the University of California Extension, the Natural Resources Conservation Service [NRCS], the USDA National Organic Program, CACs, State Water Board Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment Program, the U.S. Geological Survey [USGS], and local groundwater programs [SB 1938, Assembly Bill [AB] 3030, and Integrated Regional Water Management Plans]) to minimize duplicative regulatory oversight while ensuring program effectiveness.”*

B. Description of Waste Discharges from Irrigated Lands that may affect Water Quality

The definition of waste discharges from irrigated lands is provided in Appendix E as: “The discharge or release of waste to surface water or groundwater. Waste discharges to surface water include, but are not limited to, irrigation return flows, tailwater, drainage water, subsurface (tile) drains, stormwater runoff flowing from irrigated lands, aerial drift, and overspraying of pesticides. Waste can be discharged to groundwater through pathways including, but not limited to, percolation of irrigation or storm water through the subsurface, backflow of waste into wells (e.g., backflow during chemigation), discharges into unprotected wells and dry wells, and leaching of waste from tailwater ponds or sedimentation basins to groundwater. A discharge of waste subject to the Order is one that could directly or indirectly reach waters of the state, which includes both surface waters and groundwaters. Direct discharges may include, for example, discharges directly from piping, tile drains, wells, ditches or sheet flow to waters of the state, or percolation of wastes through the soil to groundwater. Indirect discharges may include aerial drift or discharges from one parcel to another parcel and then to waters of the state...”

As described in the definition, there exist multiple potential pathways for wastes from irrigated lands to waters of the state, where such waste discharge could affect the quality of waters of the state. Basic physical processes (e.g., contaminants going into solution in water and gravity) result in water containing waste to flow through soil or other conduits to underlying groundwater or result in water flowing over the land surface into surface water. In addition, material sprayed on the crop (such as pesticides) can drift in the wind and reach surface waters. Since farming takes place on landscapes connected to the surrounding environment (an open system), a farmer cannot prevent these physical processes from occurring. However, a farmer can take steps to limit the amount of wastes discharged and the subsequent effect on water quality.

If an operation believes it is not subject to the requirements of the Order, it may submit a report to the Central Valley Water Board describing the waste discharge (e.g., whether there is a potential to affect groundwater quality). Upon review of the report, the Central Valley Water Board may choose to waive the requirement to obtain WDRs, issue individual WDRs specific to the operation, or seek to enroll the operation under the Order.


III. Generalized Description of the San Joaquin County and Delta Area

The San Joaquin County and Delta Area includes the entire San Joaquin County and portions of Alameda, Contra Costa, Calaveras, Amador, Alpine, and Stanislaus Counties. The general watershed area boundary is a mix of county lines and subwatersheds. The north is bounded by the Sacramento and San Joaquin county lines, lower and upper Mokelumne River watersheds, and the Lower North Fork Mokelumne River. The east is bounded by the crest of the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range. The south is bounded by Upper Calaveras, Rock Creek-French Camp Slough subbasins, and the San Joaquin and

March 2014

Stanislaus County lines. The west is bounded by the San Joaquin Delta subbasin. A full description of the Coalition boundary is found in Finding 3 of the Order and mapped in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1. Generalized Geology of the San Joaquin County and Delta Area – adapted from Thiros (2010)



Surface water either flows to San Francisco Bay through the Delta or is diverted southward through State and Federal water projects and out of the San Joaquin County and Delta Area watershed. The San Joaquin County and Delta Area receives drainage from four major rivers: the San Joaquin River, Stanislaus River, Calaveras River, and the Mokelumne River. The Sacramento River also drains to the Delta, but this system is not within this Order's watershed Area. The eastern tributaries of the Delta drain the Sierra Nevada range from east to west⁴.

Much of the Delta is below sea level and consequently relies on a series of levee systems for protection against flooding. The levees form about 57 islands or tracts surrounded by a network of interconnected sloughs. Many of the islands are 10 to nearly 25 feet below sea level.

The San Joaquin County and Delta Area includes portions of two geomorphic provinces: the Sierra Nevada and Great Valley provinces. Figure 1, Thiros 2010⁵, provides a generalized view of the geology within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area. The Sacramento San Joaquin Delta soils, part of the Great Valley, are mostly composed of basin fill sediments delivered by the rivers and of peat derived from decaying marsh vegetation.⁶ The peat can be as much as 60 feet deep in the extreme western areas, but are generally thickest in backwaters and towards the centers of the islands. Part of the Delta also includes Corcoran Clay deposits, which form confining layer(s) (Figure 2, Bertold, Johnston, Evenson 1991)⁷ in the southern end of the San Joaquin County and Delta Area. Figure 3 from Thiros 2010 is a generalized diagram of the Central Valley, showing the basin-fill deposits and the components of the groundwater system under modern conditions.

⁴ This section is partly adapted from the San Joaquin County and Delta Water Quality Coalition's amended 24 January 2013 Monitoring and Reporting Program Plan.


⁵ Thiros, S.A., 2010. Section 13. Conceptual Understanding and Groundwater Quality of the Basin-Fill Aquifer in the Central Valley, California *in* Conceptual Understanding and Groundwater Quality of Selected Basin-Fill Aquifers in the Southwestern United States. United States Geological Survey Professional Paper 1781.

⁶ USGS, pubs.usgs.gov/circ/circ1182/pdf/11Delta.pdf

⁷ Bertold, G.L., Johnston, R.H., Evenson, K.D. 1991. Groundwater in the Central Valley, California—A summary report. United States Geological Survey Professional Paper 1401-A.

The region also contains all or portions of seven groundwater basins; see Figure 9 for a map of the groundwater basins. The groundwater system is estimated to recharge at a rate of 13.3 million acre feet per year from percolation of precipitation, irrigation and urban return flows, reservoirs and rivers. The discharge or pumping rate of 14.6 million acre feet per year is greater than the recharge rate (Thiros 2010). Primary sources of discharge include irrigation and municipal water supply, discharge to streams and evaporation from shallow depth to groundwater, and evapotranspiration (USGS, Scientific Investigations Report 2010-5175).

Figure 2. Cross-sectional Diagram of Groundwater Confining Layers in the San Joaquin Valley – Bertold, Johnston, and Evenson (1991)



A significant portion of the Delta is covered by peat and peaty alluvium deposited from the Sierra Nevada, Coast Ranges, and Southern Cascade Range providing fertile soil for abundant agriculture and recreation. Presently, a network of interconnected sloughs, mostly defined by more than 1,100 miles of levees that protect farm land from floods and daily high tides. Many of the islands in the Central Delta are presently 10-25 feet below sea level as a result of subsidence caused by decomposition of organic carbon in the peat soils, often due to agriculture activities.⁸ As a consequence of subsidence, the sunken Delta islands must use an extensive network of drainage ditches and pumps to remove agriculture drainage, groundwater seepage, and saline infiltration in order to maintain the water table at a level low enough to sustain agriculture (Figure 4). Without the drainage, the islands would become flooded.⁹ Water levels in the sunken islands are maintained three to six feet below the land surface.⁸

⁸ US Geological Survey, April 2000. Delta Subsidence in California: The sinking heart of the State. USGS Fact Sheet 005-00. <http://pubs.usgs.gov/fs/2000/fs00500/>

⁹ USGS, ca.water.usgs.gov/archive/reports/fs00500/fs00500.pdf

Figure 3. Generalized Diagram for the Central Valley, Showing the Basin-fill Deposits and Components of the Groundwater System under Modern Conditions. Adapted from – USGS (2010-5175); The drilling of thousands of large-diameter irrigation wells through and perforated above and below the Corcoran Clay has connected the upper and lower zones, resulting in a substantial increase in downward leakage. The natural patterns of groundwater movement and the rates of recharge and discharge throughout the Central Valley have been substantially altered by groundwater development and the diversion and redistribution of surface water for irrigation. Recharge from excess irrigation water and discharge from wells for irrigation and public supply are much larger than natural sources of recharge and discharge. Thiros (2010)





Figure 4: Cross section of Delta Island pumping to maintain the water table to sustain agriculture.



Under Conditional Waiver Order R5-2006-0053, (Coalition Group Conditional Waiver) the San Joaquin County and Delta Water Quality Coalition (SJCDWQC) divided the area into six zones based on hydrology, crop types, land use (Figure 12), soil types, and rainfall. Zone names are based on the Core Monitoring location within that zone: 1) Mokelumne River at Bruella Zone, 2) French Camp Slough at Airport Way Zone, 3) Terminous Tract Drain at Hwy 12 Zone, 4) Roberts Island at Whiskey Slough Pump Zone, 5) Lower San Joaquin Zone, 6) Contra Costa Zone, and 7) Union Island Drain at Bonetti Rd. See Table 1 for characteristics of each Zone. For the purposes of this Order, the San Joaquin County and Delta area extends easterly to include acreage in most of Calaveras and Alpine Counties not previously covered under the former Order. There is little agriculture in the Calaveras and Alpine Counties. See Figure 5 for a map of the zones.

Where the San Joaquin County and Delta Area and Sacramento River Watershed area share the Lower Dry Creek Watershed, the third parties will share the responsibility for collecting water quality data to carry out the requirements of the Order. Specifically, the third parties for the Sacramento River Watershed and the San Joaquin County and Delta Area will share responsibility for monitoring the Dry Creek at Alta Mesa Road site because the boundary splits the watershed along the Sacramento and San Joaquin County line. The third parties will use the results to address any water quality issues in their respective portion of the watershed.

Table 1¹⁰. Zone Characteristics in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area

	Zone 1 Mokelumne River at Bruella	Zone 2 French Camp Slough at Airport Way	Zone 3 Terminous Tract Drain at Hwy 12	Zone 4 Roberts Island at Whiskey Slough Pump	Zone 5 Lower San Joaquin	Zone 6 Contra Costa	Zone 7 Union Island at Bonetti Road
Total Acres	268,792	514,151	88,019	157,842	139,696	185,583	125,653
Irrigated Acres	109,510	171,378	70,704	92,369	95,648	428	94,172
Depth to groundwater:							
Weighted average, feet	99	92	17	17	32	30*	9

*only one contour/area data point exists

There are approximately 618,000¹¹ acres of irrigated agricultural land within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area, including non-member acres. Approximately 36,000 of these acres are regulated under the Central Valley Water Board's General Order for Existing Milk Cow Dairies. Approximately 582,000 associated irrigated acres and 5,922¹² growers, not including dairies, but including managed wetlands will require regulatory coverage under this Order or other WDRs or conditional waivers of WDRs. Based on the Existing Conditions Report, the top crop groups grown in the third-party area are listed in descending order (Table 2). This list includes the entire acreage in Cosumnes, Eastern San Joaquin, and Tracy subbasins that may extend beyond the San Joaquin County and Delta Area. Therefore, the tallies represent approximate acreages covered by this Order.

Table 2. Primary Crops grown and approximate acreages within the Cosumnes, Eastern San Joaquin, and Tracy subbasins (Compiled from the Existing Conditions Report. Tables 4-106, 4-107, and 4-108)


Land Use	Approximate Acreage
Field Crops	149,000
Pasture	136,000
Deciduous Fruits and Nuts	123,000
Vineyards	95,000
Truck, Nursery, and Berry Crops	91,000
Grain and Hay	87,500
Dairies	36,000

¹⁰ Table 1 adapted from the 2013 San Joaquin County and Delta Water Quality Coalition Annual Monitoring Report, Table 3.

¹¹ Irrigated acres calculated from the CA Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Geographic Information System data. Differences in total irrigated acres are due to differences in data sources.

¹² Number of growers calculated from the most recent (2007) county USDA Census of Agriculture within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area. For Alameda and Stanislaus counties that are partially within the boundary, 40% and 20% respectively, the percentage was multiplied times the 2007 grower estimate to get an estimated 5,922 growers.

Figure 5. SJCDWQC Zone Boundaries



IV. San Joaquin County and Delta Water Quality Coalition (SJCDWQC) Organization

The San Joaquin County Resources Conservation District (SJCRCD) submitted a Notice of Intent in October 2003 and received a Notice of Applicability (NOA) from the Executive Officer in January 2004. The NOA approved the SJCRCD’s request to operate as a lead entity under the previous Coalition Group Conditional Waiver within its boundaries. Similar to the Coalition Group Conditional Waiver, this Order has been written for a third-party to provide a lead role in conducting monitoring, educating member growers (Members), developing water quality management plans, and interacting with the Central Valley Water Board on behalf of Members. Due to a substantial number of new requirements, this Order requires that the third-party submit a new application to serve as a third-party representing growers under this Order. The Central Valley Water Board anticipates that the SJCDWQC will continue to operate as the third-party lead entity under this Order.

The San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District (SJCRCD) oversees and operates the SJCDWQC, which has monthly standing Steering Committee meetings¹³. The Steering Committee is open to the public and advertised to Members in Coalition newsletters, Farm Bureau newsletters, and mass emails. The Steering Committee consists of Coalition staff, representatives of water districts and

¹³ Spaletta Law, 12 June 2013. Memo to Central Valley Water Board staff: Regarding governance structure for San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District.

industry groups represented in the Coalition, and any other Coalition member that would like to be part of the Steering Committee. Steering Committee agendas and minutes are distributed monthly by mass email. All Coalition business is discussed at the Steering Committee meetings and the Steering Committee makes recommendations which are then presented to the SJCRCD board of directors for final approval. Any member of the Steering Committee, or any member of the Coalition, may attend the SJCRCD board meetings.

A. Grower Participation under the Conditional Waiver and Compliance/Enforcement Activities

The Coalition and Central Valley Water Board has facilitated grower participation in the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program. Consequently, the Coalition has a relatively high participation rate (see Finding 12 in the General Order), and compliance and enforcement action by the Central Valley Water Board related to non-participating growers has been necessary. The Central Valley Water Board has issued 658 postcards informing potential members of the ILRP regulations, 398 Water Code Section 13267 Orders for technical report and 54 Water Code Section 13260 Directives requesting former members to renew their membership to come back into compliance. As a result, additional growers enrolled with the Coalition to comply with the regulations.

Since 2006, there have been 13 water quality complaint investigations in the Coalition area. In one case, the Central Valley Water Board staff investigated a complaint of sediment to Discovery Bay for which the discharger was identified. This resulted in a 13267 Order requiring a technical report describing the actions being taken to prevent future sediment discharges. Staff followed up with the same discharger a year later and found a subsequent discharge of sediment resulting in an Administrative Civil Liability of \$10,000.

Additional landowners were found to be contributing to the Discovery Bay sediment discharges described above. These landowners were also issued Notice of Violation and 13267 Orders requiring similar technical reports. One of these landowners also received an ACL complaint issued for \$23,685, which was later withdrawn in conjunction with the issuance of a Time Schedule Order.

Another complaint that staff followed up on was a sediment discharge into Kellogg Creek, Contra Costa County. Staff issued a Notice of Violation and 13267 Orders. Staff received a technical report outlining measures that would be taken to prevent future sediment discharges from the site.

Additionally, as result of a discharge from a tomato field into Walthall Slough, the Executive Officer issued a Notice of Violation and 13267 Order. The operator submitted a technical report outlining the steps being taken to resolve the issue.

B. Grower Enrollment Process

The enrollment process whereby growers obtain membership in the third-party group under this Order is designed to incentivize speedy enrollment by increasing both submittal requirements and fees due for those that wait to obtain regulatory coverage. Members in good standing when the Order is adopted will have until 15 June 2014 to complete enrollment before additional requirements are initiated. Members in good standing will submit a Notice of Confirmation (NOC) to the third-party, confirming that they would like to continue membership in the third-party and that they are familiar with the Order's requirements. The date is established to allow the third-party to combine their annual membership fees, Farm Evaluation submittal with the NOC submittal, which should streamline its outreach efforts and increase compliance rates for both requirements.

Other growers who are not members of the third-party will submit a membership application to the third-party and will be notified by the third-party when their membership is approved. Growers who are non-Members will be given 120 days (after the NOA is issued by the Executive Officer for the third-party) to enroll directly with the third-party to become Members. A grace period to allow direct enrollment with the

third-party group will streamline the initial enrollment process for the bulk of the irrigated agricultural operations within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area.

Growers that do not enroll or confirm enrollment within the allowable timeframe, or are prompted to apply due to Central Valley Water Board enforcement or inspection, will be required to submit (1) a Notice of Intent (NOI) to comply with the terms and conditions of the Order to the Central Valley Water Board, (2) an administrative processing fee for the increased workload associated with the grower outreach (as applicable), and (3) a Membership application to the third-party group. These additional steps of submitting an NOI and fee directly to the board after the initial enrollment deadline are intended to provide an incentive for growers to enroll promptly. Board staff intends to provide the third-party group with a courtesy copy of the NOA when issued to the grower, so the third-party has confirmation that their Member has received regulatory coverage under the Order.

The third-party will provide an annual Membership List to the Central Valley Water Board that will include everyone who enrolled. The Membership List will specify Members in good standing as well as Members who have failed to meet important responsibilities under the Order. Because third-party pending and revoked memberships could be associated with grower non-compliance with the Order, this type of information is key for the board to prioritize follow-up activities. Board staff will conduct enforcement activities as needed using the Membership list, the information identifying any Members who have failed to meet specific obligations under the Order (see section IV.C.9. of the WDR), and identification of memberships revoked or pending revocation. Requiring the third-party to supply information regarding why a Member was dropped or whether a Member had failed to meet their obligations under the Order makes the process of staff oversight and follow up more efficient. Follow up could include working with the Member to bring them into compliance with the Order or requiring them to get regulatory coverage under the General Order for individual growers (R5-2013-0100). The information provided may also indicate that the third-party group needs to improve their efforts in assisting their Members in complying with the Order.

V. Vulnerability

The concept of higher and lower vulnerability areas was integrated into the Order to allow the board to tailor requirements to applicable waste discharge conditions. Resources can be focused on areas that need enhanced water quality protection, because the third-party has the option to identify low vulnerability areas where reduced program requirements would apply.

Vulnerability may be based on, but is not limited to, the physical conditions of the area (soil type, depth to groundwater, beneficial uses, etc.), water quality monitoring data, and the practices used in irrigated agriculture (pesticide permit and use conditions, label requirements, application method, etc.). Additional information such as models, studies, and information collected may also be considered in designating vulnerability areas.

A. Groundwater Quality Vulnerability

High vulnerability areas for groundwater are those areas that meet the requirements for preparing a Groundwater Quality Management Plan or areas identified in the Groundwater Assessment Report, where available information indicates irrigated lands could cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality objectives or degradation of groundwater quality that may threaten applicable beneficial uses. The Groundwater Assessment Report may rely on water quality data to identify high vulnerability areas and on assessments of hydrogeological conditions and other factors (e.g., areas of high fertilizer use) to identify high vulnerability areas. The third-party is also expected to review readily available studies and assessments of groundwater quality to identify those areas that may be impacted by irrigated agricultural operations. Examples of assessments that the third-party should review include: the Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) Ground Water Protection Areas and the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) Hydrogeologically Vulnerable Areas.

In general, low vulnerability areas for groundwater are areas that do not exhibit characteristics of high vulnerability groundwater areas (as defined in the MRP).

Vulnerability designations will be proposed by the third-party, based on the high and low vulnerability definitions provided in Attachment E of the Order. Vulnerability designations will be refined and updated periodically per the Groundwater Assessment Report and Monitoring Report processes (described in Attachment B, Monitoring and Reporting Program [MRP] Order R5-2014-0029). The Executive Officer will make the final determination regarding the irrigated lands waste discharge vulnerability areas.

VI. Surface Water and Groundwater Monitoring

A. Surface Water Quality Monitoring

1. Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program (ILRP) – Surface Water Quality Monitoring

The SJCDWQC has been operating under a Monitoring and Reporting Program Plan (MRP Plan) prepared according to the Monitoring and Reporting Program Order R5-2008-0005 for Coalition Groups under Amended Coalition Group Conditional Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges from Irrigated Lands Order R5-2006-0053. The MRP Plan, together with the SJCDWQC's Management Plan (described below), is the workplan for the monitoring and reporting program, including environmental monitoring, quality assurance and quality control, outreach, and tracking and reporting on progress.

Under previous MRP Order R5-2008-0005, the SJCDWQC conducted Assessment Monitoring for the condition of the water body, Core Monitoring for trends, Storm event monitoring, and Special Project monitoring for source identification and other studies. Monitoring design was specific to each of the six zones designated in 2008 by the SJCDWQC within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area. The zone designations were based on hydrology, crop types, land use (Figure 12), soil types, and rainfall. Each zone¹⁴ contained one Core Monitoring site and one or more Assessment Monitoring sites. Assessment monitoring sites would rotate every two years. Core Monitoring was designed to evaluate general water quality trends over time at the Core sites and included general physical parameters, nutrients, and pathogens. Assessment Monitoring rotated through Assessment sites and included analyses for a large suite of constituents. Core Monitoring sites underwent Assessment Monitoring every three years. Rain events were monitored twice per year. Special Project Monitoring occurred when the requirement for a management plan was triggered and additional data were needed to identify sources of the exceedances, as well as to assess water quality improvement due to implementation of management practices. Special Project Monitoring also occurred in areas where total maximum daily load (TMDL) studies are required by the Basin Plan. In addition, Special Project Monitoring included monitoring edge of field where management practice effectiveness evaluations took place. Zone 7 will include the monitoring design implemented for zones 1 through 6.

The basic questions to be answered by the updated surface water quality monitoring program are similar to those established under the previous MRP Order (R5-2008-005):

1. Are receiving waters to which irrigated lands discharge meeting applicable water quality objectives and Basin Plan provisions?
2. Are irrigated agricultural operations causing or contributing to identified water quality problems?¹⁵ If so, what are the specific factors or practices causing or contributing to the identified problems?
3. Are water quality conditions changing over time (e.g., degrading or improving as new management practices are implemented)?

¹⁴ Zone 6 has small pockets of agriculture, which drains into one waterbody, Sand Creek. There is Management Plan monitoring at this site due to historic exceedances. The third-party will be required to propose a surface water quality monitoring approach for this zone to ensure that a periodic assessment of irrigated agricultural discharges takes place.

¹⁵ "Water quality problem" is defined in Attachment E.

4. Are irrigated agricultural operations of Members in compliance with the provisions of the Order?
5. Are implemented management practices effective in meeting applicable receiving water limitations?
6. Are the applicable surface water quality management plans effective in addressing identified water quality problems?

The questions are addressed through the following monitoring and information gathering approaches:

1. Together, the "Core" and "Represented" monitoring sites cover all areas, except Zone 6¹¹, of the San Joaquin County and Delta Area with irrigated agricultural operations. The requirement to evaluate materials applied to crops or constituents mobilized by irrigated agricultural operations will result in monitoring of those constituents in receiving waters.
2. The monitoring and evaluation approach required as part of the surface water quality monitoring and management plan development and implementation will address this question (see below and the requirements associated with surface water quality management plans).
3. Both "special project" monitoring associated with management plans and the monitoring conducted at "Core" monitoring sites should be sufficient to allow for the evaluation of trends. The requirements to gather information on management practices will provide additional information to help estimate whether any changes in trends may be associated with the implementation of practices.
4. The surface water monitoring required will allow for a determination as to whether discharges from irrigated lands are protective of beneficial uses and meeting water quality objectives. Other provisions in the MRP should result in the gathering of information that will allow the board to evaluate overall compliance with the Order.
5. The monitoring conducted as part of the implementation of a management plan, in addition to any special project monitoring required by the Executive Officer, should allow the board to determine whether management practices representative of those implemented by irrigated agriculture are effective. In addition, information developed through studies outside of these requirements can be used to evaluate effectiveness.
6. The "special project" monitoring associated with management plans will be tailored to the specific constituents of concern and the time period when they are impacting water quality. Therefore, the water quality data gathered, together with management practice information, should be sufficient to determine whether the management plans are effective.

The surface water monitoring required by this Order's Monitoring and Reporting Program R5-2014-0029 (MRP) has been developed using the SJCDWQC's August 2008 MRP Plan as a foundation. However, a number of changes were made to improve the cost-effectiveness of the surface water monitoring effort and ensure the data collected are the most appropriate for answering the monitoring questions.

The primary changes were to: 1) eliminate the set frequency for monitoring; 2) eliminate the set parameter list for metals and pesticides; 3) change approach to trend monitoring to focus on parameters associated with irrigated agricultural waste discharges; and 4) modify the monitoring approach at previous "Core" and "Rotating" sites.

The rationale for the above changes is as follows:

- 1) The previous requirement to monitor monthly resulted in monitoring during months in which no problems would be expected and infrequent monitoring during peak periods when potential problems could occur. The third-party will be required to evaluate pesticide use patterns and peak times when metals from irrigated agriculture operations may cause problems in surface water. Based on that evaluation, the third-party will propose a frequency and time period to conduct monitoring that will adequately characterize surface waters receiving irrigated agricultural waste discharges.


- 2) The set list of parameters resulted in monitoring of some pesticides and metals that are unlikely to result in water quality problems. Also, in some cases pesticides that could be discharged and cause or contribute to a water quality problem were not monitored. The third-party will be required to evaluate use patterns and properties (e.g., physical-chemical characteristics) and propose a list of metals to monitor. Board staff will work with DPR and qualified scientists, including representatives from, third-party groups, and engage the ILRP Technical Issues Committee (TIC) to develop a process for identifying the list of pesticides for monitoring by the third-party. The third-party will apply the evaluation factors developed in this process to the relevant conditions in each site sub-watershed and will proposed the pesticides to be monitored in its Monitoring Plan Update.
- 3) The general parameters that were monitored as part of previous core monitoring have been of limited value for monitoring trends related to irrigated agricultural waste discharge. Rather than requiring monitoring of general parameters to try to determine trends, trend monitoring will occur as part of management plan monitoring and through more frequent monitoring at “Core” sites.
- 4) The previous requirement included monitoring a broad suite of parameters once every three years on a monthly monitoring schedule. The “trigger” for requiring preparation of a management plan is more than one exceedance every three years. The previous approach reduces the likelihood of identifying and addressing a problem, especially if a problem is primarily prevalent in a single month – a management plan might never be triggered. In addition, by not sampling a broad suite of parameters two out of three years, significant problems related to hydrology or climate could be missed – for example, heavy pest pressure in a non-monitored year could result in heavy pesticide use and higher discharge that would not be identified. The new MRP requires two years of monitoring/two years off at the “Core” monitoring sites (any monitoring triggered by management plans would continue even if a site had an “off” year for monitoring). This approach will ensure that each “zone” includes one or more sites in which comprehensive assessment monitoring is being conducted, which should allow the board to track and identify any significant changes, while not imposing an undue cost burden.
- 5) The previous monitoring program included a set schedule for monitoring at previously identified “Rotating” sites. The MRP for this Order does not establish a set schedule for monitoring “Rotating” sites. Instead, the third-party will monitor as described in Section III of the MRP with monitoring at additional sites (“Represented” monitoring sites) when “Core” site monitoring indicates that there is a water quality problem or as part of special studies and management plans. This change will facilitate a better process for targeted follow-up monitoring where there are water quality problems.

2. Surface Water Management Plans

Since 2004, the SJCDWQC has monitored water quality at 43 sites. Out of more than 34,400 generated data points, about 90% of the results (30,846) could be compared to the defined water quality objectives¹⁶ (for some constituents, the water quality objective has not been defined yet and evaluation is not possible). The majority of results (93%) were below defined water quality trigger limits; 7% of all evaluated results exceeded the applicable trigger limits (a total of 2,085 exceedances). Nearly three-quarters of reported exceedances were for field measurements, drinking water and general physical parameters (Figure 6).

¹⁶ Trigger limits are discussed below under “Water Quality Objectives.”

Figure 6: Proportion of exceedances out of all results that could be evaluated against a defined water quality trigger limit (WQTL), and relative contribution of various categories of analytes to the total number of exceedances.



Under Conditional Waiver Order R5-2006-0053, surface water quality management plans (SQMPs) were required for watersheds where there was an exceedance of a water quality objective or trigger limit more than one time in a three year period. Currently surface water management plans are required for 25 constituents. In addition to field and general chemistry constituents that frequently exhibit exceedances, pesticides, metals, and aquatic and sediment toxicity emerged as parameters of special concern in the Coalition region (Table 3).

Table 3. Summary of ILRP Surface Water Monitoring Data Exceedances/Tests for Management Plan Constituents in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area, 2004 through 2012

Constituent	No. of Sites Requiring a Management Plan	Range of Results ND = Non Detect ¹	Number of Exceedances/ Number of Tests	Trigger limit
Pesticides				
Chlorpyrifos	14	ND to 1.7 ug/L	103/733	0.015 ug/L
DDE	5	ND to 0.48 ug/L	19/475	0.00059 ug/L
DDT	2	ND to 0.4 ug/L	10/475	0.00059 ug/L
Dieldrin	2	ND to 0.11 ug/L	8/485	0.056 ug/L
Disulfoton	1	ND to 0.2 ug/L	4/462	0.05 ug/L
Diazinon	3	ND to 0.45 ug/L	8/623	0.10 ug/L
Diuron	4	ND to 29 ug/L	12/442	2 ug/L
Malathion	1	ND to 0.22 ug/L	6/458	Must not be detected (ND) ¹
Simazine	1	ND to 7 ug/L	4/429	4 ug/L
Thiobencarb	3	ND to 0.57 ug/L	7/279	Must not be detected (ND) ¹
Total HCH	1	ND to 0.019 ug/L	3/96	0.0039 ug/L
Toxicity				
Water, <i>Selenastrum</i>	15	0% to 100% growth ²	74/672	Statistically significant reduction in growth ²
Water, <i>Pimephales</i>	2	0% to 100% survival ²	7/525	Statistically significant reduction in survival ²
Water, <i>Ceriodaphnia</i>	10	0% to 100% survival ²	38/510	Statistically significant reduction in survival ²
Sediment, <i>Hyalella</i>	13	0% to 100% survival ²	65/176	Statistically significant reduction in survival ²
Metals				
Arsenic	5	ND to 35 ug/L	49/339	10 ug/L
Copper Dissolved	2	ND to 11 ug/L	5/214	Variable ³
Copper Total	6	0.16 to 117.6 ug/L	46/300	Variable ³
Lead Total	4	ND to 35 ug/L	17/341	Variable ³
Nutrients & Salts				
Ammonia	1	ND to 10 mg/L	8/519	Variable ⁴
Total dissolved solids	12	9 to 2800 mg/L	210/685	450 mg/L
Specific Conductance	14	8.84 to 3701 uS/cm	337/1114	700 uS/cm
Other				
Dissolved oxygen	20	0.14 to 18.92 mg/L	501/1114	<5 ⁵ or <7 mg/L
<i>E. coli</i>	19	1 to 2400 MPN/100mL	207/672	235 MPN/100mL
pH	10	4.01 to 9.28	63/1113	<6.5 or >8.5

¹ ND = Not detected at measurable levels

² Compared to the control sample

³ Hardness-dependent water quality objectives

⁴ Water quality objectives are dependent on pH and temperature

⁵ Cold freshwater and warm freshwater criteria

3. Summary of Implemented Management Plans

The SJCDWQC has been implementing management plans since 2008 for all sites/parameters that have had two or more exceedances within a consecutive three year period. The Coalition has been focusing on monitoring and management practice implementation at sites identified as High Priority, based on their approved Management Plan strategy. The Coalition developed a schedule to rotate management plans to High Priority, based on requirements in Order R5-2008-0005 and on priorities described in the Coalition’s current Monitoring and Reporting Program Plan. Generally, sampling frequency is coordinated with pesticide use and in the months when exceedances have historically occurred. The High Priority implementation schedules and status are presented in the annual Management Plan Update Reports. The five groups of High Priority sites (Table 4) have approximately three sites each with similar sets of performance goals.

Table 4: High Priority Site List

High Priority No.	Site Name
1	Duck Creek at Hwy 4
	Lone Tree Creek at Jack Tone Rd
	Unnamed Drain to Lone Tree Creek at Jack Tone Rd
2	Grant Line Canal at Clifton Court Rd
	Grant Line Canal near Calpack Rd
	Littlejohns Creek at Jack Tone Rd
3	French Camp Slough at Airport Way
	Mokelumne River at Bruella Rd
	Terminous Tract Drain at Hwy 12
4	Kellogg Creek at Hwy 4
	Mormon Slough at Jack Tone Rd
	Sand Creek at Hwy 4 Bypass
5	Bear Creek at North Alpine Rd
	Roberts Island at Whiskey Slough Pump
6	Drain at Woodbridge Rd

The first High Priority watersheds began management plan implementation in 2008. The second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth High Priority groups began in 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014, respectively. Documentation of progress and effectiveness including performance goals and measures, monitoring, outreach, and management practice implementation for each of the High Priority groups are presented in annual Management Plan Update Reports and in the Annual Monitoring Reports. Effectiveness is measured by using performance goals and measures for prioritized monitoring sites named High Priority. For example, the types of performance goals include grower management practice surveys, identify current management practices, and document management practices that the growers were encouraged to implement, assess water quality results. The Coalition has documented progress in management practices, water quality, and increased outreach to pesticide control advisors, chemical suppliers, and individual and group grower levels. The Coalition conducted approximately 173 individual outreach events (letters, email, site visits, meetings) that included approximately 27 outreach grower meetings in High Priority areas between 2007 and 2012 informing growers of water quality concerns and how to address them by implementing new management practices¹⁷. In addition to discussing exceedances of constituents such as chlorpyrifos and toxicity, the growers within management plan areas completed surveys listing management practices implemented and management practices to be implemented in the future due to information provided by the Coalition. According to the grower surveys, the most common practice implemented in the first priority subwatersheds was reducing the use of pesticides and greater

¹⁷ SJCDWQC Email, Excel spreadsheet, SJCDWQC_CoalitionOutreachTracker_2007-2012.xls

than 50% of those surveyed implemented new management practices (Table 5)¹⁸. After the Coalition engaged the growers, the subsequent surveys in the targeted subwatershed indicated that this management practice was implemented on a greater number of acres than before¹⁹. Other common management practices include, but are not limited to, reducing runoff water volume, installation of sprinkler or micro spray irrigation, installation of retention ponds, and planting of center grass rows or filter strips²⁰.

Table 5: First, second, and third priority site subwatershed acreage with newly implemented management practices.

Member Surveys	First Priority (2008-2010)	Second Priority (2010-2012)	Third Priority (2011-2013)	Acreage Sum	Acreage Percentage
Acreage of Targeted Members	15,183	6,496	6482	28,161	-
Acreage with New Practices	8,282	6,256	6463	21,001	-
Percent of Targeted Acreage with New Practices	55%	96%	99%	75%	-
Management Practices in acres					
Reduce use of the pesticide types found in exceedance	8,398	6,521	4,460	19,379	66%
Reduce runoff water volumes using irrigation management	4,376	6,948	5,892	17,216	58%
Installation of sprinkler or micro irrigation when an option	4,998	1,643	3,509	10,150	34%
Use of center grass rows, grass waterways, or grass filter strips	2,310	2,572	2,130	7,012	24%
Treat runoff waters with PAM or other materials	0	1,748	0	1,748	6%
Installation of retention pond / holding basin / return systems	704	87	205	996	3%


¹⁸ SJCDWQC Management Plan Update Report, April 2013, pp. 83, 85

¹⁹ SJCDWQC Management Plan Update Report, April 2012, p. 70,71

²⁰ SJCDWQC Management Plan Update Report, April 2012, pp-43-45


Management Plan implementation began for the first High Priority sites in 2008. The monitoring results (as percent exceedances) suggest general increasing or decreasing trends, as illustrated in Figure 7 below. Sampling results indicate a general decline in the percent exceedances (chlorpyrifos, diazinon, diuron, simazine, *Selenastrum capricornutum*, and *Ceriodaphnia dubia*) since management plan implementation. *Hyalella azteca* exceedances and copper exceedances increased since implementing the first set of management plans.

Figure 7: Based on the available data, the frequency of exceedances before and after Management Plan implementation show a general decline since implementation of High Priority 1 management plans in 2008. *Hyalella azteca* and copper exceedances appear to be increasing. (n= No. of Tests).




Management plan implementation began in 2010 for the second High Priority sites (Grant Line Canal, Littlejohns Creek). The monitoring results indicate trends, as illustrated in Figure 8 below. According to the available data, with the exception of *Ceriodaphnia dubia* and *Hyalella azteca*, each indicates a general decline in the percent exceedance since management plan implementation.

Figure 8: Based on the available data, the frequency of exceedances before and after Management Plan implementation in general (except *Ceriodaphnia dubia* and *Hyalella azteca*) have decreased since implementation of High Priority 2 management plans in 2010. (n= No. of Tests).



Management Plan implementation began in 2011 for the third High Priority sites (French Camp Slough, Mokelumne River, and Terminous Tract). The monitoring results indicate a decreasing trend in the percent exceedances, as illustrated in Figure 9 below. However, more monitoring data is needed prior to conducting a trend analysis. The analytes depicted are based on the available data.

Figure 9: Based on the available data, the frequency of exceedances before and after Management Plan implementation in general have decreased since implementing the High Priority 3 management plans in 2011. Implementation will continue through 2013 (n= No. of Tests).



Monitoring data for High Priority groups four and five have limited data and will provide a better account in the next few years because these groups started as recently as 2012 and management practices have not been fully implemented or evaluated. Surface water quality monitoring data, management practice effectiveness evaluations are in progress just as they are for the other High Priority sites and are discussed in the Coalition’s Management Plan Update reports.

In addition to pesticides and toxicity, each of the High Priority management plans typically include one or more of other analytes including, pH, specific conductance, dissolved oxygen, *E.coli*, ammonia, and total dissolved solids. These have been prioritized in accordance with the Coalition’s approved Management Plan.

Management Plan Completion Summary:

When a new management plan is triggered at a site, the Coalition records or has already recorded the current state of management practice implementation and then documents subsequent changes in management practices. Following that, additional monitoring beyond the regular core/assessment monitoring is conducted to evaluate changes in water quality and the effectiveness of newly implemented management practices. If results during two consecutive years of monitoring any time after the Management Plans are triggered demonstrate water quality improvement and compliance with water

quality objectives, the site subwatershed/analyte pair were petitioned for management plan completion. Based on the Coalition's 2012 petition for complete management plans and the available water quality data, the Executive Officer has approved 39 management plans as complete encompassing 11 sites and 14 different analytes in 2012 and 2013 approval letters. The Management Plan approval evaluation were generally based on the exceedance frequency, monitoring frequency, and management practice implementation surveys.

Table 6: 2012-2013 Completed management plans. (✓ = approved by Central Valley Water Board)

Site Subwatershed	Selenastrum Toxicity	Copper (Total & Dissolved)	Diazinon	Ceriodaphnia Toxicity	Dissolved Oxygen	Chlorpyrifos	pH	Lead (Total & Dissolved)	Diuron	Specific Conductivity	Dieldrin	Simazine	Pimephales Toxicity	Hyalella Toxicity
French Camp Slough @ Airport Way	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓		✓			
Lone Tree Creek @ Jack Tone Rd	✓	✓	✓		✓				✓	✓				✓
Kellogg Creek along Hoffman Ln		✓		✓	✓	✓								
Mokelumne River @ Brueella Rd	✓	✓		✓	✓									
Grant Line Canal @ Clifton Court Rd		✓					✓	✓						
Sand Creek @ Hwy 4 Bypass				✓	✓	✓								
Duck Creek @ Hwy 4				✓			✓							
Unnamed Drain to Lone Tree Creek @ Jack Tone Rd	✓			✓								✓		
Littlejohns Creek @ Jack Tone Rd	✓			✓										
Terminus Tract Drain @ Hwy 12	✓												✓	
Grant Line Canal near Calpack Rd						✓								

Similar to the previous Order (Coalition Group Conditional Waiver), this Order requires the third-party to develop SQMPs for watersheds where there is an exceedance of a water quality objective or trigger limit more than one time in a three year period. SQMPs may also be required where there is a trend of degradation that threatens a beneficial use. SQMPs will only be required for wastes that may be discharged by some or all of irrigated lands in the identified area. SQMPs are the key mechanism under this Order to help ensure that waste discharges from irrigated lands are meeting Surface Water Receiving Water Limitations, section III.A.1 of the Order. The limitations apply immediately unless the Member is implementing management practices consistent with an approved Surface Water Quality Management Plan (SQMP) for a specified waste parameter in accordance with the time schedule authorized pursuant to section XII of this Order. The SQMP will include a schedule and milestones for the implementation of management practices (see Appendix MRP-1). The schedule must identify the time needed to identify new management practices necessary to meet the receiving water limitations, as well as a timetable for implementation of identified management practices. The SQMP will include a schedule for implementing practices that are known to be effective in protecting surface water quality. The SQMP must also identify an approach for determining the effectiveness of the implemented management practices in protecting surface water quality.

The SQMPs are work plans describing how the third-party will assist their Members in addressing the identified water quality problem; the types of actions Members will take to address the identified water quality problem; how the third-party will conduct evaluations of effectiveness of implemented practices; and document consistency with Time Schedule for Compliance (Section XII of the Order). Executive Officer approval indicates concurrence the SQMP is consistent with the waste discharge requirements and that that the proper implementation of the identified practices (or equivalently effective practices) should result in addressing the water quality problem that triggered the preparation of the SQMP. Approval also indicates concurrence that any proposed schedules or interim milestones are consistent with the requirements in section XII of the Order. If the Executive Officer is assured that the growers in the area are taking appropriate action to come into compliance with the receiving water limitations (as

described in the SQMP), the growers will be considered in compliance with those limitations. Approval of SQMPs does not establish additional waste discharge requirements or compliance time schedule obligations not already required by these waste discharge requirements. Instead, the Executive Officer is approving a method for determining compliance with the receiving water limitations in the affected area. See *Russian River Watershed Committee v. City of Santa Rosa* (9th Cir. 1998) 142 F.3d 1136; *CASA v. City of Vacaville* (2012) 208 Cal.App.4th 1438.

The main elements of SQMPs are to A) investigate potential irrigated agriculture sources of waste discharge to surface water; B) review physical setting information for the plan area such as existing water quality data; C) considering elements A and B, develop a strategy with schedule and milestones to implement practices to ensure waste discharges from irrigated agriculture are meeting Surface Water Limitation III.A.1; D) develop a monitoring strategy to provide feedback on SQMP progress; E) develop methods to evaluate data collected under the SQMP; and F) provide annual reports to the Central Valley Water Board on progress.

Elements A – F are necessary to establish a process by which the third-party and Central Valley Water Board are able to investigate waste sources and the important physical factors in the plan area that may impact management decisions (elements A and B), implement a process to ensure effective practices are adopted by Members (element C), ensure that adequate feedback monitoring is conducted to allow for evaluation of SQMP effectiveness (elements D and E), and facilitate efficient board review of data collected on the progress of the SQMP (element F).

The SQMPs required by this Order require the third-party to include the above elements. SQMPs will be reviewed and approved by the Executive Officer. Also, because SQMPs may cover broad areas potentially impacting multiple surface water users in the plan area, these plans will be circulated for public review. Prior to plan approval, the Executive Officer will consider public comments on proposed SQMPs.

The burden of the SQMP, including costs, is reasonable, since 1) the monitoring and planning costs are significantly lower, when undertaken regionally by the third-party, than requiring individuals to undertake similar monitoring and planning efforts, and 2) the Central Valley Water Board must be informed of the efforts being undertaken by irrigated agricultural operations to address identified surface water quality problems. A regional SQMP is, therefore, a reasonable first step to address identified surface water quality problems.

However, if the regional SQMP does not result in the necessary improvements to water quality, the burden, including costs, of requiring individuals in the impacted area to conduct monitoring, describe their plans for addressing the identified problems, and evaluate their practices is a reasonable subsequent step. The benefits and necessity of such individual reporting, when regional efforts fail, include, but are not limited to: 1) the need of the board to evaluate the compliance of regulated growers with applicable orders; 2) the need of the board to understand the effectiveness of practices being implemented by regulated growers; and 3) the benefits to all users of that surface water of improved water quality.

B. Groundwater Quality

1. Groundwater Monitoring Advisory Workgroup

The Groundwater Monitoring Advisory Workgroup (GMAW) consists of groundwater experts representing state agencies, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), the United States Geological Survey (USGS), academia, and private consultants. The following questions were identified

by the GMAW and Central Valley Water Board staff as critical questions to be answered by groundwater monitoring conducted to comply with the ILRP²¹.

1. What are irrigated agriculture's impacts to the beneficial uses of groundwater and where has groundwater been degraded or polluted by irrigated agricultural operations (horizontal and vertical extent)?
2. Which irrigated agricultural management practices are protective of groundwater quality and to what extent is that determination affected by site conditions (e.g., depth to groundwater, soil type, and recharge)?
3. To what extent can irrigated agriculture's impact on groundwater quality be differentiated from other potential sources of impact (e.g., nutrients from septic tanks or dairies)?
4. What are the trends in groundwater quality beneath irrigated agricultural areas (getting better or worse) and how can we differentiate between ongoing impact, residual impact (vadose zone) or legacy contamination?
5. What properties (soil type, depth to groundwater, infiltration/recharge rate, denitrification/nitrification, fertilizer and pesticide application rates, preferential pathways through the vadose zone [including well seals, abandoned or standby wells], contaminant partitioning and mobility [solubility constants]) are the most important factors resulting in degradation of groundwater quality due to irrigated agricultural operations?
6. What are the transport mechanisms by which irrigated agricultural operations impact deeper groundwater systems? At what rate is this impact occurring and are there measures that can be taken to limit or prevent further degradation of deeper groundwater while we're identifying management practices that are protective of groundwater?
7. How can we confirm that management practices implemented to improve groundwater quality are effective?

The workgroup members reached consensus that the most important constituents of concern related to agriculture's impacts to the beneficial uses of groundwater are nitrate (NO₃-N) and salinity. In addition to addressing the widespread nitrate problems, the presence of nitrates in groundwater at elevated levels would serve as an indicator of other potential problems associated with irrigated agricultural practices. Central Valley Water Board staff utilized the recommended salinity and nitrate parameters and added general water quality parameters contained within a majority of the groundwater monitoring programs administered by the board (commonly measured in the field) and some general minerals that may be mobilized by agricultural operations (general minerals to be analyzed once every five years in Trend wells). The general water quality parameters will help in the interpretation of results and ensure that representative samples are collected. The board considered the above questions in developing the Order's groundwater quality monitoring and management practices assessment, and evaluation requirements.

2. Groundwater Quality Monitoring and Management Practice Assessment, and Evaluation Requirements

The groundwater quality monitoring, assessment, and evaluation requirements have been developed in consideration of the critical questions developed by the Groundwater Monitoring Advisory Workgroup (listed above). The third-party must collect sufficient data to describe irrigated agricultural impacts on groundwater quality and to determine whether existing or newly implemented management practices comply with the groundwater receiving water limitations of the Order. The strategy for evaluating

²¹ Groundwater Monitoring Data Needs for the ILRP (25 August 2011). Available at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/irrigated_lands/new_waste_discharge_requirements/stakeholder_advisory_workgroup/2011sept30_advrsry_wkgrp_mtg/gmaw_25aug_data_needs.pdf

groundwater quality and protection consists of: 1) a Groundwater Quality Assessment Report (GAR), 2) a Management Practices Evaluation Program, and 3) a Groundwater Quality Trend Monitoring Program.

The general purpose of the Groundwater Quality Assessment Report is to analyze existing monitoring data and provide the foundation for designing the Management Practices Evaluation Program and the Groundwater Quality Trend Monitoring Program, as well as identifying high vulnerability groundwater areas where a groundwater quality management plan must be developed and implemented.

A Management Practices Evaluation Program (MPEP) is to be developed where known groundwater quality impacts exist for which irrigated agricultural operations are a potential contributor or where conditions make groundwater more vulnerable to impacts from irrigated agricultural activities (high vulnerability areas). The purpose of the MPEP is to identify whether existing site-specific and/or commodity-specific agricultural management practices are protective of groundwater quality in the high vulnerability areas and to assess the effectiveness of any newly implemented management practices instituted to improve groundwater quality. Given the wide range of management practices/commodities within the third-party's boundaries, it is anticipated that the third-party will rank or prioritize its high vulnerability areas and commodities, and present a phased approach to implementing the MPEP. The MPEP must be designed to answer GMAW questions 2, 5, 6, and 7. Where applicable, management practices identified as protective of groundwater quality through the MPEP (or equivalent practices) must be implemented by Members, whether the Member is in a high or low vulnerability area (see section IV.B.20 of the Order).

Since the focus of the MPEP is answering the questions related to management practices, the method or tools to be used are not prescribed by the board. The third-party is required to develop a workplan that describes the tools or methods to be used to associate management practice activities on the land surface with the effect of those activities on underlying groundwater quality. The board anticipates that the MPEP workplan will likely propose using a variety of tools, such as vadose zone monitoring, modeling, and groundwater monitoring. The third-party has the option of developing the workplan as part of a group effort that may include other agricultural water quality coalitions and commodity groups. Such a joint effort may avoid duplication of effort and allow collective resources to be more effectively focused on the highest priority studies, while ensuring the goals of the MPEP are met. Existing monitoring wells can be utilized where available for the MPEP.

The trend monitoring program is designed to determine current water quality conditions of groundwater in the third-party area, and to develop long-term groundwater quality information that can be used to evaluate the regional effects (i.e., not site-specific effects) of irrigated agriculture and its practices. Trend monitoring has been developed to answer GMAW questions 1 and 4. At a minimum, trend monitoring must include annual monitoring for electrical conductivity, pH, dissolved oxygen, temperature, nitrate as nitrogen (N), and once every five year monitoring for total dissolved solids, carbonate, bicarbonate, chloride, sulfate, boron, calcium, sodium, magnesium, and potassium. Existing shallow wells, such as domestic supply wells, will be used for the trend groundwater monitoring program. The use of existing wells is less costly than installing wells specifically designed for groundwater monitoring, while still yielding data which can be compared with historical and future data to evaluate long-term groundwater trends.

As the management practices identified as protective of groundwater quality through the MPEP are implemented, the trend monitoring, together with other data included in updates to the GAR, should show improvements in water quality. The trend monitoring and GAR updates will, therefore, provide a regional view as to whether the collective efforts of Members are resulting in water quality improvements. If groundwater quality trends indicate degradation in low vulnerability areas, then a Groundwater Quality Management Plan must be developed and implemented. Negative trends of groundwater quality in high vulnerability areas over time would be an indicator that the existing Groundwater Quality Management Plan is not effective or is not being effectively implemented.

The third-party may also look to and explore using existing monitoring networks such as those being conducted in accordance with local groundwater management plans (e.g., AB 3030, SB 1938, Integrated Regional Water Management Plans).

GMAW question 3, which seeks to differentiate sources of existing impact, cannot be easily answered by traditional groundwater monitoring. The MPEP and trend monitoring will help to answer this question, but other methods such as isotope tracing and groundwater age determination may also be necessary to fully differentiate sources. The MRP does not require these advanced source methods because they are not necessary to determine compliance with the Order. The MPEP will be used to help determine whether waste discharge at represented sites is of high enough quality to meet the groundwater limitations of the Order.

Through the MPEP, the potential impacts of irrigated agriculture waste discharges to groundwater will be assessed for different types of practices and site conditions, representative of discharge conditions throughout the San Joaquin County and Delta area. In this way, the board will evaluate whether waste discharges from irrigated agricultural operations are protective of groundwater quality throughout the San Joaquin County and Delta area. Where the MPEP finds that additional “protective” practices must be implemented in order to ensure that Member waste discharges are in compliance with the Order’s receiving water limitations, the Order requires Members to implement such practices, or equivalent practices. This representative MPEP process will ensure that the effects of waste discharges are evaluated and where necessary, additional protective practices are implemented.

3. Data Summary, Pesticides

Monitoring conducted by the State Water Resources Control Board and the USGS in 2005 showed detections of pesticides used by agriculture in groundwater within the Northern San Joaquin Basin Groundwater study unit. A relatively small portion of this study area is outside of the San Joaquin County and Delta Area.²² Pesticides and pesticide degradates were detected in 49 percent of wells in the Northern San Joaquin GAMA study unit in 2005. Most frequently detected pesticide and pesticide degradates in descending order include simazine, deethylatrazine (degradate of atrazine), atrazine, and DBCP (banned in California in 1979). Most pesticide detections were below health-based thresholds and applicable water quality objectives. Analyses were not run for all pesticides used in the study areas.

The California Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR), as part of its regulatory requirements under the Pesticide Contamination Prevention Act (PCPA) enacted in 1985, is required to maintain a statewide database of wells sampled for pesticide active ingredients and, in consultation with the California Department of Public Health (DPH) and the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), provide an annual report of the data contained in the database and the actions taken to prevent pesticides contamination to the Legislature and other state agencies. These data will be evaluated by the third-party as part of its Groundwater Quality Assessment Report.

DPR also initiated the Ground Water Protection Program that focuses on evaluating the potential for pesticides to move through soil to groundwater, improving contaminant transport modeling tools, and outreach/training programs for pesticide users. There are approximately 128,000 acres of irrigated lands in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area within DPR Groundwater Protection Areas (GWPA). Of the 128,000 acres, approximately 92,000 acres of the irrigated lands are within DPR GWPA that are characterized as vulnerable to leaching of pesticides (leaching areas), approximately 22,000 acres are within GWPA that are characterized as vulnerable to movement of pesticides to groundwater by runoff from fields to areas where they may move to groundwater (runoff areas), and 14,000 acres of irrigated

²² Bennett, G.L., and Belitz, K., and Milby-Dawson, B.J., 2006. Ground-water quality data in the Northern San Joaquin Basin Study Unit, 2006: Results from the California GAMA Program: U.S. Geological Survey Data Series 196, page 21, 138 pp. Available at <http://pubs.usgs.gov/ds/2006/196/>.

lands are characterized as both leaching and runoff areas. See Figure 10 for a map of the Groundwater Protection Areas within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area.

DPR's current groundwater quality monitoring program should be sufficient to identify any emerging pesticides of concern and to track water quality trends of identified pesticides of concern. However, the presence of pesticides in groundwater indicates a discharge of waste subject to Water Board regulation. Therefore, should the board or DPR identify groundwater quality information needs related to pesticides in groundwater, the board may require the third-party to conduct studies or implement a monitoring plan to address those information needs. Where additional information collected indicates a groundwater quality problem, a coordinated effort with DPR to address the identified problem will be initiated and the board may require the third party to develop a groundwater quality management plan (GQMP).

4. Data Summary Nitrates – GeoTracker GAMA

The State Water Board's GeoTracker GAMA (Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment) online information system integrates groundwater data from multiple sources, such as GAMA, DPR, Department of Water Resources (DWR), USGS, Department of Public Health (DPH), and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. Staff queried GeoTracker GAMA. The GeoTracker GAMA system provides data for over 100,000 sampling locations state-wide and analytical results for a variety of constituents including nitrate. In January 2012 there were 22,813 nitrate results in GeoTracker GAMA within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area. These results were collected from environmental monitoring wells and water supply wells (71 percent of the samples were collected from water supply wells). The samples considered in this summary were collected from 1943 through 2012, although 88 percent of the samples were collected in years 2000 or later. Samples were collected within all 7 counties in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area, although most were collected in San Joaquin County (88 percent), followed by Contra Costa (8 percent), and Calaveras, Amador, Stanislaus, Alpine and Alameda Counties (4 percent).

Sample collection depth information is not available for download from GeoTracker GAMA. However, 65 percent (14,733) of the samples were collected by DPH from water supply wells. DPH monitors water quality in public supply wells, which are typically hundreds to thousands of feet deep and pump large volumes of water from deeper aquifers. This indicates that this particular set of 14,733 nitrate results focuses primarily on conditions in deeper groundwaters. Since DPH primarily monitors active municipal supply wells, wells that have excessive nitrates (that are not treated or blended with better quality water) are generally taken out of water supply service, so monitoring ceases. Therefore, DPH data for active municipal wells generally do not include nitrate-contaminated wells. Additional data collected at shallower depths (where applicable) may be needed to adequately assess current groundwater quality conditions in the area.

Seven percent of sample results for all GAMA well data for the San Joaquin County and Delta Area were greater than the nitrate drinking water standard of 45 mg/L (as nitrate). An additional 24 percent of results fell between the drinking water standard and half of the standard (22.5 mg/L).

Of the 2,780 samples collected from 1943 through 1999, three percent were greater than the nitrate drinking water standard and an additional 19 percent fell between the drinking water standard and half of the standard. Of the 20,033 samples collected 2000 through 2012, six percent were greater than the nitrate drinking water standard and an additional 25 percent fell between the drinking water standard and half of the standard.

All nitrate results collected between 1984 and 2012 were reported by DPH or USGS. Of the 7,425 nitrate results reported by groups other than DPH and USGS that were collected 2001 through 2012, 11 percent were greater than the nitrate drinking water standard and an additional 10 percent fell between the standard and half of the standard.

There were 724 square-mile sections of land (township, range, and section or TRS) within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area with nitrate results in the GeoTracker GAMA dataset. When data were analyzed per TRS, four percent of sampled sections had an average nitrate level above the drinking water standard and an additional 16 percent of sections had an average nitrate level between 22.5 and 45 mg/L. Twenty percent of sampled sections had a maximum nitrate level above 45 mg/L and an additional twenty percent of sampled sections had a maximum level between 22.5 and 45 mg/L. See Figure 11 for a map showing the maximum nitrate result per square mile section of land with detections between years 2000 and 2012.

5. Hydrogeologically Vulnerable Areas

In 2000, the State Water Resources Control Board created a map showing locations where published hydrogeologic information indicated conditions that may be more vulnerable to groundwater contamination. They termed these areas “Hydrogeologically Vulnerable Areas.” The map identifies areas where geologic conditions allow recharge to underlying water supply aquifers at rates or volumes substantially higher than in lower permeability or confined areas of the same groundwater basin. The map does not include hydrogeologically vulnerable areas where local groundwater supplies occur mainly in the fractured igneous and metamorphic rocks which underlie the widespread mountain and foothill regions of the Sierra Nevada, or in permeable lava flows which may provide primary recharge for extensive but sparsely populated groundwater basins. See Figure 10 for a map of the hydrogeologically vulnerable areas within the third-party region.

6. Groundwater Quality Management Plans (GQMPs)

Under this Order, groundwater quality management plans will be required where there are exceedances of water quality objectives, where there is a trend of degradation²³ that threatens a beneficial use, as well as for “high vulnerability groundwater areas” (to be designated by the third-party in the Groundwater Assessment Report based on definitions provided in Attachment E).

Instead of development of separate GQMPs, the Order allows for the submittal of a comprehensive GQMP along with the Groundwater Assessment Report. GQMPs will only be required if irrigated lands may cause or contribute to the groundwater quality problem. GQMPs are the key mechanism under this Order to help ensure that waste discharges from irrigated lands are meeting Groundwater Receiving Water Limitation III.B. The limitations apply immediately unless the Member is implementing management practices consistent with an approved Groundwater Quality Management Plan (GQMP) for a specified waste in accordance with the time schedule authorized pursuant to section XII of this Order. The GQMP will include a schedule and milestones for the implementation of management practices (see Appendix MRP-1). The schedule must identify the time needed to identify new management practices necessary to meet the receiving water limitations, as well as a timetable for implementation of identified management practices. The MPEP will be the process used to identify the effectiveness of management practices, where there is uncertainty regarding practice effectiveness under different site conditions. However, the GQMP will also be expected to include a schedule for implementing practices that are known to be effective in partially or fully protecting groundwater quality. For example, the ratio of total nitrogen available to crop consumption of nitrogen that is protective of water quality may not be known for different site conditions and crops. However, accounting for the amount of nitrate in irrigation supply water is known to be an effective practice at reducing the amount of excess nitrogen applied.

The GQMPs are work plans describing how the third-party will assist their Members in addressing the identified water quality problem; the types of actions Members will take to address the identified water

²³ A trend in degradation could be identified through the required trend monitoring or through the periodic updates of the Groundwater Quality Assessment Report.

quality problem; how the third-party will conduct evaluations of effectiveness of implemented practices; and document consistency with Time Schedule for Compliance (Section XII of the Order). Executive Officer approval indicates concurrence the GQMP is consistent with the waste discharge requirements and that the proper implementation of the identified practices (or equivalently effective practices) should result in addressing the water quality problem that triggered the preparation of the GQMP. Approval also indicates concurrence that any proposed schedules or interim milestones are consistent with the requirements in section XII of the Order. If the Executive Officer is assured that the growers in the area are taking appropriate action to come into compliance with the receiving water limitations (as described in the GQMP), the growers will be considered in compliance with those limitations. Approval of GQMPs does not establish additional waste discharge requirements or compliance time schedule obligations not already required by these waste discharge requirements. Instead, the Executive Officer is approving a method for determining compliance with the receiving water limitations in the affected area. See *Russian River Watershed Committee v. City of Santa Rosa* (9th Cir. 1998) 142 F.3d 1136; *CASA v. City of Vacaville* (2012) 208 Cal.App.4th 1438.

The main elements of GQMPs are to A) investigate potential irrigated agricultural sources of waste discharge to groundwater, B) review physical setting information for the plan area such as geologic factors and existing water quality data, C) considering elements A and B, develop a strategy with schedules and milestones to implement practices to ensure discharge from irrigated lands are meeting Groundwater Receiving Water Limitation III.B, D) develop a monitoring strategy to provide feedback on GQMP progress, E) develop methods to evaluate data collected under the GQMP, and F) provide reports to the Central Valley Water Board on progress.

Elements A – F are necessary to establish a process by which the third-party and Central Valley Water Board are able to investigate waste sources and the important physical factors in the plan area that may impact management decisions (elements A and B), implement a process to ensure effective practices are adopted by Members (element C), ensure that adequate feedback monitoring is conducted to allow for evaluation of GQMP effectiveness (elements D and E), and facilitate efficient board review of data collected on the progress of the GQMP (element F).

This Order requires the third-party to develop GQMPs that include the above elements. GQMPs will be reviewed and approved by the Executive Officer. Also, because GQMPs may cover broad areas potentially impacting multiple groundwater users in the plan area, these plans will be circulated for public review. Prior to plan approval, the Executive Officer will consider public comments on proposed GQMPs.

In accordance with Water Code section 13267, the burden of the GQMP, including costs, is reasonable, since 1) the monitoring and planning costs are significantly lower when undertaken regionally by the third-party than requiring individual Members to undertake similar monitoring and planning efforts, and 2) the Central Valley Water Board must be informed of the efforts being undertaken by Members to address identified groundwater quality problems. A regional GQMP is, therefore, a reasonable first step to address identified groundwater quality problems.

However, if the regional GQMP does not result in the necessary improvements to water quality, the burden, including costs, of requiring individual Members in the impacted area to conduct monitoring, describe their plans for addressing the identified problems, and evaluate their practices is a reasonable subsequent step. The benefits and necessity of such individual reporting, when regional efforts fail, include, but are not limited to: 1) the need of the board to evaluate the compliance of regulated Members with applicable orders; 2) the need of the board to understand the effectiveness of practices being implemented by Members; and 3) the benefits of improved groundwater quality to all users.

VII. Member Reports

The Order requires that Members prepare farm plans and reports as described below. The Order establishes prioritization for Member completion and updating of the farm plans and reports based on March 2014

whether the operation is within a high or low vulnerability area. The Central Valley Water Board intends to provide templates for Member reports to the third-party, and the third-party will have an opportunity to comment on the template applicability to its geographic area.

A. Farm Evaluations

The Order requires that all Members complete a farm evaluation describing management practices implemented to protect surface and groundwater quality. The evaluation also includes information such as location of the farm, surface water discharge points, location of in service wells and abandoned wells and whether wellhead protection practices have been implemented.

The Order requires all members to complete the Farm Evaluation and submit it with the annual membership renewal and Notice of Confirmation. Concurrent due date for the Notice of Confirmation and Farm Evaluation and annual membership renewal in the third-party will allow the third-party to more efficiently outreach to its growers and ensure timely submittal of both documents. The schedule for completing subsequent Farm Evaluations is based on whether the operation is within a high or low vulnerability area. Farm evaluations must be maintained at the Member's farming operations headquarters or primary place of business and submitted to the third-party for summary reporting to the Central Valley Water Board.

The farm evaluation is intended to provide the third-party and the Central Valley Water Board with information regarding individual Member implementation of the Order's requirements. Without this information, the board would rely solely on representative surface and groundwater monitoring to determine compliance with water quality objectives. The board would not be able to determine through representative monitoring by itself whether all Members are implementing protective practices, such as wellhead protection measures for groundwater. For groundwater protection practices, it may take years in many areas (even decades in some areas) before broad trends in groundwater may be measured and associated with implementation of this Order. Farm evaluations will provide evidence that Members are implementing management practices to protect groundwater quality while Groundwater Quality Trend Monitoring data and Management Practices Evaluation Program (MPEP) information are collected.

The reporting of practices identified in the farm evaluation will allow the third-party and board to effectively implement the MPEP. Evaluating management practices at representative sites (in lieu of farm-specific monitoring) only works if the results of the monitored sites can be extrapolated to non-monitored sites. One of the key ways to extrapolate those results will be to have an understanding of which farming operations have practices similar to the site that is monitored. The reporting of practices will also allow the board to determine whether the GQMP is being implemented by Members according to the approved schedule.

In addition, reporting of practices will allow the third-party and board to evaluate changes in surface water quality relative to changes in practices. The SQMP will include a schedule and milestones for the implementation of practices to address identified surface water quality problems. The reporting of practices will allow the board to determine whether the SQMP is being implemented by Members according to the approved schedule. Absent information on practices being implemented by Members, the board would not be able to determine whether individual Members are complying with the Order.

The focus of the reporting is on parcels in high vulnerability areas. The Central Valley Water Board needs to have an understanding of whether Members are improving practices in those areas where surface or groundwater quality are most impacted (or potentially impacted). Reporting frequency is annual for all sizes of farming operations in high vulnerability areas. The reporting frequency is every five years for all farming operations in low vulnerability areas. The Executive Officer is given the discretion to reduce the reporting frequency for Members in high vulnerability areas, if there are minimal year to year changes in the practices reported and the implemented practices are protective of water

quality. This discretion is provided, since the reporting burden would be difficult to justify given the costs if there were minimal year to year changes in the information provided.

While the focus of the reporting is on high vulnerability areas, the MPEP requirement affects management practices implemented in both high and low vulnerability areas. Management practices identified as protective of groundwater quality through the MPEP (or equivalent practices) must be implemented by Members, where applicable, whether the Member is in a high or low vulnerability area (see section IV.B.21 of the Order).

B. Nitrogen Management Plans

Nitrate derived from both agricultural and non-agricultural sources has resulted in degradation and/or pollution of groundwater beneath agricultural areas in California's Central Valley.²⁴ As shown in Figure 11, there are a number of wells within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area with nitrate concentrations that are higher than drinking water quality objectives. To address these concerns, the Order requires that Members implement practices that minimize excess nitrogen application relative to crop consumption. Proper nutrient management will work to reduce excess plant nutrients, such as nitrogen, from reaching state waters. Nitrogen management must take site-specific conditions into consideration in identifying steps that will be taken and practices that will be implemented to minimize nitrate movement through surface runoff and leaching past the root zone.

All Members will be required to complete a nitrogen management plan according to the schedule in the Order. Growers in low vulnerability areas are required to prepare nitrogen management plans, but do not need to certify the plans or provide summary reports to the third-party. Should the groundwater vulnerability designation change from "low" to "high" vulnerability, those Members in the previously designated low vulnerability area would then need to have their nitrogen management plan certified and submit summary reports in accordance with a schedule issued by the Executive Officer.

For all Members, the plan must be maintained at the Member's farming operations headquarters or primary place of business.

For Members located within a high vulnerability groundwater area, for which nitrate is identified as a constituent of concern, the plan must be certified in one of the following ways²⁵:

- Self-certified by the Member who attends a California Department of Food and Agriculture or other Executive Officer approved training program for nitrogen plan certification. The Member must retain written documentation of their attendance in the training program; or
- Self-certified by the Member that the plan adheres to a site-specific recommendation from the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) or the University of California Cooperative Extension. The Member must retain written documentation of the recommendation provided; or
- Certified by a nitrogen management plan specialist as defined in Attachment E of this Order. Such specialists include Professional Soil Scientists, Professional Agronomists, Crop Advisors²⁶ certified

²⁴ ICF International. 2011. *Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program - Program Environmental Impact Report*. Final and Draft. March. (ICF 05508.05.) Sacramento, CA. Prepared for Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Sacramento, CA. Appendix A, page 46.

²⁵ The certification for Members is required by 15 June 2016. The Groundwater Quality Assessment Report, which identifies high vulnerability areas, would not be due until after 15 June 2015, therefore, Members would not know whether they are in a high vulnerability area until after the initial 1 March 2015 due date for the Nitrogen Management Plan.

²⁶ Should the California Department of Food and Agriculture and the California Certified Crop Adviser's establish a specific nitrogen management certification, any Certified Crop Adviser who certifies a nitrogen management plan must have a nitrogen management certification.

by the American Society of Agronomy, or Technical Service Providers certified in nutrient management in California by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS).

- Certified in an alternative manner approved by the Executive Officer. Such approval will be provided based on the Executive Officer's determination that the alternative method for preparing the nitrogen management plan meets the objectives and requirements of this Order.

The Order requires nitrogen management reporting (nitrogen management plan summary reports) for Members in high vulnerability groundwater areas. The first nitrogen management plan summary report must be submitted one year after the first nitrogen management plan must be developed. The nitrogen management plan summary report provides information based on what was actually done the previous crop year, while the plan indicates what is planned for the upcoming crop year. Therefore, the first summary report is due the year following the implementation of the first nitrogen management plan. This reporting will provide the third-party and the Central Valley Water Board with information regarding individual Member implementation of the Order's requirements. Without this information, the board would rely primarily on groundwater monitoring to determine compliance with water quality objectives. Groundwater monitoring alone would not provide a real-time indication as to whether individual Members are managing nutrients to protect groundwater. Improved nitrogen management may take place relatively quickly, although it may take many years before broad trends in nitrate reduction in groundwater may be measured. Nitrogen management reporting will provide evidence that Members are managing nutrients to protect groundwater quality while trend data and Management Practices Evaluation Program (MPEP) information are collected.

1. Spatial Resolution of Nitrogen Management Plan and Farm Evaluation Information

The Order requires reporting to the Central Valley Water Board of nitrogen management information and management practices identified through the farm evaluation. These data are required to be associated with the township (36 square mile area) where the farm is located. The spatial resolution by township provides a common unit that should facilitate analysis of data and comparisons between different areas.

Information collected from nitrogen management summary reports will be provided annually. The nitrogen management data collected by the third-party from individual Members will be aggregated by the township where the enrolled parcel is located and will not be associated with the Member or their enrolled parcel. For example, the third-party may have information submitted for 180 different parcels in a given township. At a minimum, the board would receive a statistical summary of those 180 data records describing the range, percentiles (10th, 25th, 50th, 75th, 90th), and any outliers for similar soil conditions and similar crops in that township. A box and whisker plot or equivalent tabular or graphical presentation of the data approved by the Executive Officer may be used. Based on this analysis, the Central Valley Water Board intends to work with the third-party to ensure that those Members who are not meeting the nitrogen management performance standards identified in the Order improve their practices. As part of its annual review of the monitoring report submitted by the third-party, the board will evaluate the effectiveness of third-party outreach efforts, and trends associated with nitrogen management. The board intends to request information from the third-party for those Members who, based on the board's evaluation of available information, do not appear to be meeting nitrogen management performance standards. The reporting of nitrogen management data may be adjusted based on the outcomes of the efforts of the State Water Resources Control Board's Expert Panel and the California Department of Food and Agriculture's Nitrogen Tracking and Reporting System Task Force (see Finding 50 and the State Water Board's Report to the Legislature²⁷).

In order to determine whether growers in a given township are improving their practices, the third-party will need to assess the data collected from Farm Evaluations and evaluate trends. The third-party's

²⁷ State Water Board Resources Control Board. 2013. Report to the Legislature, Recommendations Addressing Nitrate in Groundwater <http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/nitrate_project/docs/nitrate_rpt.pdf>

assessment and evaluation, along with the data used to make the evaluation, will be provided in the third-party’s annual monitoring report. By receiving the individual data records identified to at least the township level, the board will be able to determine whether individual Members are in compliance and the board will be able to identify specific data records for additional follow-up (e.g., requesting that the third-party provide the Member name and parcel associated with the data record). The board will be able to independently verify the assessments and evaluations conducted by the third-party. The board, as well as other stakeholders, can also conduct its own analysis and interpretation of the data, which may not be possible if only summary information for implemented management practices were provided. If the data suggest that growers are not improving their practices, the Executive Officer can require the third-party to submit the management practice or nitrogen management plan summary information in a manner that specifically identifies individual Members and their parcels.

C. Sediment and Erosion Control Plans

The Order requires that Members with the potential to cause erosion and discharge sediment that may degrade surface waters prepare a sediment and erosion control plan. Control of sediment discharge will work to achieve water quality objectives associated with sediment and also water quality objectives associated with sediment bound materials such as pesticides. To ensure that water quality is being protected, this Order requires that sediment and erosion control plans be prepared in one of the following ways:

- The sediment and erosion control plan must adhere to the site-specific recommendation from the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), NRCS technical service provider, the University of California Cooperative Extension, the local Resource Conservation District; or conform to a local county ordinance applicable to erosion and sediment control on agricultural lands. The Member must retain written documentation of the recommendation provided and certify that they are implementing the recommendation; or
- The plan must be prepared and self-certified by the Member, who has completed a training program that the Executive Officer concurs provides necessary training for sediment and erosion control plan development; or
- The plan must be written, amended, and certified by a qualified professional possessing one of the registrations shown in Table 7 below; or
- The plan must be prepared and certified in an alternative manner approved by the Executive Officer. Such approval will be provided based on the Executive Officer’s determination that the alternative method for preparing the plan meets the objectives and requirements of this Order.

Table 7. Qualified Sediment and Erosion Control Plan Developers

Title/Certification	Certifier
Professional Civil Engineer	State of California
Professional Geologist or Engineering Geologist	State of California
Landscape Architect	State of California
Professional Hydrologist	American Institute of Hydrology
Certified Professional in Erosion and Sediment Control™ (CPESC)	EnviroCert International Inc.
Certified Professional in Storm Water Quality™ (CPSWQ)	EnviroCert International Inc.
Certified Soil Scientist	American Society of Agronomy
Certified Conservation Planner (CCP)	NRCS

The sediment and erosion control plan will: (1) help identify the sources of sediment that affect the quality of storm water and irrigation water discharges; and (2) describe and ensure the implementation of water

quality management practices to reduce or eliminate sediment and other pollutants bound to sediment in storm water and irrigation water discharges. The plan must be appropriate for the Member's operations and will be developed and implemented to address site specific conditions. Each farming operation is unique and requires specific description and selection of water quality management practices needed to address waste discharges of sediment. The plan must be maintained at the farming operations headquarters or primary place of business.

To assist Members in determining whether they need to prepare a sediment and erosion control plan, the third-party must prepare a sediment and erosion control assessment report that identifies the areas susceptible to erosion and the discharge of sediment that could impact receiving waters. In addition, the Executive Officer may identify areas requiring such plans based on evidence of ongoing erosion or sediment control problems.

D. Templates for Farm Evaluation, Nitrogen Management Plan, Nitrogen Management Plan Summary Report, and Sediment and Erosion Control Plans

The Central Valley Water Board intends to provide templates (Farm Evaluation; Nitrogen Management Plan, Nitrogen Management Plan Summary Report, and Sediment and Erosion Control Plan) to all Members that must be used to comply with the applicable reporting requirements of this Order. In issuing Order R5-2012-0116, the Central Valley Water Board allowed agricultural water quality coalitions and commodity groups to jointly propose templates to be used to satisfy the requirements of Order R5-2012-0116. The Central Valley Water Board understands that the San Joaquin County and Delta Water Quality Coalition and commodity groups in the San Joaquin County and Delta area have worked with the East San Joaquin Water Quality Coalition to develop templates. The purposes of the templates are to collect information consistently across irrigated agricultural areas and commodities, and to minimize the costs for growers to provide that information. Consistent information collection will facilitate analysis within a geographic area and across the Central Valley. Those purposes may not be met if the Central Valley Water Board includes provisions that allows for submittal of proposed templates under each third-party order issued as part of the long-term irrigated lands regulatory program. However, the Central Valley Water Board recognizes that templates may require modifications for different geographic areas. Therefore, although the third-party will not have an opportunity to develop new templates under this Order, the third-party will have an opportunity to provide comments on the templates' applicability to its geographic area.

1. Managed Wetlands

These wetlands represent a small fraction of the wetlands that historically occurred prior to conversion to agriculture and other land uses and the creation of complex water control infrastructure that now exists. A common wetland management objective is to create and maintain native plant communities and provide habitat for a diverse range of species. Managed wetlands support migratory and resident birds, listed species, and other fish and wildlife. Natural and managed wetlands may also provide other environmental benefits, such as flood management and improved water quality.²⁸ The capacity for both managed and natural wetlands to reduce contaminants such as nitrates, phosphorus, pesticides, and sediments is well-documented.²⁸

The potential number of pollutants discharged from managed wetlands is limited compared with agricultural operations. Many wetland management activities differ from agricultural management activities and, therefore, the timing and nature of the potential effects on water quality are different. Seasonal wetlands are typically flooded between August and October and drawn down in spring between March and May. Depending on spring weather conditions, the type of wetland vegetation that is being encouraged, or the need to discourage certain species, irrigation can occur any time from May through July and can vary in both frequency and duration. Irrigation of a relatively limited acreage of

²⁸ Carter, V. (1997). Technical Aspects of Wetlands, Wetland Hydrology, Water Quality and Associated Functions. National Summary of Wetland Resources, United States Geological Survey Water Supply Paper 2425.

cropland may also occur during summer. Crops grown to provide food or habitat for waterfowl include irrigated pasture, small grains, corn and winter wheat. Flood-up and drawdown periods typically result in some discharge flows from wetlands.²⁹ Infrastructure in managed wetlands includes levees, water control structures, and other features to control the timing, depth, and duration of flooding. Examples of infrastructure maintenance activities include levee repair, and water control structure, ditch, and swale cleaning. Habitat and vegetation management activities include disking and mowing in seasonal wetlands following the drawdown period.²⁹

During the development of the ILRP Orders, concerns were raised regarding the applicability of templates for Farm Evaluation, Nitrogen Management Plan and Nitrogen Management Summary Report, and Sediment and Erosion Control Plan to wetland areas. Wetland managers provided comments that fertilizers and pesticides are not a part of the practices on wetlands, and that wetlands typically have elements associated with practices to prevent and minimize sediment discharge and erosion, such as holding ponds, vegetative buffers, and minimum tillage.

However, there is evidence that wetland drainage can have negative impacts on water quality^{30, 31, 32, 33} including salts and high biological oxygen demand. Therefore, discharges from wetlands may contain wastes that could affect the quality of waters of the state. In addition, the Basin Plan's methylmercury control programs identify that some managed wetlands may be sources of methylmercury. As part of the Delta methylmercury control program, studies are being conducted with managed wetlands operators to develop and evaluate water and land management practices to control methylmercury discharges.³⁴

Since fertilizers are not used on managed wetlands, this Order does not require the preparation of nitrogen management plans and nitrogen management plan summary reports for parcels that are solely operated as a managed wetland. Although the wetland itself will generally act as a sedimentation basin and not contribute to excess sediment, wetland drainage channels, access roads, or stream crossings may contribute to discharge of excess sediment. The sediment discharge and erosion assessment will provide information on the vulnerability status of areas with managed wetlands. Given the unique environmental conditions and effects of wetlands on water quality, the board recognizes that a different evaluation template from the standard farm evaluation template may be better suited for managed wetlands. To address the unique features of managed wetlands, an alternate managed wetland template may be crafted and proposed by the third-party. The third party also has an option to submit a wetland-specific Sediment and Erosion Control Plan Template. Any template to be used for wetlands reporting should be developed collaboratively by the third-party, wetland managing agencies, Resource Conservation Districts, and federal and state agencies.

²⁹ ICF International. 2011. Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, Program Environmental Impact Report. Draft and Final. March. (ICF 05508.05.) Sacramento, CA. Prepared for Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Sacramento, CA.

³⁰ Stringfellow WT, Hanlon JS, Borglin SE, Quinn NWT. (2008). Comparison of wetland and agriculture drainage as sources of biochemical oxygen demand to the San Joaquin River, California. *Agricultural Water Management* 95: 527-538.

³¹ Quinn, NWT. (2009). Environmental decision support system development for seasonal wetland salt management in a river basin subjected to water quality regulation. *Agricultural Water Management* 96: 247-254.

³² California Department of Fish and Game and Suisun Resource Conservation District. (No Date). Initial Draft, Conceptual Model for Managed Wetlands in Suisun Marsh. Compiled by DFG and SRCD staff, 129 pages.

³³ Diaz FJ, O'Geen AT, Dahlgren RA. (2012) Agricultural pollutant removal by constructed wetlands: Implications for water management and design. *Agricultural Water Management* 104: 171-183.

³⁴ See

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/tmdl/central_valley_projects/delta_hg/stakeholder_meetings/2012mar06/2012mar06_irrwetlands_pres.pdf

E. Small Farming Operations

In counties within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area, small farming operations are operated by approximately 69 percent of the growers, and account for approximately 6% of the total irrigated lands.³⁵ These percentages are for the entire counties within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area and are therefore approximate for the area because all but one of the counties is not completely within the area. During the development of previous Orders, the board recognized that small farming operations have more limited resources and access to technical experts, and accordingly, provided additional time for small farming operations to initially prepare applicable farm evaluations, nitrogen management plans, and sediment and erosion control plans. However, in this case, the likely third-party (the San Joaquin County and Delta Water Quality Coalition) has indicated that additional time for small farming operations is not necessary because separate requirements for owners and operators based on operation size would increase its administrative burden, which would ultimately increase costs for all of its Members including small farming operations. The Coalition has also indicated that it has the capacity to conduct outreach to all farming operations to assist all of its Members to meet the applicable plan preparation and reporting timelines. Thus, it is unnecessary to provide different timeframes for small farming operations in this Order.

VIII. Technical Reports

The surface water and trend groundwater quality monitoring under the Order is representative in nature instead of individual field discharge monitoring. The monitoring sites are established to be representative of the effect of discharges from irrigated agriculture on water quality. Areas that are represented by the monitoring site have the same or similar characteristics as the area discharging to the monitored site. The land use immediately upstream of the monitored sites is agriculture and the mix of crops around the monitored sites is similar to the crop mix in unmonitored areas (Figure 12). Therefore, it is reasonable to use the results from the monitored sites to draw conclusions regarding water quality impacts in areas with similar crops and similar practices that are not being monitored.

The benefits of representative monitoring include the ability to determine whether water bodies accepting discharges from numerous irrigated lands are meeting receiving water limitations (e.g., through selection of representative sampling locations and representative MPEP studies). Representative monitoring also allows the Central Valley Water Board to determine whether practices are protective of water quality.

Through the Management Practices Evaluation Program and the Surface Water Quality Management Plans and Groundwater Quality Management Plans, the third-party must evaluate the effectiveness of management practices in protecting water quality. Surface water quality management plans have been triggered throughout the Order area under the Conditional Waiver; therefore, the evaluation of surface water quality management practices is applicable for the whole Order area. Members must report the practices they are implementing to protect water quality. Therefore, information from the evaluation of management practices (per the Management Plans and Management Practices Evaluation Program) can be applied to individual Members to determine whether their implemented practices are protective of water quality.

An effective method of determining compliance with water quality objectives is water quality monitoring at the individual level. Individual monitoring may also be used to help determine sources of water quality problems. Individual monitoring of waste discharges is required under many other Water Board programs. Examples of such programs include regulation of wastewater treatment plants and the

³⁵ Data are for San Joaquin, Alameda, Contra Costa, Alpine, Stanislaus, Amador, and Calaveras Counties; United States Department of Agriculture. 2007. *Census of Agriculture*.

Central Valley Water Board's Dairy Program.³⁶ The costs of individual monitoring would be much higher than representative surface and groundwater quality monitoring required under the Order. Representative monitoring site selection may be based on a group or category of represented waste discharges that will provide information required to assess compliance for represented Members, reducing the number of samples needed to evaluate compliance with the requirements of this Order. The third-party is tasked with ensuring that selected monitoring sites are representative of waste discharges from all irrigated agricultural operations within the Order's boundaries.

This Order requires the third-party to provide technical reports. These reports may include special studies at the direction of the Executive Officer. The Executive Officer may require special studies where representative monitoring is ineffective in determining potential sources of water quality problems or to identify whether management practices are effective. Special studies help ensure that the potential information gaps described above under the Order's representative monitoring requirements may be filled through targeted technical reports, instead of more costly individual monitoring programs.

The Board recognizes that representative monitoring data in and of itself will not allow the Board to determine the specific source or sources of water quality problems; however, subsequent actions, assessments and reporting required of the third party will result in the identification of the source(s) and causes of the water quality problem, the identification of actions implemented by Members to ensure water quality is protected, and the reporting of water quality data to demonstrate the water quality problem has been resolved. Therefore, representative monitoring in conjunction with other requirements in this Order³⁷ and the board's compliance and enforcement activities will also allow the board to determine whether Members are complying with this Order.

IX. Reports and Plans

This Order is structured such that the Executive Officer is to make determinations regarding the adequacy of reports and information provided by the third-party or Members and allows the Executive Officer to approve such reports. All plans and reports that require approval by the Executive Officer will be posted on the board's website upon approval. In addition, this Order identifies specific reports and Executive Officer's decisions that must be posted for public comment and review. It is the right of any interested person to request the Central Valley Water Board to review any of the aforementioned Executive Officer decisions.

X. Approach to Implementation and Compliance and Enforcement

The board has been implementing the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program since 2003. The implementation of the program has included compliance and enforcement activities to ensure growers have the proper regulatory coverage and are in compliance with the applicable board orders. The following section describes the state-wide policy followed by the board, as well as how the board intends to implement and enforce the Order.

The State Water Board's Water Quality Enforcement Policy (Enforcement Policy) defines an enforcement process that addresses water quality in an efficient, effective, and consistent manner³⁸. A variety of enforcement tools are available in response to noncompliance. The Enforcement Policy endorses the progressive enforcement approach which includes an escalating series of actions from informal to formal enforcement. Informal enforcement actions are any enforcement taken by staff that is not defined in

³⁶ The dairy program requires individual monitoring of surface water discharges and allows for a "representative" groundwater monitoring in lieu of individual groundwater monitoring.

³⁷ See Table 10 for a summary of required third-party and Member reports.

³⁸ State Water Resources Control Board. 2010. Water Quality Enforcement Policy.

<http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/enforcement/docs/enf_policy_final111709.pdf>

statute or regulation, such as oral, written, or electronic communication concerning violations. The purpose of informal enforcement is to quickly bring an actual, threatened, or potential violation to the discharger's attention and to give the discharger an opportunity to return to compliance as soon as possible. Formal enforcement includes statutorily based actions that may be taken in place of, or in addition to, informal enforcement. Formal enforcement is recommended as a first response to more significant violations, such as the highest priority violations, chronic violations, and/or threatened violations. There are multiple options for formal enforcement, including Administrative Civil Liabilities (ACLs) imposed by a Regional Water Board or the State Water Board. A 30-day public comment period is required prior to the settlement or imposition of any ACL and prior to settlement of any judicial civil liabilities.

Compliance/Enforcement Related to Grower Participation

To facilitate grower participation in the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program (ILRP) under the Conditional Waiver, the Central Valley Water Board staff engaged in outreach and followed the progressive enforcement series of actions. For example, staff had sent outreach postcards informing non-participating landowners who potentially require coverage under the ILRP. Water Code Section 13267 Orders for technical reports had been issued to landowners who first received an outreach postcard and did not respond. Landowners were required to respond to postcards or 13267 Orders by obtaining the required regulatory coverage, or claiming an exemption from the ILRP requirements. The Central Valley Water Board staff routinely conducted inspections to verify landowner exemption claims; occasionally the outcome of inspections led to an enforcement action for failure to obtain appropriate regulatory coverage.

Upon the adoption of the Eastern San Joaquin River Watershed Order in December 2012, staff sent letters to thousands of landowners who may now require regulatory coverage, since like this Order, the Eastern San Joaquin River Watershed Order addresses discharge to both groundwater and surface water. Parcels that potentially need regulatory coverage are identified from readily available information sources, such as county tax assessor records; aerial photography; and the California Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. The staff also conducts inspections in the field to verify that parcels have an irrigated agricultural operation. The Executive Officer sends Water Code Section 13260 Directives when inspections verify that parcels require coverage under the ILRP, when growers who used to be third-party members are no longer listed on the annual membership lists, or when growers who received Executive Officer approval to join a third-party have not done so. The 13260 Directives require growers to enroll or re-instate their membership with a third-party, obtain coverage for their discharges under other applicable general waste requirements, or submit a Report of Waste Discharge to the Central Valley Water Board. As the highest level of informal enforcement, Notices of Violation (NOV's) are sent to growers who fail to respond to Orders and Directives, and direct the recipients obtain the proper regulatory coverage for their waste discharges. The board intends to issue Administrative Civil Liability Complaints to those growers who do not respond to the NOV. In addition, the board may enroll those growers under the general WDRs for dischargers not participating in a third-party group (R5-2013-0100), after such growers are provided an opportunity for a hearing.

Compliance/Enforcement Related to Water Quality Violations

The board intends to respond promptly to complaints and conduct field inspections on a routine basis to identify potential water quality violations. Complaints will generally result from local residents contacting the board based on their observations of sediment plumes, fish kills, or odor problems. The board will generally contact and coordinate with the third-party, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the local county agricultural commissioner depending on the nature of the problem.

In addition, the board staff will conduct field inspections of individual grower's operations to determine whether practices protective of groundwater are in place. Such practices include backflow prevention devices; well head protection; and those practices found protective through the Management Practices Evaluation Program. The field inspections will also include a review of whether implemented practices

are protective of surface water, and may include sampling of runoff. The informal and formal enforcement process described above will be used should any violations of the Order be identified through field inspections.

Compliance/Enforcement Related to Information Collected

As a part of field inspections, and with the consent of the Member, owner or authorized representative as required by applicable laws, staff may also review information and farm plans prepared by Members. The Executive Officer will request information, as necessary, from Members and the third-party to audit the quality and accuracy of information being submitted. The Executive Officer will regularly report to the board on the results of any audits of the information reported by the third-party, the outcome of any field verification inspections of information submitted by the Members, and make recommendations regarding changes to the reporting requirements and the information submittal process, if needed. The findings of this Order provide a further description of the enforcement priorities and process for addressing violations.

XI. Water Quality Objectives

Surface water and groundwater receiving water limitations in section III of the Order specify that waste discharge from irrigated lands may not cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality objectives in surface water or underlying groundwater, unreasonably affect beneficial uses, or cause a condition of pollution or nuisance.

Water quality objectives that apply to surface water are described in the *Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins* (Basin Plan) and the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary. Applicable water quality objectives include, but are not limited to, (1) the numeric objectives, including the bacteria objective, the chemical constituents objective (includes listed chemicals and state drinking water standards, i.e., maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) promulgated in Title 22 California Code of Regulations (CCR) Division 4, Chapter 15 sections 64431, 64444, and 64449 that are applicable through the Basin Plan to waters designated as municipal and domestic supply), dissolved oxygen objectives, pH objectives, the salinity objectives, and the turbidity objectives; and (2) the narrative objectives, including the biostimulatory substances objective, the chemical constituents objective, and the toxicity objective. The Basin Plan also contains numeric water quality objectives that apply to specifically identified water bodies, such as specific temperature objectives. Federal water quality criteria that apply to surface water are contained in federal regulations referred to as the California Toxics Rule and the National Toxics Rule. See 40 CFR sections 131.36 and 131.38.

Water quality objectives that apply to groundwater include, but are not limited to, (1) numeric objectives, including the bacteria objective and the chemical constituents objective (includes state MCLs promulgated in Title 22 CCR Division 4, Chapter 15 sections 64431, 64444, and 64449 and are applicable through the Basin Plan to municipal and domestic supply), and (2) narrative objectives including the chemical constituents, taste and odor, and toxicity objectives.

The requirements that waste discharge not unreasonably affect beneficial uses or cause a condition of pollution or nuisance are prescribed pursuant to sections 13263 and 13241 of the California Water Code. Section 13263 of the California Water Code requires Regional Water Boards, when establishing waste discharge requirements, to consider the need to prevent nuisance and the provisions in section 13241 of the California Water Code. Section 13241 requires Regional Water Boards to consider several factors when establishing water quality objectives including prevention of nuisance and reasonable protection of beneficial uses.

A. Implementation of Water Quality Objectives

The Basin Plan includes numeric and narrative water quality objectives. The narrative toxicity objective states: *“All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.”* The Basin Plan states that material and relevant information, including numeric criteria, and recommendations from other agencies and scientific literature will be utilized in evaluating compliance with the narrative toxicity objective. The narrative chemical constituent objective states that waters shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses. At a minimum, *“...water designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs)”* in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR). The Basin Plan further states that, to protect all beneficial uses, the Regional Water Board may apply limits more stringent than MCLs. The narrative tastes and odors objective states: *“Water shall not contain taste- or odor-producing substances in concentrations that impart undesirable tastes or odors to domestic or municipal water supplies or to fish flesh or other edible products of aquatic origin, or that cause nuisance, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.”*

The Sacramento-San Joaquin Basin Plan starting at page IV-16.00, contains an implementation policy, “Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives,” that includes a description of how the Central Valley Water Board will evaluate compliance with the narrative water quality objectives. The Policy states, in part, *“To evaluate compliance with the narrative water quality objectives, the Regional Water Board considers, on a case-by-case basis, direct evidence of beneficial use impacts, all material and relevant information submitted by the discharger and other interested parties, and relevant numerical criteria and guidelines developed and/or published by other agencies and organizations...”* For purposes of this Order, these and other applicable Basin Plan provisions will be used as part of the process described below.

Implementation of numeric and narrative water quality objectives under the Order involves an iterative process. The Order’s MRP establishes management plan trigger limits that are equivalent to the applicable Basin Plan numeric water quality objectives. For constituents that are not assigned Basin Plan numeric water quality objectives, Central Valley Water Board staff will develop trigger limits in consultation with the Department of Pesticide Regulation (for pesticides) and other agencies as appropriate. Central Valley Water Board staff will provide interested parties, including the third-party representing Members, with an opportunity to review and comment on the trigger limits. The Executive Officer will then provide the trigger limits to the third-party. Those trigger limits will be considered the numeric interpretation of the applicable narrative objectives. In locations where trigger limits are exceeded, water quality management plans must be developed that will form the basis for reporting which steps have been taken by growers to achieve compliance with numeric and narrative water quality objectives.

XII. Non-Point Source (NPS) Program

This Order regulates waste discharges from irrigated agricultural lands to state waters as an NPS program. Accordingly, the waste discharge requirements must implement the provisions of the State Water Board’s *Policy for Implementation and Enforcement of the Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program* (NPS Policy). Under the NPS Policy, the Regional Water Board must find that the program will promote attainment of water quality objectives. The nonpoint-source program also must meet the requirements of five key structural elements. These elements include (1) the purpose of the program must be stated and the program must address NPS pollution in a manner that achieves and maintains water quality objectives and beneficial uses, including any applicable antidegradation requirements; (2) describe the practices to be implemented and processes to be used to select and verify proper implementation of practices; (3) where it is necessary to allow time to achieve water quality requirements, include a specific time schedule, and corresponding quantifiable milestones designed to measure progress toward reaching specified requirements; (4) feedback mechanisms to determine

whether the program is achieving its purpose; and (5) the consequences of failure to achieve the stated purpose.

This Order addresses each of the five key elements, as described below.

- (1) The purpose of the long-term irrigated lands regulatory program, of which this Order is an implementing mechanism, is stated above under the section titled "Goals and Objectives of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program."³⁹ The program goals and objectives include meeting water quality objectives. The requirements of this Order include requirements to meet applicable water quality objectives and the requirements of State Water Board Resolution 68-16 (antidegradation requirements). Further discussion of this Order's implementation of antidegradation requirements is given below under the section titled "State Water Board Resolution 68-16."
- (2) The board is prevented by Water Code section 13360 from prescribing specific management practices to be implemented. However, it may set forth performance standards and require dischargers to report on what practices they have or will implement to meet those standards. Examples of the types of practices that irrigated agricultural operations may implement to meet program goals and objectives have been described in the Economics Report⁴⁰ and evaluated in the Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR)⁴¹ for the long-term ILRP. This Order requires each individual operation to develop a farm evaluation that will describe their management practices in place to protect surface water and groundwater quality. This Order also requires the development of surface/groundwater quality management plans (SQMPs/GQMPs) in areas where there are exceedances of water quality objectives. The requirements for SQMPs and GQMPs include that the third-party identify management practices and develop a process for evaluating the effectiveness of such practices. The requirements of this Order are consistent with Key Element 2.
- (3) This Order requires the development of SQMPs/GQMPs in areas where water quality objectives are not met. SQMPs/GQMPs must include time schedules for implementing the plans and meeting the surface and groundwater receiving water limitations (section III of the Order) as soon as practicable, but within a maximum of 10 years for surface and groundwater. The time schedules must be consistent with the requirements for time schedules set forth in this Order. The time schedules must include quantifiable milestones that will be reviewed by the Executive Officer and the public prior to approval. The time schedule requirements in this Order are consistent with Key Element 3.
- (4) To provide feedback on whether program goals are being achieved, this Order requires surface and groundwater quality monitoring, tracking of management practices, and evaluation of effectiveness of implemented practices. The feedback will allow iterative implementation of practices to ensure that program goals are achieved. The feedback mechanisms required by this Order are consistent with Key Element 4.
- (5) This Order establishes the following consequences where requirements are not met:

³⁹ The goals and objectives were developed as part of the ILRP Program Environmental Impact Report, ICF International. 2011. *Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program - Program Environmental Impact Report*. Final and Draft. March. (ICF 05508.05.) Sacramento, CA. Prepared for Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Sacramento, CA.

⁴⁰ ICF International. 2010. *Draft Technical Memorandum Concerning the Economic Analysis of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program*. July. (ICF 05508.05.) Sacramento, CA. Prepared for: Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Sacramento, CA.

⁴¹ ICF International. 2011. *Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program - Program Environmental Impact Report*. Final and Draft. March. (ICF 05508.05.) Sacramento, CA. Prepared for Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Sacramento, CA.

- (a) The third-party or Members will be required, in an iterative process, to conduct additional monitoring and/or implement management practices where water quality objectives are not being met;
- (b) Appropriate Central Valley Water Board enforcement action where the iterative management practices process is unsuccessful, program requirements are not met, or time schedules are not met;
- (c) Require noncompliant Members, or all Members where the third-party fails to meet the requirements of this Order, to submit a report of waste discharge to obtain individual waste discharge requirements from the Central Valley Water Board (i.e., revoke coverage under this Order).

This Order describes consequences for failure to meet requirements and is consistent with Key Element 5.

XIII. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

For the purposes of adoption of this Order, the Central Valley Water Board is the lead agency pursuant to CEQA (Public Resources Code sections 21100 et seq.). The Central Valley Water Board has prepared a Final Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR)⁴² that analyzes the potential environmental impacts of six program alternatives for a long term ILRP. As described more fully in Attachment D, this Order relies upon the PEIR for CEQA compliance. The requirements of the Order include regulatory elements that are also contained in the six alternatives analyzed in the PEIR. Therefore, the actions by Members to protect water quality in response to the requirements of this Order are expected to be similar to those described for Alternatives 2-6 of the PEIR (Alternative 1 does not include groundwater protection).

The PEIR describes that potential environmental impacts of all six alternatives are associated with implementation of water quality management practices, construction of monitoring wells, and impacts to agriculture resources (e.g., loss of production of prime farmland) due to increased regulatory costs. Under this Order, Members will be required to implement water quality management practices to address water quality concerns. The PEIR describes and evaluates potential impacts of practices likely to be implemented to meet water quality and other management goals on irrigated lands. These water quality management practices include:

- Nutrient management
- Improved water management
- Tailwater recovery system
- Pressurized irrigation
- Sediment trap, hedgerow, or buffer
- Cover cropping or conservation tillage
- Wellhead protection

These practices are examples of the types of practices that would be broadly applied by irrigated agricultural operations throughout the Central Valley and are considered representative of the types of practices that would have potential environmental impacts. It is important to note that the evaluated practices are not required; operators will have the flexibility to select practices to meet water quality goals. This Order represents one order in a series of orders that will be developed, based on the alternatives evaluated in the PEIR for all irrigated agriculture within the Central Valley. The requirements

⁴² ICF International. 2011. *Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program Final Program Environmental Impact Report*. Final and Draft. March. (ICF 05508.05.) Sacramento, CA. Prepared for: Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Sacramento, CA

of this Order would lead to implementation of the above practices within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area to a similar degree as is described for Alternatives 2-6 analyzed in the PEIR. Also, the requirements of this Order will require installation of monitoring wells (with the extent depending on the adequacy of existing wells for water quality monitoring).

As described in the PEIR for Alternatives 2-6, the combination of an operator's choice of management practice and where that practice is implemented (i.e., located within a sensitive resource area) may result in significant environmental impacts for the following resource areas*:

- Cultural resources: Potential loss of resources from construction and operation of management practices and monitoring wells.
- Noise and vibration: Exposure of sensitive land uses to noise from construction and operation of management practices (e.g., construction of tailwater return system, pump noise) and monitoring wells.
- Air quality: Generation of construction and operational emissions from management practices and monitoring wells (e.g., equipment and pump emissions generated during construction and continued operation of practices).
- Climate change: Cumulative, from a potential increase in greenhouse gas emissions.
- Vegetation and wildlife: Loss of habitat, wildlife, and wetland communities from reduced surface water discharge and construction and operation of practices and monitoring wells (e.g., loss of habitat if a practice is sited in a previously undisturbed area). Cumulative loss of habitat.
- Fisheries: Loss of habitat from construction of management practices, monitoring wells, and toxicity attributable to coagulant additives.
- Agriculture resources: Loss of farmland from increased regulatory cost. Cumulative loss of agriculture resources.

* The above is a generalized summary of affected resource areas. The reader is directed to the Attachment D, Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, of this Order for specific impacts and discussion. Attachment D provides a listing of the above impacts, the written findings regarding those impacts consistent with § 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines, and the explanation for each finding.

A. Mitigation Measures

The impacts described above, except for agriculture resources, cumulative climate change, and cumulative vegetation and wildlife can be reduced to a less than significant level through the employment of alternate practices or by choosing a location that avoids sensitive areas (e.g., installing a sedimentation basin in a portion of the property that is already developed rather than in an area that provides riparian habitat). Where no alternate practice or less sensitive location for a practice exists, this Order requires that the third-party and Members choosing to employ these practices avoid impacts to sensitive resources by implementing the mitigation measures described in Attachment C. A CEQA Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is included in Attachment B of this Order, Monitoring and Reporting Program R5-2014-0029.

XIV. Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality Waters in California (State Water Board Resolution 68-16)

This section of the Information Sheet first provides background on State Water Board Resolution 68-16 *Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California* (Resolution 68-16). Following the background discussion, the Information Sheet describes how the various provisions in the WDR and MRP collectively implement Resolution 68-16. In summary, the requirements of Resolution 68-16 are met through a combination of upfront planning and implementation at the farm level,

representative monitoring and assessments to determine whether trends in degradation are occurring, and regional planning and on-farm implementation when degradation trends are identified.

Initially, all Members will need to conduct an on-farm evaluation to determine whether their practices are protective of water quality and whether they are meeting the established farm management performance standards. Through the process of becoming aware of effective management practices, evaluating their practices, and implementing improved practices, Members are expected to meet the farm management performance standards and, thereby, achieve best practicable treatment or control (BPTC), where applicable. All Members must prepare and implement a farm-specific nitrogen management plan. In addition, each Member with the potential to cause erosion and discharge sediment that may degrade surface waters must prepare and implement a sediment and erosion control plan. Implementation of the sediment/erosion control plan should result in achieving BPTC for sediment associated pollutants. Implementation of the nitrogen management plan should result in achieving BPTC for nitrates discharged to groundwater.

Representative monitoring of surface water and groundwater together with periodic assessments of available surface water and groundwater information is required to determine compliance with water quality objectives and determine whether any trends in water quality (improvement or degradation) are occurring. If trends in such degradation are identified that could result in impacts to beneficial uses, a surface water (or groundwater) quality management plan must be prepared by the third-party. The plan must include the identification of practices that will be implemented to address the trend in degradation and an evaluation of the effectiveness of those practices in addressing the degradation. The third-party must report on the implementation of practices by its Members. Failure of individual Members to implement practices to meet farm management performance standards or address the identified water quality problems will result in further direct regulation by the board, including, but not limited to, requiring individual farm water quality management plans, regulating the individual grower directly through WDRs for individual farmers, or taking other enforcement action.

As discussed further below, the combination of these requirements fulfills the requirements of Resolution 68-16 for any degradation of high quality waters authorized by this Order.

A. Background

Basin Plan water quality objectives are developed to ensure that ground and surface water beneficial uses are protected. The quality of some state ground and surface waters is higher than established Basin Plan water quality objectives. For example, nutrient levels in good, or “high quality” waters may be very low, or not detectable, while existing water quality standards for nutrients may be much higher. In such waters, some degradation of water quality may occur without compromising protection of beneficial uses. State Water Board Resolution 68-16 *Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California* (Resolution 68-16) was adopted in October of 1968 to address high quality waters in the state. Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Section 131.12—Antidegradation Policy (40 CFR 131.12) was developed in 1975 to ensure water quality necessary to protect existing uses in waters of the United States. Resolution 68-16 applies to discharges to all high quality waters of the state, including groundwater and surface water (Water Code section 13050[e]); 40 CFR 131.12 applies only to surface waters.

The requirement to implement the Antidegradation Policy is contained in Resolution 68-16 (provision 2 presented below) and in the Basin Plan. The Basin Plan states that the Central Valley Water Board actions must conform with State Water Board plans and policies and among these policies is Resolution 68-16, which requires that:

1. *“Whenever the existing quality of water is better than the quality established in policies as of the date on which such policies become effective, such existing high quality will be maintained until it has been demonstrated to the State that any change will be consistent with maximum benefit to the*

people of the State, will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial use of such water and will not result in water quality less than that prescribed in the policies.”

2. *“Any activity which produces or may produce a waste or increased volume or concentration of waste and which discharges or proposes to discharge to existing high quality waters will be required to meet waste discharge requirements which will result in the best practicable treatment or control of the discharge necessary to assure that (a) a pollution or nuisance will not occur and (b) the highest water quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State will be maintained.”*

For discharges to surface waters only, the Federal Antidegradation Policy (Section 131.12, Title 40, CFR) requires:

1. *“Existing instream water uses and the level of water quality necessary to protect the existing uses shall be maintained and protected.*
2. *Where the quality of the waters exceed levels necessary to support propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and recreation in and on the water, that quality shall be maintained and protected unless the State finds, after full satisfaction of the intergovernmental coordination and public participation provisions of the State’s continuing planning process, that allowing lower water quality is necessary to accommodate important economic or social development in the area in which the waters are located. In allowing such degradation or lower water quality, the State shall assure water quality adequate to protect existing uses fully. Further, the State shall assure that there shall be achieved the highest statutory and regulatory requirements for all new and existing point sources and all cost-effective and reasonable best management practices for nonpoint source control.*
3. *When high quality waters constitute an outstanding National resource, such as waters of National and State parks and wildlife refuges and waters of exceptional recreational or ecological significance, that water quality shall be maintained and protected.*
4. *In those cases where potential water quality impairment associated with a thermal discharge is involved, the antidegradation policy and implementing method shall be consistent with section 316 of the Act.”*

The State Water Board has interpreted Resolution 68-16 to incorporate the Federal Antidegradation Policy in situations where the policy is applicable (SWRCB Order WQ 86-17). The application of the Federal Antidegradation Policy to nonpoint source discharges (including discharges from irrigated agriculture) is limited.⁴³

Administrative Procedures Update (APU) 90-004, Antidegradation Policy Implementation for NPDES Permitting, provides guidance for the Regional Water Boards in implementing Resolution 68-16 and 40 CFR 131.12, as these provisions apply to NPDES permitting. APU 90-004 is not applicable in the context of this Order because nonpoint discharges from agriculture are exempt from NPDES permitting.

⁴³ 40 CFR 131.12(a)(2) requires that the “State shall assure that there shall be achieved the highest statutory and regulatory requirements for all new and existing point sources and *all cost-effective and reasonable best management practices for nonpoint source control.*” The EPA Handbook, Chapter 4, clarifies this as follows: “Section 131.12(a)(2) does not mandate that States establish controls on nonpoint sources. The Act leaves it to the States to determine what, if any, controls on nonpoint sources are needed to provide attainment of State water quality standards (See CWA Section 319). States may adopt enforceable requirements, or voluntary programs to address nonpoint source pollution. Section 40 CFR 131.12(a)(2) does not require that States adopt or implement best management practices for nonpoint sources prior to allowing point source degradation of a high quality water. However, States that have adopted nonpoint source controls must assure that such controls are properly implemented before authorization is granted to allow point source degradation of water quality.” Accordingly, in the context of nonpoint discharges, the BPTC standard established by state law controls.

A number of key terms are relevant to application of Resolution 68-16 and 40 CFR 131.12 to this Order. These terms are described below.

High Quality Waters: Resolution 68-16 applies whenever “existing quality of water is better than quality established in policies as of the date such policies become effective,”⁴⁴ and 40 CFR 131.12 refers to “quality of waters [that] exceed levels necessary to support propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and recreation.” Such waters are “high quality waters” under the state and federal antidegradation policies. In other words, high quality waters are waters with a background quality of better quality than that necessary to protect beneficial uses.⁴⁵ The Water Code directs the State Water Board and the Regional Water Boards to establish water quality objectives for the reasonable protection of beneficial uses. Therefore, where water bodies contain levels of water quality constituents or characteristics that are better than the established water quality objectives, such waters are considered high quality waters.

Both state and federal guidance indicates that the definition of high quality waters is established by constituent or parameter [State Water Board Order WQ 91-10; USEPA Water Quality Handbook, Chapter 4 Antidegradation (40 CFR 131.12) (“EPA Handbook”)]. Waters can be of high quality for some constituents or beneficial uses but not for others. With respect to degraded groundwater, a portion of the aquifer may be degraded with waste while another portion of the same aquifer may not be degraded with waste. The portion not degraded is high quality water within the meaning of Resolution 68-16 (see State Water Board Order WQ 91-10).

In order to determine whether a water body is a high quality water with regard to a given constituent, the background quality of the water body unaffected by the discharge must be compared to the water quality objectives. If the quality of a water body has declined since the adoption of the relevant policies and that subsequent lowering was not a result of regulatory action consistent with the state antidegradation policy, a baseline representing the historically higher water quality may be an appropriate representation of background.⁴⁶ However, if the decline in water quality was permitted consistent with state and federal antidegradation policies, the most recent water quality resulting from permitted action constitutes the relevant baseline for determination of whether the water body is high quality (see, e.g., SWRCB Order WQ 2009-0007, page 12). Additionally, if water quality conditions have improved historically, the current higher water quality would again be the point of comparison for determining the status of the water body as a high quality water.

Best Practicable Treatment or Control: Resolution 68-16 requires that, where degradation of high quality waters is permitted, best practicable treatment or control (BPTC) limits the amount of degradation that may occur. Neither the Water Code nor Resolution 68-16 defines the term “best practicable treatment or control.”

Despite the lack of a BPTC definition, certain State Water Board water quality orders and other documents provide direction on the interpretation of BPTC. The State Water Board has stated: “one factor to be considered in determining BPTC would be the water quality achieved by other similarly situated dischargers, and the methods used to achieve that water quality” (see Order WQ 2000-07, pages 10-11). In a “Questions and Answers” document for Resolution 68-16 (the Questions and Answers Document), BPTC is interpreted to additionally include a comparison of the proposed method

⁴⁴ Such policies would include policies such as State Water Board Resolution 88-63, Sources of Drinking Water Policy, establishing beneficial uses, and water quality control plans.

⁴⁵ USEPA Water Quality Handbook, Chapter 4 Antidegradation (40 CFR 131.12) , defines “high quality waters” as “those whose quality exceeds that necessary to protect the section 101(a)(2) goals of the Act [Clean Water Act], regardless of use designation.”

⁴⁶ The state antidegradation policy was adopted in 1968, therefore water quality as far back as 1968 may be relevant to an antidegradation analysis. For purposes of application of the federal antidegradation policy only, the relevant year would be 1975.

to existing proven technology, evaluation of performance data (through treatability studies), comparison of alternative methods of treatment or control, and consideration of methods currently used by the discharger or similarly situated dischargers.⁴⁷ The costs of the treatment or control should also be considered. Many of the above considerations are made under the “best efforts” approach described later in this section. In fact, the State Water Board has not distinguished between the level of treatment and control required under BPTC and what can be achieved through “best efforts.”

The Regional Water Board may not “specify the design, location, type of construction, or particular manner in which compliance may be had with [a] requirement, order, or decree” (Water Code 13360). However, the Regional Water Board still must require the discharger to demonstrate that the proposed manner of compliance constitutes BPTC (SWRCB Order WQ 2000-07). The requirement of BPTC is discussed in greater detail below.

Maximum Benefit to People of the State: Resolution 68-16 requires that where degradation of water quality is permitted, such degradation must be consistent with the “maximum benefit to people of the state.” Only after “intergovernmental coordination and public participation” and a determination that “allowing lower water quality is necessary to accommodate important economic or social development in the area in which the waters are located” does 40 CFR 131.12 allow for degradation.

As described in the Question and Answers Document, factors considered in determining whether degradation of water quality is consistent with maximum benefit to people of the State include economic and social costs, tangible and intangible, of the proposed discharge, as well as the environmental aspects of the proposed discharge, including benefits to be achieved by enhanced pollution controls. With reference to economic costs, both costs to the dischargers and the affected public are considered. Closely related to the BPTC requirement, consideration must be given to alternative treatment and control methods and whether lower water quality can be abated or avoided through reasonable means, and the implementation of feasible alternative treatment or control methods should be considered.

USEPA guidance clarifies that the federal antidegradation provision “is not a ‘no growth’ rule and was never designed or intended to be such. It is a policy that allows public decisions to be made on important environmental actions. Where the state intends to provide for development, it may decide under this section, after satisfying the requirements for intergovernmental coordination and public participation, that some lowering of water quality in “high quality waters” is necessary to accommodate important economic or social development” (EPA Handbook for Developing Watershed Plans to Restore and Protect Our Waters, Chapter 4). Similarly, under Resolution 68-16, degradation is permitted where maximum benefit to the people of the state is demonstrated.

Water Quality Objectives and Beneficial Uses: As described above, Resolution 68-16 and Section 40 CFR 131.12 are both site-specific evaluations that are not easily employed to address large areas or broad implementation for classes of discharges. However, as a floor, any degradation permitted under the antidegradation policies must not cause an exceedance of water quality objectives or a pollution or nuisance. Furthermore, the NPS Policy establishes a floor for all water bodies in that implementation programs must address NPS pollution in a manner that achieves and maintains water quality objectives and beneficial uses.

Waters that are Not High Quality: The “Best Efforts” Approach: Where a water body is not high quality and the antidegradation policies are accordingly not triggered, the Central Valley Water Board should, under State Water Board precedent, set limitations more stringent than the objectives set forth in the Basin Plan. The State Water Board has directed that, “where the constituent in a groundwater basin is already at or exceeding the water quality objective, . . . the Regional Water Board should set limitations more stringent than the Basin Plan objectives if it can be shown that those limitations can be

⁴⁷ See *Questions and Answers, State Water Resources Control Board, Resolution 68-16* (February 16, 1995).

met using ‘best efforts.’” SWRCB Order WQ 81-5; see also SWRCB Orders Nos. WQ 79-14, WQ 82-5, WQ 2000-07. Finally, the NPS Policy establishes standards for management practices.

The “best efforts” approach involves the Regional Water Board establishing limitations expected to be achieved using reasonable control measures. Factors which should be analyzed under the “best efforts” approach include the effluent quality achieved by other similarly situated dischargers, the good faith efforts of the discharger to limit the discharge of the constituent, and the measures necessary to achieve compliance (SWRCB Order WQ 81-5, page 7). The State Water Board has applied the “best efforts” factors in interpreting BPTC (see SWRCB Order Nos. WQ 79-14, and WQ 2000-07).

In summary, the board may set discharge limitations more stringent than water quality objectives even outside the context of the antidegradation policies. The “best efforts” approach must be taken where a water body is not “high quality” and the antidegradation policies are accordingly not triggered.

B. Application of Resolution 68-16 Requirements to this Order

The determination of a high quality water within the meaning of the antidegradation policies is water body and constituent-specific. Very little guidance has been provided in state or federal law with respect to applying the antidegradation policy to a program or general permit where multiple water bodies are affected by various discharges, some of which may be high quality waters and some of which may, by contrast, have constituents at levels that already exceed water quality objectives. Given these limitations, the board has used readily available information regarding the water quality status of surface water and groundwater in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area to construct provisions in this Order to meet the substantive requirements of Resolution 68-16.

This Order regulates discharges from thousands of individual fields to a very large number of water bodies within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area. There is no comprehensive, waste constituent-specific information available for all surface waters and groundwater aquifers accepting irrigated agricultural wastes that would allow site-specific assessment of current conditions. Likewise, there are no comprehensive historic data.⁴⁸

However, data collected by the Central Valley Water Board, dischargers, educational institutions, and others demonstrate that many water bodies within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area are already impaired for various constituents that are or could be associated with irrigated agricultural activities. As described above, there are surface water quality management plan requirements for the following constituents and indicators: ammonia, arsenic, chlorpyrifos, copper, DDE, diazinon, diuron, dissolved oxygen, electrical conductivity, *E. coli*, lead, molybdenum, nitrate, pH, simazine, total dissolved solids, thiobencarb, algae toxicity, sediment toxicity, fathead minnow toxicity, and water flea toxicity. Those same data collection efforts also indicate that surface water bodies within the watershed meet objectives for particular constituents and would be considered “high quality waters” with respect to those constituents.

Similarly, as described above in the “Groundwater Quality Monitoring” section, 22 percent of sampled square mile sections (i.e., sections containing wells for which sampling information is available) had a maximum nitrate level above applicable water quality objectives. While the lack of historical data prevents the board from being able to determine whether the groundwater represented by these wells are considered “high quality” with respect to nitrates⁴⁹ because it is unknown when the degradation occurred, available data show that currently existing quality of certain water bodies is better than the water quality objectives; for example, deeper groundwaters, represented by municipal supply wells, are

⁴⁸Irrigated lands discharges have been regulated under a conditional waiver since 1982, but comprehensive data as to trends under the waiver are not available.

⁴⁹ As mentioned above, water quality dating as far back as 1968 may be needed to determine whether such waters are considered “high quality” under Resolution 68-16.

generally high quality with respect to pesticides and nitrates. Degradation of such waters can be permitted only consistent with the state and federal antidegradation policies.

Given the significant variation in conditions over the broad areas covered by this Order, any application of the antidegradation requirements must account for the fact that at least some of the waters into which agricultural discharges will occur are high quality waters (for some constituents). Further, the Order provisions should also account for the fact that even where a water body is not high quality (such that discharge into that water body is not subject to the antidegradation policy), the board should, under State Water Board precedent, impose limitations more stringent than the objectives set forth in the Basin Plan, if those limits can be met by “best efforts.”

C. Consistency with BPTC and the “Best Efforts” Approach

Due to the numerous commodities being grown on irrigated agricultural lands and varying hydrogeologic conditions within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area, identification of a specific technology or treatment device as BPTC or “best efforts” has not been accomplished. By contrast, there are a variety of technologies that have been shown to be effective in protecting water quality. For example, Chapter 5 of the Irrigated Lands Program Existing Conditions Report⁵⁰ (ECR) describes that there are numerous management practices that Members could implement to achieve water quality protection goals. The Central Valley Water Board recognizes that there is often site-specific, crop-specific, and regional variability that affects the selection of appropriate management practices, as well as design constraints and pollution-control effectiveness of various practices.

Growers need the flexibility to choose management practices that best achieve a management measure’s performance expectations given their own unique circumstances. Management practices developed for agriculture are to be used as an overall system of measures to address nonpoint-source pollution sources on any given site. In most cases, not all of the practices will be needed to address the nonpoint sources at a specific site. Operations may have more than one constituent of concern to address and may need to employ two or more of the practices to address the multiple sources. Where more than one source exists, the application of the practices should be coordinated to produce an overall system that adequately addresses all sources for the site in a cost-effective manner.

There is no specific set of technologies, practices, or treatment devices that can be said to achieve BPTC/best efforts universally in the watershed. This Order, therefore, establishes a set of performance standards that must be achieved and an iterative planning approach that will lead to implementation of BPTC/best efforts. The iterative planning approach will be implemented as two distinct processes, 1) establishment of a baseline set of universal farm water quality management performance standards combined with upfront evaluation, planning and implementation of management practices to attain those goals, and 2) additional planning and implementation measures where degradation trends are observed that threaten to impair a beneficial use or where beneficial uses are impaired (i.e., water quality objectives are not being met). Taken together, these processes are considered BPTC/best efforts. The planning and implementation processes that growers must follow on their farms should lead to the on-the-ground implementation of the optimal practices and control measures to address waste discharge from irrigated agriculture.

1. Farm Management Performance Standards⁵¹

This Order establishes on farm standards for implementation of management practices that all Members must achieve. The selection of appropriate management practices must include analysis of site-specific conditions, waste types, discharge mechanisms, and crop types. Considering this, as well

⁵⁰ California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, and Jones and Stokes. 2008. *Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program Existing Conditions Report*. Sacramento, CA.

⁵¹ Table 10 includes a summary of the reports that will be provided by Members or third-party to provide the information needed to evaluate compliance with the Farm Management Performance Standards.

as the Water Code 13360 mandate that the Regional Water Board not specify the manner of compliance with its requirements, selection must be done at the farm level. Following are the performance standards that all Members must achieve:

- a. minimize waste discharge offsite in surface water,
- b. minimize or eliminate the discharge of sediment above background levels,
- c. minimize percolation of waste to groundwater,
- d. minimize excess nutrient application relative to crop consumption,
- e. prevent pollution and nuisance
- f. achieve and maintain water quality objectives and beneficial uses,
- g. protect wellheads from surface water intrusion.

BPTC is not defined in Resolution 68-16. However, the State Water Board describes in its 1995 Questions and Answers, Resolution 68-16: "To evaluate the best practicable treatment or control method, the discharger should compare the proposed method to existing proven technology; evaluate performance data, e.g., through treatability studies; compare alternative methods of treatment or control; and/or consider the method currently used by the discharger or similarly situated dischargers." Available state and federal guidance on management practices may serve as a measure of the types of water quality management goals for irrigated agriculture recommended throughout the state and country (e.g., water quality management goals for similarly situated dischargers). This will provide a measure of whether implementation of the above performance standards will lead to implementation of BPTC/best efforts.

- As part of California's Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program, the State Water Board, California Coastal Commission, and other state agencies have identified seven management measures to address agricultural nonpoint sources of pollution that affect state waters (*California's Management Measures for Polluted Runoff*, referred to below as "Agriculture Management Measures").⁵² The agricultural management measures include practices and plans installed under various NPS programs in California, including systems of practices commonly used and recommended by the USDA as components of resource management systems, water quality management plans, and agricultural waste management systems.
- USEPA's National Management Measures to Control Nonpoint Source Pollution from Agriculture (EPA 841-B-03-004, July 2003),⁵³ "is a technical guidance and reference document for use by State, local, and tribal managers in the implementation of nonpoint source pollution management programs. It contains information on the best available, economically achievable means of reducing pollution of surface and ground water from agriculture."

Both of the above guidance documents describe a series of management measures, similar to the farm management performance standards and related requirements of the Order. The agricultural management measures described in the state and USEPA reference documents generally include:

- 1) erosion and sediment control,
- 2) facility wastewater and runoff from confined animal facilities,
- 3) nutrient management,
- 4) pesticide management,
- 5) grazing management,
- 6) irrigation water

⁵² *California's Management Measures for Polluted Runoff*
(http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/nps/docs/cammpr/info.pdf)

⁵³ *National Management Measures to Control Nonpoint Source Pollution from Agriculture*
(http://water.epa.gov/polwaste/nps/agriculture/agmm_index.cfm)

management, and 7) education and outreach. A comparison of the recommendations with the Order's requirements is provided below.

Management measure 1, erosion and sediment control. Practices implemented to minimize waste discharge offsite and erosion (performance standards a. and b.) are consistent with this management measure to achieve erosion and sediment control. The Order requires that all Members implement sediment discharge and erosion prevention practices to minimize or eliminate the discharge of sediment above background levels. Those Members that have the potential to cause erosion and discharge sediment that may degrade surface waters must develop a farm-specific sediment and erosion control plan.

Management measure 2 is not applicable, as this Order does not address waste discharges from confined animal facilities.

Management measure 3, nutrient management. As described in the State's Agricultural Management Measures document, "this measure addresses the development and implementation of comprehensive nutrient management plans for areas where nutrient runoff is a problem affecting coastal waters and/or water bodies listed as impaired by nutrients." Nutrient management practices implemented to meet performance standards are consistent with this measure. The Order also requires nitrogen management plans to be developed by Members within both high vulnerability and low vulnerability groundwater areas. Nitrogen management plans require Members to document how their fertilizer use management practices meet performance standard (d). Finally, where nutrients are causing exceedances of water quality objectives in surface waters, this Order would require development of a detailed SQMP which would address sources of nutrients and require implementation of practices to manage nutrients. Collectively, these requirements work together in a manner consistent with management measure 3.

Management measure 4, pesticide management. As described in the State's Agricultural Management Measures document, this measure "is intended to reduce contamination of surface water and groundwater from pesticides." Performance standards a, c, e, f, and g are consistent with this management measure, requiring Members to implement practices that minimize waste discharge to surface and groundwater (such as pesticides), prevent pollution and nuisance, achieve and maintain water quality objectives, and implement wellhead protection measures.

Management measure 5, grazing management. As described in the state Agriculture Management Measures document, this measure is "intended to protect sensitive areas (including streambanks, lakes, wetlands, estuaries, and riparian zones) by reducing direct loadings of animal wastes and sediment." While none of the Order's farm management goals directly address grazing management, performance standards a, b, e and f, when considered by an irrigated pasture operation would lead to the same management practices, e.g., preventing erosion, discharge of sediment, and ensuring that animal waste loadings do not cause pollution, nuisance, and achieve water quality objectives. The Order also requires that all Members implement sediment discharge and erosion prevention practices to minimize or eliminate the discharge of sediment above background levels.

Management measure 6, irrigation water management. As described in the state Agricultural Management Measures document, this measure "promotes effective irrigation while reducing pollutant delivery to surface and ground waters." Performance standards a and c, requiring Members to minimize waste discharge to surface and groundwater will lead to practices that will also achieve this management measure. For example, a Member may choose to implement efficient irrigation

management programs (e.g., timing, uniformity testing), technologies (e.g., spray, drip irrigation, tailwater return), or other methods to minimize discharge of waste to surface water and percolation to groundwater.

Management measure 7, education and outreach. The Order requires that third-party groups conduct education and outreach activities to inform Members of program requirements and water quality problems.

Implementation of practices to achieve the Order's water quality requirements described above is consistent with the state and federal guidance for management measures. Because these measures are recommended for similarly situated dischargers (e.g., agriculture), compliance with the requirements of the Order will lead to implementation of BPTC/best efforts by all Members.

2. Additional Planning and Implementation Measures (SQMP/GQMPs)

This Order requires development of water quality management plans (surface or groundwater) where degradation trends are observed that threaten to impair a beneficial use or where beneficial uses are impaired (i.e., water quality objectives are not being met). SQMPs/GQMPs include requirements to investigate sources, develop strategies to implement practices to ensure waste discharges are meeting the Order's surface and groundwater receiving water limitations, and develop a monitoring strategy to provide feedback on the effectiveness of the management plan. In addition, the SQMPs/GQMPs must include actions to "Identify, validate, and implement management practices to reduce loading of COC's [constituents of concern] to surface water or groundwater, as applicable, thereby improving water quality" (see Appendix MRP-1). Under these plans, additional management practices will be implemented in an iterative manner, to ensure that the management practices represent BPTC/best efforts and that degradation does not threaten beneficial uses. The SQMPs/GQMPs need to meet the performance standards set forth in this Order. The SQMPs/GQMPs are also reviewed periodically to determine whether adequate progress is being made to address the degradation trend or impairment. If adequate progress is not being made, then the Executive Officer can require field monitoring studies, on-site verification of implementation of practices, or the board may revoke the coverage under this Order and regulate the discharger through an individual WDR.

In cases where effectiveness of practices in protecting water quality is not known, the data and information gathered through the SQMP/GQMP and MPEP processes will result in the identification of management practices that meet the performance standards and represent BPTC/best efforts. Since the performance standards also apply to low vulnerability areas with high quality waters, those data and information will help inform the Members and board of the types of practices that meet performance standard requirements.

It is also important to note that in some cases, other agencies may establish performance standards that are equivalent to BPTC and may be relied upon as part of a SQMP or GQMP. For example, the Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) has established Groundwater Protection Areas within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area that require growers to implement specific groundwater quality protection requirements for certain pesticides. The practices required under DPR's Groundwater Protection Program are considered BPTC for those pesticides requiring permits in groundwater protection areas, since the practices are designed to prevent those pesticides from reaching groundwater and they apply uniformly to similarly situated dischargers in the area.

The State Water Board indicates in its Questions and Answers, Resolution 68-16: "To evaluate the best practicable treatment or control method, the discharger should...evaluate performance data, e.g., through treatability studies..." Water quality management plans, referred to as SQMPs/GQMPs above, institute an iterative process whereby the effectiveness of any set of practices in achieving receiving

water limitations will be periodically reevaluated as necessary and/or as more recent and detailed water quality data become available. The monitoring reports and management plan progress reports submitted by the third-party on an ongoing basis will include information on the practices being implemented and, for practices implemented in response to SQMPs/GQMPs, an evaluation of their effectiveness. This process of reviewing data and instituting additional practices where necessary will continue to assure that BPTC/best efforts are implemented and will facilitate the collection of information necessary to demonstrate the performance of the practices. This iterative process will also ensure that the highest water quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the state will be maintained.

Resolution 68-16 does not require Members to use technology that is better than necessary to prevent degradation. As such, the board presumes that the performance standards required by this Order are sufficiently achieving BPTC where water quality conditions and management practice implementation are already preventing degradation. Further, since BPTC determinations are informed by the consideration of costs, it is important that discharges in these areas not be subject to the more stringent and expensive requirements associated with SQMPs/GQMPs. Therefore, though Members in "low vulnerability" areas must still meet the farm management performance standards described above, they do not need to incur additional costs associated with SQMPs/GQMPs where there is no evidence of their contributing to degradation of high quality waters.

3. Management Practices Evaluation Program (MPEP) and Other Reporting and Planning Requirements

In addition to the SQMPs/GQMPs, the Order includes a comprehensive suite of reporting requirements that should provide the board with the information it needs to determine whether the necessary actions are being taken to achieve BPTC and protect water quality, where applicable. These reporting provisions have been crafted in consideration of Water Code section 13267, which requires that the burden, including costs, of monitoring requirements bear a reasonable relationship to the need for and the benefits to be gained from the monitoring. In high vulnerability groundwater areas, the third-party must develop and implement a Management Practices Evaluation Program (MPEP). The MPEP will include evaluation studies of management practices to determine whether those practices are protective of groundwater quality (e.g., that will not cause or contribute to exceedances of water quality objectives) for identified constituents of concern under a variety of site conditions. If the management practices are not protective, new practices must be developed, implemented, and evaluated. Any management practices that are identified as being protective of water quality, or those that are equally effective, must be implemented by Members who farm under similar conditions (e.g., crop type, soil conditions) (see provision IV.B.21 of the Order).

Farm management performance standards are applicable to both high and low vulnerability areas. The major difference in high and low vulnerability areas is the priority for action. High vulnerability areas may contain both high and low quality waters with respect to constituents discharged by irrigated agriculture, and the MPEP and other reporting, planning, and implementation requirements will determine and require actions to achieve BPTC and best efforts for high and low quality waters, respectively. Because low vulnerability areas present less of a threat of degradation or pollution, additional time is provided, or a lower level of review and certification is required, for some of the planning and reporting requirements. Also, while an MPEP is not required for the low vulnerability areas, the actions required by the MPEP must be implemented as applicable by Members in both high and low vulnerability areas, and will therefore result in the implementation of BPTC and best efforts in high and low vulnerability areas, and will inform evaluation of compliance with performance standards in all areas. The Order requires implementation of actions that achieve BPTC and best efforts for both high and low quality waters, respectively.

To determine whether a degradation trend is occurring, the Order requires representative surface water monitoring of specific “discharge” monitoring sites. The data gathered from the surface water monitoring effort will allow the board to determine whether there is a trend in degradation of water quality related to discharges from irrigated agriculture. For groundwater, a trend monitoring program is required in both “low vulnerability” and “high vulnerability” areas. The trend monitoring for the low vulnerability areas is required to help the board determine whether any trend in degradation of groundwater quality is occurring. For pesticides in groundwater, the board will initially rely on the information gathered through the Department of Pesticide Regulation’s (DPR) monitoring efforts to determine whether any degradation related to pesticides is occurring. If the available groundwater quality data (e.g., nitrates, pesticides) in a low vulnerability area suggest that degradation is occurring that could threaten to impair beneficial uses, then the area would be re-designated as a high vulnerability area.

The third-party is required to prepare a Groundwater Quality Assessment Report (GAR) and update that report every five years. The GAR will include an identification of high vulnerability and low vulnerability areas, including identification of constituents that could cause degradation. The initial submittal of the GAR will include a compilation of water quality data, which the board and third-party will use to evaluate trends. The periodic updates to the GAR will require the consideration of data collected by the third-party, as well as other organizations, and will also allow the board and third-party to evaluate trends. The GAR will provide a reporting vehicle for the board to periodically evaluate water quality trends to determine whether degradation is occurring. If the degradation triggers the requirement for a GQMP, then the area in which the GQMP is required would be considered “high vulnerability” and all of the requirements associated with a high vulnerability area would apply to those Members.

All Members will also need to report on their management practices through the farm evaluation process. In addition, all members will need to prepare nitrogen management plans prepared in accordance with the nitrogen management plan templates approved by the Executive Officer. The plans require Members to document how their fertilizer use management practices minimize excess nutrient application relative to crop consumption. The planning requirements are phased according to threat level such that members in low vulnerability areas have more time to complete their plans than those in high vulnerability areas. Members in high vulnerability areas will need to submit nitrogen management plan summary reports. Through the farm evaluation, the Member must identify “...*on-farm management practices implemented to achieve the Order’s farm management performance standards*”. In addition, the nitrogen management plan summary reports required in high vulnerability areas will include, at a minimum, information on the ratio of total nitrogen available for crop uptake to the estimated crop consumption of nitrogen. Nitrogen management plans and nitrogen management plan summary reports provide indicators as to whether the Member is meeting the performance standard to minimize excess nutrient application relative to crop consumption of nitrogen. The MPEP study process would be used to determine whether the nitrogen consumption ratio meets the performance standard of the Order.

D. Summary

Members are required to implement practices to meet the above performance standards and periodically review the effectiveness of implemented practices and make improvements where necessary. Members in both high and low vulnerability areas will identify the practices they are implementing to achieve water quality protection requirements as part of farm evaluations and nitrogen management plans. Members in high vulnerability areas have additional requirements associated with the SQMPs/GQMPs, preparing sediment and erosion control plans; implementing practices identified as protective through the MPEP studies, and reporting on their activities more frequently.

Also, the Order requires water quality monitoring and assessments aimed to identify trends, evaluate effectiveness of management practices, and detect exceedances of water quality objectives. The requirements were designed in consideration of Water Code section 13267. The process of periodic review of SQMPs/GQMPs provides a mechanism for the board to better ensure that Members are meeting the requirements of the Order, if the third-party led efforts are not effective in ensuring receiving water limitations are achieved.

Requirements for individual farm evaluations, nitrogen management plans, sediment and erosion control plans, management practices tracking, and water quality monitoring and reporting are designed to ensure that degradation is minimized and that management practices are protective of water quality. These requirements are aimed to ensure that all irrigated lands are implementing management practices that minimize degradation, the effectiveness of such practices is evaluated, and feedback monitoring is conducted to ensure that degradation is minimized. Even in low vulnerability areas where there is no information indicating degradation of a high quality water, the farm management performance standards act as a preventative requirement to ensure degradation does not occur. The information and evaluations conducted as part of the GQMP/SQMP process will help inform those Members in low vulnerability areas of the types of practices that meet the performance standards. In addition, even Members in low vulnerability groundwater areas must implement practices (or equivalent practices) that are identified as protective through the MPEP studies (where these practices are applicable to the Members' site conditions). The farm evaluations and nitrogen management plan requirements for low vulnerability areas provide indicators as to whether Members are meeting applicable performance standards. The required monitoring and periodic reassessment of vulnerability designations will allow the board to determine whether degradation is occurring and whether the status of a low vulnerability area should be changed to high vulnerability, and vice versa.

The Order is designed to achieve site-specific antidegradation and antidegradation-related requirements through implementation of BPTC/best efforts as appropriate and monitoring, evaluation, and reporting to confirm the effectiveness of the BPTC/best efforts measures in achieving their goals. The Order relies on implementation of practices and treatment technologies that constitute BPTC/best efforts and requires monitoring of water quality and evaluation studies to ensure that the selected practices in fact constitute BPTC where degradation of high quality waters is or may be occurring, and best efforts where waters are already degraded. Because the State Water Board has not distinguished between the level of treatment and control required under BPTC and what can be achieved through best efforts, the requirements of this Order for BPTC/best efforts apply equally to high quality waters and already degraded waters.

This Order allows degradation of existing high quality waters. This degradation is consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the state for the following reasons:

- At a minimum, this Order requires that irrigated agriculture achieve and maintain compliance with water quality objectives and beneficial uses;
- The requirements implementing the Order will result in use of BPTC where irrigated agricultural waste discharges may cause degradation of high quality waters; where waters are already degraded, the requirements will result in the pollution controls that reflect the "best efforts" approach. Because BPTC will be implemented, any lowering of water quality will be accompanied by implementation of the most appropriate treatment or control technology;
- Central Valley communities depend on irrigated agriculture for employment (PEIR, Appendix A). Direct employment is associated with agricultural crops and agricultural support services are

approximately 13,500 jobs in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area⁵⁴. Widespread to total elimination of farming would result in loss of these jobs, which would disproportionately impact already disadvantaged communities that depend on farm jobs and the farm economy. The total output of the agricultural sector, including support services is approximately \$1,400 million, which could be substantially reduced if no degradation were allowed⁵⁵;

- The state and nation depend on Central Valley agriculture for food (PEIR, Appendix A). As stated in the PEIR, one goal of this Order is to maintain the economic viability of agriculture in California's Central Valley. The Order is anticipated to result in an estimated loss of 42,000 acres of irrigated lands (see Attachment D, II.C.6). Failing to authorize degradation of high quality waters could result in a significantly higher loss of farmland;
- Consistent with the Order's and PEIR's stated goal of ensuring that irrigated agricultural discharges do not impair access to safe and reliable drinking water, the Order protects high quality waters relied on by local communities from degradation by current practices on irrigated lands. The Order is designed to prevent irrigated lands discharges from causing or contributing to exceedances of water quality objectives, which include maximum contaminant levels for drinking water. The Order imposes more stringent requirements in areas deemed "high vulnerability" based on threat to groundwater beneficial uses, including the domestic and municipal supply use. The Order also is designed to detect and address exceedances of water quality objectives, if they occur, in accordance with the compliance time schedules provided therein;
- Because the Order prohibits degradation above a water quality objective and establishes representative surface water monitoring and groundwater monitoring programs to determine whether irrigated agricultural waste discharges are in compliance with the Order's receiving water limitations, local communities should not incur any additional treatment costs associated with the degradation authorized by this Order. In situations where water bodies are already above water quality objectives and communities are currently incurring treatment costs to use the degraded water, the requirements established by this Order will institute time schedules for reductions in irrigated agricultural sources to achieve the Order's receiving water limitations; therefore, this Order will, over time, work to reduce treatment costs of such communities; and
- The Order requires Members to achieve water quality management practice performance standards and includes farm management practices monitoring to ensure practices are implemented to achieve these standards. The iterative process whereby Members implement practices to achieve farm management performance standards, coupled with representative surface and groundwater monitoring feedback to assess whether the practices are effective, will prevent degradation of surface and groundwater quality above water quality objectives. The requirement that Members not cause or contribute to exceedances of water quality objectives is a ceiling. Achieving the farm management performance standards will, in many instances, result in preventing degradation or degradation well below water quality objectives.⁵⁶

The requirements of the Order and the degradation that would be allowed are consistent with State Water Board Resolution 68-16. The requirements of the Order will result in the implementation of BPTC

⁵⁴ Estimated based on the total number of jobs in the San Joaquin River Basin associated with agricultural crops (~21,051) and support services (~27,408) (Table 4-9 of the Economics Report) times the ratio of irrigated lands under this Order (582,000) divided by the total irrigated acreage in the San Joaquin River Basin (2,100,000 from Table 3-3 of the Economics Report).

⁵⁵ Estimated based on the total industrial output in the San Joaquin River Basin associated with agricultural crops (~4,318,400,000) and support services (~759,000,000) (Table 4-3 of the Economics Report) times the ratio of irrigated lands under this Order (582,000) divided by the total irrigated acreage in the San Joaquin River Basin (2,100,000 from Table 3-3 of the Economics Report)

⁵⁶ For example, for certain crops and farming operations, total elimination of tailwater during the irrigation season is achievable, which would totally eliminate the discharge of any wastes in surface water runoff from the farming operation during the irrigation season. Some farming operations may be able to eliminate the use of a pesticide that is degrading water quality.

necessary to assure the highest water quality consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the state. The receiving water limitations in section III of the Order, the compliance schedules in section XII, and the Monitoring and Reporting Program's requirements to track compliance with the Order, are designed to ensure that the authorized degradation will not cause or contribute to exceedances of water quality objectives, unreasonably affect beneficial uses, or cause a condition of pollution or nuisance. Finally, the iterative process of reviewing data and instituting additional management practices where necessary will ensure that the highest water quality consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the state will be maintained.

XV. California Water Code Sections 13141 and 13241

The total estimated annual average cost of compliance with this Order, e.g., summation of costs for administration, monitoring, reporting, tracking, implementation of management practices, is expected to be approximately \$6.09 per acre greater than the cost associated with the protection of surface water only under the Coalition Group Conditional Waiver. The total estimated average cost of compliance associated with continuation of the previous Coalition Group Conditional Waiver within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area is expected to be approximately 68 million dollars per year (\$117.48 per acre annually). The total average estimated cost of this Order is 72 million dollars per year (\$123.56 per acre annually).

Approximately \$115.69 of the estimated \$123.56 per acre annual cost of the Order is associated with implementation of water quality management practices (see discussion below for a breakdown of estimated costs). This Order does not require that Members implement specific water quality management practices.⁵⁷ Many of the management practices that have water quality benefits can have other economic and environmental benefits (e.g., improved irrigation can reduce water and energy consumption, as well as reduce runoff). Management practice selection will be based on decisions by individual Members in consideration of the unique conditions of their irrigated agricultural lands, water quality concerns, and other benefits expected from implementation of the practice. As such, the cost estimate is an estimate of potential, not required costs of implementing specific practices. Any costs for water quality management practices will be based on a market transaction between Members and those vendors or individuals providing services or equipment and not based on an estimate of those costs provided by the board. The cost estimates include estimated fees the third-party may charge to prepare the required reports and conduct the required monitoring, as well as annual permit fees that are charged to permitted dischargers for permit coverage. In accordance with the State Water Board's Fee Regulations, the current annual permit fee charged to members covered by this Order is \$0.75/acre. The combined total estimated average costs that include third-party and state fees are estimated to be \$6.04 /acre annually or less than 5% of the total estimated average cost of \$123.56 per acre. There are a number of funding programs that may be available to assist growers in the implementation of water quality management practices through grants and loans (e.g., Environmental Quality Incentives Program, State Water Board Agricultural Drainage Management Loan Program). Following is a discussion regarding derivation of the cost estimate for the Order.

This Order, which implements the Long-term ILRP within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area, is based mainly on Alternatives 2 and 4 of the PEIR, but does include elements from Alternatives 2-5. The Order contains the third-party lead entity structure, surface and groundwater management plans, and watershed-based surface water quality monitoring approach similar to Alternative 2 of the PEIR; farm planning, management practices tracking, nitrogen tracking, and regional groundwater monitoring similar to Alternative 4 of the PEIR; sediment and erosion control plan (under Alternative 3, "farm plan") recommendation/ certification requirements similar to Alternative 3; prioritized installation of groundwater monitoring wells similar to Alternative 5; and a prioritization system based on systems described by

⁵⁷ Per Water Code section 13360, the Central Valley Water Board may not specify the manner in which a Member complies with water quality requirements.

Alternatives 2 and 4. Therefore, potential costs of these portions of the Order are estimated using the costs for these components of Alternative 2 and Alternative 5 given in the *Draft Technical Memorandum Concerning the Economic Analysis of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program* (Economics Report).⁵⁸ Table 8 summarizes the major regulatory elements of the Order and provides reference to the PEIR alternative basis.

Table 8. Summary of regulatory elements

Order elements	Equivalent element from Alternatives 2-5
Third-party administration	Alternative 2
Farm evaluation Sediment and erosion control plan Nitrogen management plans	Alternative 4: farm water quality management plan and certified nutrient management plan
Recommended/ certified sediment and erosion plans	Alternative 3: certification of farm water quality plans
Surface and groundwater management plans	Alternative 2 surface and groundwater management plans
Watershed-based representative surface water monitoring	Alternative 2 watershed-based surface water monitoring
Trend groundwater quality monitoring	Alternative 4 regional groundwater quality trend monitoring
Management practices evaluation program	Alternative 4 regional groundwater monitoring, targeted site-specific studies to evaluate the effects of changes in management practices on groundwater quality and Alternative 5 installation of groundwater monitoring wells at prioritized sites
Management practice reporting	Alternative 4 tracking of practices
Nitrogen management plan summary reporting	Alternative 4 nutrient tracking
Management practices implementation	Alternative 2 or 4 management practice implementation

The administrative costs of the Order are estimated to be similar to the costs shown for Alternative 2 in Table 2-19 of the Economics Report. Additional costs have been included for third-party preparation of: notice of applicability, sediment and erosion assessment report, monitoring report. Farm evaluation, sediment and erosion control plan and nitrogen management planning (farm planning) costs are estimated using the costs for farm planning (page 2-22, Economics Report, \$2,500 per Member plus an additional annual cost for updating farm planning documents and associated reporting). Alternative 3’s cost estimate for certification of individual farm water quality plans is included to estimate the potential cost of recommended/certified sediment and erosion control plans (Table 2-20, Economics Report). Total surface water monitoring and reporting costs are estimated to be similar to the costs shown for Alternative 2 –essentially a continuation of the current watershed-based surface water monitoring approach. Total trend groundwater monitoring and reporting costs are estimated using regional groundwater monitoring costs and planning costs given on page 2-20 and Table 2-14 of the Economics Report, respectively. Additional cost estimates have been included for the groundwater quality assessment report and management practices evaluation program. Costs for installation of groundwater monitoring wells are estimated using the costs shown in Table 2-15 of the Economics Report. Tracking costs of management practices and nitrogen management plan information are estimated to be similar to the costs shown for Alternative 4 in Table 2-21 of the economics report –under “tracking.” Management practices costs have been estimated for the Delta Carbona and North Valley Floor Watersheds (Existing Conditions Report) generally using the methodology outlined in pages 2-6 to 2-16 of the Economics

⁵⁸ ICF International. 2010. *Draft Technical Memorandum Concerning the Economic Analysis of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program*. Draft. July. (ICF 05508.05.) Sacramento, CA. Prepared for: Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Sacramento, CA

Report.⁵⁹ Estimated average annualized costs per acre of the Order relative to full implementation of the current waiver program in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area are summarized below in Table 9.⁶⁰

Table 9. Estimated annual average per acre cost* of the Order relative to full implementation of the current program (PEIR Alternative 1) in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area

	Order	Current program	Change
Administration	1.46	1.08	0.37
Farm planning	1.83	--	1.83
Monitoring/reporting/tracking	4.58	1.18	3.41
Management practices*	115.69	115.22	0.47
Total	123.56	117.48	6.09

* Costs are an estimate of *potential*, not required costs of implementing specific practices
 Totals may not add up due to rounding.

The Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basin Plan includes an estimate of potential costs and sources of financing for the long-term irrigated lands program. The estimated costs were derived by analyzing the alternatives evaluated in the PEIR using the cost figures provided in the Economics Report. The Basin Plan cost estimate is provided as a range applicable to implementation of the program throughout the Central Valley. The Basin Plan’s estimated total annualized cost of the irrigated lands program is \$216 million to \$1.3 billion, or \$27 to \$168 per acre.⁶¹ The estimated total average annual cost of this Order of \$72 million dollars (\$123.56 per acre) falls within the estimated cost range for the irrigated lands program as described in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basin Plan when considering per acre costs (\$27-\$168 per acre).

The estimated total average annual cost per acre of Alternative 4 in the San Joaquin River Watershed is \$122.90 (generally applicable to the San Joaquin County and Delta Area).⁶² The Order, based substantially on Alternative 4, has a similar average annual cost to members and is expected to have similar overall economic impacts, as described in the Economics Report⁶³. This is because all costs of the ILRP are paid by Members through fees or other direct costs (e.g., individual implementation of improved practices). Therefore potential economic effects to individual Members associated with such costs will also be similar in nature.

XVI. California Water Code Section 13263

California Water Code section 13263 requires that the Central Valley Water Board consider the following factors, found in section 13241, when considering adoption of waste discharge requirements.

⁵⁹ The estimation for management practice costs does not include a potential cost for installation of tailwater return systems at irrigated pasture operations. Source studies for observed water/sediment toxicity in the watershed point to pesticides not used by irrigated pasture (see pp. 3-76 and 3-102, Existing Conditions Report and Table 2-6, Economics Report).

⁶⁰ This discussion provides a brief summary of the major costs. A detailed cost spreadsheet showing calculations and assumptions for this analysis is part of the administrative record.

⁶¹ Per acre average cost calculated using an estimate for total irrigated agricultural acres in the Central Valley (7.9 million acres, Table 3-3, Economics Report).

⁶² This is an average estimated cost of Alternative 4 within the entire San Joaquin River Watershed, which encompasses the San Joaquin and Delta Area. Therefore, this overall average cost is applicable for estimating costs of Alternative 4 in the San Joaquin and Delta Area.

⁶³ The estimated average cost of this Order is less than the cost estimated for Alternative 4. It is expected that the costs will not be exactly the same because the Order is based on components of alternatives other than Alternative 4 alone. Utilization of Alternative 4’s potential economic impacts provides a conservative measurement of the Order’s potential economic effects.

(a) *Past, present, and probable future beneficial uses of water*

The Central Valley Water Board's Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins (Basin Plan), and Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary identify applicable beneficial uses of surface and groundwater within the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins, and San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary. The Order protects the beneficial uses identified in the Plans. Applicable past, present, and probable future beneficial uses of Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basin, and San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary waters were considered by the Central Valley Water Board as part of the Basin Planning process and are reflected in the Basin Plans themselves. The Order is a general order applicable to a wide geographic area. Therefore, it is appropriate to consider beneficial uses as identified in the Basin Plans and applicable policies, rather than a site specific evaluation that might be appropriate for WDRs applicable to a single discharger.

(b) *Environmental characteristics of the hydrographic unit under consideration, including the quality of water available thereto*

Environmental characteristics of the San Joaquin County and Delta Area have been considered in the development of irrigated lands program requirements as part of the Central Valley Water Board's 2008 *Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program Existing Conditions Report* and the PEIR. In these reports, existing water quality and other environmental conditions throughout the Central Valley have been considered in the evaluation of six program alternatives for regulating waste discharge from irrigated lands. This Order's requirements are based on the alternatives evaluated in the PEIR.

(c) *Water quality conditions that could reasonably be achieved through the coordinated control of all factors which affect water quality in the area*

This Order provides a process to review these factors during implementation of water quality management plans (SQMPs/GQMPs). The Order requires that discharges of waste from irrigated lands to surface water and groundwater do not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable water quality objectives. SQMPs and GQMPs are required in areas where water quality objectives are not being met—where irrigated lands are a potential source of the concern, and in areas where irrigated agriculture may be causing or contributing to a trend of degradation that may threaten applicable beneficial uses. GQMPs are also required in high vulnerability groundwater areas. Under these plans, sources of waste must be estimated along with background water quality to determine what options exist for reducing waste discharge to ensure that irrigated lands are not causing or contributing to the water quality problem. The SQMPs and GQMPs must be designed to ensure that waste discharges from irrigated lands do not cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality objective and meet other applicable requirements of the Order, including, but not limited to, section III.

(d) *Economic considerations*

The PEIR was supported by the *Draft Technical Memorandum Concerning the Economic Analysis of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program* (Economics Report). An extensive economic analysis was presented in this report to estimate the cost and broader economic impact on irrigated agricultural operations associated with the five alternatives for the irrigated lands program, including the lands regulated by this Order. Central Valley Water Board staff was also able to use that analysis to estimate costs of a sixth alternative, since the sixth alternative fell within the range of the five alternatives. This cost estimate is found in Appendix A of the PEIR. This Order is based on the alternatives evaluated in the PEIR, which is part of the administrative record. Therefore, potential economic considerations related to the Order have been considered as part of the overall economic analysis for implementation of the long-term irrigated lands regulatory program. This Order is a single action in a series of actions to implement the ILRP in the Central Valley region. Because the Order has been developed from the alternatives evaluated in the PEIR, economic effects will be within the range of those described for the alternatives.

One measure considered in the PEIR is the potential loss of Important Farmland⁶⁴ due to increased regulatory costs. This information has been used in the context of this Order to estimate potential loss of Important Farmland within the San Joaquin County and Delta area. It is estimated that approximately 39,000 acres of Important Farmland within the San Joaquin County and Delta area potentially would be removed from production under full implementation of the previous conditional waiver program (Conditional Waiver Order R5-2006-0053); it is estimated that an additional 2,882 acres of Important Farmland may be removed from production due to increased regulatory costs of this Order (total of approximately 42,000 acres, as described in Attachment D of this Order). As described in the Economics Report, most of the estimated losses would be to lower value crop land, such as irrigated pasture and forage crops.

As described in Attachment D, the board also considered the costs and potential loss of Important Farmland associated with directly regulating growers and requiring individual monitoring.

Using the results from the Economics Report (Table 2-22) for the San Joaquin River basin, the projected cost of Alternative 5 is an average of \$186.11 per acre per year, with a projected \$47.98 per acre annual cost for monitoring and \$8.88 per acre for administration (primarily board staff costs). The estimated average cost of this Order is \$123.56 per acre annually with an estimated average annual cost of \$4.58 per acre for monitoring. For the approximately 582,000 in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area, the additional \$62.55 per acre average annual cost for an individual monitoring/direct regulatory oversight approach would increase costs for the whole watershed by approximately \$36 million per year.

The costs associated with Alternative 5 would result in a projected loss of 68,000⁶⁵ acres of irrigated lands, as compared to the estimated loss associated with this Order of approximately 42,000 acres.

The additional costs and potential additional loss of Important Farmland associated with direct, individual regulation can be avoided should growers be able to successfully protect water quality under this Order. The successful monitoring, reporting, and outreach efforts by the Coalition and the improvements in water quality under the Coalition Group waiver suggest that providing a less costly alternative for a grower to comply with Porter-Cologne is reasonable, appropriate, and has high a strong likelihood of success.

(e) *The need for developing housing within the region*

This Order establishes waste discharge requirements for irrigated lands in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area. The Order is not intended to establish requirements for any facilities that accept wastewater from residences or stormwater runoff from residential areas. This Order will not affect the development of housing within the region.

(f) *The need to develop and use recycled water*

This Order does not establish any requirements for the use or purveyance of recycled wastewater. Where an agricultural operation may have access to recycled wastewater of appropriate quality for application to fields, the operation would need to obtain appropriate waste discharge requirements from the Central Valley Water Board prior to initiating use. This need to obtain additional waste discharge requirements in order to recycle wastewater on agricultural fields instead of providing requirements under this Order may complicate potential use of recycled wastewater on agricultural fields. However, the location of agricultural fields in rural areas generally limits access to large

⁶⁴ Important Farmland is defined in the PEIR as farmland identified as prime, unique, or of statewide importance by the California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.

⁶⁵ Staff calculated the potential loss of agricultural land similar to Alternative 5 from Table 5.10-6, Volume I of the draft PEIR based on the ratio of irrigated lands covered by the tentative Order to the total irrigated lands in the San Joaquin River Basin (this is the same methodology as described in Attachment D, pages 18 and 19 for calculating potential loss of Important Farmland under the tentative Order).

volumes of appropriately treated recycled wastewater. As such, it is not anticipated that there is a need to develop general waste discharge requirements for application of recycled wastewater on agricultural fields in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area.

Table 10. Reports, plans and monitoring required under the Order. Requirements are associated with fulfilling the Non-Point Source Policy, Resolution 68-16, and requirements contained in the Basin Plans. Page numbers refer to Information Sheet, unless noted otherwise.

Frequency	Report/Plan or Type of Monitoring	Purpose/Intent	Information Sheet Page
Third-Party Requirements			
One-time	Sediment Discharge and Erosion Assessment Report (General Order § VIII.E; AttB § VI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify areas subject to erosion and sediment discharge. Basis for determining which Members must prepare Sediment and Erosion Control Plans to meet Performance Standards b, e, and f. 	AttB, p.30
	Groundwater Quality Assessment Report (GAR) (General Order § VIII.D.1; AttB § IV.A)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify groundwater vulnerability areas and constituents of concern for high vulnerability areas - provides foundation for management plan, MPEP and trend monitoring. Identify areas in which to meet Performance Standards c, e, f, and potentially d; Members may need to take additional action. 	11,12,22, 26-27, 49,50
	Comprehensive Management Plan (Surface/Groundwater Quality) (General Order § VIII.H)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop regional plans to collectively address identified water quality problems or degradation trends (based on monitoring results/GAR). Develop strategy with schedule and milestones to encourage and track implementation of management practices necessary to meet Performance Standards and describe feedback monitoring. 	13-23,28-29, 50-53, 57,58
Quarterly / Annually	Annual Monitoring Report/ Management Plan Status Report (General Order § VIII.G; AttB § V)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summarize and assess monitoring results and management practice implementation status/effectiveness. Provide feedback on whether monitoring, management plans, or management practice implementation needs to be adjusted. 	35, 36
	Trend Groundwater Quality Monitoring (General Order § VIII.D.3; AttB § IV.C)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess groundwater quality and track spatial/temporal trends. Based on vulnerability designations in GAR. Provide feedback on regional scale as to whether management practices are improving water quality. 	24-26, 41, 54, 55
Variable	Surface Water Monitoring (AttB § III)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess surface water quality and track spatial/temporal trends, feedback on progress towards meeting goals. Results inform management plan implementation. Provide feedback at sites representative of irrigated lands discharges as to whether management practices are improving water quality. 	11-13, 51,55
	Management Practices Evaluation Program (MPEP) (General Order § VIII.D.2; AttB § IV.B)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify existing management practices protective of groundwater quality and assess effectiveness of new management practices. Provide information needed to identify which practices meet Performance Standards c, e, and f. Based on identification of constituents of concern for high vulnerability areas in GAR. 	25,26,51-52

Frequency	Report/Plan or Type of Monitoring	Purpose/Intent	Information Sheet Page
Member Requirements			
One-time	Sediment Discharge and Erosion Control Plan (General Order § VII.C)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify site-specific practices the Member is implementing to meet Performance Standard b in high vulnerability areas. Only Members in high vulnerability areas, as identified in the Sediment Discharge and Erosion Assessment Report, need to develop the Plan (updated as needed). 	33-34
Annually	Nitrogen Management Plan (NMP)/ NMP Summary Report (General Order § VII.D)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce nitrogen discharges to groundwater to meet nitrate standards. Describe if/how Performance Standard d is met.* Provide information needed to determine whether Member is causing or contributing to nitrate problem (NMP Summary Report). Only Members in high vulnerability areas, as identified in GAR, need to prepare Summary Reports. 	31-32,41-42, 47-49, 52-54
	Farm Evaluation (General Order § VII.B)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide information on management practices implemented by the Member to meet Performance Standards a-g.* Reporting every five (5) years in low vulnerability areas. 	30-31,41, 47-48,52-54

Farm Management Performance Standards constitute best practicable treatment or control (BPTC)/best efforts (Attachment A, page 48):

- a. Minimize waste discharge offsite in surface water (General Order § IV.B.20)
- b. Minimize or eliminate the discharge of sediment above background levels (General Order § IV.B.7)
- c. Minimize percolation of waste to groundwater (General Order § IV.B.20)
- d. Minimize excess nutrient application relative to crop consumption (General Order § IV.B.8)
- e. Prevent pollution and nuisance (General Order § III.A.1, § III.B.1, § IV.A.3)
- f. Achieve and maintain water quality objectives and beneficial uses (General Order § III.A.1, § III.B.1, § IV.A.3)
- g. Protect wellheads from surface water intrusion (General Order § IV.B.20)

* Members may need to take additional action (i.e., improve practices), if Performance Standard is not met.

Figure 10. Groundwater Protection Areas and Hydrogeologically Vulnerable Areas within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area.




Figure 11. Maximum Nitrate Concentrations per Square Mile Section of Land for Samples with Nitrate Detections. GAMA Database.





Figure 12. Land use for the San Joaquin County and Delta Area.



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

ORDER R5-2014-0029
**ATTACHMENT B TO ORDER R5-2014-0029
MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS GENERAL ORDER
FOR
GROWERS WITHIN THE SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY AND DELTA AREA WATERSHED
THAT ARE MEMBERS OF A THIRD-PARTY GROUP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction	2
II. General Provisions.....	2
III. Surface Water Quality Monitoring Requirements.....	3
A. Surface Water Monitoring Sites	3
1. Core Site Monitoring.....	3
2. Represented Site Monitoring	3
3. Special Project Sites.....	4
B. Monitoring Locations	4
C. Monitoring Requirements and Schedule.....	6
1. Surface Water Monitoring	6
2. Monitoring Schedule and Frequency	6
3. Monitoring Parameters	7
4. Toxicity Testing.....	9
5. Special Project Monitoring	11
D. Surface Water Data Management Requirements.....	11
IV. Groundwater Quality Monitoring and Management Practice Assessment, and Evaluation Requirements	12
A. Groundwater Quality Assessment Report	13
B. Management Practice Evaluation Program	15
C. Groundwater Quality Trend Monitoring	17
D. Management Practices Evaluation Workplan	18
E. Trend Monitoring Workplan	19
V. Third-Party Reporting Requirements.....	20
A. Quarterly Submittals of Surface Water Monitoring Results.....	20
B. Annual Groundwater Monitoring Results.....	21
C. Monitoring Report	21
D. Surface Water Exceedance Reports	24
E. Basin Plan Amendment Workplan	25
VI. Sediment Discharge and Erosion Assessment Report.....	26
VII. Water Quality Triggers for Development of Management Plans	26
VIII. Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP).....	26

Appendix MRP-1: Third-Party Management Plan Requirements

Appendix MRP-2: Monitoring Well Installation and Sampling Plan and Completion Report

I. Introduction

This Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) is issued pursuant to California Water Code (Water Code) section 13267 which authorizes the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (hereafter Central Valley Water Board or “board”), to require preparation and submittal of technical and monitoring reports. This MRP includes requirements for a third-party representative entity assisting individual irrigated lands operators or owners that are members of the third-party (Members), as well as requirements for individual Members subject to and enrolled under Waste Discharge Requirements General Order for Growers within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area that are Members of the Third-Party Group, Order R5-2014-0029 (hereafter referred to as the “Order”). This MRP applies to each third-party issued an NOA by the Executive Officer. The requirements of this MRP are necessary to monitor Member compliance with the provisions of the Order and determine whether state waters receiving discharges from Member parcels are meeting water quality objectives. Additional discussion and rationale for this MRP’s requirements are provided in Attachment A of the Order.

This MRP establishes specific surface and groundwater monitoring, reporting, and electronic data deliverable requirements for the third-party. Due to the nature of irrigated agricultural operations, monitoring requirements for surface waters and groundwater will be periodically reassessed to determine if changes should be made to better represent irrigated agriculture discharges to state waters. The monitoring schedule will also be reassessed so that constituents are monitored during application and/or release timeframes when constituents of concern are most likely to affect water quality. The third-party shall not implement any changes to this MRP unless the Central Valley Water Board or the Executive Officer issues a revised MRP. The Central Valley Water Board or Executive Officer may revise this MRP as it applies to a third-party or all third-parties governed by the Order. The Central Valley Water Board or Executive Officer may rescind this MRP and issue a new MRP as it applies to a third-party or all third-parties governed by the Order.

II. General Provisions

This Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) conforms to the goals of the Non-point Source (NPS) Program as outlined in *The Plan for California’s Nonpoint Source Pollution (NPS) Program* by:

- tracking, monitoring, assessing and reporting program activities,
- ensuring consistent and accurate reporting of monitoring activities,
- targeting NPS Program activities at the watershed level,
- coordinating with public and private partners, and
- tracking implementation of management practices to improve water quality and protect existing beneficial uses.

Monitoring data collected to meet the requirements of the Order must be collected and analyzed in a manner that assures the quality of the data. The third-party must follow sampling and analytical procedures as specified in Attachment C, Order No. R5-2008-0005, Coalition Group Monitoring Program Quality Assurance Project Plan Guidelines (QAPP Guidelines) and any revisions thereto approved by the Executive Officer.¹

To the extent feasible, all technical reports required by this MRP must be submitted electronically in a format specified by the Central Valley Water Board that is reasonably available to the third-party.

This MRP requires the third-party to collect information from its Members and allows the third-party to report the information to the board in a summary format. The third-party must submit specific

¹ Central Valley Water Board staff will circulate proposed revisions of the QAPP Guidelines for public review and comment prior to Executive Officer consideration for approval.

Member information collected as part of the Order and this MRP when requested by the Executive Officer or as specified in the Order.

This MRP Order becomes effective on 12 March 2014. The Central Valley Water Board Executive Officer may revise this MRP as necessary. Upon the Executive Officer issuing the Notice of Applicability to the third-party, the third-party, on behalf of the individual Members, shall implement the following monitoring and reporting.

III. Surface Water Quality Monitoring Requirements

The surface water quality monitoring and reporting requirements in the MRP have been developed in consideration of the critical questions identified in the Information Sheet (Attachment A, section VI.A.1). The third-party must collect sufficient data to describe irrigated agriculture's impacts on surface water quality and to determine whether existing or newly implemented management practices comply with the surface water receiving water limitations of the Order.

A. Surface Water Monitoring Sites

There are three different types of monitoring sites described below: 1) Core sites; 2) Represented sites; and 3) Special Project sites. Core sites are monitored comprehensively on a recurring basis to track trends in surface water quality and to identify water quality problems. Represented sites generally have characteristics similar to, and are, therefore, represented by the Core sites within their common zone.² When a water quality problem is identified at a Core site, the Represented sites are evaluated and potentially monitored to determine whether the water quality problem is also occurring at the Represented site (some represented water bodies may not have a monitoring site, e.g. in cases when there is no access). Special Project sites are identified and monitored to investigate identified water quality problems. A Core site or Represented site may also be a Special Project site.

1. Core Site Monitoring

At a minimum, surface water monitoring (as described in section III.C.1.a) within each zone shall be conducted at one of the designated Core sites (see Table 1) for two consecutive years, followed by two years of monitoring at the second Core monitoring site for those zones in which two Core sites are present. If two Core monitoring sites are established, core site monitoring shall alternate continuously between the two Core sites. If the Executive Officer has approved a single Core site within a zone, monitoring is to occur for a minimum of two consecutive years followed by two years of no Core site monitoring (per Section III.C.1.a). The Executive Officer may determine that additional monitoring must continue per Section III.C.1.b. during the years of no regularly scheduled Core Site monitoring. When a water quality objective or trigger limit at a monitored Core site is exceeded, the parameter associated with the exceedance must be monitored for a third consecutive year. If two exceedances have occurred within the two years the Core site is being monitored, a third year of monitoring is not required. However, the parameter will be monitored in accordance with the Management Plan for that parameter and site.

2. Represented Site Monitoring

When a water quality objective or trigger limit is exceeded at a Core site, the third-party must evaluate the potential for similar risks or threats to water quality associated with that parameter at the sites represented by the Core site (Represented sites). The evaluation must be included in the Monitoring Report (see section V below). If pesticide use information or other factors indicate a

² As part of their 25 August 2008 Monitoring and Reporting Program Plan (2008 MRPP), the San Joaquin County and Delta Area Coalition (the Coalition) designated six zones within its area based on hydrology, crop types, land use, soil types, and rainfall. A seventh zone was added in 2013 as part of the Order development.

risk, the third party must either 1) perform monitoring for that parameter in the appropriate Represented water bodies, or 2) where site access is not available, implement the applicable surface water quality management plan actions associated with the Core site. The proposed monitoring plan must be included in the Monitoring Plan Update (see section III.C below). Any such monitoring must occur for a minimum of two years during the time period of highest risk of exceedance of water quality objectives for that parameter. When a water quality objective at a monitored Represented site is exceeded, the parameter associated with the exceedance must be monitored for a third consecutive year. If two exceedances have occurred within the two years the Represented site is being monitored, a third year of monitoring is not required. However, the parameter will be monitored in accordance with the Management Plan for that parameter and site.

Any area with irrigated agricultural waste discharge that does not contain a monitoring site due to issues of access or location downstream of urban influence must be represented by the Core site(s) in that zone. Any applicable surface water quality management plan (SQMP) actions associated with the Core site must take place in the associated represented watershed areas (represented drainages without monitoring sites) unless the Executive Officer concurs with an evaluation of the represented watershed area (described above) that concludes the water quality problem identified at the Core site is not likely to occur in the represented watershed area due to discharge from irrigated agriculture.

3. Special Project Sites

In addition to Core and Represented sites, the third-party may designate Special Project sites as needed in a surface water quality management plan (SQMP) to evaluate commodity or management practice-specific effects on identified water quality problems,³ or to evaluate sources of identified water quality problems.

In accordance with Water Code section 13267, the Executive Officer may require the third-party to conduct local or site-specific monitoring to address a parameter associated with a management plan or TMDL (see section III.C.5. below). Core sites and Represented sites located in areas where management plans are required will also be considered Special Project sites for the parameter(s) subject to the management plan(s).

B. Monitoring Locations

The location of Core and monitored Represented sites are identified in Table 1 below. The third-party may submit written requests (including technical justification) for removal/addition of monitoring sites for approval by the Executive Officer. Sites that are marked as TBD (to be determined) will be determined by 1 August of the year in which monitoring begins (monitoring period begins 1 October). See Monitoring Schedule and Frequency, III.C.2.

³ "Water quality problem" is defined in Attachment E.

Table 1. Third-party Core and Monitored Represented* Sites By Zone

Zone	Core Site (First, Second)	Represented HUC Subwatershed ¹	Represented Site Name	Station Code	Latitude	Longitude
1	1	Mokelumne River @ Bruella Rd, TBD		531XMRABR	38.16010	-121.20510
1		Coyote Creek	Coyote Creek tributary @ Jack Tone Rd	531CCTALR	38.24082	-121.15191
1		Jahant Slough	Jahant Slough @ Cherokee Ln	531XJSACL	38.21035	-121.26199
1		Lower Bear Creek	Bear Creek @ North Alpine Rd	531BCANAR	38.07431	-121.21090
1		Mosher Creek	Mosher Creek @ North Alpine Rd	531MCANAR	38.06088	-121.20913
1		Murphy Creek-Mokelumne River	Mokelumne River Drain @ North Lower Sacramento Rd	531MRDNLS	38.19557	-121.29362
1		Pixley Slough	Pixley Slough @ Fury Rd	531XPSAFR	38.08256	-121.24147
2	2	French Camp Slough @ Airport Way, TBD		531SJC504	37.88170	-121.24930
2		Lower Duck Creek	Duck Creek @ Highway 4	531XDCAHF	37.94910	-121.18100
2		Lower Lone Tree Creek	Unnamed Drain to Lone Tree Creek @ Jack Tone Rd	531UDLTAJ	37.85358	-121.14570
2		McLeod Lake-Mormon Slough	Mormon Slough @ Jack Tone Rd	544MSAJTR	37.96470	-121.14880
2		Middle Lone Tree Creek	Lone Tree Creek @ Jack Tone Rd	531XLTCJR	37.83760	-121.14380
2		Simmons Creek-Littlejohns Creek	Littlejohns Creek @ Jack Tone Rd	531XLCAJR	37.88960	-121.14610
3	3	Terminus Tract Drain @ Hwy 12, TBD		544XTTHWT	38.11660	-121.49360
3		Fivemile Creek-San Joaquin River	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
3		Hog Slough	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
3		South Mokelumne River-Mokelumne River	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
3		Telephone Cut-Bishop Cut	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
3		Venice Island-Little Connection Slough	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
4	4	Roberts Island @ Whiskey Slough Pump Rd, TBD		544RIAWSP	37.96698	-121.46366
4		Jersey Island-Taylor Slough	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
4		Lower Kellogg Creek	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
4		Lower Old River	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
4		Mandeville Island-Connection Slough	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
4		McDonald Island-Hayes Slough	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
4		Middle River-San Joaquin River	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
5	5	Walthall Slough @ Woodward Ave, NA				
5		Walthall Slough-San Joaquin River	Walthall Slough @ Woodward Ave	544WSAWAV	37.77046	-121.29227
6	6	Contra Costa Zone ¹ , TBD		TBD	TBD	TBD
7	7	Union Island Drain @ Bonetti Rd, TBD		544UIDABR	37.87170	-121.52551
7		Roberts Island-Trapper Slough	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
7		Town of French Camp-San Joaquin River	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
7		Union Island	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
<p>¹The first Monitoring Plan Update must identify a site within Zone 6 or in another Zone that will be representative of discharges for the 428 irrigated acres in this Zone. *Monitored Represented sites in the table are not an exhaustive list; the Executive Officer may require the third-party to add monitoring sites for represented water bodies as necessary to meet the requirements of the Order.</p>						

C. Monitoring Requirements and Schedule

1. Surface Water Monitoring

- a. Surface water monitoring must provide sufficient data to describe irrigated agriculture's impacts on surface water quality, determine effectiveness of existing or newly implemented management practices, determine whether waste discharges from all represented types of irrigated agricultural operations comply with the receiving water limitations of the Order, and track any trends in degradation. Surface water assessment monitoring shall include a comprehensive suite of constituents (also referred to as "parameters") monitored periodically in a manner that allows for an evaluation of the condition of a water body and determination of whether irrigated agriculture operations in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area are causing or contributing to any surface water quality problems.

Surface water monitoring shall be conducted at Core sites and shall consist of the general water quality parameters, nutrients, pathogen indicators, water column and sediment toxicity, pesticides, and metals identified in section III.C.3.

- b. *Follow-up sampling.* The Central Valley Water Board Executive Officer may request that a parameter(s) of concern continue to be monitored at a specific Core or Represented site during non-scheduled periods. Parameters of concern may include, but are not limited to, parameters that exceed an applicable water quality objective or water quality trigger (see section VII).
- c. *Storm runoff monitoring.* Sampling events shall be scheduled to capture at least two storm runoff events per year at all monitoring sites, except where a different frequency has been required or approved by the Executive Officer. The third-party shall identify storm runoff monitoring criteria in the initial Monitoring Plan Update (see section III.C.2). The criteria may include, but are not limited to, precipitation amounts or intensity, visually observed or measured increases in flow at the monitoring site(s) following a rainfall event, knowledge of soils or other factors affecting when storm runoff is expected to occur at monitoring sites, or consultation with Central Valley Water Board staff. Storm runoff monitoring may be coordinated with Assessment monitoring such that no additional sampling is required that month. However, the collection of storm runoff samples shall not be contingent upon the timing of other sampling events and could result in monitoring more than once during a month.

2. Monitoring Schedule and Frequency

By 1 August of the calendar year in which monitoring begins, the third-party shall prepare a Monitoring Plan Update. The Monitoring Plan Update shall identify the appropriate monitoring periods (e.g., months, seasons) and frequency for all parameters that require testing (Table 2) at each site that is scheduled to be monitored (see section III.C.3 below)⁴. The Monitoring Plan Update shall include a discussion of the rationale to support the proposed schedule, and shall be subject to Executive Officer review and approval prior to the initiation of changes in monitoring. The third-party shall continue monitoring as described in the Coalition's 25 August 2008 Monitoring and Reporting Program Order (2008 MRP) and approved modifications thereto until the Executive Officer has approved the initial Monitoring Plan Update

For metals, pesticides, and aquatic toxicity, the monitoring periods shall be determined utilizing previous monitoring results, knowledge of agricultural use patterns (if applicable), pesticide use trends, chemical characteristics, and other applicable criteria. Parameters not previously monitored under Monitoring and Reporting Program Order R5-2008-0831 at a site shall be monitored for two consecutive years during periods when most likely to be present. All other required parameters

⁴ A monitoring year is defined according to water year, which is 1 October through 30 September.

shall be monitored according to an approved schedule and frequency during the periods when monitoring is conducted at the Core and Represented sites.

Monitoring must be conducted when the pollutant is most likely to be present. If there is a temporal or seasonal component to the beneficial use, monitoring must also be conducted when beneficial use impacts could occur. The frequency of data collection must be sufficient to allow determination of compliance with the relevant numeric water quality objective(s) or water quality triggers. Adequate characterization of the presence of some pollutants may require monitoring more than once per month. The third-party may submit written requests for the removal or addition of monitoring sites or parameters, or to modify the monitoring schedule and frequency, for approval by the Executive Officer.

3. Monitoring Parameters

Water quality and flow monitoring shall be used to assess the wastes in discharges from irrigated lands to surface waters and to evaluate the effectiveness of implemented management practices. Water quality is evaluated with both field-measured parameters and laboratory analytical data as listed in Table 2 of this MRP, according to time of year and monitoring regime. The pesticides marked as "to be determined" (TBD) in Table 2 shall be identified as part of a process that includes input from qualified scientists and coordination with the Department of Pesticide Regulation. Based on the evaluation factors identified in this process, the Executive Officer will provide the third-party with a list of pesticides⁵ that must be considered by the third-party for inclusion in the Monitoring Plan Update. The third-party shall apply the evaluation factors to the relevant conditions in each site sub-watershed and propose the pesticides to be monitored in its Monitoring Plan Update.

Parameters that are part of an adopted TMDL that is in effect and for which irrigated agriculture is a source within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area shall be monitored in accordance with the adopted Basin Plan provisions or as directed by the Executive Officer. Current adopted TMDLs within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area for which irrigated agriculture is a source include the San Joaquin River Deep Water Ship Channel dissolved oxygen; San Joaquin River salt, boron, selenium, and Delta diazinon, and chlorpyrifos, and Delta methyl-mercury.

The metals to be monitored at sites within each site subwatershed shall be determined through an evaluation of several factors. The evaluation will provide the basis for including or excluding each metal. Evaluation factors shall include, but not be limited to: documented use of the metal applied to lands for irrigated agricultural purposes in the last three years; prior monitoring results; geological or hydrological conditions; and mobilization or concentration by irrigated agricultural operations. The third-party may also consider other factors such as acute and chronic toxicity thresholds and chemical characteristics of the metals. The third-party shall evaluate the monitoring parameters listed in Table 2 to determine which metals and metal fractions warrant monitoring for each site subwatershed. Documentation of the evaluations must be provided to the Central Valley Water Board as part of the Monitoring Plan Update.

⁵ Pesticides to be monitored may include environmentally stable degradates of the registered active ingredient. The evaluation factors applied to degradates will be the same as those applied to the registered active ingredient and will include consideration of the commercial availability of analytical methods to detect the degradate. Potential degradates to evaluate will be identified through Central Valley Water Board and third-party consultation with the Department of Pesticide Regulation.

Table 2: Monitoring Parameters

	Measured Parameter	Matrix	Required
Field Measurements	Estimated Flow (cfs)	Water	x
	Photo Documentation	Site	x
	Conductivity (at 25 °C) (µs/cm)	Water	x
	Temperature (°C)	Water	x
	pH	Water	x
	Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)	Water	x
Drinking Water	<i>E. coli</i>	Water	x
	Total Organic Carbon (TOC)	Water	x
General Physical	Hardness (as CaCO ₃)	Water	TBD
	Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	Water	x
	Turbidity	Water	x
Metals	Arsenic (total)	Water	TBD
	Boron (total)	Water	TBD
	Cadmium (dissolved)**	Water	TBD
	Copper (dissolved)**	Water	TBD
	Lead (dissolved)**	Water	TBD
	Molybdenum (total)	Water	TBD
	Nickel (dissolved)**	Water	TBD
	Selenium (total)	Water	TBD
	Zinc (dissolved)**	Water	TBD
Nutrients	Total Ammonia (as N)	Water	x
	Unionized Ammonia (calculated value)	Water	x
	Nitrogen, Nitrate+Nitrite	Water	x
	Soluble Orthophosphate	Water	x
Pesticides	Registered pesticides and degradates determined according to the process identified in section III.C.3.	Water	TBD
303(d)	TMDL constituents required by the Basin Plan 303(d) listed constituents to be monitored if irrigated agriculture is identified as a contributing source within the San Joaquin and Delta Area and requested by the Executive Officer.	Water or Sediment	TBD

Table 2: Monitoring Parameters

	Measured Parameter	Matrix	Required
Water Toxicity	<i>Ceriodaphnia dubia, acute</i>	Water	x
	<i>Pimephales promelas, acute</i>	Water	x
	<i>Selenastrum capricornutum, chronic</i>	Water	x
	Toxicity Identification Evaluation	Water	see section III.C.4
Sediment Toxicity	<i>Hyalella azteca, acute</i>	Sediment	x
Pesticides & Sediment Parameters	Bifenthrin	Sediment	As needed*
	Cyfluthrin	Sediment	As needed*
	Cypermethrin	Sediment	As needed*
	Deltamethrin	Sediment	As needed*
	Esfenvalerate/Fenvalerate	Sediment	As needed*
	Fenpropathrin	Sediment	As needed*
	Lambda cyhalothrin	Sediment	As needed*
	Permethrin	Sediment	As needed*
	Piperonyl butoxide (PBO)	Sediment	As needed*
	Chlorpyrifos	Sediment	As needed*
	Total Organic Carbon	Sediment	x
	Grain Size	Sediment	x

* For sediment samples measuring significant toxicity and < 80% organism survival compared to the control, the sediment pesticide analysis will be performed. Sediment pesticide analyses may be identified according to an evaluation of PUR data (see sediment toxicity testing requirements in section III.C.4 below).

** Hardness samples shall be collected when sampling for these metals.

4. Toxicity Testing

The purpose of toxicity testing is to: 1) evaluate compliance with the Basin Plan narrative toxicity water quality objective; 2) identify the causes of toxicity when and where it is observed (e.g. metals, pesticides, ammonia, etc.); and 3) evaluate any additive toxicity or synergistic effects due to the presence of multiple constituents.

a. Aquatic Toxicity

Aquatic toxicity testing shall include *Ceriodaphnia dubia* (water flea), *Pimephales promelas* (fathead minnow), and *Selenastrum capricornutum* (green alga) in the water column (see Table 2). Testing for *C. dubia* and *P. promelas* shall follow the USEPA acute toxicity testing methods.⁶ Testing for *S. capricornutum* shall follow the USEPA short-term chronic toxicity testing methods.⁷ Toxicity test endpoints are survival for *C. dubia* and *P. promelas*, and growth for *S. capricornutum*.

Water column toxicity analyses shall be conducted on 100% (undiluted) sample for the initial screening. A sufficient sample volume shall be collected in order to allow the laboratory to conduct a Phase I Toxicity Identification Evaluation (TIE) on the same sample, should toxicity be detected, in an effort to identify the cause of the toxicity.

⁶ USEPA. 2002. Methods for Measuring the Acute Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater and Marine Organisms, Fifth Edition. Office of Water, Washington, D.C. USEPA-821-R-02-012.

⁷ USEPA. 2002. Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms, Fourth Edition. Office of Water, Washington, D.C. USEPA-821-R-02-013.

If a 50% or greater difference in *Ceriodaphnia dubia* or *Pimephales promelas* mortality in an ambient sample, as compared to the laboratory control, is detected at any time in an acceptable test, a TIE shall be initiated within 48 hours of such detection. If a 50% or greater reduction in *Selenastrum capricornutum* growth in an ambient sample, as compared to the laboratory control, is detected at the end of an acceptable test, a TIE shall be initiated within 48 hours of such detection.

At a minimum, Phase I TIE⁸ manipulations shall be conducted to determine the general class(es) (e.g., metals, non-polar organics, and polar organics) of the chemical(s) causing toxicity. The laboratory report of TIE results submitted to the Central Valley Water Board must include a detailed description of the specific TIE manipulations that were utilized.

If within the first 96 hours of the initial toxicity screening, the mortality reaches 100%, a multiple dilution test shall be initiated. The dilution series must be initiated within 24 hours of the sample reaching 100% mortality, and must include a minimum of five (5) sample dilutions in order to quantify the magnitude of the toxic response. For the fathead minnow test, the laboratory must take the steps to procure test species within one working day, and the multiple dilution tests must be initiated the day fish are available.

Ceriodaphnia dubia and *Pimephales promelas* Media Renewal

Daily sample water renewals shall occur during all acute toxicity tests to minimize the effects of rapid pesticide losses from test waters. A feeding regime of 2 hours prior to test initiation and 2 hours prior to test renewal shall be applied. Test solution renewal must be 100% renewal for *Ceriodaphnia dubia* by transferring organisms by pipet into fresh aliquot of the original ambient sample, as defined in the freshwater toxicity testing manual.

Selenastrum capricornutum Pre-Test Treatment

Algae toxicity testing shall not be preceded with treatment of the chelating agent EDTA. The purpose of omitting EDTA is to ensure that metals used to control vegetation in the field are not removed from sample aliquots prior to analysis or during the initial screening.

b. Sediment Toxicity

Sediment toxicity analyses shall be conducted according to EPA Method 600/R-99/064. Sampling and analysis for sediment toxicity testing utilizing *Hyalella azteca* (freshwater amphipod also known as Mexican scud) shall be conducted at each monitoring location established by the third-party for water quality monitoring, if appropriate sediment (i.e. silt, clay) is present at the site. If appropriate sediment is not present at the designated water quality monitoring site, an alternative site with appropriate sediment shall be designated for all sediment collection and toxicity testing events. Sediment samples shall be collected and analyzed for toxicity twice per year when water is present. Attempts should be made to collect one sample between 15 August and 15 October, and one sample between 1 March and 30 April, during each year of monitoring. The *H. azteca* sediment toxicity test endpoint is survival. The Executive Officer may request different sediment sample collection timing and frequency under a SQMP.

All sediment samples must be analyzed for total organic carbon (TOC) and grain size. Analysis for TOC is necessary to evaluate the expected magnitude of toxicity to the test species. Note that sediment collected for grain size analysis shall not be frozen. If the sample is not toxic to the test species, the additional sample volume can be discarded.

⁸ USEPA. 1991. Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations. Phase I Toxicity Characterization Procedures. Office of Research and Development, Washington DC. 20460. EPA-600-6-91-003.

Sediment samples that show significant toxicity to *Hyalella azteca* at the end of an acceptable test and that exhibit < 80% organism survival compared to the control will require pesticide analysis of the same sample in an effort to determine the potential cause of toxicity. The third-party may use the previous three years of available pesticide use information to determine which of the parameters listed in Table 2 require testing in the sediment sample. Analysis at practical reporting limits of 1 ng/g on a dry weight basis for each pesticide is required to allow comparison to established lethal concentrations of these chemicals to the test species. This follow-up analysis must begin within five business days of when the toxicity criterion described above is exceeded. The third-party may also follow up with a sediment TIE when there is \geq 50% reduction in test organism survival as compared to the laboratory control. Sediment TIEs are an optional tool.

5. Special Project Monitoring

The Central Valley Water Board or Executive Officer may require the third-party to conduct local or site-specific monitoring where monitoring identifies a water quality problem (Special Project Monitoring). The studies shall be designed to evaluate the effects of changes in management practices on water quality for the parameters of concern. Once Special Project Monitoring is required, the third-party must submit a Special Project Monitoring proposal. The proposal must provide the justification for the proposed study design, specifically identifying how the study design will quantify irrigated agriculture's contribution to the water quality problem, identify sources, and evaluate management practice effectiveness. When such a study is required, the proposed study must include an evaluation of the feasibility of conducting commodity and management practice specific field studies for those commodities and irrigated agricultural practices that could be associated with the constituents of concern. Special Project Monitoring studies will be designed to evaluate the effectiveness of practices used by multiple Members and will not be required of the third-party to evaluate compliance of an individual Member.

D. Surface Water Data Management Requirements

All surface water field and laboratory data (including sediment) must be uploaded into the Central Valley Regional Data Center (CV RDC) database and will be exported to the California Environmental Data Exchange Network (CEDEN) once data have been approved as CEDEN comparable. The third-party will input its data into a replica of the CV RDC database following CV RDC and CEDEN business and formatting rules.

The third-party shall utilize the most current version of the database and update associated lookup lists on a routine basis. The third-party shall ensure that the data loaded meet the formatting and business rules as detailed in the most current version of the document "Format and Business Rules for the CV RDC CEDEN Comparable Database."

The Central Valley Water Board has developed several tools to assist the third-party with processing and loading of its data. These tools, whether required or optional, will help the third-party to efficiently conduct data processing and loading and meet data management requirements.

CEDEN Comparable Field Sheets (Required)

The third party shall use CEDEN comparable field sheets when entering data. An example CEDEN comparable field sheet can be found on the CV RDC webpage. This field sheet was designed to match the entry user interface within the CEDEN comparable database to allow for easier data entry of all sample collection information. Modified versions of the field sheet may be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board Executive Officer for approval.

Format Quick Guide (Optional Tool)

The Format Quick Guide is a guidance document for the formatting of data tailored specifically for the third-party. It contains a column by column guide for filling out the CV RDC data templates with

the applicable required codes. The Central Valley Water Board CV RDC will provide this document, and updates to it, upon request based on an approved monitoring plan and associated QAPP.

EDD Checklist (Optional Tool)

The electronic data deliverable (EDD) checklist provides for a structured method for reviewing data deliverables from data entry staff or laboratories prior to loading. An updated checklist will be made available on the CV RDC website.

Online Data Checker (Optional Tool)

An online data checker was developed to automate the checking of the datasets against the current format requirements and business rules associated with CEDEN comparable data. The data checker can be accessed on the CV RDC webpage. Please note that data submission will not be accepted through this tool; however, the checker can still be used to check data for errors.

Electronic Quality Assurance Program Plan (eQAPP) (Required)

The third-party shall use an eQAPP when collecting and analyzing monitoring data. The eQAPP is a spreadsheet document containing the quality control requirements for each analyte and method as detailed in the most current version of the third-party's approved QAPP. Each analyte, method, extraction, units, recovery limits, QA sample requirement, etc. is included in this document using the appropriate codes required for the CEDEN comparable database. The third party shall use the document to format the reported data and conduct a quality control review prior to loading. Data that do not meet the project quality assurance acceptance requirements must be flagged accordingly and must include brief notes detailing the problem within the provided comments field. Included in this file are also the most recent CEDEN comparable station name and code list as well as the applicable project CEDEN codes for retrieving data from the CEDEN website once data arrive there.

IV. Groundwater Quality Monitoring and Management Practice Assessment, and Evaluation Requirements

The groundwater quality monitoring, assessment, and evaluation requirements in this MRP have been developed in consideration of the critical questions developed by the Groundwater Monitoring Advisory Workgroup (questions are presented in the Information Sheet, Attachment A). The third-party must collect and analyze sufficient data to describe irrigated agricultural impacts on groundwater quality and to determine whether existing or newly implemented management practices comply with the groundwater receiving water limitations of the Order.

The strategy for evaluating groundwater quality and protection consists of 1) Groundwater Quality Assessment Report, 2) Management Practices Evaluation Program, and 3) Groundwater Quality Trend Monitoring Program.

1. The Groundwater Quality Assessment Report (GAR) provides the foundational information necessary for design of the Management Practices Evaluation Program and the Groundwater Quality Trend Monitoring Program. The GAR also identifies the high vulnerability groundwater areas where a Groundwater Quality Management Plan must be developed and implemented, as well as data gap areas for further evaluation.
2. The overall goal of the Management Practice Evaluation Program (MPEP) is to determine the effects, if any, irrigated agricultural practices have on first encountered groundwater under different conditions that could affect the discharge of waste from irrigated lands to groundwater (e.g., soil type, depth to groundwater, irrigation practice, crop type, nutrient management practice).
3. The overall objectives of the Groundwater Quality Trend Monitoring Program are to determine current water quality conditions of groundwater relevant to irrigated agriculture and develop

long-term groundwater quality information that can be used to evaluate the regional effects of irrigated agricultural practices.

Each of these elements has its own specific objectives (provided below), and the design of each will differ in accordance with the specific objectives to be reached. While it is anticipated that these programs will provide sufficient groundwater quality and management practice effectiveness data to evaluate whether management practices of irrigated agriculture are protective of groundwater quality, the Executive Officer may also, pursuant to Water Code section 13267, order Members to perform additional monitoring or evaluations, where violations of this Order are documented or the irrigated agricultural operation is found to be a significant threat to groundwater quality.

A. Groundwater Quality Assessment Report

The purpose of the Groundwater Quality Assessment Report (GAR) is to provide the technical basis informing the scope and level of effort for implementation of the Order's groundwater monitoring and implementation provisions. Three (3) months after receiving an NOA from the Central Valley Water Board, the third-party will provide a proposed outline of the GAR to the Executive Officer that describes data sources and references that will be considered in developing the GAR. The third-party must review and update the GAR to incorporate new information every five (5) years after Executive Officer approval of the GAR.

1. *Objectives.* The main objectives of the GAR are to:

- Provide an assessment of all readily available, applicable and relevant data and information to determine the high and low vulnerability areas where discharges from irrigated lands may result in groundwater quality degradation.
- Establish priorities for implementation of monitoring and studies within high vulnerability or data gap areas.
- Provide a basis for establishing monitoring workplans developed to assess groundwater quality trends.
- Provide a basis for establishing management practices evaluation program workplans and priorities developed to evaluate the effectiveness of agricultural management practices to protect groundwater quality.
- Provide a basis for establishing groundwater quality management plans in high vulnerability areas and priorities for implementation of those plans.

2. *GAR components.* The GAR shall include, at a minimum, the following data components:

- Detailed land use information with emphasis on land uses associated with irrigated agricultural operations. The information shall identify the largest acreage commodity types in the third-party area, including the most prevalent commodities comprising up to at least 80% of the irrigated agricultural acreage in the third-party area.
- Information regarding depth to groundwater, provided as a contour map(s), if readily available. Tabulated and/or graphical data from discrete sampling events may be submitted if limited data precludes producing a contour map.
- Groundwater recharge information, if readily available, including identification of areas contributing recharge to urban and rural communities where groundwater serves as a significant source of supply.
- Soil survey information, including significant areas of high salinity, alkalinity and acidity.
- Shallow groundwater constituent concentrations from existing monitoring networks (potential constituents of concern include any material applied as part of the agricultural operation, including constituents in irrigation supply water [e.g., pesticides, fertilizers, soil amendments, etc.] that could impact beneficial uses or cause degradation).

- Information on existing groundwater data collection and analysis efforts relevant to this Order (e.g., Department of Pesticide Regulation [DPR] United States Geological Survey [USGS] State Water Board Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment [GAMA], California Department of Public Health, local groundwater management plans, etc.). This groundwater data compilation and review shall include readily accessible information relevant to the Order on existing monitoring well networks, individual well details, and monitored parameters. For existing monitoring networks (or portions thereof) and/or relevant data sets, the third-party should assess the possibility of data sharing between the data-collecting entity, the third-party, and the Central Valley Water Board.
3. *GAR data review and analysis.* To develop the above data components, the GAR shall include review and use, where applicable, of relevant existing federal, state, county, and local databases and documents. The GAR shall include an evaluation of the above data components to:
- Determine where known groundwater quality impacts exist for which irrigated agricultural operations are a potential contributor or where conditions make groundwater more vulnerable to impacts from irrigated agricultural activities.
 - Determine the merit and feasibility of incorporating existing groundwater data collection efforts, and their corresponding monitoring well systems for obtaining appropriate groundwater quality information to achieve the objectives of and support groundwater monitoring activities under this Order. This shall include specific findings and conclusions and provide the rationale for conclusions.
 - Prepare a ranking of high vulnerability areas to provide a basis for prioritization of workplan activities.
 - Describe pertinent geologic and hydrogeologic information for the third-party area(s) and utilize GIS mapping applications, graphics, and tables, as appropriate, in order to clearly convey pertinent data, support data analysis, and show results.
4. *Groundwater vulnerability designations.* The GAR shall designate high/low vulnerability areas for groundwater in consideration of high and low vulnerability definitions provided in Attachment E of the Order. Vulnerability designations may be refined/ updated periodically during the Monitoring Report process. The third-party must review and confirm or modify vulnerability designations every five (5) years after Executive Officer approval of the GAR. The vulnerability designations will be made by the third-party using a combination of physical properties (soil type, depth to groundwater, known agricultural impacts to beneficial uses, etc.) and management practices (e.g. irrigation method, crop type, nitrogen application and removal rates, extent of implementation, etc.). If the third-party intends to develop a Basin Plan Amendment Workplan (as described in section VIII.L of the Order), the third-party must identify the areas where a high vulnerability designation results from exceedances due to naturally elevated levels of a constituent. The third-party shall provide the rationale for proposed vulnerability determinations. The Executive Officer will make the final determination regarding vulnerability designations.

If the GAR is not submitted to the board by the required deadline, the Executive Officer will designate high/low vulnerability groundwater areas considering such information as 1) those areas that have been identified by the State Water Board as Hydrogeologically Vulnerable Areas, 2) California Department of Pesticide Regulation groundwater protection areas, and 3) areas with exceedances of water quality objectives for which irrigated agriculture waste discharges may cause or contribute to the exceedance.

5. *Prioritization of high vulnerability groundwater areas.* The third-party may prioritize the areas designated as high vulnerability areas to comply with the requirements of this Order, including

conducting monitoring programs and carrying out required studies. When establishing relative priorities for high vulnerability areas, the third party may consider, but not be limited to, the following:

- Identified exceedances of water quality objectives for which irrigated agriculture waste discharges are the cause, or a contributing source.
- The proximity of the high vulnerability area to areas contributing recharge to municipal and domestic supplies where groundwater serves as a significant source of supply.
- Existing field or operational practices identified to be associated with irrigated agriculture waste discharges that are the cause, or a contributing source.
- The largest acreage commodity types comprising up to at least 80% of the irrigated agricultural acreage in the high vulnerability areas and the irrigation and fertilization practices employed by these commodities.
- Legacy or ambient conditions of the groundwater.
- Groundwater basins currently or proposed to be under review by CV-SALTS.
- Identified constituents of concern, e.g., relative toxicity (as compared to other constituents of concern), mobility.

Additional information such as models, studies, and information collected as part of this Order may also be considered in designating and prioritizing vulnerability areas for groundwater. Such data include, but are not limited to, 1) published scientific studies, 2) hydrogeologic models, 3) data from areas with exceedances of water quality objectives for which irrigated agriculture waste discharges may cause or contribute to the exceedance, 4) those areas that have been identified by the State Water Board as Hydrogeologically Vulnerable Areas, and 5) California Department of Pesticide Regulation groundwater protection areas.

The Executive Officer will review and may approve or require changes to any third-party proposed high/low vulnerability areas and the proposed priority ranking. The vulnerability areas or any changes thereto, shall not be effective until third-party receipt of written approval by the Executive Officer. An interested person may seek review by the Central Valley Water Board of the Executive Officer's decision on the designation of high and low vulnerability areas associated with approval of the Groundwater Quality Assessment Report.

B. Management Practice Evaluation Program

The goal of the Management Practice Evaluation Program (MPEP) is to determine the effects, if any, that irrigated agricultural practices⁹ have on groundwater quality. A MPEP is required in high vulnerability groundwater areas and must address the constituents of concern described in the GAR. This section provides the goals, objectives, and minimum reporting requirements for the MPEP. As specified in section IV.D of this MRP, the third-party is required to develop a workplan that will describe the methods that will be utilized to achieve the MPEP requirements.

1. *Objectives.* The objectives of the MPEP are to:

- Identify whether existing site-specific and/or commodity-specific management practices are protective of groundwater quality within high vulnerability groundwater areas,
- Determine if newly implemented management practices are improving or may result in improving groundwater quality.
- Develop a quantitative estimate of the effect of Members' discharges of constituents of concern on groundwater quality in high vulnerability areas.

⁹ In evaluating management practices, the third-party is expected to focus on those practices that are most relevant to the Members' groundwater quality protection efforts.

- Utilize the results of evaluated management practices to determine whether practices implemented at represented Member farms (i.e., those not specifically evaluated, but having similar site conditions), are sufficiently protective of groundwater quality or if management practices need to be improved.

Given the wide range of management practices/commodities that are used within the third-party's boundaries, it is anticipated that the third-party will rank or prioritize its high vulnerability areas and commodities, and present a phased approach to implement the MPEP.

2. *Implementation.* Since management practices evaluation may transcend watershed or third-party boundaries, this Order allows developing a MPEP on a watershed or regional basis that involves participants in other areas or third-party groups, provided the evaluation studies are conducted in a manner representative of areas to which it will be applied. The MPEP may be conducted in one of the following ways:

- By the third-party,
- by watershed or commodity groups within an area with known groundwater impacts or vulnerability, or
- by watershed or commodity groups that wish to determine the effects of regional or commodity driven management practices.

A master schedule describing the rank or priority for the investigation(s) of the high vulnerability areas (or commodities within these areas) to be examined under the MPEP shall be prepared and submitted to the Executive Officer as detailed in the Management Practices Evaluation Program Workplan section IV.D below.

3. *Report.* Reports of the MPEP must be submitted to the Executive Officer as part of the third-party's Monitoring Report or in a separate report due on the same date as the Monitoring Report. The report shall include all data¹⁰ (including analytical reports) collected by each phase of the MPEP since the previous report was submitted. The report shall also contain a tabulated summary of data collected to date by the MPEP. The report shall summarize the activities conducted under the MPEP, and identify the number and location of installed monitoring wells relative to each other and other types of monitoring devices. Within each report, the third-party shall evaluate the data and make a determination whether groundwater is being impacted by activities at farms being monitored by the MPEP.

Each report shall also include an evaluation of whether the specific phase(s) of the Management Practices Evaluation Program is/are on schedule to provide the data needed to complete the Management Practices Evaluation Report (detailed below) by the required deadline. If the evaluation concludes that information needed to complete the Management Practices Evaluation Report may not be available by the required deadline, the report shall include measures that will be taken to bring the program back on schedule.

4. *Management Practices Evaluation Report.* No later than six (6) years after implementation of each phase of the MPEP, the third-party shall submit a Management Practices Evaluation Report (MPER) identifying management practices that are protective of groundwater quality for the range of conditions found at farms covered by that phase of the study. The identification of management practices for the range of conditions must be of sufficient specificity to allow Members of the third-party and staff of the Central Valley Water Board to identify which practices at monitored farms are appropriate for farms with the same or similar range of site

¹⁰ The data need not be associated with a specific parcel or Member.

conditions, and generally where such farms may be located within the third-party area (e.g., the summary report may need to include maps that identify the types of management practices that should be implemented in certain areas based on specified site conditions). The MPER must include an adequate technical justification for the conclusions that incorporates available data and reasonable interpretations of geologic and engineering, and agronomic principles to identify management practices protective of groundwater quality.

The report shall include an assessment of each management practice to determine which management practices are protective of groundwater quality. If monitoring concludes that management practices currently in use are not protective of groundwater quality based upon information contained in the MPER, and therefore are not confirmed to be sufficient to ensure compliance with the groundwater receiving water limitations of the Order, the third-party in conjunction with commodity groups and/or other experts (e.g., University of California Cooperative Extension, Natural Resources Conservation Service) shall propose and implement new/alternative management practices to be subsequently evaluated. Where applicable, existing GQMPs shall be updated by the third-party group to be consistent with the findings of the Management Practices Evaluation Report.

C. Groundwater Quality Trend Monitoring

This section provides the objectives and minimum sampling and reporting requirements for Groundwater Quality Trend Monitoring. As specified in section IV.E of this MRP, the third-party is required to develop a workplan that will describe the methods that will be utilized to meet the trend monitoring requirements.

1. *Objectives.* The objectives of Groundwater Quality Trend Monitoring are (1) to determine current water quality conditions of groundwater relevant to irrigated agriculture, and (2) to develop long-term groundwater quality information that can be used to evaluate the regional effects (i.e., not site-specific effects) of irrigated agriculture and its practices.
2. *Implementation.* To reach the stated objectives for the Groundwater Quality Trend Monitoring program, the third-party shall develop a groundwater monitoring network that will (1) be implemented over both high and low vulnerability areas in the third-party area; and will (2) employ shallow wells, but not necessarily wells completed in the uppermost zone of first encountered groundwater. The use of existing wells is less costly than installing wells specifically designed for groundwater monitoring, while still yielding data which can be compared with historical and future data to evaluate long-term groundwater trends. The third party may also consider using existing monitoring networks such as those used by AB 3030 and SB 1938 plans.

The third-party shall submit a proposed Trend Groundwater Monitoring Workplan described in section IV.E below to the Central Valley Water Board. The proposed network shall consist of a sufficient number of wells to provide coverage in the third-party geographic area so that current water quality conditions of groundwater and composite regional effects of irrigated agriculture can be assessed according to the trend monitoring objectives. The rationale for the distribution of trend monitoring wells shall be based on the findings in the GAR and included in the workplan.

3. *Reporting.* The results of trend monitoring are to be included in the third-party's Monitoring Report and shall include a map of the sampled wells, tabulation of the analytical data, and time concentration charts. Groundwater monitoring data are to be submitted electronically to the State Water Board's GeoTracker Database and to the Central Valley Water Board in a format specified by the Executive Officer.

Following collection of sufficient data (sufficiency to be determined by the method of analysis proposed by the third-party) from each well, the third-party is to evaluate the data for trends. The methods to be used to evaluate trends shall be proposed by the third-party in the Trend Groundwater Monitoring Workplan described in section IV.E below.

D. Management Practices Evaluation Workplan

The third-party, either solely or in conjunction with a Management Practices Evaluation Group (watershed or commodity based), shall prepare a Management Practices Evaluation Workplan. The workplan shall be submitted to the Executive Officer for review and approval. The workplan must identify a reasonable number of locations situated throughout the high vulnerability groundwater area(s), and encompassing the range of management practices used, the major agricultural commodities, and site conditions under which these commodities are grown. The workplan shall be designed to meet the objectives and minimum requirements described in section IV.B of this MRP.

1. *Workplan approach.* The workplan must include a scientifically sound approach to evaluating the effect of management practices on groundwater quality. The workplan must include a mass balance and conceptual model of the transport, storage, and degradation/chemical transformation mechanisms for the constituents of concern, or equivalent method approved by the Executive Officer,¹¹ must be provided. The proposed approach may include:

- literature review of identified management practices,
- root zone studies,
- groundwater monitoring,
- modeling,
- vadose zone sampling, and/or
- other scientifically sound and technically justifiable methods for meeting the objectives of the Management Practices Evaluation Program.

Sufficient groundwater quality monitoring data should be collected or available to confirm or validate the conclusions regarding the effect of the evaluated practices on groundwater quality. Any groundwater quality monitoring that is part of the workplan must be of first encountered groundwater. Monitoring of first encountered groundwater more readily allows identification of the area from which water entering a well originates than deeper wells and allows identification of changes in groundwater quality from activities on the surface at the earliest possible time.

2. *Groundwater quality monitoring –constituent selection.* Where groundwater quality monitoring is proposed, the Management Practices Evaluation Workplan must identify:

- the constituents to be assessed, and
- the frequency of the data collection (e.g., root zone pore water, groundwater quality monitoring, vadose zone monitoring; soil sampling) for each constituent, and
- sampling techniques/methodology.

The proposed constituents shall be selected based upon the information collected from the GAR and must be sufficient to determine if the management practices being evaluated are protective

¹¹ For nitrate, the proposed “equivalent method” may be based on recommendations developed by the California Department of Food and Agriculture’s Nitrogen Task Force or the State Water Resource Control Board’s Expert Panel on nitrates (see Finding 50).

of groundwater quality. At a minimum, the baseline constituents for any groundwater quality monitoring must include those parameters required under trend monitoring.

3. *Workplan implementation and analysis.* The proposed Management Practices Evaluation Workplan shall contain sufficient information/justification for the Executive Officer to evaluate the ability of the evaluation program to identify whether existing management practices in combination with site conditions, are protective of groundwater quality. The workplan must explain how data collected at evaluated farms will be used to assess potential impacts to groundwater at represented farms that are not part of the Management Practices Evaluation Program's network. This information is needed to demonstrate whether data collected will allow identification of management practices that are protective of water quality at Member farms, including represented farms (i.e., farms for which on-site evaluation of practices is not conducted).
4. *Master workplan –prioritization.* If the third-party chooses to rank or prioritize its high vulnerability areas in its GAR, a single Management Practices Evaluation Workplan may be prepared which includes a timeline describing the priority and schedule for each of the areas/commodities to be investigated and the submittal dates for addendums proposing the details of each area's investigation.
5. *Installation of monitoring wells.* Upon approval of the Management Practices Evaluation Workplan, the third-party shall prepare and submit a Monitoring Well Installation and Sampling Plan (MWISP), if applicable. A description of the MWISP and its required elements/submittals are presented as Appendix MRP-2. The MWISP must be approved by the Executive Officer prior to the installation of the MWISP's associated monitoring wells.

E. Trend Monitoring Workplan

The third-party shall develop a workplan for conducting trend monitoring within its boundaries that meets the objectives and minimum requirements described in section IV.C of this MRP. The workplan shall be submitted to the Executive Officer for review and approval. The Trend Monitoring Workplan shall provide information/details regarding the following topics:

1. *Workplan approach.* A discussion of the rationale for the number of proposed wells to be monitored and their locations is required in the workplan. The rationale needs to consider: 1) the variety of agricultural commodities produced within the third-party's boundaries (particularly those commodities comprising the most irrigated agricultural acreage), 2) the conditions discussed/identified in the GAR related to the vulnerability or data gap prioritization within the third-party area, and 3) the areas identified in the GAR as contributing significant recharge to urban and rural communities where groundwater serves as a significant source of supply.
2. *Well details.* The Workplan will provide details for wells proposed for trend monitoring, including:
 - i. GPS coordinates;
 - ii. Physical address of the property on which the well is situated (if available);
 - iii. California State well number (if known);
 - iv. Well depth;
 - v. Top and bottom perforation depths;
 - vi. A copy of the water well drillers log, if available;
 - vii. Depth of standing water (static water level), if available (this may be obtained after implementing the program); and
 - viii. Well seal information (type of material, length of seal).

3. *Proposed sampling schedule.* Trend monitoring wells will be sampled, at a minimum, annually at the same time of the year for the indicator parameters identified in Table 3 below.
4. *Workplan implementation and analysis.* The Workplan will describe proposed method(s) to be used to evaluate trends in the groundwater monitoring data over time.

Table 3: Monitored Parameters at groundwater Trend Monitoring Wells

Annual Monitoring Conductivity (at 25 °C)* (µmhos/cm) pH* in pH units Dissolved oxygen (DO)* (mg/L) Temperature* (°C) Nitrate as nitrogen (mg/L)
Sampled initially and once every five years thereafter Total dissolved solids (TDS) (mg/L) General minerals (mg/L): Anions (carbonate, bicarbonate, chloride, and sulfate) Cations (boron, calcium, sodium, magnesium, and potassium)

* field parameters

V. Third-Party Reporting Requirements

Reports and notices shall be submitted in accordance with section IX of the Order, Reporting Provisions.

A. Quarterly Submittals of Surface Water Monitoring Results

Each quarter, the third-party shall submit the previous quarter’s surface water monitoring results in an electronic format. The deadlines for these submittals are listed in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Quarterly Surface Water Monitoring Data Reporting Schedule

Due Date	Type	Reporting Period
1 March	Quarterly Monitoring Data Report	1 July through 30 September of previous calendar year
1 June	Quarterly Monitoring Data Report	1 October through 31 December of previous calendar year
1 September	Quarterly Monitoring Data Report	1 January through 31 March of same calendar year
1 December	Quarterly Monitoring Data Report	1 April through 30 June of same calendar year

Exceptions to due dates for submittal of electronic data may be granted by the Executive Officer if good cause is shown. The Quarterly Surface Water Monitoring Data Report shall include the following for the required reporting period:

1. An Excel workbook(s) containing all data records uploaded and/or entered into the CEDEN comparable database (surface water data).
2. The most current version of the third-party’s eQAPP.

3. Electronic copies of all field sheets.
4. Electronic copies of photos obtained from all surface water monitoring sites, clearly labeled with the CEDEN comparable station code and date.
5. Electronic copies of all applicable laboratory analytical reports on a CD.
6. For toxicity reports, all laboratory raw data must be included in the analytical report (including data for failed tests), as well as copies of all original bench sheets showing the results of individual replicates, such that all calculations and statistics can be reconstructed. The toxicity analyses data submittals must include individual sample results, negative control summary results, and replicate results. The minimum in-test water quality measurements reported must include the minimum and maximum measured values for specific conductivity, pH, ammonia, temperature, and dissolved oxygen.
7. For chemistry data, analytical reports must include, at a minimum, the following:
 - a. A lab narrative describing QC failures,
 - b. Analytical problems and anomalous occurrences,
 - c. Chain of custody (COCs) and sample receipt documentation,
 - d. All sample results for contract and subcontract laboratories with units, RLs and MDLs,
 - e. Sample preparation, extraction and analysis dates, and
 - f. Results for all QC samples including all field and laboratory blanks, lab control spikes, matrix spikes, field and laboratory duplicates, and surrogate recoveries.

Laboratory raw data such as chromatograms, spectra, summaries of initial and continuing calibrations, sample injection or sequence logs, prep sheets, etc., are not required for submittal, but must be retained by the laboratory in accordance with the requirements of section X of the Order, Record-keeping Requirements.

If any data are missing from the quarterly report, the submittal must include a description of what data are missing and when they will be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board. If data are not loaded into the CEDEN comparable database, this shall also be noted with the submittal.

B. Annual Groundwater Monitoring Results

Annually, in the 1 May Monitoring Report, the third-party shall submit the prior year's groundwater monitoring results as an Excel workbook containing an export of all data records uploaded and/or entered into the State Water Board GeoTracker database. If any data are missing from the report, the submittal must include a description of what data are missing and when they will be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board. If data are not loaded into the GeoTracker database, this shall also be noted with the submittal.

C. Monitoring Report

The Monitoring Report shall be submitted by 1 May every year, with the first report due 1 May 2014. The report shall cover the monitoring periods from the previous hydrologic water year. A hydrologic water year is defined as 1 October through 30 September. The report shall include the following components:

1. Signed Transmittal Letter;
2. Title page;
3. Table of contents;
4. Executive Summary;
5. Description of the third-party geographical area;
6. Monitoring objectives and design;
7. Sampling site/monitoring well descriptions and rainfall records for the time period covered under the Annual Monitoring Report;
8. Location map(s) of sampling sites/monitoring wells, crops and land uses;

9. Tabulated results of all analyses arranged in tabular form so that the required information is readily discernible;
10. Discussion of data relative to water quality objectives/trigger limits, and water quality management plan milestones, Basin Plan Amendment Workplan (BPAW) updates, where applicable;
11. Sampling and analytical methods used;
12. Associated laboratory and field quality control samples results;
13. Summary of Quality Assurance Evaluation results (as identified in the most recent version of the third-party's approved QAPP for Precision, Accuracy and Completeness);
14. Specification of the method(s) used to obtain estimated flow at each surface water monitoring site during each monitoring event;
15. Summary of exceedances of water quality objectives/trigger limits occurring during the reporting period and surface water related pesticide use information;
16. Actions taken to address water quality exceedances that have occurred, including but not limited to, revised or additional management practices implemented;
17. Evaluation of monitoring data to identify temporal and spatial trends and patterns;
18. Summary of Nitrogen Management Plan information submitted to the third-party;
19. Summary of management practice information collected as part of Farm Evaluations;
20. Summary of mitigation monitoring;
21. Summary of education and outreach activities;
22. Conclusions and recommendations.

Additional requirements and clarifications necessary for the above report components are described below.

Report Component (1) — Signed Transmittal Letter

A transmittal letter shall accompany each report. The transmittal letter shall be submitted and signed in accordance with the requirements of section IX of the Order, Reporting Provisions.

Report Component (8) — Location Maps

Location map(s) showing the sampling sites/monitoring wells, crops, and land uses within the third party's geographic area must be updated (based on available sources of information) and included in the Monitoring Report. An accompanying GIS shapefile or geodatabase of monitoring site and monitoring well information must include the CEDEN comparable site code and name (surface water only) and Global Positioning System (GPS) coordinates (surface water sites and wells used for monitoring). The map(s) must contain a level of detail that ensures they are informative and useful. GPS coordinates must be provided as latitude and longitude in the decimal degree coordinate system (at a minimum of five decimal places). The datum must be either WGS 1984 or NAD83, and clearly identified on the map(s) or in an associated key or table included in the report. The source and date of all data layers must be identified on the map(s) or in an associated key or table included in the report. All data layers/shapefiles/geodatabases included in the map shall be submitted with the initial Monitoring Report. If changes occur to any submitted data, the updated portion shall be submitted in the subsequent annual monitoring report.

Report Component (9) – Tabulated Results

In reporting monitoring data, the third-party shall arrange the data in tabular form so that the required information is readily discernible. The data shall be summarized in such a manner to clearly illustrate compliance with the data collection requirements of the MRP.

Report Component (10) — Data Discussion to Illustrate Compliance

The report shall include a discussion of the third-party's compliance with the data collection requirements of the MRP. If a required component was not met, an explanation for the missing data must be included. Results must also be compared to water quality objectives and trigger

limits. If a Basin Plan Amendment Workplan (BPAW) has been approved by the Executive Officer, updates on progress made toward BPAW goals and milestones, including any adjustments to the time schedule, must be included.

Report Component (13) — Quality Assurance Evaluation (Precision, Accuracy and Completeness)

A summary of precision and accuracy results (both laboratory and field) is required in the report. The required data quality objectives are identified in the most recent version of the third-party's approved QAPP; acceptance criteria for all measurements of precision and accuracy must be identified. The third-party must review all QA/QC results to verify that protocols were followed and identify any results that did not meet acceptance criteria. A summary table or narrative description of all QA/QC results that did not meet objectives must be included. Additionally, the report must include a discussion of how the failed QA/QC results affect the validity of the reported data. The corrective actions to be implemented are described in the QAPP Guidelines.

In addition to precision and accuracy, the third-party must also calculate and report completeness. Completeness includes the percentage of all quality control results that meet acceptance criteria, as well as a determination of project completeness. For further explanation of this requirement, refer to the most recent version of the QAPP Guidelines. The third-party may ask the laboratory to provide assistance with evaluation of their QA/QC data, provided that the third-party prepares the summary table or narrative description of the results for the Monitoring Report.

Report Component (15) — Summary of Exceedances

A summary of the exceedances of water quality objectives or trigger limits that have occurred during the monitoring period is required in the Monitoring Report. For exceedances of pesticide trigger limits, the data must be summarized in tables showing number of samples taken, number of detections, number of exceedances, and range of detection values by pesticide and monitoring site. In the event of exceedances for pesticides or toxicity in surface water, pesticide use data must be included in the Monitoring Report. Pesticide use information may be acquired from the agricultural commissioner. This requirement is described further in the following section on Exceedance Reports.

Report Component (17) — Evaluation of Monitoring Data

The third-party must evaluate its monitoring data in the Monitoring Report in order to identify potential trends¹² and patterns in surface and groundwater quality that may be associated with waste discharge from irrigated lands. As part of this evaluation, the third-party must analyze all readily available monitoring data that meet program quality assurance requirements to determine deficiencies in monitoring for discharges from irrigated agricultural lands and whether additional sampling locations are needed. If deficiencies are identified, the third-party must propose a schedule for additional monitoring or source studies. Upon notification from the Executive Officer, the third-party must monitor any parameter in an area that lacks sufficient monitoring data (i.e., a data gap should be filled to assess irrigated agriculture's effects on water quality).

The third-party should incorporate pesticide use information, as needed, to assist in its data evaluation. Wherever possible, the third-party should utilize tables or graphs that illustrate and summarize the data evaluation.

Report Component (18) – Summary of Reported Nitrogen Data

The third-party shall aggregate information from Members' Nitrogen Management Plan Summary Reports to characterize the input, uptake, and loss of nitrogen fertilizer applications by specific crops in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area. The third-party's assessment of Nitrogen Management Plan information must include, at a minimum, comparisons of farms with the same

¹² All results (regardless of whether exceedances are observed) must be included to determine whether there are trends in degradation.

crops, similar soil conditions, and similar practices (e.g., irrigation management). At a minimum, the statistical summary of nitrogen consumption ratios by crop or other equivalent reporting units and the estimated nitrogen consumed for the different crop types and soil conditions will describe the range, percentiles (10th, 25th, 50th, 75th, 90th) and any outliers. A box and whisker plot or equivalent tabular or graphical presentation of the data approved by the Executive Officer may be used. The nitrogen consumption ratio is the ratio of total nitrogen available for crop uptake (from sources including, but not limited to, fertilizers, manures, composts, nitrates in irrigation supply water and soil) to the estimated crop consumption of nitrogen. The summary of nitrogen management data must include an assessment of the quality of the collected information by township (e.g. missing data, potentially incorrect/inaccurate reporting), and a description of corrective actions to be taken regarding any deficiencies in the quality of data submitted, if such deficiencies were identified. The third-party will also provide an aggregate of the data submitted by its Members in an electronic format, compatible with ArcGIS, identified to at least the township level.¹³

Report Component (19) – Summary of Management Practice Information

The third-party will aggregate and summarize information collected from Farm Evaluations.¹⁴ The summary of management practice data must include a quality assessment of the collected information by township (e.g. missing data, potentially incorrect/inaccurate reporting), and a description of corrective actions to be taken regarding any deficiencies in the quality of data submitted, if such deficiencies were identified. In addition to summarizing and aggregating the information collected, the third party will provide the individual data records used to develop this summary in an electronic format, compatible with ArcGIS, identified to at least the township level.¹⁵

Report Component (20) – Mitigation Monitoring

As part of the Monitoring Report, the third-party shall report on the CEQA mitigation measures reported by Members to meet the provisions of the Order and any mitigation measures the third-party has implemented on behalf of Members. The third-party is not responsible for submitting information that Members do not send them directly by the 1 March deadline (see section VII.E of the Order for individual Discharger mitigation monitoring requirements). The Mitigation Monitoring Report shall include information on the implementation of CEQA mitigation measures (mitigation measures are described in Attachment C of the Order), including the measure implemented, identified potential impact the measure addressed, location of the mitigation measure (township, range, section), and any steps taken to monitor the ongoing success of the measure.

D. Surface Water Exceedance Reports

The third-party shall provide surface water exceedance reports if monitoring results show exceedances of adopted numeric water quality objectives or trigger limits, which are based on interpretations of narrative water quality objectives. For each surface water quality objective exceeded at a monitoring location, the third-party shall submit an Exceedance Report to the Central Valley Water Board. The estimated flow at the monitoring location and photographs of the site must be submitted in addition to the exceedance report but do not need to be submitted more than once. The third-party shall evaluate all of its monitoring data and determine exceedances no later than five (5) business days after receiving the laboratory analytical reports for an event. Upon determining an exceedance, the third-party shall send the Exceedance Report by email to the third-party's designated Central Valley Water Board staff contact by the next business day. The Exceedance Report shall describe the exceedance, the follow-up monitoring, and analysis or other actions the third-party may take to address the exceedance. Upon request, the third-party shall

¹³ The Member and their associated parcel need not be identified.

¹⁴ Note that the evaluation of the reported management practices information is discussed in Appendix MRP-1 and will be part of the annual Management Plan Progress Report.

¹⁵ The Member and their associated parcel need not be identified.

also notify the agricultural commissioner of the county in which the exceedance occurred and/or the director of the Department of Pesticide Regulation.

Surface water exceedances of pesticides or toxicity: When any pesticide or toxicity exceedance is identified at a location that is not under an approved management plan for toxicity or pesticides, follow-up actions must include an investigation of pesticide use within the location's watershed area. The investigation of toxicity exceedances must include all pesticides applied within the area that drains to the monitoring site during the four weeks immediately prior to the exceedance date. The pesticide use information may be acquired from the agricultural commissioner, or from information received from Members within the same drainage area. Results of the pesticide use investigation must be summarized and discussed in the Monitoring Report.

E. Basin Plan Amendment Workplan

Should the third-party choose to pursue a Basin Plan Amendment as described in Section VIII.L. of the Order, the third-party must prepare a Basin Plan Amendment Workplan (BPAW) that includes the following elements:

1. A technical justification for initiating the basin plan amendment process including maps of the areas proposed for basin plan amendment. The justification must include an assessment of naturally occurring (background) concentrations of the constituent(s), evaluate the potential for irrigated agriculture to further degrade groundwater quality beyond background in the identified areas, and include a preliminary evaluation as to whether controllable water quality factors (as defined in the Basin Plan) are reasonably likely to result in attainment of the applicable use(s);
2. A use attainability study plan to determine whether the beneficial use(s) proposed for de-designation may be attained through the application of current or anticipated technologies, whether groundwater within the proposed basin plan amendment area is currently being used for the beneficial use proposed for de-designation, and whether the groundwater proposed for de-designation meets any of the criteria set forth in the Basin Plan that the board considers in making exceptions to beneficial use designations;
3. A description of how the third-party will coordinate the basin plan amendment process through CV-SALTS, if the amendment is based on elevated salt and/or nitrate concentrations;
4. A proposal for reduced reporting requirements for Members in the areas proposed for basin plan amendment. The third-party may propose that trend monitoring be reduced in those areas. The third-party may also propose that the requirement that the Management Practice Evaluation Program evaluate those areas be suspended. The reduced monitoring and reporting requirements shall be no less stringent than the requirements for low vulnerability areas;
5. A description of the monitoring and reporting required to complete the BPAW must be identified; and
6. A time schedule including workplan goals and milestones for completing BPAW items.

To the extent applicable, the above BPAW workplan elements may be met by existing efforts. However, the third-party must provide the information associated with the applicable element demonstrating that element's requirements are met.

The Executive Officer may approve the BPAW workplan if the Executive Officer determines that the BPAW workplan includes all of the required elements. To approve the workplan, the Executive Officer must conclude that the technical justification provides sufficient evidence indicating that waters within the identified high vulnerability areas would likely qualify for de-designation of a beneficial use or uses under the Basin Plan. Should the Executive Officer approve the BPAW

workplan, the Executive Officer will also provide the applicable approved modifications to the monitoring and reporting program.

Annual updates on progress made toward BPAW goals and milestones, including any proposed adjustments to the time schedule, must be included in the Annual Monitoring Report.

The Executive Officer may reinstate high vulnerability monitoring and reporting requirements if any of the following occur: 1) information gathered during implementation of the BPAW indicates a basin plan amendment is unlikely to be adopted, 2) the basin plan amendment is not likely to be brought before the board within five years of the original proposal date due to insufficient progress in meeting workplan goals and milestones, or 3) the basin plan amendment is not approved by the regional board or state water board.

VI. Sediment Discharge and Erosion Assessment Report

The third-party shall prepare a Sediment Discharge and Erosion Assessment Report. The report shall be submitted to the Executive Officer for review. The goal of the report is to determine which irrigated agricultural areas within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area are subject to erosion and may discharge sediment that may degrade surface waters. The objective of the report is to determine which Member operations are within such areas, and need to develop a Sediment and Erosion Control Plan. The report must be developed to achieve the above goal and objective and must, at a minimum, provide a description of the sediment and erosion areas as a series of ArcGIS shapefiles with a discussion of the methodologies utilized to develop the report.

VII. Water Quality Triggers for Development of Management Plans

This Order requires that Members comply with all adopted water quality objectives and established federal water quality criteria applicable to their discharges. The *Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins* (Basin Plan) contains numeric and narrative water quality objectives applicable to surface water and groundwater within the Order's watershed area. USEPA's 1993 National Toxics Rule (NTR) and 2000 California Toxics Rule (CTR) contain water quality criteria which, when combined with Basin Plan beneficial use designations, constitute numeric water quality standards. Table 5 of this MRP lists Basin Plan numeric water quality objectives and NTR/CTR criteria for constituents of concern that may be discharged by Members.

Table 5 does not include water quality criteria that may be used to interpret narrative water quality objectives, which shall be considered trigger limits. Trigger limits will be developed by the Central Valley Water Board staff through a process involving coordination with the Department of Pesticide Regulation (for pesticides) and stakeholder input. The trigger limits will be designed to implement narrative Basin Plan objectives and to protect applicable beneficial uses. The Executive Officer will make a final determination as to the appropriate trigger limits.

VIII. Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP)

The third-party must develop and/or maintain a QAPP that includes watershed and site-specific information, project organization and responsibilities, and the quality assurance components in the QAPP Guidelines. Chemical, bacteriological, and bioassay analyses shall be conducted at a laboratory certified for such analyses by the California Department of Public Health (DPH), except where the DPH has not developed a certification program for the material to be analyzed.

The San Joaquin County and Delta Area Coalition's existing QAPP was approved by the Executive Officer on 15 September 2008. The existing QAPP is acceptable for use by the third-party. Any necessary modifications to the QAPP for groundwater monitoring shall be submitted with the MPEP

and groundwater trend monitoring workplans (section IV, MRP). Any proposed modifications to the approved QAPP must receive Executive Officer approval prior to implementation.

The Central Valley Water Board may conduct an audit of the third-party's contracted laboratories at any time in order to evaluate compliance with the most current version of the QAPP Guidelines. Quality control requirements are applicable to all of the constituents listed in the QAPP Guidelines, as well as any additional constituents that are analyzed or measured, as described in the appropriate method. Acceptable methods for laboratory and field procedures as well as quantification limits are described in the QAPP Guidelines.

This MRP Order becomes effective 12 March 2014 and remains in effect unless rescinded or revised by the Central Valley Water Board or the Executive Officer.

I, PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer, do hereby certify the foregoing is a full and correct copy of an Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region on 12 March 2014.

Original signed by:
Kenneth D. Landau for:

PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer

Table 5. Basin Plan Numeric Water Quality Objectives for the San Joaquin County and Delta Area¹⁶. * Where more than one objective is applicable, the most stringent shall be applied.

Constituent / Parameter Chemical Abstracts Service (CAS) Registry Number (Synonym, if any)	Basin Plan Water Quality Objective	Numeric Water Quality Objectives Source of Numeric Threshold <i>(footnotes in parentheses are at the bottom of table)</i>	Numeric Threshold (a)	Units	G= Groundwater IS= Inland Surface Water	Numeric Threshold Protects Designated Beneficial Use(s) in the Water Body:							
						Groundwater			Inland Surface Waters				
						MUN- MCL	MUN- Toxicity	AGR	MUN- MCL	MUN- Toxicity	Aquatic Life & Consumption	AGR	
Boron, total 7440-42-8	Chemical Constituents	Basin Plan. SJR, mouth of Merced R to Vernalis (15 Mar – 15 Sep)	2,000	ug/L	IS							X	
		Basin Plan. SJR, mouth of Merced R to Vernalis (15 Mar – 15 Sep)	800 (b)	ug/L	IS								X
		Basin Plan. SJR, mouth of Merced R to Vernalis (16 Sep – 14 Mar)	2,600	ug/L	IS								X
		Basin Plan. SJR, mouth of Merced R to Vernalis (16 Sep – 14 Mar)	1,000 (b)	ug/L	IS								X
		Basin Plan. SJR, mouth of Merced R to Vernalis (critical year) (c)	1,300 (b)	ug/L	IS								X
Chlorpyrifos 2921-88-2	Pesticides	Basin Plan. SJR from Mendota Dam to Vernalis; Delta Waterways (I); 1-hour average	0.025	ug/L	IS							X	
		Basin Plan. SJR from Mendota Dam to Vernalis; Delta Waterways (I); 4-day average	0.015	ug/L	IS							X	
Coliform, fecal	Bacteria	Basin Plan (d) (e)	200/100	MPN/mL	IS				X				
		Basin Plan (d) (f)	400/100	MPN/mL	IS				X				
Coliform, total	Bacteria	Basin Plan	2.2/100	MPN/mL	G	X							
Conductivity (at 25° C) (Electrical conductivity)	Salinity	Basin Plan. See Table III-5 of Basin Plan.	variable	umhos/cm	IS								
		California Secondary MCL	900-1600	umhos/cm	G & IS	X	X		X	X			
Copper 7440-50-8	Chemical Constituents Toxicity	California Secondary MCL (total copper)	1,000	ug/L	G & IS	X			X	X			
		California Toxics Rule (USEPA), (g) (dissolved copper)	variable	ug/L	IS							X	
Diazinon 50-29-3	Pesticides	Basin Plan. SJR from Mendota Dam to Vernalis; Delta Waterways (I); 1-hour average	0.16	ug/L	IS							X	
		Basin Plan. SJR from Mendota Dam to Vernalis; Delta Waterways (I); 4-day average	0.10	ug/L	IS							X	
Dissolved Oxygen, minimum 7782-44-7	Dissolved Oxygen	Basin Plan. SJR between Turner Cut and Stockton (1 Sep – 30 Nov)	6.0	mg/L	IS							X	
		Basin Plan. In all other Delta waters except for those constructed for special purposes and from which fish have been excluded or where the fishery is not important as a beneficial use.	5.0	mg/L	IS							X	
		Basin Plan. Waters designated WARM	5.0	mg/L	IS							X	
		Basin Plan. Waters designated COLD and/or SPWN	7.0	mg/L	IS							X	

¹⁶ Numeric water quality objectives applicable to surface waters in the area governed by this Order can also be found in the State Water Board's Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary.
 March 2014

Constituent / Parameter Chemical Abstracts Service (CAS) Registry Number (Synonym, if any)	Basin Plan Water Quality Objective	Numeric Water Quality Objectives Source of Numeric Threshold <i>(footnotes in parentheses are at the bottom of table)</i>	Numeric Threshold (a)	Units	G= Groundwater IS= Inland Surface Water	Numeric Threshold Protects Designated Beneficial Use(s) in the Water Body:					
						Groundwater			Inland Surface Waters		
						MUN- MCL	MUN- Toxicity	AGR	MUN- MCL	MUN- Toxicity	Aquatic Life & Consumption
Lead 7439-92-1	Chemical Constituents	California Primary MCL (total lead)	15	ug/L	G & IS	X			X		
	Toxicity	California Toxics Rule (USEPA) (g) (dissolved lead)	variable	ug/L	IS					X	
Molybdenum, total 7439-98-7	Chemical Constituents	Basin Plan. SJR, mouth of Merced R to Vernalis	15	ug/L	IS						X
Nitrate (as nitrogen) 14797-55-8	Chemical Constituents	California Primary MCL	10	mg/L	G & IS	X	X		X	X	
Nitrite (as nitrogen) 14797-65-0	Chemical Constituents	California Primary MCL	1	mg/L	G & IS	X	X		X	X	
Nitrate+Nitrite (as nitrogen)	Chemical Constituents	California Primary MCL	10	mg/L	G & IS	X	X		X	X	
pH – minimum	pH	Basin Plan	6.5	units	G & IS	X	X		X	X	
pH – maximum			8.5	units	G & IS	X	X		X	X	
Selenium, total 7782-49-2	Chemical Constituents	Basin Plan. SJR, mouth of Merced R to Vernalis	12	ug/L							
		Basin Plan. SJR, mouth of Merced R to Vernalis (4-day mean)	5	ug/L							
	Toxicity	California Primary MCL	50	ug/L	G & IS	X			X		
		National Toxics Rule (USEPA), 4-day mean	5	ug/L	IS					X	
Simazine 122-34-9	Chemical Constituents	California Primary MCL	4	ug/L	G & IS	X	X		X	X	
Temperature	Temperature	Basin Plan (h)	variable		IS						
Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)	Chemical Constituents	California Secondary MCL, recommended level	500 – 1,000	mg/L	G & IS	X	X		X	X	
Turbidity	Turbidity	Basin Plan. Where natural turbidity is <1 NTU	2	NTU	IS						
		Where natural turbidity is between 1 and 5 NTUs, increases shall not exceed 1 NTU.	variable; 2-6	NTU	IS						
		Where natural turbidity is between 5 and 50 NTUs, increases shall not exceed 20%.	variable; 6 - 70	NTU	IS						
		Where natural turbidity is between 50 and 100 NTUs, increases shall not exceed 10 NTUs.	variable; 60-110	NTU	IS						
		Where natural turbidity is greater than 100 NTUs, increases shall not exceed 10%.	variable	NTU	IS						
Zinc 7440-66-6	Chemical Constituents	California Secondary MCL (total zinc)	5,000	ug/L	G & IS	X			X		
	Toxicity	California Toxics Rule (USEPA) (g) (dissolved zinc)	variable	ug/L	IS					X	

March 2014

Footnotes to Table 8:

- a Numeric thresholds are maximum levels unless noted otherwise.
- b Monthly mean.
- c See Basin Plan for definition of Critical Year.
- d Applies in waters designated for contact recreation (REC-1).
- e Geometric mean of the fecal coliform concentration based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period shall not exceed this number.
- f No more than ten percent of the total number of samples taken during any 30-day period shall exceed this number.
- g The numeric thresholds for dissolved metals are hardness dependent. As hardness increases, water quality objectives generally increase.
- h The natural receiving water temperature shall not be altered unless it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Water Board that such alteration does not adversely affect beneficial uses. However, at no time shall the temperature of WARM and COLD waters be increased more than 5 degrees Fahrenheit (or 2.78°C) above natural receiving water temperature.
- i See Delta Waterways listed in Appendix 42 of the Basin Plan

Beneficial
Uses:

AGR – Agricultural water uses, including irrigation supply and stock watering

Aquatic Life & Consumption – Aquatic life and consumption of aquatic resources.

MUN-MCL – Municipal or domestic supply (MUN) with default selection of drinking water maximum contaminant limit (MCL) when available

MUN-Toxicity – Municipal or domestic supply (MUN) with consideration of human toxicity thresholds that are more stringent than drinking water MCLs

March 2014

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

ORDER R5-2014-0029

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

APPENDIX MRP-1

Management Plan Requirements

Surface Water and Groundwater

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Management Plan Development and Required Components	2
	A. Introduction and Background Section	2
	B. Physical Setting and General Information.....	3
	1. General Requirements	3
	2. Surface Water – Additional Requirements.....	3
	3. Groundwater – Additional Requirements.....	3
	C. Management Plan Strategy	4
	D. Monitoring Design	5
	1. General Requirements	5
	2. Surface Water – Additional Requirements.....	5
	3. Groundwater – Additional Requirements.....	6
	E. Data Evaluation	6
	F. Records and Reporting	6
	G. Source Identification Study Requirements.....	7
II.	Approval and Review of the Management Plan	7
III.	Management Plan Completion.....	8

MRP - 1: Management Plan Requirements for Surface Water and Groundwater

I. Management Plan Development and Required Components

This appendix describes requirements for the development of water quality management plans under Waste Discharge Requirements General Order for Growers within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area that are Members of the Third-Party Group, Order R5-2014-0029 (hereafter "Order"). When a management plan has been triggered, the third-party shall ascertain whether or not irrigated agriculture is known to cause or contribute to the "water quality problem" (as defined in Attachment E). If the potential source(s) of the water quality exceedance(s) is unknown, the third-party may propose studies to be conducted to determine the cause, or to eliminate irrigated agriculture as a potential source (see Source Identification Study Requirements in section I.G. below).

When a Surface Water or Groundwater Quality Management Plan (SQMP/GQMP) has been triggered, the management plan shall contain the required elements presented and discussed in the following sections. The third-party may develop one SQMP or GQMP to cover all areas where plans have been triggered rather than developing separate management plans for each management area where plans have been triggered. The third-party would maintain the overarching plan as new information is collected, potentially triggering additional management plans and completion of other management plans.

If multiple constituents of concern (COCs) are to be included in a single management plan, a discussion of the prioritization process and proposed schedule shall be included in the plan. Prioritization schedules must be consistent with requirements described in section XII of the Order, Time Schedule for Compliance.

If a number of management plans are triggered, the third-party shall submit a SQMP/GQMP prioritization list to the Central Valley Water Board Executive Officer. This list may prioritize the order of SQMP/GQMP development based on, for example, 1) the potential to harm public health; 2) the beneficial use affected; and/or 3) the likelihood of meeting water quality objectives by implementing management practices. Prioritization schedules shall be consistent with requirements described in section XII of this Order, Time Schedule for Compliance. The third-party may continue to utilize the surface water quality prioritization process described in the San Joaquin County and Delta Water Quality Coalition's Management Plan,¹ as approved by the Executive Officer. The Executive Officer may approve or require changes be made to the SQMP/GQMP priority list. The third-party shall implement the prioritization schedule approved by the Executive Officer.

A. Introduction and Background Section

The introduction portion of the management plan shall include a discussion of the COCs that are the subject of the plan and the water quality objective(s) or trigger(s) requiring preparation of the management plan. The introduction shall also include an identification (both narrative and in map form) of the boundaries (geographic and surface water/ groundwater basin[s] or portion of a basin) to be covered by the management plan including how the boundaries were delineated.

For groundwater, previous work conducted to identify the occurrence of the COCs (e.g., studies, monitoring conducted) should be summarized for the GQMP area.

¹ The San Joaquin County and Delta Water Quality Coalition Management Plan, with Addendum, was submitted on 23 December 2008 and approved by the Executive Officer on 23 January 2009. References to this Management Plan include the original submittal and subsequent changes and updates approved by the Executive Officer.

B. Physical Setting and General Information

1. General Requirements

The management plan needs to provide a discussion of the physical conditions that affect surface water (for a SQMP) or groundwater (for a GQMP) in the management plan area and the associated existing data. At a minimum, the discussion needs to include the following:

- a. Land use maps which identify the crops being grown in the SQMP watershed or GQMP area. For groundwater, these maps may already be presented in the Groundwater Quality Assessment Report (GAR) and may be referenced and/or updated as appropriate. Map(s) must be in electronic format using standard geographic information system software (ArcGIS shapefiles).
- b. Identification of the potential irrigated agricultural sources of the COC(s) for which the management plan is being developed. If the potential sources are not known, a study may be designed and implemented to determine the source(s) or to eliminate irrigated lands as a potential source. Requirements for source identification studies are given in section I.G below. In the alternative, instead of conducting a source identification study, the third-party may develop a management plan for the COC(s) that meets the management plan requirements as specified in this appendix.
- c. A list of the designated beneficial uses as identified in the applicable Basin Plan.
- d. A baseline inventory of identified existing management practices in use within the management plan area that could be affecting the concentrations of the COCs in surface water and/or groundwater (as applicable) and locations of the various practices.
- e. A summary, discussion, and compilation of available surface water and/or groundwater quality data (as applicable) for the parameters addressed by the management plan. Available data from existing water quality programs may be used, including but not limited to: Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP), California State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) Groundwater Ambient Monitoring Assessment (GAMA) Program, United States Geological Survey (USGS), California Department of Public Health (DPH), California Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR), California Department of Water Resources (DWR), and local groundwater management programs. The GAR developed for the third-party's geographic area, and groundwater quality data compiled in that document, may serve as a reference for these data.

2. Surface Water – Additional Requirements

The SQMP shall also include a description of the watershed areas and associated COC being addressed by the plan. For a water body that is representative of other water bodies, those areas being represented must also be identified in the SQMP.

3. Groundwater – Additional Requirements

The GQMP shall include:

- a. Soil types and other relevant soils data as described by the appropriate Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) soil survey or other applicable studies. The soil unit descriptions and a map of their areal extent within the study area must be included. The GAR developed for the third-party's geographic area, and the soils mapping contained in that document, may satisfy this requirement.
- b. A description of the geology and hydrogeology for the area covered by the GQMP. The description shall include:

- i. Regional and area specific geology, including stratigraphy and existing published geologic cross-sections.
 - ii. Groundwater basin(s) and sub-basins contained within the GQMP area, including a discussion of their general water chemistry as known from existing publications, including the GAR (range of electrical conductivity [conductivity at 25° C, EC], concentrations of major anions and cations, nutrients, total dissolved solids [TDS], pH, dissolved oxygen and hardness). The discussion should reference and provide figures of existing Piper (tri-linear) diagrams, Stiff diagrams and/or Durov Diagrams for the GQMP area (see definitions in Attachment E of the Order).
 - iii. Known water-bearing zones, areas of shallow and/or perched groundwater, as well as areas of discharge and recharge to the basin/sub-basin in the GQMP area (rivers, unlined canals, lakes, and recharge or percolation basins).
 - iv. Identification of which water-bearing zones within the GQMP area are being utilized for domestic, irrigation, and municipal water production.
 - v. Aquifer characteristics such as depth to groundwater, groundwater flow direction, hydraulic gradient, and hydraulic conductivity, as known or estimated based on existing information (see definitions in Attachment E of the Order).
- c. Identification, where possible, of irrigation water sources (surface water origin and/or groundwater) and their available general water chemistry (range of EC, concentrations of major anions and cations, nutrients, TDS, pH, dissolved oxygen and hardness).

C. Management Plan Strategy

This section provides a discussion of the strategy to be used in the implementation of the management plan and should at a minimum, include the following elements:

1. A description of the approach to be utilized by the management plan (e.g., multiple COC's addressed in a scheduled priority fashion, multiple areas covered by the plan with a single area chosen for initial study, or all areas addressed simultaneously [area-wide]). Any prioritization included in the management plan must be consistent with the requirements in section XII of the Order, Time Schedule for Compliance.
2. Actions to meet the following goals and objectives:
 - a. Compliance with the Order's receiving water limitations (section III of the Order).
 - b. Educate Members about the sources of the water quality exceedances in order to promote prevention, protection, and remediation efforts that can maintain and improve water quality.
 - c. Identify, validate, and implement management practices to reduce loading of COC's to surface water or groundwater, as applicable, thereby improving water quality.
3. A description of duties and responsibilities of the individuals or groups implementing the management plan. This section should include:
 - a. Identification of key individuals involved in major aspects of the project (e.g., project lead, data manager, sample collection lead, lead for stakeholder involvement, quality assurance manager).
 - b. Discussion of each individual's responsibilities.
 - c. An organizational chart with identified lines of authority.
4. Strategies to implement the management plan tasks. This element must:
 - a. Identify the entities or agencies that will be contacted to obtain data and assistance.
 - b. Identify management practices used to control sources of COCs from irrigated lands that are 1) technically feasible; 2) economically feasible; 3) proven to be effective at protecting water

quality, and 4) will comply with sections III.A and B of the Order. Practices that growers will implement must be discussed, along with an estimate of their effectiveness or any known limitations on the effectiveness of the chosen practice(s). Practices identified may include those that are required by local, state, or federal law. Where an identified constituent of concern is a pesticide that is subject to DPR's Groundwater Protection Program, the GQMP may refer to DPR's regulatory program for that pesticide and any requirements associated with the use of that pesticide provided that the requirement(s) are sufficient to meet water quality objectives.

- c. Identify outreach that will be used to disseminate information to participating growers. This discussion shall include: the strategy for informing growers of the water quality problems that need to be addressed, method for disseminating information on relevant management practices to be implemented, and a description of how the effectiveness of the outreach efforts will be evaluated. The third-party may conduct outreach efforts or work with the assistance of the County Agricultural Commissioners, U.C. Cooperative Extension, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Resource Conservation District, California Department of Food and Agriculture, or other appropriate groups or agencies.
- d. Include a specific schedule and milestones for the implementation of management practices and tasks outlined in the management plan. The schedule must include the following items: time estimated to identify new management practices as necessary to meet the Order's surface and groundwater receiving water limitations (section III of the Order) and a timetable for implementation of identified management practices (e.g., at least 25% of growers identified must implement management practices by year 1; at least 50% by year 2). The overall time schedule for compliance must be consistent with the requirements in section XII of the Order, Time Schedule for Compliance.
- e. Establish measureable performance goals that are aligned with the elements of the management plan strategy. Performance goals include specific targets that identify the expected progress towards meeting a desired outcome.

D. Monitoring Design

1. General Requirements

The monitoring system must be designed to measure effectiveness at achieving the goals and objectives of the SQMP or GQMP and capable of determining whether management practice changes made in response to the management plan are effective and can comply with the terms of the Order.

Management practice-specific or commodity-specific field studies may be used to approximate the contribution of irrigated lands operations. Where the third-party determines that field studies are appropriate or the Executive Officer requires a technical report under CWC 13267 for a field study, the third-party must identify a reasonable number and variety of field study sites that are representative of the particular management practice being evaluated.

2. Surface Water – Additional Requirements

The strategy to be used in the development and implementation of the monitoring methods for surface water must address the general requirements and, at a minimum, meet the following requirements:

- a. The location(s) of the monitoring site and schedule (including frequencies) for monitoring should be chosen to be representative of the COC discharge to the watershed.

- b. Surface water monitoring data must be submitted electronically per the requirements given in section III.D of the MRP.

3. Groundwater – Additional Requirements

The third-party's Management Practice Evaluation Program and Groundwater Quality Trend Monitoring shall be evaluated to determine whether additional monitoring is needed in conjunction with the proposed management strategy(ies) to evaluate the effectiveness of the strategy(ies). This may include commodity-based representative monitoring that is conducted to determine the effectiveness of management practices implemented under the GQMP. Refer to section IV of the MRP for groundwater monitoring requirements.

E. Data Evaluation

Methods to be used to evaluate the data generated by SQMP/GQMP monitoring and to evaluate the effectiveness of the implemented management practices must be described. The discussion should include at a minimum, the following:

1. Methods to present data and perform data analysis (graphical, statistics, modeling, index computation, or some combination thereof).
2. Information necessary to assess program effectiveness going forward, including the tracking of management practice implementation. The approach for determining the effectiveness of the management practices implemented must be described. Acceptable approaches include field studies of management practices at representative sites and modeling or assessment to associate the degree of management practice implementation to changes in water quality. The process for tracking implementation of management practices must also be described. The process must include a description of how the information will be collected from growers, the type of information being collected, how the information will be verified, and how the information will be reported.

F. Records and Reporting

With each annual monitoring report, the third-party must prepare a Management Plan Progress Report that summarizes the progress in implementing management plans. The Management Plan Progress Report must summarize the progress for the reporting period. The Management Plan Progress Report shall include the following components:

- (1) Title page
- (2) Table of contents
- (3) Executive Summary
- (4) Location map(s) and a brief summary of management plans covered by the report
- (5) Updated table that tallies all exceedances for the management plans
- (6) A list of new management plans triggered since the previous report
- (7) Progress update on preparation of new management plans
- (8) A summary and assessment of management plan monitoring data collected during the reporting period
- (9) A summary of management plan grower outreach conducted
- (10) A summary of the degree of implementation of management practices
- (11) Results from evaluation of management practice effectiveness
- (12) An evaluation of progress in meeting performance goals and schedules
- (13) Any recommendations for changes to the management plan

G. Source Identification Study Requirements

Should the third-party conduct a Source Identification Study to comply with this Order, the third-party must first receive approval from the Executive Officer. Once approved, the third-party may proceed with its study.

The minimum components for a source identification study are:

- (1) An evaluation of the types of practices, commodities, and locations that may be a source.
- (2) Continued monitoring at the management plan site/area and increased monitoring if appropriate.
- (3) An assessment of the potential pathways through which waste discharges can occur.
- (4) A schedule for conducting the study.

Commodity specific and/or management practice specific field studies (including edge-of field studies) may be required to approximate the contribution of irrigated agriculture. At a minimum, the third-party must evaluate the feasibility of field studies as part of its source identification study proposal. Where field studies are deemed appropriate, the third-party should identify a reasonable number and variety of field study sites that are representative of the particular commodity or management practice being evaluated. If field studies are not proposed, the third-party must demonstrate how the alternative source identification method will produce data or information that will enable the determination of contributions from irrigated agricultural operations to the water quality problem.

If an approved study shows that irrigated lands are not a cause or a contributing source, then the third-party can request the Executive Officer to approve completion of the associated management plan. Where irrigated lands are identified as a source, a full SQMP/GQMP shall be prepared and implemented.

II. Approval and Review of the Management Plan

The following discussion describes the review and approval process for draft management plans submitted to the Executive Officer for approval. In approving the Management Plan, the Executive Officer is concurring that the proper implementation of the identified practices (or equivalently effective practices) should result in addressing the water quality problem that triggered the preparation of the Management Plan. The Executive Officer is also concurring that any proposed schedules or interim milestones are consistent with the requirements in section XII of the Order, Time Schedule for Compliance. Any proposed changes to the management plan must be approved by the Executive Officer prior to implementation.

- a. Water quality management plan approval – Prior to Executive Officer approval of any management plan, the Central Valley Water Board will post the draft management plan on its website for a review and comment period. Central Valley Water Board staff will consider stakeholder comments. Based on information provided by the third-party and after consideration of comments provided by other interested stakeholders, the Central Valley Water Board's Executive Officer will either: (1) approve the management plan; (2) conditionally approve the management plan or (3) disapprove the management plan. Review of the management plan and the associated action by the Executive Officer will be based on findings as to whether the plan meets program requirements and goals and contains all of the information required for a management plan.
- b. Periodic review of water quality management plans – At least once every five years, the Central Valley Water Board intends to review available data to determine whether the approved management plan is resulting in water quality improvements. Central Valley Water Board staff

will meet with the third-party and other interested parties to evaluate the adequacy of management plans. Based on input from all parties, the Executive Officer will determine whether and how the management plan should be updated based on new information and progress in achieving compliance with the Order's surface or groundwater receiving water limitations, as applicable (see section III of the Order). The Executive Officer also may require revision of the management plan based on available information indicating that irrigated agriculture waste discharges are not in compliance with surface or groundwater receiving water limitations (as applicable) of the Order. The Executive Officer may also require revision to the management plan if available information indicates that degradation of surface and/or groundwater calls for the inclusion of additional areas, constituents of concern(s), or improved management practices in the management plan. During this review, the Executive Officer will make one of the findings described below:

1. Adequate progress – The Executive Officer will make a determination of adequate progress in implementing the plan if water quality improvement milestones and compliance time schedules have been met or the surface/groundwater receiving water limitations of the Order are met.
2. Inadequate progress – The Executive Officer will make a determination of inadequate progress in implementing the plan if the Order's surface or groundwater receiving water limitations are not being met, and water quality improvement milestones and compliance time schedules in the approved management plan have not been met.

The actions taken by the Executive Officer upon a determination of inadequate progress include, but are not limited to one or more of the following for the area in which inadequate progress has been made:

- Management practice field monitoring studies – The third-party may be required to develop and implement a field monitoring study plan to characterize the commodity-specific discharge of the constituent of concern and evaluate the pollutant reduction efficacy of specific management practices. Based on the study and evaluation, the Executive Officer may require the SQMP/GQMP to be revised to include additional practices to achieve compliance with the Order's surface and groundwater receiving water limitations.
- Independent, on-site verification of implementation of management practices and evaluation of their adequacy.
- Individual WDRs or waiver of WDRs – The board may revoke the third-party coverage for individual irrigated agricultural operations and require submittal of a report of waste discharge.

III. Management Plan Completion

Management Plans can be completed in one of two ways. The first way a Management Plan can be completed is if an approved source study shows that irrigated agriculture is not causing or contributing to the water quality problem. The second way a Management Plan can be completed is if the improved management practices have resolved the water quality problem.

The goal of all management plans is to identify the source(s) of COCs, track the implementation of effective management practices, and ultimately ensure that irrigated agriculture waste discharges are meeting the surface and groundwater receiving water limitations of the Order. If an approved source study shows that irrigated agriculture is not a source, then the third-party can request the Executive Officer to approve completion of the associated management plan.

A request for approval of completion of a management plan due to improved management practices will require credible evidence that the water quality problem has been resolved. The Executive Officer will evaluate each request on a case-by-case basis. The following key components must be addressed in the request:

- a) Demonstration through evaluation of monitoring data that the water quality problem is no longer occurring (i.e., 3 or more years with no exceedances during the times of the year when previous exceedances occurred²) or demonstrated compliance with the Order's surface and groundwater receiving water limitations.
- b) Documentation of third-party education and outreach to applicable Members in the watershed where water quality impairment occurred.
- c) Documentation of Member implementation of management practices that address the water quality exceedances.
- d) Demonstration that the management practices implemented by Members are effective in addressing the water quality problem.

Management plans may be completed for all or some of the constituents that prompted preparation of the management plan. When Executive Officer approval is given for completion of a management plan for one or more constituents, each constituent shall revert to regular, ongoing monitoring requirements (as described in the MRP). The third-party must also continue tracking on-going implementation of appropriate management practices by growers, which may be done through the Farm Evaluation process.

Requests for management plan completion must summarize and discuss all information and data being used to justify completion. The third-party shall not discontinue any of the associated management plan requirements prior to Executive Officer approval of its completion request.

² The demonstration must include consideration of periods of peak use and/or periods when a parameter is likely to be present.

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

ORDER R5-2014-0029
MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

APPENDIX MRP-2

**Monitoring Well Installation and Sampling Plan
and
Monitoring Well Installation Completion Report**

I. Introduction

The provisions of Appendix MRP-2 are set out pursuant to the Central Valley Water Board's authority under California Water Code (CWC) section 13267. The purpose and requirements of the Management Practice Evaluation Program (MPEP) are set forth in Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) R5-2014-0029.

Implementation of the MPEP requires that the third-party develop and submit a Monitoring Well Installation and Sampling Plan (MWISP) to the Executive Officer for approval prior to installation of monitoring wells. Stipulations and required elements of the MWISP are presented in section II below.

Upon completion of any monitoring well network, the third-party shall submit to the Central Valley Water Board a Monitoring Well Installation Completion Report (MWICR) which describes the field activities performed during that phase of the work. Required elements to be included in the MWICR are presented in section III below.

II. Monitoring Well Installation and Sampling Plan (MWISP)

Prior to installation of groundwater monitoring wells, a Monitoring Well Installation and Sampling Plan (MWISP) and schedule prepared by, or under the direct supervision of, and certified by, a California registered civil engineer or a California registered geologist with experience in hydrogeology shall be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board for Executive Officer approval. If the third-party has chosen to rank or prioritize its high vulnerability areas, the initial MWISP must present an overview and justification for the phased approach. Separate MWISPs showing the proposed monitoring well locations are required prior to implementation of each phase (alternatively, the third-party may prepare a master MWISP covering all of the proposed phases of well installation). Installation of monitoring wells shall not begin until the Executive Officer notifies the third-party in writing that the MWISP is acceptable. The MWISP or an MWISP for the initial phase if the third-party has chosen to employ a phased approach must be submitted within 180 days after Executive Officer approval of the Management Practices Evaluation Workplan (see section IV of Monitoring and Reporting Program Order R5-2014-0029, "MRP").

A. Stipulations

1. All monitoring wells shall be constructed in a manner that maintains the integrity of the monitoring well borehole and prevents the well (including the annular space outside of the well casing) from acting as a conduit for waste/contaminant transport. Each monitoring well shall be appropriately designed and constructed to enable collection of representative samples of the first encountered groundwater.

2. Where applicable, the third-party shall follow state, county or local agency standards with respect to water wells and groundwater quality when constructing new wells, modifying existing wells, or destroying wells. Absent such standards, at a minimum, the third-party shall follow the standards and guidelines described in the California Department of Water Resources' *Water Well Standards (Bulletins 74-81 & 74-90 combined)*. More stringent practices shall be implemented if needed to prevent the well from acting as a conduit for the vertical migration of waste constituents.
3. The horizontal and vertical position of each monitoring well shall be determined by a registered land surveyor or other qualified professional. The horizontal position of each monitoring well shall be measured with one-foot lateral accuracy using the North American Datum 1983 (NAD83 datum). The vertical elevations of each monitoring well, at the point where depth to groundwater shall be measured to an absolute accuracy of at least 0.5 feet and a relative accuracy between monitoring wells of 0.01 feet referenced to the North American Vertical Datum 1988 (NAVD88 datum).
4. Once the groundwater monitoring network is installed pursuant to an approved MWISP, the third-party shall sample monitoring wells for the constituents and at the frequencies as specified in the approved MPEP. Groundwater monitoring shall include monitoring during periods of the expected highest and lowest annual water table levels and be of sufficient frequency to allow for evaluation of any seasonal variations.
5. Groundwater samples from monitoring wells shall be collected as specified in an approved MWISP and in accordance with the third-party's approved QAPP.

B. MWISP Required Elements

At a minimum, the MWISP must contain all of the information listed below.

1. General Information:
 - a. Topographic map showing any existing nearby (about 2,000 feet) domestic, irrigation, municipal supply, and known monitoring wells, utilities, surface water bodies, drainage courses and their tributaries/destinations, and other major physical and man-made features, as reasonably known and appropriate.
 - b. Site plan showing proposed well locations, other existing wells, unused and/or abandoned wells, and major physical site structures (such as tailwater retention systems, tile-drainage systems including discharge points, chemigation and/or fertigation tanks, flood control features, irrigation canals, etc.).
 - c. Rationale for the number of proposed monitoring wells, their locations and depths, and identification of anticipated depth to groundwater. This information must include an explanation of how the location, number, and depths of wells proposed will result in the collection of data that can be used to assess groundwater at farms not directly monitored by the MPEP and under a variety of hydrogeologic conditions.
 - d. Local permitting information (as required for drilling, well seals, boring/well abandonment).

- e. Drilling details, including methods and types of equipment for drilling and soils logging activities. Equipment decontamination procedures (as appropriate) should be described.
 - f. Health and Safety Plan.
2. Proposed Drilling Details:
- a. Drilling techniques.
 - b. Well/soil sample collection and logging method(s).
3. Proposed Monitoring Well Design - all proposed well construction information must be displayed on a construction diagram or schematic. For items f. through i., the vertical location of all annular materials (filter pack, seals, etc.) shall be shown and a description of the material and its method of emplacement given. The construction diagram or schematic shall accurately identify the following:
- a. Well depth.
 - b. Borehole depth and diameter.
 - c. Well construction materials.
 - d. Casing material and diameter - include conductor casing, if appropriate.
 - e. Location and length of perforation interval, size of perforations, and rationale.
 - f. Location and thickness of filter pack, type and size of filter pack material, and rationale.
 - g. Location, thickness, and composition of any intermediate seal.
 - h. Location, thickness, and composition of annular seal.
 - i. Surface seal depth and composition.
 - j. Type of well cap(s).
 - k. Type of well surface completion.
 - l. Well protection devices (such as below-grade water-tight vaults, locking steel monument, bollards, etc.).
4. Proposed Monitoring Well Development:
- a. Schedule for development (not less than 48 hours or more than 10 days after well completion).
 - b. Method of development.
 - c. Method of determining when development is complete.
 - d. Parameters to be monitored during development.

5. Proposed Surveying:
 - a. How horizontal and vertical position of each monitoring well will be determined.
 - b. The accuracy of horizontal and vertical measurements to be obtained.
6. Proposed Groundwater Monitoring: refer to Monitoring and Reporting Program Order R5-2014-0029 and QAPP Guidelines.

III. Monitoring Well Installation Completion Report (MWICR)

Within 60 days after completion of any monitoring well network, the third-party shall submit to the Executive Officer a Monitoring Well Installation Completion Report (MWICR) prepared by, or under the direct supervision of, and certified by, a California registered civil engineer or a California registered geologist with experience in hydrogeology. In cases where monitoring wells are completed in phases or completion of the network is delayed for any reason, monitoring well construction data are to be submitted within 90 days of well completion, even if this requires submittal of multiple reports. At a minimum, the MWICR shall summarize the field activities as described below.

1. General Information:
 - a. Brief overview of field activities including well installation summary (such as number, depths), and description and resolution of difficulties encountered during field program.
 - b. A site plan depicting the positions of the newly installed monitoring wells, other existing wells, unused and/or abandoned wells, and major physical site structures (such as tailwater retention systems, tile-drainage systems including discharge points, chemigation and/or fertigation holding tanks, flood control features, irrigation canals, etc.).
 - c. Period of field activities and milestone events (e.g., distinguish between dates of well installation, development, and sampling).
2. Monitoring Well Construction:
 - a. Number and depths of monitoring wells installed.
 - b. Monitoring well identification (i.e., numbers).
 - c. Date(s) of drilling and well installation.
 - d. Description of monitoring well locations including field-implemented changes (from proposed locations) due to physical obstacles or safety hazards.
 - e. Description of drilling and construction, including equipment, methods, and difficulties encountered (such as hole collapse, lost circulation, need for fishing).
 - f. Name of drilling company, driller, and logger (site geologist/engineer to be identified).
 - g. As-builts for each monitoring well with the following details:

- i. Well identification.
 - ii. Total borehole and well depth.
 - iii. Date of installation.
 - iv. Boring diameter.
 - v. Casing material and diameter (include conductor casing, if appropriate).
 - vi. Location and thickness of slotted casing, perforation size.
 - vii. Location, thickness, type, and size of filter pack.
 - viii. Location, thickness, and composition of any intermediate seal.
 - ix. Location, thickness, and composition of annular seal.
 - x. Surface seal depth and composition.
 - xi. Type of well cap.
 - xii. Type of surface completion.
 - xiii. Depth to water (note any rises in water level from initial measurement) and date of measurement.
 - xiv. Well protection device (such as below-grade water-tight vaults, stovepipe, bollards, etc.).
 - xv. Lithologic log and electric log (if conducted) of well borings
 - xvi. Results of all soil tests (e.g., grain size, permeability, etc.)
 - h. All depth to groundwater measurements during field program.
 - i. Field notes from drilling and installation activities (e.g., subcontractor dailies, as appropriate).
 - j. Construction summary table of pertinent information such as date of installation, well depth, casing diameter, screen interval, bentonite seal interval, and well elevation.
3. Monitoring Well Development:
- a. Date(s) and time of development.
 - b. Name of developer.
 - c. Method of development.
 - d. Methods used to identify completion of development.

- e. Development log: volume of water purged and measurements of temperature, pH, electrical conductivity, and any other parameters measured during and after development.
 - f. Disposition of development water.
 - g. Field notes (such a bailing to dryness, recovery time, number of development cycles).
4. Monitoring Well Survey:
- a. Identify coordinate system or reference points used.
 - b. Description of measuring points (e.g., ground surface, top of casing, etc.).
 - c. Horizontal and vertical coordinates of well casing with cap removed (measuring point where water levels are measured to nearest ± 0.01 foot).
 - d. Name, license number, and signature of California licensed professional who conducted survey.
 - e. Surveyor's field notes.
 - f. Tabulated survey data.

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

**ATTACHMENT C TO ORDER R5-2014-0029
CEQA MITIGATION MEASURES**

**WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS GENERAL ORDER
FOR
GROWERS WITHIN THE SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY AND DELTA AREA
THAT ARE MEMBERS OF A THIRD-PARTY GROUP**

A. Cultural Resources

1. Mitigation Measure CUL-MM-1: Avoid Impacts to Cultural Resources

The measure described below will reduce the severity of impacts on significant cultural resources, as defined and described in sections 5.3.1 and 5.3.3 of the PEIR.¹ Avoidance of such impacts also can be achieved when Members choose the least impactful management practices that will meet the quality improvement goals and objectives of Waste Discharge Requirements General Order for Growers within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area that are Members of a Third-Party Group, Order R5-2014-0029 (hereafter referred to as the "Order"). Note that these mitigation measures may not be necessary in cases where no ground-disturbing activities would be undertaken as a result of implementation of the Order.

Although cultural resource inventories and evaluations typically are conducted prior to preparation of a CEQA document, the size of the Order's coverage area and the lack of specificity regarding the location and type of management practices that would be implemented following adoption of the Order rendered conducting inventories prior to release of the draft Order untenable. Therefore, where the Order's water quality improvement goals cannot be achieved without modifying or disturbing an area of land or existing structure to a greater degree than through previously employed farming practices, individual farmers or third-party representatives will implement the following measures to reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels.

- Where construction within areas that may contain cultural resources cannot be avoided through the use of alternative management practices, conduct an assessment of the potential for damage to cultural resources prior to construction; this may include the hiring of a qualified cultural resources specialist to determine the presence of significant cultural resources.
- Where the assessment indicates that damage may occur, submit a non-confidential records search request to the appropriate California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) information center(s).

¹ ICF International. 2011. *Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program Final Program Environmental Impact Report*. Final and Draft. March. (ICF 05508.05.) Sacramento, CA. Prepared for: Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Sacramento, CA

- Implement the recommendations provided by the CHRIS information center(s) in response to the records search request.
- Where adverse effects to cultural resources cannot be avoided, the grower's coverage under this Order is not authorized. The grower must then apply for its own individual waste discharge requirements. Issuance of individual waste discharge requirements would constitute a future discretionary action by the board subject to additional CEQA review.

In addition, California state law provides for the protection of interred human remains from vandalism and destruction. According to the California Health and Safety Code, six or more human burials at one location constitute a cemetery (section 8100), and the disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony (section 7052). Section 7050.5 requires that construction or excavation be stopped in the vicinity of the discovered human remains until the County Coroner has been notified, according to California Public Resource Code (PRC) section 5097.98, and can determine whether the remains are those of Native American origin. If the coroner determines that the remains are of Native American origin, the coroner must contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours (Health and Safety Code section 7050[c]). The NAHC will identify and notify the most likely descendant of the interred individual(s), who will then make a recommendation for means of treating or removing, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in PRC section 5097.98.

PRC section 5097.9 identifies the responsibilities of the project proponent upon notification of a discovery of Native American burial remains. The project proponent will work with the most likely descendant (determined by the NAHC) and a professional archaeologist with specialized human osteological experience to develop and implement an appropriate treatment plan for avoidance and preservation of, or recovery and removal of, the remains.

Members implementing management practices should be aware of the following protocols for identifying cultural resources.

- If built environment resources or archaeological resources, including chipped stone (often obsidian, basalt, or chert), ground stone (often in the form of a bowl mortar or pestle), stone tools such as projectile points or scrapers, unusual amounts of shell or bone, historic debris (such as concentrations of cans or bottles), building foundations, or structures are inadvertently discovered during ground-disturbing activities, the land owner should stop work in the vicinity of the find and retain a qualified cultural resources specialist to assess the significance of the resources. If necessary, the cultural resource specialist also will develop appropriate treatment measures for the find.
- If human bone is found as a result of ground disturbance, the land owner should notify the County Coroner in accordance with the instructions described above. If Native American remains are identified and descendants are found, the descendants may, with the permission of the owner of the land or his or her authorized representative, inspect the site of the discovery of the Native American remains. The descendants may recommend to the owner or the person responsible for the excavation work means for treating or disposing of the human remains and any associated grave goods, with appropriate dignity. The descendants will make their recommendation within 48 hours of inspection of the remains. If the NAHC is unable to identify a descendant, if the

descendants identified fail to make a recommendation, or if the landowner rejects the recommendation of the descendants, the landowner will inter the human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further and future subsurface disturbance.

B. Vegetation and Wildlife

1. Mitigation Measure BIO-MM-1: Avoid and Minimize Impacts on Sensitive Biological Resources

Implementation of the following avoidance and minimization measures would ensure that the construction activities related to implementation of management practices and installation of monitoring wells on irrigated lands would minimize effects on sensitive vegetation communities (such as riparian habitat and wetlands adjacent to the construction area) and special-status plants and wildlife species as defined and listed in section 5.7.3 of the PEIR. In each instance where particular management practices could result in impacts on the biological resources listed above, Members should use the least impactful effective management practice to avoid such impacts. Where the Order's water quality improvement goals cannot be achieved without incurring potential impacts, individual farmers or third-party representatives will implement the following measures to reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels.

- Where detention basins are to be abandoned, retain the basin in its existing condition or ensure that sensitive biological resources are not present before modification.
- Where construction in areas that may contain sensitive biological resources cannot be avoided through the use of alternative management practices, conduct an assessment of habitat conditions and the potential for presence of sensitive vegetation communities or special-status plant and animal species prior to construction. This may include the hiring of a qualified biologist to identify riparian and other sensitive vegetation communities and/or habitat for special-status plant and animal species.
- Avoid and minimize disturbance of riparian and other sensitive vegetation communities.
- Avoid and minimize disturbance to areas containing special-status plant or animal species.
- Where adverse effects on sensitive biological resources cannot be avoided, the grower's coverage under this Order is not authorized. The grower must then apply for its own individual waste discharge requirements. Issuance of individual waste discharge requirements would constitute a future discretionary action by the board subject to additional CEQA review.

2. Mitigation Measure BIO-MM-2: Determine Extent of Wetland Loss and Compensate for Permanent Loss of Wetlands

Prior to implementing any management practice that will result in the permanent loss of wetlands, conduct a delineation of affected wetland areas to determine the acreage of loss in accordance with current U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) methods. For compliance with the federal Clean Water Act section 404 permit and WDRs protecting state waters from unauthorized fill, compensate for the permanent loss (fill) of wetlands and ensure no net loss of habitat functions and values. Compensation ratios will be determined through coordination with the Central Valley Water Board and USACE as part of the

permitting process. Such process will include additional compliance with CEQA, to the extent that a further discretionary approval by the board would require additional CEQA review. Compensation may be a combination of mitigation bank credits and restoration/creation of habitat, as described below:

- Purchase credits for the affected wetland type (e.g., perennial marsh, seasonal wetland) at a locally approved mitigation bank and provide written evidence to the resource and regulatory agencies, as needed, that compensation has been established through the purchase of mitigation credits.
- Develop and ensure implementation of a wetland restoration plan that involves creating or enhancing the affected wetland type.

C. Fisheries

1. Mitigation Measure FISH-MM-1: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Fish and Fish Habitat

This mitigation measure incorporates all measures identified in Mitigation Measure BIO-MM-1: Avoid and Minimize Impacts on Sensitive Biological Resources. In each instance where particular management practices could result in impacts to special-status fish species (see “Regulatory Classification of Special-Status Species” in section 5.8.2 of the PEIR), Members should use the least impactful effective management practice to avoid such impacts. Where the Order’s water quality improvement goals cannot be achieved without incurring potential impacts, individual farmers or third-party representatives will implement the following measures to reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. Note that these measures may not be necessary in many cases and are dependent on the location of construction in relation to water bodies containing special-status fish.

- Where construction in areas that may contain special-status fish species cannot be avoided through the use of alternative management practices, conduct an assessment of habitat conditions and the potential for presence of special-status fish species prior to construction; this may include the hiring of a qualified fisheries biologist to determine the presence of special-status fish species.
- Based on the species present in adjacent water bodies and the likely extent of construction work that may affect fish, limit construction to periods that avoid or minimize impacts to special-status fish species.
- Where construction periods cannot be altered to minimize or avoid effects on special-status fish, the grower’s coverage under this Order is not authorized. The grower must then apply for its own individual waste discharge requirements. Issuance of individual waste discharge requirements would constitute a future discretionary action by the board subject to additional CEQA review.

2. Mitigation Measure FISH-MM-2: Educate Members on the Use of Polyacrylamides (PAMs) for Sediment Control

The third-party will provide information on the potential risks to aquatic life, including special-status fish, that may result from the use of cationic or neutral PAMs during water management activities. Information in the form of leaflets and website information will be provided to Member, encouraging the use of anionic PAMs. Application of anionic PAMs at

prescribed rates will be emphasized in the information provided to Members. Adoption of the United States Department of Agriculture National Conservation Practice Standard 450 also will be recommended in the information.

D. Agriculture Resources

1. Mitigation Measure AG-MM-1: Assist the Agricultural Community in Identifying Sources of Financial Assistance that would Allow Members to Keep Important Farmland in Production.

The third-party will assist the agricultural community in identifying sources of financial assistance from existing federal, state, or local programs that promote water conservation and water quality through improved management practices. Funding received from grants, cost-sharing, or low interest loans would offset some of the local Members' expenditures for compliance with and implementation of the Order, and likely would reduce the estimated losses in irrigated acreage. Potential funding sources for this mitigation measure are discussed below. The programs described below are illustrative and are not intended to constitute a comprehensive list of funding sources.

Federal Farm Bill

Title II of the 2014 Farm Bill (the Agriculture Act of 2014, in effect through 30 September 2018) authorizes funding for conservation programs such as the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) and the Conservation Stewardship Program. Both of these programs provide financial and technical assistance for activities that improve water quality on agricultural lands.

State Water Resources Control Board

The Division of Financial Assistance administers water quality improvement programs for the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board). The programs provide grant and loan funding to reduce non-point-source pollution discharge to surface waters.

The Division of Financial Assistance currently administers two programs that improve water quality associated with agriculture—the Agricultural Drainage Management Loan Program and the Agricultural Drainage Loan Program. Both of these programs were implemented to address the management of agricultural drainage into surface water. The Agricultural Water Quality Grant Program provides funding to reduce or eliminate the discharge of non-point-source pollution from agricultural lands into surface water and groundwater. It currently is funded through bonds authorized by Proposition 84.

The State Water Board's Clean Water State Revolving Fund also has funding authorized through Proposition 84. It provides loan funds to a wide variety of point-source and non-point-source water quality control activities.

Potential Funding Provided by the Safe, Clean, and Reliable Drinking Water Supply Act

This act was placed on the ballot by the Legislature as SBX7-2 and was originally scheduled for voter approval in November 2010. In August of 2010, the Legislature removed this issue from the 2010 ballot with the intent to re-introduce it in November of 2012. In July 2012, the Legislature approved a bill to take the measure off the 2012 ballot and put it on the 2014 ballot. If approved by the public, the new water bond would provide grant and loan funding for a wide range of water-related activities, including improving agricultural water quality, conservation and watershed protection, and groundwater protection and water quality. The majority of public funds allocated by the bond would go through a rigorous competitive process to ensure dollars would go to a public benefit. Additionally, this water bond is expected to leverage more than \$30 billion in additional investments in local, regional, and state wide infrastructure for water supply, water quality, and environmental restoration enhancements. The actual amount and timing of funding availability will depend on its passage, on the issuance of bonds and the release of funds, and on the kinds of programs and projects proposed and approved for funding.

Other Funding Programs

Other state and federal funding programs have been available in recent years to address agricultural water quality improvements. Integrated Regional Water Management grants were authorized and funded by Proposition 50 and now by Proposition 84. These are administered jointly by the State Water Board and the California Department of Water Resources. Proposals can include agricultural water quality improvement projects. The Bureau of Reclamation also can provide assistance and cost-sharing for water conservation projects that help reduce discharges.

E. Mitigation Measure CC-MM-2: Apply Applicable California Attorney General Mitigation Measures to Reduce Construction and Operational GHG Emissions

A 2008 report by the California Attorney General's office entitled *The California Environmental Quality Act: Addressing Global Warming at the Local Agency Level* identifies various example measures to reduce GHG emissions at the project level (California Department of Justice 2008). The following mitigation measures and project design features were compiled from the California Attorney General's Office report. They are not meant to be exhaustive but to provide a sample list of measures that should be incorporated into future project design. Only those measures applicable to the Order are included.

Solid Waste Measures

- Reuse and recycle construction and demolition waste (including, but not limited to, soil, vegetation, concrete, lumber, metal, and cardboard).
- Provide interior and exterior storage areas for recyclables and green waste and adequate recycling containers.
- Recover by-product methane to generate electricity.

Transportation and Motor Vehicles

- Limit idling time for commercial vehicles, including delivery and construction vehicles.
- Use low- or zero-emission vehicles, including construction vehicles.

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

ORDER R5-2014-0029
ATTACHMENT D TO ORDER R5-2014-0029
FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS GENERAL ORDER
FOR
GROWERS WITHIN THE SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY AND DELTA AREA
THAT ARE MEMBERS OF A THIRD-PARTY GROUP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction	3
II. Findings	3
A. History of the Project.....	4
B. Applicability of the Program EIR.....	5
C. Impact Findings	6
1. Cultural Resources	6
2. Noise	7
3. Air Quality	8
4. Vegetation and Wildlife	10
5. Fisheries	14
6. Agriculture Resources.....	16
7. Cumulative Impacts	17
D. Mitigation Measures.....	20
1. Cultural Resources	20
2. Noise	22
3. Air Quality	22
4. Vegetation and Wildlife	22
5. Fisheries	24
6. Agriculture Resources.....	24
7. Cumulative Impacts	26
E. Feasibility of Alternatives Considered in the EIR.....	26
Alternative 1: Full Implementation of the Current Program - No Project.....	27
Alternative 2: Third-Party Lead Entity	28
Alternative 3: Individual Farm Water Quality Management Plans.....	29
Alternative 4: Direct Oversight with Regional Monitoring	30
Alternative 5: Direct Oversight with Farm Monitoring	31
Alternative 6: Staff Recommended Alternative in the Draft PEIR	33
III. Statement of Overriding Considerations Supporting Approval of the Waste Discharge Requirements General Order for Growers Within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area that are Members of a Third-Party Group	34
IV. References Cited.....	36

Acronyms and Abbreviations

2014 Farm Bill	Agriculture Act of 2014
CACs	county agricultural commissioners
CCR	California Code of Regulations
Central Valley Water Board	California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CRHR	California Register of Historic Resources
CV-SALTS	Central Valley Salinity Alternatives for Long-Term Sustainability
DO	dissolved oxygen
DPH	California Department of Public Health
DPM	diesel particulate matter
DPR	California Department of Pesticide Regulation
EIR	environmental impact report
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
EQIP	Environmental Quality Incentives Program
ESA	federal Endangered Species Act
PEIR	Long-Term Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program Final Program EIR (incorporates Draft)
GHGs	greenhouse gasses
GQMPs	groundwater quality management plans
HAPs	hazardous air pollutants
ILRP	Long-Term Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program
ILRP Framework Report	Recommended Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program Framework Staff Report, March 2011
MMRP	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NPS	nonpoint source
NPS Policy	State Water Board's Policy for Implementation and Enforcement of the Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
PAMs	polyacrylamides
PRC	California Public Resources Code
SB	Senate Bill
State Water Board	State Water Resources Control Board
TACs	toxic air contaminants
TMDLs	total maximum daily loads
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
WDRs	waste discharge requirements

I. Introduction

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code [PRC] sections 21002, 21002.1, 21081, 21081.5, 21100) and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a) provide that no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an environmental impact report (EIR) has been certified when one or more significant environmental effects of the project have been identified, unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. These findings explain the disposition of each of the significant effects, including those that will be less than significant with mitigation. The findings must be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

There are three possible findings under section 15091(a). The public agency must make one or more of these findings for each significant effect. The section 15091(a) findings are:

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Long-Term Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program (ILRP) Final Program EIR (PEIR) (ICF International 2011). Pub. Resources Code section 15091(a)(1).
2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. Pub. Resources Code section 15091(a)(2).
3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the PEIR. Pub. Resources Code section 15091(a)(3).

II. Findings

The findings in the *Impact Findings* (section II. C) discuss the significant direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the program to be adopted, which is referred to throughout as Waste Discharge Requirements General Order for Growers within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area that are Members of a Third-party, Order R5-2014-0029 (Order). The Order is described in California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region Order R5-2014-0029 and supporting attachments, and is being approved consistent with the requirements of CEQA.

The requirements of this Order have been developed from the alternatives evaluated in the PEIR, and include regulatory elements contained within those alternatives. As described below (see Applicability of the Program EIR), there are no new effects that could occur or no new mitigation measures that would be required as a result of the Order that were not already identified and described in the PEIR. None of the conditions that would trigger the need to prepare a subsequent EIR under State CEQA Guidelines section 15162 exist with respect to the Order.

The findings adopted by the Central Valley Water Board address each of the Order's significant effects in their order of appearance in the PEIR certified for the Long-term ILRP. The findings also address the alternatives analyzed in the PEIR that were not selected as a basis for the Order.

For the purposes of section 15091, the documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the Central Valley Water Board based its decision are held by the Central Valley Water Board.

For findings made under section 15091(a)(1), required mitigation measures have been adopted for the Order. These mitigation measures are described in the *Mitigation Measures* below (section II.D), and are included in Attachment C of the Order. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for these measures has been included in the Order's Monitoring and Reporting Program R5-2014-0029 (MRP).

Where mitigation measures are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency, the finding in section 15091(a)(2) should be made by the lead agency. In order to make the finding, the lead agency must find that the mitigation measures have been adopted by the other public agency or can and should be adopted by the other public agency.

Where the finding is made under section 15091(a)(3) regarding the infeasibility of mitigation measures or alternatives, the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations are described in a subsequent section.

Each of these findings must be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

The Order implements the Long-Term ILRP for irrigated lands in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area. The Order is intended to serve as a single implementing order in a series of orders that will implement the Long-Term ILRP for the entire Central Valley.

A. History of the Project

In 2003 the Central Valley Water Board adopted a conditional waiver of waste discharge requirements for discharges from irrigated agricultural lands. As part of the 2003 waiver program the Central Valley Water Board directed staff to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for a long-term irrigated lands regulatory program (ILRP).

On 5 and 6 March 2003, CEQA scoping meetings were held in Fresno and Sacramento to solicit and receive public comment on the scope of the EIR as described in the Notice of Preparation (released on 14 February 2003). Following the scoping meetings, the Central Valley Water Board began preparation of the draft *Existing Conditions Report* (ECR) in 2004 to assist in defining the baseline condition for the EIR's environmental analyses. The draft ECR was circulated in 2006, public comment on the document was received and incorporated and it was released in 2008.¹

In March and April 2008, the Central Valley Water Board conducted another series of CEQA scoping meetings to generate recommendations on the scope and goals of the long-term ILRP. Information was also gathered as to how stakeholders would like to be involved in development of the long-term program. Stakeholders indicated in these scoping meetings that they would like to be actively involved in developing the program. To address this interest, the Central

¹ ICF Jones & Stokes. 2008. *Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program Existing Conditions Report*. December. (ICF J&S 05508.05.) Sacramento, CA. Prepared for the State Water Resources Control Board and Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Rancho Cordova, CA.

Valley Water Board initiated the Long-term ILRP Stakeholder Advisory Workgroup. The Stakeholder Advisory Workgroup assisted in the development of long-term program goals and objectives and a range of alternatives to be considered in the PEIR.

On 28 July 2010, the Central Valley Water Board, serving as the lead agency under CEQA, released the Draft PEIR for the long-term ILRP. The PEIR provides programmatic analysis of impacts resulting from the implementation of six regulatory alternatives. Five of the alternatives were developed with the Stakeholder Advisory Workgroup. The sixth alternative was developed by staff in an effort to fulfill program goals and objectives, meet applicable state policy and law, and minimize potentially adverse environmental impacts and economic effects. The PEIR does not analyze a preferred program alternative, but rather equally analyzes the environmental impacts of each alternative. Further discussion regarding the PEIR alternatives is included below in the section titled “Feasibility of Alternatives Considered in the EIR.”

The Central Valley Water Board provided a 60-day period for submitting written comments on the Draft PEIR. In September 2010, Central Valley Water Board staff held public workshops in Chico, Modesto, Rancho Cordova, and Tulare to receive input. The Central Valley Water Board provided substantive responses to all written comments received on the Draft PEIR. The Central Valley Water Board provided public notice of the availability of the Final PEIR on 8 March 2011. The Central Valley Water Board certified the PEIR on 7 April 2011 (Central Valley Water Board Resolution R5-2011-0017). In December 2012, the board adopted a long-term ILRP third-party order for the Eastern San Joaquin River Watershed and for the Tulare Lake Basin Area in September 2013. The requirements of the Order have been developed from the alternatives evaluated in the PEIR.

B. Applicability of the Program EIR

Pursuant to Guidelines Section 15168(c)(2), the Central Valley Water Board finds that the Order is within the scope of the project covered by the PEIR, and no new environmental document is required. There are no new effects that could occur or no new mitigation measures that would be required as a result of the Order that were not already identified and described in the PEIR. None of the conditions that would trigger the need to prepare a subsequent EIR under State CEQA Guidelines section 15162 exist with respect to the Order.

This Order represents one order in a series of orders that will be developed, based on the alternatives evaluated in the PEIR, for all irrigated agriculture within the Central Valley. The PEIR describes that potential environmental impacts of all six alternatives are associated with implementation of water quality management practices, construction of monitoring wells, and impacts to agriculture resources (e.g., loss of production of prime farmland) due to increased regulatory costs.

The PEIR describes and evaluates potential impacts of practices likely to be implemented to meet water quality and other management goals on irrigated lands. The representative water quality management practices analyzed include:

- Nutrient management
- Improved water management
- Tailwater recovery system
- Pressurized irrigation

- Sediment trap, hedgerow, or buffer
- Cover cropping or conservation tillage
- Wellhead protection

As discussed in Attachment A, the requirements of the Order have been developed from the alternatives evaluated in the PEIR. Because the Order includes regulatory elements that are also contained in the six alternatives analyzed in the PEIR, the actions by Members to protect water quality in response to the requirements of this Order are expected to be similar to those described for Alternatives 2-6 of the PEIR (Alternative 1 does not include groundwater protection). Therefore, the requirements of this Order would lead to implementation of the above practices within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area to a similar degree as is described for Alternatives 2-6 analyzed in the PEIR.

Specifically, project-level review of the requirements in the Order has revealed that the requirements of the Order most closely resemble those described for Alternatives 2 and 4 of the PEIR, but do include elements from Alternatives 2-5. The Order contains the third-party lead entity structure, regional surface and groundwater management plans, and regional surface water quality monitoring approach similar to Alternative 2 of the PEIR; farm planning, management practices tracking, nutrient tracking, and regional groundwater monitoring similar to Alternative 4 of the PEIR; sediment and erosion control plan (under Alternative 3, "farm plan") recommendation/ certification requirements similar to Alternative 3; prioritized installation of groundwater monitoring wells similar to Alternative 5; and a prioritization system based on systems described by Alternatives 2 and 4.

C. Impact Findings

1. Cultural Resources

Impact CUL-1. Physical destruction, alteration, or damage of cultural resources from implementation of management practices (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Finding

As specified in section 15091(a)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Order that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the PEIR.

Rationale for Finding

Upon implementation of the Order, Members may implement a variety of management practices that include physical and operational changes to agricultural land in the Order's regulated area. Such management practices may occur near cultural resources that are historically significant and eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) or the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Implementation of these practices may lead to physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of cultural resources.

The location, timing, and specific suite of management practices to be chosen by Members to improve water quality are not known at this time. This impact is considered significant.

Mitigation Measure CUL-MM-1: Avoid Impacts to Cultural Resources has been incorporated into the Order to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures are included in the *Mitigation Measures* section II.D.1.

Impact CUL-2. Potential Damage to Cultural Resources from Construction Activities and Installation of Groundwater Monitoring Wells (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Finding

As specified in section 15091(a)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Order that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the PEIR.

Rationale for Finding

Under the Order, construction impacts would result from implementation of management practices that require physical changes, including, installation of groundwater monitoring wells. The location of monitoring wells, as well as the location, timing, and specific suite of management practices to be selected by Members are not known at this time, and will not be defined until the need for additional monitoring wells is established. This impact is considered significant. Mitigation **Measure CUL-MM-1: Avoid Impacts to Cultural Resources** has been incorporated into the Order to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures are included in the *Mitigation Measures* section II.D.1.

2. Noise

Impact NOI-1. Exposure of Sensitive Land Uses to Noise from Construction Activities in Excess of Applicable Standards (Responsibility of Other Agencies)

Finding

As specified in section 15091(a)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines, implementation of the mitigation measures for this impact is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies that can and should implement the measures.

Rationale for Finding

Under the Order, construction noise impacts would result from implementation of management practices that require the use of heavy-duty construction equipment. Because management practices are a function of crop type and economics, it cannot be determined whether the management practices selected under the Order would change relative to existing conditions. Accordingly, it is not possible to determine construction-related effects based on a quantitative analysis.

Noise levels from anticipated heavy-duty construction equipment are expected to range from approximately 55 to 88 A-weighted decibels (dBA) at 50 feet. These levels would be short term and would attenuate as a function of distance from the source. Noise from construction equipment operated within several hundred feet of noise-sensitive land uses has the potential to exceed local noise standards. This is considered a potentially significant impact.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-1: Implement Noise-Reducing Construction Practices**, which is described in the *Mitigation Measures* section II.D.2, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-1 is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of local agencies, who can and should implement these measures.

Impact NOI-2. Exposure of Sensitive Land Uses to Noise from Operational Activities in Excess of Applicable Standards (Responsibility of Other Agencies)

Finding

As specified in section 15091(a)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines, implementation of the mitigation measures for this impact is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies that can and should implement the measures.

Rationale for Finding

Under the Order, a third-party group would perform regional surface water and groundwater quality monitoring. Surface and groundwater monitoring under the Order would be similar to the regional monitoring described for Alternatives 2 and 4 of the PEIR. The PEIR provides that operational noise from vehicle trips associated with water quality sampling for these alternatives is expected to be minimal.

Operation of new well pumps as part of tailwater recovery systems may result in increased noise levels relative to existing conditions. Noise generated from individual well pumps would be temporary and sporadic. Information on the types and number of pumps, as well as the number and distances of related vehicle trips, is currently unavailable.

Depending on the type of management practice selected, the Order also may result in noise benefits relative to existing conditions. For example, improved irrigation management may reduce the amount of time that pressurized pump generators are used. Enhanced nutrient application may minimize the number of tractors required to fertilize or plow a field. Removing these sources of noise may mediate any increases related to the operation of new pumps. However, in the absence of data, a quantitative analysis of noise impacts related to operations of the Order is not possible. Potential noise from unenclosed pumps located close to noise-sensitive land uses could exceed local noise standards. This is considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of **Mitigation Measures NOI-MM-1: Implement Noise-Reducing Construction Practices** and **NOI-MM-2: Reduce Noise Generated by Individual Well Pumps**, which are described in the *Mitigation Measures* section II.D.2, should reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures NOI-MM-1 and NOI-MM-2 are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of local agencies, who can and should implement these measures.

3. Air Quality

Impact AQ-1. Generation of Construction Emissions in Excess of Local Air District Thresholds (Responsibility of Other Agencies)

Finding

As specified in section 15091(a)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines, implementation of the mitigation measures for this impact is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies that can and should implement the measures.

Rationale for Finding

Under the Order, construction impacts would result from implementation of management practices that require physical changes or the use of heavy-duty construction equipment. It is difficult to determine how management practices selected under this Order would change relative to existing conditions. Accordingly, it is not possible to determine construction-related effects based on a quantitative analysis. However, under the Order there would be selection and implementation of additional management practices to meet surface and groundwater

quality goals. Consequently, implementation of the Order may result in increased criteria pollutant emissions from construction activities relative to existing conditions.

Construction emissions associated with the Order would result in a significant impact if the incremental difference, or increase, relative to existing conditions exceeds the applicable air district thresholds shown in Table 5.5-2 of the PEIR. Management practices with the greatest potential for emissions include those that break ground or move earth matter, thus producing fugitive dust, and those that require the use of heavy-duty construction equipment (e.g., backhoes or bulldozers), thus producing criteria pollutants from exhaust. The management practices fitting this description include sediment trap, hedgerow, or buffer; pressurized irrigation; and tailwater recovery systems.

While it is anticipated that any emissions resulting from construction activities would be minuscule on a per-farm basis, in the absence of a quantitative analysis, data are insufficient to determine whether emissions would exceed the applicable air district thresholds. Consequently, this is considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure AQ-MM-1: Apply Applicable Air District Mitigation Measures to Reduce Construction Emissions below the District Thresholds**, which is described at the end of the *Impact Findings* section, should reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation Measure AQ-MM-1 is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of local air districts, who can and should implement these measures.

Impact AQ-2. Generation of Operational Emissions in Excess of Local Air District Thresholds (Responsibility of Other Agencies)

Finding

As specified in section 15091(a)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines, implementation of the mitigation measures for this impact is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies that can and should implement the measures.

Rationale for Finding

Under the Order, operational emissions would result from vehicle trips made by the third-party groups to perform surface water and groundwater monitoring, and from new diesel-powered pumps installed as part of tailwater recovery systems.

Any new emissions generated under the Order are not expected to be substantial or to exceed applicable air district thresholds. In addition, they may be moderated by emissions benefits related to management practices that reduce irrigation and cover crops (see Table 5.5-8 of the PEIR). However, the difference in emissions relative to existing conditions is not known at this time and therefore cannot be compared to the significance criteria. This is considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure AQ-MM-2: Apply Applicable Air District Mitigation Measures to Reduce Operational Emissions below the District Thresholds**, which is described in the *Mitigation Measures* section II.D.3, should reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation Measure AQ-MM-2 is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of local air districts, who can and should implement these measures.

Impact AQ-3. Elevated Health Risks from Exposure of Nearby Sensitive Receptors to Toxic Air Contaminants/Hazardous Air Pollutants (TACS/HAPs) (Responsibility of Other Agencies)

Finding

As specified in section 15091(a)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines, implementation of the mitigation measures for this impact is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies that can and should implement the measures.

Rationale for Finding

Toxic air contaminants (TACs) and hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) resulting from the Order include diesel particulate matter (DPM) from diesel construction equipment and new pumps, pesticides/fertilizers, and asbestos. Sensitive receptors near Members could be affected by these sources.

As discussed in Chapter 3 of the PEIR, one of the goals of the nutrient management and conservation tillage management practices is to reduce the application of pesticides/fertilizers. Because the Order would result in greater likelihood of these management practices being implemented, it is reasonable to assume that pesticides/fertilizers—and thus the potential for exposure to these chemicals—would be reduced under the Order.

It is expected that construction emissions may increase relative to existing conditions, thus resulting in minor increases of DPM. Elevated levels of construction in areas where naturally occurring asbestos is common may also increase the likelihood of exposure to asbestos. New diesel-powered pumps also would increase DPM emissions relative to existing conditions. This is considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of **Mitigation Measures AQ-MM-1: Apply Applicable Air District Mitigation Measures to Reduce Construction Emissions below the District Thresholds**, **AQ-MM-2: Apply Applicable Air District Mitigation Measures to Reduce Operational Emissions below the District Thresholds**, and **AQ-MM-3: Apply Applicable Air District Mitigation Measures to Reduce TAC/HAP Emissions**, which are described in the *Mitigation Measures* section II.D.3, should reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measures AQ-MM-1, AQ-MM-2, and AQ-MM-3 are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of local air districts, who can and should implement these measures.

4. Vegetation and Wildlife

Impact BIO-1. Loss of Downstream Habitat from Reduced Field Runoff (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Finding

As specified in section 15091(a)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Order that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the PEIR.

Rationale for Finding

Under the Order, management practices that reduce field runoff would result in beneficial impacts on water quality but may adversely affect downstream wildlife and vegetation that depend on agricultural surface runoff. These practices cause water to be recirculated or used at an agronomic rate, resulting in a minimal amount of agricultural runoff. This would result in a net loss of water entering waterways and potential habitat loss along runoff ditches and downstream water bodies.

Such habitat would be seasonally present, available only during times of irrigation, and unlikely to support sensitive communities or special-status plants. While reduced runoff leads to, or is the result of, reduced surface water diversions to fields, some regions rely largely on groundwater to irrigate. While it is anticipated that the loss of sensitive communities or special-status plants resulting from reduced runoff would be small, if any, data are insufficient to determine how much loss would occur. Consequently, this is considered a potentially significant impact. **Mitigation Measure BIO-MM-2: Avoid and Minimize Impacts on Sensitive Biological Resources** has been incorporated into the Order to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures are included in the *Mitigation Measures* section II.D.4.

Impact BIO-3. Potential Loss of Sensitive Natural Communities and Special-Status Plants from Construction Activities (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Finding

As specified in section 15091(a)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Order that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the PEIR.

Rationale for Finding

Under the Order, construction impacts would result from implementation of management practices that require physical changes, such as construction of water and sediment control basins, temporary water checks, tailwater return systems, vegetated drain systems, windbreaks, wellhead protection berms, and filter strips. It is difficult to determine to what extent management practices selected under the Order would change relative to existing conditions; thus, it is not possible to quantify any construction-related effects. However, it is logical to assume that implementation of the Order would result in selection of more management practices to meet water quality goals. Consequently, implementation of the Order may result in effects on vegetation from construction activities.

In general, management practices would be implemented on existing agricultural lands and managed wetlands, which are unlikely to support native vegetation or special-status plants. However, construction that directly or indirectly affects natural vegetation communities adjacent to existing irrigated lands, particularly annual grasslands with inclusions of seasonal wetlands or vernal pools and riparian vegetation, could result in loss of sensitive wetland communities or special-status plants growing in the uncultivated or unmanaged areas. While it is anticipated that the loss of sensitive communities or special-status plants resulting from construction activities would be small, if any, data are insufficient to determine how much loss would occur. Consequently, this is considered a potentially significant impact. **Mitigation Measure BIO-MM-1: Avoid and Minimize Impacts on Sensitive Biological Resources** has been incorporated into the Order to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures are described in the *Mitigation Measures* section II.D.4.

Impact BIO-4. Potential Loss of Wetland Communities due to Loss of Existing Sedimentation Ponds (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Finding

As specified in section 15091(a)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Order that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the PEIR.

Rationale for Finding

Under the Order, the assumed decrease in the use of surface water management practices that may be harmful to groundwater could result in abandonment or fill of tailwater sedimentation ponds in areas that currently percolate water to groundwater basins. Although they are not natural features, sedimentation ponds can develop vegetation communities that support wetland species, depending on the specific hydrologic regime of individual ponds. Ponds that hold water intermittently or seasonally may support plant species adapted to seasonal wetland conditions, and ponds that are continually flooded may support emergent vegetation adapted to permanent wetland conditions. Thus, the loss of these ponds could result in drying of artificially created wetlands and an indirect loss of wetland habitat. The loss of wetland communities resulting from abandonment or fill of retention ponds would be small but cannot be quantified. It is also important to note that implementation of one of the potential management practices under the Order—installation of tailwater return systems—would result in creation of tailwater ponds that could develop the same wetland characteristics as the abandoned or filled sedimentation ponds. Creation of new tailwater ponds could result in no net loss or potentially an increase in these wetland communities. However, the final extent of the tailwater ponds that could be created under the Order cannot be quantified. Consequently, the loss of existing sedimentation ponds is considered a potentially significant impact. **Mitigation Measure BIO-MM-2: Determine Extent of Wetland Loss and Compensate for Permanent Loss of Wetlands** has been incorporated into the Order to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures are described in the *Mitigation Measures* section II.D.4.

Impact BIO-5. Impacts to Special-Status Wildlife Species due to Loss of Existing Sedimentation Ponds (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Finding

As specified in section 15091(a)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Order that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the PEIR.

Rationale for Finding

Under the Order, the assumed decrease in the use of surface water management practices that may be harmful to groundwater could result in abandonment or fill of tailwater sedimentation ponds in areas that currently percolate water to groundwater basins. Although they are not natural features, sedimentation ponds can provide habitat for special-status wildlife species. The banks of these ponds could support habitat for special-status burrowing wildlife species, including San Joaquin kit fox and western burrowing owl. Ponds that hold water intermittently or seasonally may support special-status wildlife species adapted to seasonal wetland conditions, such as vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp, California red-legged frog, and California tiger salamander, depending on the proximity of these ponds to natural habitats. The ponds also provide foraging habitat for many bird species. Ponds that hold water intermittently provide foraging habitat for wading birds, and ponds that are continually flooded may support foraging and nesting habitat for waterfowl. The abandonment or fill of retention ponds would be small and cannot be quantified but could affect wildlife species that are dependent on them. However, the creation of new tailwater ponds could mitigate part or all of this impact. Because the extent of new tailwater ponds cannot be quantified, the loss of existing sedimentation ponds is considered a potentially significant impact. **Mitigation Measure BIO-MM-1: Avoid and Minimize Impacts on Sensitive Biological Resources** has been incorporated into the Order to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures are described in the *Mitigation Measures* section II.D.4.

Impact BIO-6. Loss of Sensitive Natural Communities and Special-Status Plants from Construction Activities and Installation of Groundwater Monitoring Wells (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Finding

As specified in section 15091(a)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Order that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the PEIR.

Rationale for Finding

Under the Order, construction impacts would result from installation of groundwater monitoring wells. The placement of monitoring wells cannot be predetermined; consequently, the potential impacts on sensitive natural communities and special-status plants cannot be quantified.

In general, management practices would be implemented on existing agricultural lands and managed wetlands, resulting in a less-than-significant impact. It was assumed that groundwater monitoring well placement also could be primarily limited to agricultural land and non-sensitive habitat. However, if construction related to installation of groundwater monitoring wells required changes to managed wetlands or to natural vegetation communities that are adjacent to existing irrigated lands, there would be a potential for loss of vegetation in sensitive wetland communities or loss of special-status plants growing in the uncultivated or unmanaged areas. While it is anticipated that the loss of sensitive communities or special-status plants resulting from construction activities would be small, if any, data are insufficient to determine how much loss would occur. Consequently, this is considered a potentially significant impact. **Mitigation Measure BIO-MM-1: Avoid and Minimize Impacts on Sensitive Biological Resources** has been incorporated into the Order to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures are described in the *Mitigation Measures* section II.D.4.

Impact BIO-7. Loss of Special-Status Wildlife from Construction Activities and Installation of Groundwater Monitoring Wells (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Finding

As specified in section 15091(a)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Order that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the PEIR.

Rationale for Finding

Under the Order, construction impacts would result from installation of groundwater monitoring wells. The placement of monitoring wells cannot be predetermined; consequently, the potential impacts on special-status wildlife species and their habitat cannot be quantified.

In general, management practices would be implemented on existing agricultural lands and managed wetlands, resulting in a less-than-significant impact. It was assumed that placement of groundwater monitoring wells also could be limited primarily to agricultural land and non-sensitive habitat. However, construction of groundwater monitoring wells that requires changes to managed wetlands or to natural vegetation communities adjacent to existing irrigated lands could result in a loss of special-status wildlife species occurring in the uncultivated or unmanaged areas. While it is anticipated that the loss of special-status wildlife species resulting from construction activities would be small, if any, data are insufficient to determine how much loss would occur. Consequently, this is considered a potentially significant impact. **Mitigation Measure BIO-MM-1: Avoid and Minimize Impacts on Sensitive Biological Resources** has been incorporated into the Order to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures are described at in the *Mitigation Measures* section II.D.4.

5. Fisheries

Impact FISH-2. Temporary Loss or Alteration of Fish Habitat during Construction of Facilities for Management Practices (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Finding

As specified in section 15091(a)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Order that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the PEIR.

Rationale for Finding

Under the Order, construction impacts would result from implementation of management practices that require physical changes to lands in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area. These physical changes primarily include erosion and sediment controls with features such as construction of water and sediment control basins, temporary water checks, tailwater return systems, vegetated drain systems, windbreaks, wellhead protection berms, and filter strips. Physical changes may be associated with implementation of other management practices, such as construction of filter ditches for pesticide management. Installation of facilities for management practices such as pressurized irrigation and sediment traps is unlikely to significantly exceed the baseline disturbance that occurs during routine field preparation. Construction of features associated with management practices may temporarily reduce the amount or quality of existing fish habitat in certain limited circumstances (e.g., by encroachment onto adjacent water bodies, removal of riparian vegetation, or reduction in water quality—such as increases in sediment runoff during construction). It is difficult to determine whether the management practices selected under the Order would change relative to existing conditions, and it is not possible to quantify any construction-related effects. Implementation of the Order may result in effects on fish habitat from construction activities related to management practices.

While it is anticipated that the loss of fish habitat resulting from construction activities would be small, if any, data are insufficient to determine how much loss would occur. Consequently, this is considered a potentially significant impact. **Mitigation Measure FISH-MM-1: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Fish and Fish Habitat** has been incorporated into the Order to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures are described in the *Mitigation Measures* section II.D.5.

Impact FISH-3. Permanent Loss or Alteration of Fish Habitat during Construction of Facilities for Management Practices (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Finding

As specified in section 15091(a)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Order that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the PEIR.

Rationale for Finding

In some cases, permanent loss of fish habitat may occur as a result of construction required for implementation of management practices under the Order. Some of the impact may be due to loss of structural habitat (e.g., vegetation) whereas loss of dynamic habitat (e.g., wetted habitat) could be an issue where tailwater augments natural flows or makes seasonal streams into perennial systems. This may be of concern in areas where tailwater return flows are composed mostly of pumped groundwater. Because the extent of the loss is not known, the impact is considered potentially significant. **Mitigation Measure FISH-MM-1: Avoid and Minimize**

Impacts to Fish and Fish Habitat has been incorporated into the Order to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures are described in the *Mitigation Measures* section II.D.5.

Impact FISH-4. Toxicity to Fish or Fish Prey from Particle-Coagulant Water Additives (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Finding

As specified in section 15091(a)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Order that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the PEIR.

Rationale for Finding

Under the Order, polyacrylamides (PAMs) may be applied to reduce erosion and sediment runoff and thereby improve water quality (Sojka et al. 2000). Anionic PAMs are safe to aquatic life when used at prescribed rates (Sojka et al. 2000). Because neutral and cationic PAMs may be toxic to fish and their prey (Sojka et al. 2000; Mason et al. 2005), application of anionic PAMs is recommended in areas with sensitive fish species (Mason et al. 2005). This impact is considered potentially significant. **Mitigation Measure FISH-MM-2: Educate Growers on the Use of Polyacrylamides (PAMs) for Sediment Control** has been incorporated into the Order to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures are described in the *Mitigation Measures* section II.D.5.

Impact FISH-6. Temporary Loss or Alteration of Fish Habitat during Construction of Facilities for Management Practices and Groundwater Monitoring Wells (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Finding

As specified in section 15091(a)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Order that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the PEIR.

Rationale for Finding

This impact is essentially the same as *Impact FISH-2* except that, in addition to the temporary loss or alteration of habitat due to construction of management practices, further loss or alteration of fish habitat may occur from construction of groundwater monitoring wells under the Order. Accordingly, the impact is considered potentially significant. **Mitigation Measure FISH-MM-1: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Fish and Fish Habitat** has been incorporated into the Order to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures are described in the *Mitigation Measures* section II.D.5.

Impact FISH-7. Permanent Loss or Alteration of Fish Habitat during Construction of Facilities for Management Practices and Groundwater Monitoring Wells (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Finding

As specified in section 15091(a)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Order that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the PEIR.

Rationale for Finding

This impact is essentially the same as *Impact FISH-3* except that, in addition to the temporary loss or alteration of habitat due to construction of features associated with management practices, permanent loss or alteration of fish habitat may occur from construction of groundwater monitoring wells under the Order. Accordingly, the impact is considered potentially significant. **Mitigation Measure FISH-MM-1: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Fish and Fish Habitat** has been incorporated into the Order to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures are described in the *Mitigation Measures* section II.D.5.

6. Agriculture Resources

Impact AG-1. Conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance to Nonagricultural Use (Significant and Unavoidable)

Finding

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Order, but these changes or alterations are not sufficient to reduce the significant environmental effect to less than significant as identified in the PEIR. As specified in section 15091(a)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines, specific considerations make mitigation and alternatives infeasible. A statement of overriding consideration has been adopted, as indicated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations Supporting Approval of the Order presented below.

Rationale for Finding

Under the Order, irrigated lands operations would be required to achieve surface and groundwater quality goals, and to conduct monitoring and reporting to verify such achievement. It is anticipated many or most operations will implement new management practices to achieve these surface and groundwater quality goals. Consequently, operations under the Order will experience increased operational costs due to increased monitoring and reporting activities, as well as increased management practices, if such practices are needed to meet goals. Where such increased costs make agricultural operations unlikely or unable to continue, agriculture lands may be at risk of conversion to nonagricultural use, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact to prime and/or unique farmland, as well as farmland of statewide importance.

As described in Attachment A of the Order under “California Water Code Sections 13141 and 13241,” the Order is based mainly on components of Alternatives 2-5 of the PEIR. It follows that, because the costs of the Order are similar to the costs of Alternative 4, economic impacts of the Order, including those causing potential loss of Important Farmland, may be estimated using the analysis of Alternative 4.

The PEIR describes that, under Alternative 1, described as full implementation of the previous conditional waiver program, 142 thousand acres of Important Farmland within the entire San Joaquin River Basin potentially would be removed from production. It is estimated that under Alternative 4, an additional 10 thousand acres of Important Farmland within the San Joaquin River Basin potentially would be removed from production because of the increased costs (total of 152 thousand acres). Applying the ratio of irrigated lands within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area that would be regulated under this Order (est. 582,000 acres) to the total irrigated

lands within the San Joaquin River Basin (est. 2,126,028 acres, Table 3-3, Economics Report),² it is estimated that approximately 39 thousand acres of Important Farmland potentially would be removed from production under Alternative 1 (full implementation of the current program). Under the Order (estimated using Alternative 4), an additional 2,882 acres of Important Farmland potentially would be removed from production within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area because of increased costs (total of 42 thousand acres). It is unlikely that all of this acreage would be converted to a nonagricultural use, but it is reasonable to assume that some unknown quantity would be impacted.

Because implementation of the Order potentially would result in conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use, this impact is considered significant. **Mitigation Measure AG-MM-1: Assist the Agricultural Community in Identifying Sources of Financial Assistance that would Allow Growers to Keep Important Farmland in Production** has been incorporated into the Order to reduce the magnitude of the impact, but no feasible mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures are described in the *Mitigation Measures* section II.D.6.

7. Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative Cultural Resource Impacts (Less than Cumulatively Considerable with Mitigation)

Finding

As specified in section 15091(a)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Order that avoid or substantially lessen the significant cumulative environmental effect as identified in the PEIR.

Rationale for Finding

Use of ground-disturbing management practices under the Long-term ILRP alternatives could result in cumulatively considerable effects to cultural resources in concert with other, non-program-related agricultural enterprises and nonagricultural development in the program area. **Mitigation Measure CUL-MM-1: Avoid Impacts to Cultural Resources** has been incorporated into the Order to reduce the Order's contribution to this impact to a level that is not cumulatively considerable. The mitigation measure calls for identification of cultural resources and minimization of impacts to identified resources. Mitigation measures are described in the *Mitigation Measures* section.

Cumulative Climate Change Impacts (Significant and Unavoidable)

Finding

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Order, but these changes or alterations are not sufficient to reduce the significant environmental effect to less than significant as identified in the PEIR. As specified in section 15091(a)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines, implementation of **Mitigation Measure CC-MM-1: Apply Applicable Air District Mitigation Measures to Reduce Construction and Operational GHG Emissions** for this impact is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies that can and should enforce the implementation of these measures. Further, as specified in section 15091(a)(3) of the Guidelines, specific

² ICF International 2010.

considerations make mitigation and alternatives infeasible. A statement of overriding consideration has been adopted, as indicated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations Supporting Approval of the Order presented below.

Rationale for Finding

Unlike criteria pollutant impacts, which are local and regional, climate change impacts occur at a global level. The relatively long lifespan and persistence of GHGs (as shown in Table 5.6-1 of the PEIR) require that climate change be considered a cumulative and global impact. As discussed in the PEIR, it is unlikely that any increase in global temperature or sea level could be attributed to the emissions resulting from a single project. Rather, it is more appropriate to conclude that, under the Order, GHG emissions would combine with emissions across California, the United States, and the globe to cumulatively contribute to global climate change.

Given the magnitude of state, national, and international GHG emissions (see Tables 5.6-2 through 5.6-4 of the PEIR), climate change impacts from implementation of the Order likely would be negligible. However, scientific consensus concludes that, given the seriousness of climate change, small contributions of GHGs may be cumulatively considerable. Because it is unknown to what extent, if any, climate change would be affected by the incremental GHG emissions produced by the Order, the impact to climate change is considered cumulatively considerable. **Mitigation Measure CC-MM-1: Apply Applicable Air District Mitigation Measures to Reduce Construction and Operational GHG Emissions** is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of local agencies, who can and should implement these measures. **Mitigation Measure CC-MM-2: Apply Applicable California Attorney General Mitigation Measures to Reduce Construction and Operational GHG Emissions** has been incorporated into the Order; these measures will result in lower GHG emissions levels than had they not been incorporated, but they will not completely eliminate GHG emissions that could result from the Order. No feasible mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures are described in the *Mitigation Measures* section.

Cumulative Vegetation and Wildlife Impacts (Significant and Unavoidable)

Finding

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Order, but these changes or alterations are not sufficient to reduce the significant environmental effect to less than significant as identified in the PEIR. As specified in section 15091(a)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines, specific considerations make mitigation and alternatives infeasible. A statement of overriding consideration has been adopted, as indicated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations Supporting Approval of the Order presented below.

Rationale for Finding

The Central Valley of California has been subjected to extensive human impacts from land conversion, water development, population growth, and recreation. These impacts have altered the physical and biological integrity of the Central Valley, causing loss of native riparian vegetation along river systems, loss of wetlands, and loss of native habitat for plant and wildlife species. **Mitigation Measures BIO-MM-1: Avoid and Minimize Impacts on Sensitive Biological Resources** and **BIO-MM-2: Determine Extent of Wetland Loss and Compensate for Permanent Loss of Wetlands** have been incorporated into the Order to reduce the severity of these effects. The measures are sufficient to mitigate any program-related impacts to rare or endangered plant or wildlife species, and to habitat for these species; however, the cumulative

impact of the reduction in quality habitat and the take of individual listed plants or wildlife species is potentially cumulatively considerable. Mitigation measures are described in the *Mitigation Measures* section.

Cumulative Fish Impacts (Less than Cumulatively Considerable with Mitigation)

Finding

As specified in section 15091(a)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Order that avoid or substantially lessen the significant cumulative environmental effect as identified in the PEIR.

Rationale for Finding

The ongoing impacts of impaired water quality from irrigated lands are likely to cumulatively affect fish, in combination with contaminants that remain in the Order's coverage area from past activities. Such activities include mining and past use of pesticides such as DDT that remain within sediments. Because many of the existing effects discussed in the section "Existing Effects of Impaired Water Quality on Fish" are cumulative, it is difficult to determine the relative contribution of irrigated lands and other sources. For example, low dissolved oxygen (DO) in the Stockton Deepwater Ship Channel is a result of contamination from upstream nonpoint sources (possibly including agricultural runoff) and discharges from the Stockton sewage treatment plant (Lehman et al. 2004; Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board 2005). Application of pesticides to nonagricultural lands such as urban parks and the resultant contaminant runoff also cumulatively contribute to impacts of inputs from irrigated lands.

Given the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) ongoing federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) consultation process for pesticides as a result of recent court orders, it is reasonably foreseeable that further reasonable and prudent measures would be required by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) that would improve water quality within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area. Revision of water quality control plans and total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) also can be expected to improve water quality. These and other measures, in combination with the likely beneficial effects of the Order, suggest that the cumulative effects of the Order are not cumulatively considerable with implementation of mitigation measures. **Mitigation Measures FISH-MM-1: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Fish and Fish Habitat** and **FISH-MM-2: Educate Growers on the Use of Polyacrylamides (PAMs) for Sediment Control** have been incorporated into the Order to reduce these impacts to a less than cumulatively considerable level. Mitigation measures are described in the *Mitigation Measures* section.

Cumulative Agriculture Resources Impacts (Significant and Unavoidable)

Finding

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Order, but these changes or alterations are not sufficient to reduce the significant environmental effect to less than significant as identified in the PEIR. As specified in section 15091(a)(3) of the Guidelines, specific considerations make mitigation and alternatives infeasible. A statement of overriding consideration has been adopted, as indicated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations Supporting Approval of the Order presented below.

Rationale for Finding

Since 1984, the average biennial net conversion of prime and unique farmland, and farmlands of statewide importance in California has been 28,344 acres (California Department of

Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection 2008). However, conversion has increased substantially since 2000, with an average biennial net conversion of 114,003 acres (California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection 2008). During the 2002–2004 period, prime farmland, unique farmland, and farmland of statewide importance was reduced by 133,024 acres (California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection 2006). The trend continued during the 2004–2006 period, with a net reduction of 125,495 acres (California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection 2008).

While conversion of important farmland may not continue at the accelerated rate of the past 10 years due to decreased demand for new housing, it is reasonably foreseeable that it will continue at a rate comparable to that seen since 1984. Given the magnitude of important farmland conversion expected from implementation of the Order, the Order could result in cumulatively considerable impacts to agriculture resources. **Mitigation Measure AG-MM-1** has been incorporated into the Order to reduce the severity of these effects. While implementation of AG-MM-1 could reduce these impacts to a level that is not a cumulatively considerable contribution to this statewide impact, such a reduction cannot be quantified. As such, the Order's contribution to this impact is potentially cumulatively considerable. No feasible mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures are described in the *Mitigation Measures* section.

D. Mitigation Measures

1. Cultural Resources

Mitigation Measure CUL-MM-1: Avoid Impacts to Cultural Resources

The measure described below will reduce the severity of impacts on significant cultural resources, as defined and described in sections 5.3.1 and 5.3.3 of the PEIR. Avoidance of such impacts also can be achieved when Members choose the least impactful management practices that will meet the Order's water quality improvement goals and objectives. Note that these mitigation measures may not be necessary in cases where no ground-disturbing activities would be undertaken as a result of implementation of the Order.

Although cultural resource inventories and evaluations typically are conducted prior to preparation of a CEQA document, the size of the Order's coverage area and the lack of specificity regarding the location and type of management practices that would be implemented following adoption of the Order rendered conducting inventories prior to release of the draft Order untenable. Therefore, where the Order's water quality improvement goals cannot be achieved without modifying or disturbing an area of land or existing structure to a greater degree than through previously employed farming practices, individual farmers or third-party representatives will implement the following measures to reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels.

- Where construction within areas that may contain cultural resources cannot be avoided through the use of alternative management practices, conduct an assessment of the potential for damage to cultural resources prior to construction; this may include the hiring of a qualified cultural resources specialist to determine the presence of significant cultural resources.

- Where the assessment indicates that damage may occur, submit a non-confidential records search request to the appropriate California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) information center(s).
- Implement the recommendations provided by the CHRIS information center(s) in response to the records search request.
- Where adverse effects to cultural resources cannot be avoided, the grower's coverage under this Order is not authorized. The grower must then apply for its own individual waste discharge requirements. Issuance of individual waste discharge requirements would constitute a future discretionary action by the board subject to additional CEQA review.

In addition, California state law provides for the protection of interred human remains from vandalism and destruction. According to the California Health and Safety Code, six or more human burials at one location constitute a cemetery (section 8100), and the disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony (section 7052). section 7050.5 requires that construction or excavation be stopped in the vicinity of the discovered human remains until the County Coroner has been notified, according to PRC section 5097.98, and can determine whether the remains are those of Native American origin. If the coroner determines that the remains are of Native American origin, the coroner must contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours (Health and Safety Code section 7050[c]). The NAHC will identify and notify the most likely descendant of the interred individual(s), who will then make a recommendation for means of treating or removing, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in PRC section 5097.98.

PRC section 5097.9 identifies the responsibilities of the project proponent upon notification of a discovery of Native American burial remains. The project proponent will work with the most likely descendant (determined by the NAHC) and a professional archaeologist with specialized human osteological experience to develop and implement an appropriate treatment plan for avoidance and preservation of, or recovery and removal of, the remains.

Growers implementing management practices should be aware of the following protocols for identifying cultural resources.

- If built environment resources or archaeological resources, including chipped stone (often obsidian, basalt, or chert), ground stone (often in the form of a bowl mortar or pestle), stone tools such as projectile points or scrapers, unusual amounts of shell or bone, historic debris (such as concentrations of cans or bottles), building foundations, or structures are inadvertently discovered during ground-disturbing activities, the land owner should stop work in the vicinity of the find and retain a qualified cultural resources specialist to assess the significance of the resources. If necessary, the cultural resource specialist also will develop appropriate treatment measures for the find.
- If human bone is found as a result of ground disturbance, the land owner should notify the County Coroner in accordance with the instructions described above. If Native American remains are identified and descendants are found, the descendants may—with the permission of the owner of the land or his or her authorized representative—inspect the site of the discovery of the Native American remains. The descendants may recommend to the owner or the person responsible for the excavation work means for treating or disposing of the human remains and any associated grave goods, with appropriate dignity. The descendants will make their recommendation within 48 hours of inspection of the remains. If the NAHC is unable to identify a descendant, if the descendants identified fail to make a recommendation, or if the landowner rejects the recommendation of the descendants, the

landowner will inter the human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further and future subsurface disturbance.

2. Noise

Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-1: Implement Noise-Reducing Construction Practices

Growers should implement noise-reducing construction practices that comply with applicable local noise standards or limits specified in the applicable county ordinances and general plan noise elements.

Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-2: Reduce Noise Generated by Individual Well Pumps

If well pumps are installed, Members should enclose or locate them behind barriers such that noise does not exceed applicable local noise standards or limits specified in the applicable county ordinances and general plan noise elements.

3. Air Quality

Mitigation Measure AQ-MM-1: Apply Applicable Air District Mitigation Measures to Reduce Construction Emissions below the District Thresholds

Growers should apply appropriate construction mitigation measures from the applicable air district to reduce construction emissions. These measures will be applied on a project-level basis and may be tailored in consultation with the appropriate air district, depending on the severity of anticipated construction emissions.

Mitigation Measure AQ-MM-2: Apply Applicable Air District Mitigation Measures to Reduce Operational Emissions below the District Thresholds

Growers should apply appropriate mitigation measures from the applicable air district to reduce operational emissions. These measures were suggested by the district or are documented in official rules and guidance reports; however, not all districts make recommendations for operational mitigation measures. Where applicable, measures will be applied on a project-level basis and may be tailored in consultation with the appropriate air district, depending on the severity of anticipated operational emissions.

Mitigation Measure AQ-MM-3: Apply Applicable Air District Mitigation Measures to Reduce TAC/HAP Emissions

Growers should apply appropriate TAC and HAP mitigation measures from the applicable air district to reduce public exposure to DPM, pesticides, and asbestos. These measures were suggested by the district or are documented in official rules and guidance reports; however, not all districts make recommendations for mitigation measures for TAC/HAP emissions. These measures will be applied on a project-level basis and may be tailored in consultation with the appropriate air district, depending on the severity of anticipated TAC/HAP emissions.

4. Vegetation and Wildlife

Mitigation Measure BIO-MM-1: Avoid and Minimize Impacts on Sensitive Biological Resources

Implementation of the following avoidance and minimization measures would ensure that the construction activities related to implementation of management practices and installation of

monitoring wells on irrigated lands would minimize effects on sensitive vegetation communities (such as riparian habitat and wetlands adjacent to the construction area) and special-status plants and wildlife species as defined and listed in section 5.7.3 of the PEIR. In each instance where particular management practices could result in impacts on the biological resources listed above, Members should use the least impactful effective management practice to avoid such impacts. Where the Order's water quality improvement goals cannot be achieved without incurring potential impacts, individual farmers or third-party representatives will implement the following measures to reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels.

- Where detention basins are to be abandoned, retain the basin in its existing condition or ensure that sensitive biological resources are not present before modification.
- Where construction in areas that may contain sensitive biological resources cannot be avoided through the use of alternative management practices, conduct an assessment of habitat conditions and the potential for presence of sensitive vegetation communities or special-status plant and animal species prior to construction. This may include the hiring of a qualified biologist to identify riparian and other sensitive vegetation communities and/or habitat for special-status plant and animal species.
- Avoid and minimize disturbance of riparian and other sensitive vegetation communities.
- Avoid and minimize disturbance to areas containing special-status plant or animal species.
- Where adverse effects on sensitive biological resources cannot be avoided, the grower's coverage under this Order is not authorized. The grower must then apply for its own individual waste discharge requirements. Issuance of individual waste discharge requirements would constitute a future discretionary action by the board subject to additional CEQA review.

Mitigation Measure BIO-MM-2: Determine Extent of Wetland Loss and Compensate for Permanent Loss of Wetlands

Prior to implementing any management practice that will result in the permanent loss of wetlands, conduct a delineation of affected wetland areas to determine the acreage of loss in accordance with current U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) methods. For compliance with the federal Clean Water Act section 404 permit and WDRs protecting State waters from unauthorized fill, compensate for the permanent loss (fill) of wetlands and ensure no net loss of habitat functions and values. Compensation ratios will be determined through coordination with the Central Valley Water Board and USACE as part of the permitting process. Such process will include additional compliance with CEQA, to the extent that a further discretionary approval by the board would require additional CEQA review. Compensation may be a combination of mitigation bank credits and restoration/creation of habitat, as described below:

- Purchase credits for the affected wetland type (e.g., perennial marsh, seasonal wetland) at a locally approved mitigation bank and provide written evidence to the resource and regulatory agencies, as needed, that compensation has been established through the purchase of mitigation credits.
- Develop and ensure implementation of a wetland restoration plan that involves creating or enhancing the affected wetland type.

5. Fisheries

Mitigation Measure FISH-MM-1: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Fish and Fish Habitat

This mitigation measure incorporates all measures identified in Mitigation Measure BIO-MM-1: Avoid and Minimize Impacts on Sensitive Biological Resources. In each instance where particular management practices could result in impacts to special-status fish species (see “Regulatory Classification of Special-Status Species” in section 5.8.2 of the PEIR), Members should use the least impactful effective management practice to avoid such impacts. Where the Order’s water quality improvement goals cannot be achieved without incurring potential impacts, individual farmers or third-party representatives will implement the following measures to reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. Note that these measures may not be necessary in many cases and are dependent on the location of construction in relation to water bodies containing special-status fish.

- Where construction in areas that may contain special-status fish species cannot be avoided through the use of alternative management practices, conduct an assessment of habitat conditions and the potential for presence of special-status fish species prior to construction; this may include the hiring of a qualified fisheries biologist to determine the presence of special status fish species.
- Based on the species present in adjacent water bodies and the likely extent of construction work that may affect fish, limit construction to periods that avoid or minimize impacts to special-status fish species.
- Where construction periods cannot be altered to minimize or avoid effects on special-status fish, the grower’s coverage under this Order is not authorized. The grower must then apply for its own individual waste discharge requirements. Issuance of individual waste discharge requirements would constitute a future discretionary action by the board subject to additional CEQA review.

Mitigation Measure FISH-MM-2: Educate Growers on the Use of Polyacrylamides (PAMs) for Sediment Control

The third-party will provide information to Members on the potential risks to aquatic life, including special-status fish, that may result from the use of cationic or neutral PAMs during water management activities. Information in the form of leaflets or website information will be provided to Members, encouraging the use of anionic PAMs. Application of anionic PAMs at prescribed rates will be emphasized in the information provided to Members. Adoption of the United States Department of Agriculture National Conservation Practice Standard 450 also will be recommended in the information.

6. Agriculture Resources

Mitigation Measure AG-MM-1: Assist the Agricultural Community in Identifying Sources of Financial Assistance that would Allow Growers to Keep Important Farmland in Production

The third-party will assist the agricultural community in identifying sources of financial assistance from existing federal, state, or local programs that promote water conservation and water quality through increased management practices. Funding received from grants, cost-sharing, or low-interest loans would offset some of the local Members expenditures for compliance with and implementation of the Order, and likely would reduce the estimated losses in irrigated acreage. Potential funding sources for this mitigation measure are discussed below.

The programs described below are illustrative and are not intended to constitute a comprehensive list of funding sources.

Federal Farm Bill

Title II of the 2014 Farm Bill (the Agriculture Act of 2014, in effect through 30 September 2018) authorizes funding for conservation programs such as the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) and the Conservation Stewardship Program. Both of these programs provide financial and technical assistance for activities that improve water quality on agricultural lands.

State Water Resources Control Board

The Division of Financial Assistance administers water quality improvement programs for the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board). The programs provide grant and loan funding to reduce non-point-source pollution discharge to surface waters.

The Division of Financial Assistance currently administers two programs that improve water quality associated with agriculture—the Agricultural Drainage Management Loan Program and the Agricultural Drainage Loan Program. Both of these programs were implemented to address the management of agricultural drainage into surface water. The Agricultural Water Quality Grant Program provides funding to reduce or eliminate the discharge of non-point-source pollution from agricultural lands into surface water and groundwater. It is currently funded through bonds authorized by Proposition 84.

The State Water Board's Clean Water State Revolving Fund also has funding authorized through Proposition 84. It provides loan funds to a wide variety of point-source and non-point-source water quality control activities.

Potential Funding Provided by the Safe, Clean, and Reliable Drinking Water Supply Act

This act was placed on the ballot by the Legislature as SBX 7-2 and was originally scheduled for voter approval in November 2010. In August of 2010, the Legislature removed this issue from the 2010 ballot with the intent to re-introduce it in November of 2012. In July 2012, the Legislature approved a bill to take the measure off the 2012 ballot and put it on the 2014 ballot. If approved by the public, the new water bond would provide grant and loan funding for a wide range of water-related activities, including improving agricultural water quality, conservation and watershed protection, and groundwater protection and water quality. The majority of public funds allocated by the bond would go through a rigorous competitive process to ensure dollars would go to a public benefit. Additionally, this water bond is expected to leverage more than \$30 billion in additional investments in local, regional, and state wide infrastructure for water supply, water quality, and environmental restoration enhancements. The actual amount and timing of funding availability will depend on its passage, on the issuance of bonds and the release of funds, and on the kinds of programs and projects proposed and approved for funding.

Other Funding Programs

Other state and federal funding programs have been available in recent years to address agricultural water quality improvements. Integrated Regional Water Management grants were authorized and funded by Proposition 50 and now by Proposition 84. These are administered jointly by the State Water Board and the California Department of Water Resources. Proposals can include agricultural water quality improvement projects. The Bureau of Reclamation also can provide assistance and cost-sharing for water conservation projects that help reduce discharges.

7. Cumulative Impacts

Mitigation Measure CC-MM-1: Apply Applicable Air District Mitigation Measures to Reduce Construction and Operational GHG Emissions

Several of the standard mitigation measures provided by Central Valley local air districts to reduce criteria pollutant emissions would also help to minimize GHG emissions (please see section 5.6.5 of the PEIR). Measures to reduce vehicle trips and promote use of alternative fuels, as well as clean diesel technology and construction equipment retrofits, should be considered by Members.

Mitigation Measure CC-MM-2: Apply Applicable California Attorney General Mitigation Measures to Reduce Construction and Operational GHG Emissions

A 2008 report by the California Attorney General's office entitled *The California Environmental Quality Act: Addressing Global Warming at the Local Agency Level* identifies various example measures to reduce GHG emissions at the project level (California Department of Justice 2008). The following mitigation measures and project design features were compiled from the California Attorney General's Office report. They are not meant to be exhaustive but to provide a sample list of measures that could be incorporated into future project design. Only those measures applicable to the Order are included.

Solid Waste Measures

- Reuse and recycle construction and demolition waste (including, but not limited to, soil, vegetation, concrete, lumber, metal, and cardboard).
- Provide interior and exterior storage areas for recyclables and green waste and adequate recycling containers.
- Recover by-product methane to generate electricity.

Transportation and Motor Vehicles

- Limit idling time for commercial vehicles, including delivery and construction vehicles.
- Use low- or zero-emission vehicles, including construction vehicles.

E. Feasibility of Alternatives Considered in the EIR

The following text presents findings relative to the project alternatives. Findings about the feasibility of project alternatives must be made whenever the project within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the lead agency will have a significant environmental effect.

In July 2010, the Central Valley Water Board released, for public review, the Draft PEIR and Draft Technical Memorandum Concerning the Economic Analysis of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program (Economics Report). In these reports, Alternatives 1-6 were evaluated considering environmental and economic impacts, and consistency with applicable state policies and law.³ In Volume II: Appendix A of the PEIR, on page 136, each alternative was found to

³ Economic impacts of Alternatives 1-5 have been evaluated in the Economics Report. Staff was also able to use that analysis to estimate costs of the recommended program alternative (Alternative 6), since the recommended program alternative fell within the range of the five alternatives. This cost estimate is found in Appendix A of the PEIR.

achieve some of the program evaluation measures but not others. As is shown in Table 11 of Appendix A, no single alternative of Alternatives 1-5 achieved complete consistency with all evaluation measures. However, after review of each of the alternatives and their common elements (lead entity, monitoring type), it was clear that a program that more completely satisfied the evaluation measures could be developed by selecting from the best-performing elements of the proposed alternatives. Alternative 6, described in Appendix A of the Draft PEIR, was developed by selecting these best-performing elements and became the draft staff recommended alternative.

In consideration of comments received concerning Alternative 6 during the Draft PEIR review process, staff developed the recommended ILRP Framework, and prepared the *Staff Report on Recommended Irrigated Lands Regulatory Framework*, or 'ILRP Framework Report' (Central Valley Water Board 2011). The Central Valley Water Board did not adopt the Framework, but advised staff to use the Framework as a starting point to support the development of ILRP Orders. The Framework is based upon the sixth alternative, and is composed of elements from the range of alternatives evaluated in the PEIR. The requirements of the Order were developed considering the Framework as a starting point per Central Valley Water Board direction (Central Valley Water Board hearing, June 2011). Project-level review of the requirements in the Order has revealed that the requirements of the Order most closely resemble those described for Alternatives 4 and 2 of the PEIR, but do include elements from Alternatives 2-5.

The Order implements the long-term irrigated lands program for irrigated lands in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area. The Alternatives in the PEIR have been developed for implementation throughout the entire Central Valley Region. The Order is intended to serve as a single implementing order in a series of orders that will implement the long-term irrigated lands program for the entire Central Valley. The findings below summarize why particular program alternatives are not being pursued.

Alternative 1: Full Implementation of the Current Program - No Project

Under Alternative 1, the Central Valley Water Board would renew the current program and continue to implement it into the future. This would be considered the "No Project" Alternative per CEQA guidance at Title 14 California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 15126.6(e)(3)(A): "When the project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy or ongoing operation, the 'No Project' Alternative will be the continuation of the existing plan, policy, or operation into the future." Given the reasonably foreseeable nature of the extension or renewal of the ongoing waiver, which would allow continuation of the existing program, Alternative 1 is best characterized as the "No Project" Alternative. This approach best serves the purpose of allowing the Central Valley Water Board to compare the impacts of revising the ILRP with those of continuing the existing program (14 CCR section 15126.6[e][1]).

Third-party groups would continue to function as lead entities representing growers (owners of irrigated lands, wetland managers, nursery owners, and water districts). This alternative is based on continuing watershed monitoring to determine whether operations are causing water quality problems. Where monitoring indicates a problem, third-party groups and growers would be required to implement management practices to address the problem and work toward compliance with applicable water quality standards. This alternative would not establish any new Central Valley Water Board requirements for discharges to groundwater from irrigated agricultural lands.

Monitoring under this alternative would be the same as the watershed-based monitoring required under the current ILRP. Under this monitoring scheme, third-party groups would work with the Central Valley Water Board to develop monitoring plans for Central Valley Water Board approval. These plans would specify monitoring parameters and site locations.

Finding

An order based on Alternative 1 is not being pursued to regulate irrigated agricultural operations in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area instead of the Order because it would not substantially reduce or eliminate any of the significant adverse effects of the Order (listed in the findings above) and it would not meet all of the goals and objectives of the program (program goals and objectives are described in Appendix A of the PEIR). Because Alternative 1 does not address discharges of waste from agricultural lands to groundwater, it would not be fully consistent with Program Goals 1 and 2:

- **Goal 1**—Restore and/or maintain the highest reasonable quality of State waters considering all the demands being placed on the water.
- **Goal 2**—Minimize waste discharge from irrigated agricultural lands that could degrade the quality of State waters.

In addition, the lack of a groundwater discharge component to this alternative makes it inconsistent with Goal 4 of the program:

- **Goal 4**—Ensure that irrigated agricultural discharges do not impair access by Central Valley communities and residents to safe and reliable drinking water.

Alternative 1 is also inconsistent with sections 13263 and 13269 of the California Water Code, the State Water Board's nonpoint source (NPS) program, and the State's antidegradation policy. These inconsistencies are documented in detail in the (PEIR), Appendix A, at pages 96-130. The Order is considered superior to Alternative 1 for implementation in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area.

Alternative 2: Third-Party Lead Entity

Under Alternative 2, the Central Valley Water Board would develop a single mechanism or a series of regulatory mechanisms (WDRs or conditional waivers of WDRs) to regulate waste discharges from irrigated agricultural lands to ground and surface waters.

Third-party groups would function as lead entities representing growers. Regulation of discharges to surface water would be similar to Alternative 1 (the current ILRP). However, this alternative allows for a reduction in monitoring under lower threat circumstances and where watershed or area management objective plans are being developed. This alternative also includes requirements for development of groundwater quality management plans (GQMPs) to minimize discharge of waste to groundwater from irrigated lands. Under Alternative 2, local groundwater management plans or integrated regional water management plans could be utilized, all or in part, for ILRP GQMPs, with Central Valley Water Board approval. This alternative relies on coordination with the California Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) for regulating discharges of pesticides to groundwater.

Growers would be required to track implemented management practices and submit the results to the third-party group. Surface water monitoring under this alternative would be similar to Alternative 1. The third-party group would report summary results to the Central Valley Water Board. The third-party group would be required to summarize the results of groundwater and surface water monitoring and tracking in an annual monitoring report to the Central Valley Water Board.

Finding

An order based wholly on Alternative 2 is not being pursued to regulate irrigated agricultural operations in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area instead of the Order because it would not substantially reduce or eliminate any of the significant adverse effects of the Order (listed in the findings above) and because it would not as consistently meet the Program's goals and objectives as would the Order. As indicated in Appendix A, pages 96–130 of the PEIR, Alternative 2 would be consistent with most of the Programs goals and objectives, but would be only partially consistent with the State Water Board's nonpoint source policy and the state's antidegradation policy. Alternative 2 includes third-party GQMPs, but does not require groundwater quality monitoring. The Order is considered superior to Alternative 2 for implementation in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area.

Alternative 3: Individual Farm Water Quality Management Plans

Under Alternative 3, growers would have the option of working directly with the Central Valley Water Board or another implementing entity (e.g., county agricultural commissioners) in development of an individual farm water quality management plan. Growers would individually apply for a conditional waiver or WDRs that would require Central Valley Water Board approval of their farm water quality management plan.

On-farm implementation of effective water quality management practices would be the mechanism to reduce or eliminate waste discharged to state waters. This alternative would provide incentive for individual growers to participate by providing growers with Central Valley Water Board certification that they are implementing farm management practices to protect state waters. This alternative relies on coordination with DPR for regulating discharges of pesticides to groundwater.

Unless specifically required in response to water quality problems, owners/operators would not be required to conduct water quality monitoring of adjacent receiving waters or underlying groundwater. Required monitoring would include evaluation of management practice effectiveness. The Central Valley Water Board, or a designated third-party entity, would conduct annual site inspections on a selected number of operations. They also would review available applicable water quality monitoring data as additional means of monitoring the implementation of management practices and program effectiveness.

Finding

An order based wholly on Alternative 3 is not being pursued to regulate irrigated agricultural operations in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area instead of the Order because it would not substantially reduce or eliminate any of the significant adverse effects of the Order (listed in the findings above) and because it would not as consistently meet the ILRP's goals and objectives as would the Order. As indicated in Appendix A, pages 96–130 of the PEIR, Alternative 3 would be only partially consistent with the Central Valley Water Board's program objectives (Objectives 4 and 5) to coordinate with other programs such as TMDL development, CV-SALTS

and WDRs for dairies; and promote coordination with other agriculture-related regulatory and non-regulatory programs of the DPR, the California Department of Public Health (DPH), and other agencies. These objectives are:

- **Objective 4**—Coordinate with other Central Valley Water Board programs, such as the Grassland Bypass Project WDRs for agricultural lands, total maximum daily load development, CV-Salts, and WDRs for dairies.
- **Objective 5**—Promote coordination with other regulatory and non-regulatory programs associated with agricultural operations (e.g., DPR, DPH Drinking Water Program, the California Air Resources Board, the California Department of Food and Agriculture, Resource Conservation Districts, the University of California Extension, Natural Resource Conservation Service, National Organic Program, California Agricultural Commissioners, State Water Board Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment program, U.S. Geological Survey, and local groundwater programs [Senate Bill (SB) 1938, AB 3030, Integrated Regional Water Management Plans]) to minimize duplicative regulatory oversight while ensuring program effectiveness.

Alternative 3 makes it more difficult to coordinate with these programs because it involves direct interaction by the Central Valley Water Board with individual growers, rather than with third-party entities. Also, the lack of mandatory surface and groundwater quality monitoring and the primary reliance on visual inspection of management practices reduces this alternative's ability to be consistent with the State Water Board's nonpoint source program. The Order is considered superior to Alternative 3 for implementation in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area.

Alternative 4: Direct Oversight with Regional Monitoring

Under Alternative 4, the Central Valley Water Board would develop WDRs and/or a conditional waiver of WDRs for waste discharge from irrigated agricultural lands to groundwater and surface water. As in Alternative 3, growers would apply directly to the Central Valley Water Board to obtain coverage ("direct oversight"). As in Alternative 3, growers would be required to develop and implement individual farm water quality management plans to minimize discharge of waste to groundwater and surface water from irrigated agricultural lands. Alternative 4 would also allow for formation of responsible legal entities that could serve a group of growers who discharge to the same general location and thus could share monitoring locations. In such cases, the legal entity would be required to assume responsibility for the waste discharges of member growers, to be approved by the Central Valley Water Board, and ultimately to be responsible for compliance with ILRP requirements.

Discharge of waste to groundwater and surface water would be regulated using a tiered approach. Fields would be placed in one of three tiers based on their threat to water quality. The tiers represent fields with minimal (Tier 1), low (Tier 2), and high (Tier 3) potential threat to water quality. Requirements to avoid or minimize discharge of waste would be the least comprehensive for Tier 1 fields and the most comprehensive for Tier 3 fields. This would allow for less regulatory oversight for low-threat operations while establishing necessary requirements to protect water quality from higher-threat discharges. This alternative relies on coordination with DPR for regulating discharges of pesticides to groundwater.

For monitoring, growers would have the option of enrolling in a third-party group regional monitoring program. In cases where responsible legal entities were formed, these entities would be responsible for conducting monitoring. All growers would be required to track nutrient, pesticide, and implemented management practices and submit the results to the Central Valley Water Board (or an approved third-party monitoring group) annually. Other monitoring requirements would depend on designation of the fields as Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3. Similar to Alternative 3, this alternative also includes requirements for inspection of regulated operations.

Finding

An order based wholly on Alternative 4 is not being pursued to regulate irrigated agricultural operations in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area instead of the Order because it would not substantially reduce or eliminate any of the significant adverse effects of the Order (listed in the findings above) and because it would not as consistently meet the Program's goals and objectives as would the Order. As indicated in Appendix A, pages 96–130 of the PEIR, Alternative 4 would meet most of the Program goals and objectives. However, it relies on Central Valley Water Board staff interaction directly with each irrigated agricultural operation, making it less effective at meeting the coordination objectives (Objectives 4 and 5) (page 103 of Appendix A in the PEIR):

- **Objective 4**—Coordinate with other Central Valley Water Board programs, such as the Grassland Bypass Project WDRs for agricultural lands, total maximum daily load development, CV-Salts, and WDRs for dairies.
- **Objective 5**—Promote coordination with other regulatory and non-regulatory programs associated with agricultural operations (e.g., DPR, DPH Drinking Water Program, the California Air Resources Board, the California Department of Food and Agriculture, Resource Conservation Districts, the University of California Extension, Natural Resource Conservation Service, National Organic Program, California Agricultural Commissioners, State Water Board Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment program, U.S. Geological Survey, and local groundwater programs [SB 1938, AB 3030, Integrated Regional Water Management Plans]) to minimize duplicative regulatory oversight while ensuring program effectiveness.

Alternative 4 makes it more difficult to coordinate with these programs because it involves direct interaction by the Central Valley Water Board with individual growers, rather than with third-party entities. The Order is considered superior to Alternative 4 for implementation in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area.

Alternative 5: Direct Oversight with Farm Monitoring

Alternative 5 would consist of general WDRs designed to protect groundwater and surface water from discharges associated with irrigated agriculture. All irrigated agricultural operations would be required to individually apply for and obtain coverage under the general WDRs working directly with the Central Valley Water Board (“direct oversight”). This alternative would include requirements to (1) develop and implement a farm water quality management plan; (2) monitor (a) discharges of tailwater, drainage water, and storm water to surface water; (b) applications of irrigation water, nutrients, and pesticides; and (c) groundwater; (3) keep records of (a) irrigation water; (b) pesticide applications; and (c) the nutrients applied, harvested, and moved off the site; and (4) submit an annual monitoring report to the Central Valley Water

Board. Similar to Alternative 3, Alternative 5 also includes requirements for inspection of regulated operations.

Finding

An order based wholly on Alternative 5 is not being pursued to regulate irrigated agricultural operations in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area instead of the Order because it would not substantially reduce or eliminate any of the significant adverse effects of the Order (listed in the findings above) and it would not as consistently meet the Program's goals and objectives as would the Order. As indicated in Appendix A, pages 96–130 of the PEIR, Alternative 5 would be only partially consistent with the Central Valley Water Board's Program objectives (Objectives 4 and 5) to coordinate with other programs such as TMDL development, CV-SALTS and WDRs for dairies; and promote coordination with other agriculture-related regulatory and non-regulatory programs of the DPR, the California Department of Public Health, and other agencies. These objectives are:

- **Objective 4**—Coordinate with other Central Valley Water Board programs, such as the Grassland Bypass Project WDRs for agricultural lands, total maximum daily load development, CV-Salts, and WDRs for dairies.
- **Objective 5**—Promote coordination with other regulatory and non-regulatory programs associated with agricultural operations (e.g., DPR, DPH Drinking Water Program, the California Air Resources Board, the California Department of Food and Agriculture, Resource Conservation Districts, the University of California Extension, Natural Resource Conservation Service, National Organic Program, California Agricultural Commissioners, State Water Board Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment program, U.S. Geological Survey, and local groundwater programs [SB 1938, AB 3030, Integrated Regional Water Management Plans]) to minimize duplicative regulatory oversight while ensuring program effectiveness.

Alternative 5 makes it more difficult to coordinate with these programs because it involves direct interaction by the Central Valley Water Board with individual growers, rather than with third-party entities.

Also, an order based on Alternative 5, due to its high relative cost as compared to the Order, would not be consistent with Program Goal 3:

- **Goal 3**—Maintain the economic viability of agriculture in California's Central Valley.

As indicated in the Draft Technical Memorandum Concerning the Economic Analysis of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program (ICF International 2010), the program costs funded by growers and operators would be significantly higher than other alternatives (see Economics Report Tables 2-18 through 2-22). This high cost could affect the viability of thousands of acres of irrigated agricultural land throughout the Central Valley.

Using the results from the Economics Report (Table 2-22) for the San Joaquin River basin, the projected cost of Alternative 5 is an average of \$186.11 per acre per year, with a projected \$47.98 per acre annual cost for monitoring and \$8.88 per acre for administration (primarily board staff costs). The estimated average cost of this Order is \$123.56 per acre annually with an estimated average annual cost of \$4.58 per acre for monitoring. For the approximately 582,000 acres in the San Joaquin County and Delta area, the additional \$62.55 per acre

average annual cost for an individual monitoring/direct regulatory oversight approach would increase costs for the whole watershed by approximately \$36 million per year.

The costs associated with Alternative 5 would result in a projected loss of 68,000⁴ acres of irrigated lands, as compared to the estimated loss associated with this Order of approximately 42,000 acres (see Attachment D, page 18).

The additional costs and potential additional loss of Important Farmland associated with direct, individual regulation can be avoided should growers be able to successfully protect water quality under the proposed third-party administered Order.

Since the impacts to agricultural resources are substantially less with the Order than an order similar to Alternative 5, the Order is considered superior to Alternative 5 for implementation in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area.

Alternative 6: Staff Recommended Alternative in the Draft PEIR

Under Alternative 6, 8–12 general WDRs or conditional waivers of WDRs would be developed that would be geographic and/or commodity-based. The alternative would establish requirements for waste discharge from irrigated agricultural lands to groundwater and surface water. Similar to Alternatives 1 and 2, third-party groups would be responsible for general administration of the ILRP. The alternative would establish prioritization factors for determining the type of requirements and monitoring that would be applied. The prioritization would be applied geographically as a two tier system, where Tier 1 areas would be “low priority,” and Tier 2 would be “high priority.”

Program requirements, monitoring and management would be dependent on the priority (Tier 1 or 2). Generally, this alternative requires regional management plans to address water quality concerns and regional monitoring to provide feedback on whether the practices implemented are working to solve identified water quality concerns. In Tier 1 areas, irrigated agricultural operations and third-party groups would be required to describe management objectives to be achieved, report on management practices implemented, and make an assessment of ground and surface water quality every 5 years. In Tier 2 areas, irrigated agricultural operations and third-party groups would be required to develop and implement ground and/or surface water quality management plans, as appropriate to address water quality concerns, report on management practices, and provide annual regional ground and surface water quality monitoring. Similar to Alternative 2, Alternative 6 would allow local groundwater management plans or integrated regional water management plans to substitute, all or in part, for ILRP GQMPs, with Central Valley Water Board approval.

Alternative 6 would establish a time schedule for compliance for addressing surface and groundwater quality problems. The schedule would require compliance with water quality objectives within five to ten years for surface water problems and demonstrated improvement within five to ten years for groundwater problems.

⁴ The potential loss of agricultural land for Alternative 5 is calculated from Table 5.10-6, Volume I of the draft PEIR based on the ratio of irrigated lands covered by the tentative Order to the total irrigated lands in the San Joaquin River Basin (this is the same methodology as described in Attachment D, pages 18 and 19 for calculating potential loss of Important Farmland under the tentative Order).

Finding

An order based wholly on Alternative 6 is not being pursued to regulate irrigated agricultural operations in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area instead of the Order because it would not substantially reduce or eliminate any of the significant adverse effects of the Order (listed in the findings above) and does not adequately reflect the clarifications and minor adjustments that were requested in comments on the Draft PEIR. The Order is considered superior to Alternative 6 for implementation in the San Joaquin County and Delta Area.

III. Statement of Overriding Considerations Supporting Approval of the Waste Discharge Requirements General Order for Growers Within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area that are Members of a Third-Party Group

Pursuant to the requirements of CEQA (PRC sections 21002, 21002.1, 21081) and State CEQA Guidelines (15 CCR 15093), the Central Valley Water Board finds that approval of the Order, whose potential environmental impacts have been evaluated in the PEIR, and as indicated in the above findings, will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are not avoided or substantially lessened, as described in the above findings. These significant effects include:

- Conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use.
- Cumulative climate change.
- Cumulative vegetation and wildlife impacts.
- Cumulative conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use.

Pursuant to PRC section 21081(b), specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects. The specific reasons to support this approval, given the potential for significant unavoidable adverse impacts, are based on the following.

Economic Benefits

The water quality improvements expected to occur in both surface and groundwater throughout the San Joaquin County and Delta Area as a result of implementing the Order are expected to create broad economic benefits for residents of the area. Control of pollutants contained in agricultural discharges, as summarized in pages 18–21 of Appendix A in the PEIR and documented in detail in the *Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program Existing Conditions Report*, should, over time, reduce water treatment costs for some communities in the San Joaquin County Area. Pages 5-3–5-5 of the *Draft Technical Memorandum Concerning the Economic Analysis of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program* (ICF International 2010) identify the potential costs of upgrading wells or treating well water that is affected by nitrate contamination. The nitrate contamination is believed to be coming from a variety of sources, including fertilizers used on agricultural lands.

Consistency with NPS Policy and State Water Board Resolution 68-16 (Antidegradation Policy)

Waste discharges from irrigated agricultural operations have the potential to affect surface and groundwater quality. As documented in the *Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program Existing Conditions Report*, many state waters have been adversely affected due in part to waste

discharges from irrigated agriculture. State policy and law require that the Central Valley Water Board institute requirements that will implement Water Quality Control Plans (California Water Code sections 13260, 13269), the State Water Board's Policy for Implementation and Enforcement of the Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program (NPS Policy) and applicable antidegradation requirements (State Water Board Resolution 68-16). As described in the Program EIR, WDR findings and Information Sheet, the Board has considered the need for and expected benefits of an Order such as this, and finds that the Order is a necessary component of the Central Valley Water Board's efforts to be consistent with state policy and law through its regulation of discharges from irrigated agriculture and to protect water quality. As documented in the PEIR Hydrology and Water Quality analysis, implementation of a long-term ILRP, of which the Order is an implementing mechanism, will improve water quality through development of farm management practices that reduce discharges of waste to state waters.

After balancing the above benefits of the Order against its unavoidable environmental risks, the specific economic, legal, and social benefits of the proposal outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, and these adverse environmental effects are considered acceptable, consistent with the Order, Central Valley Water Board Order R5-2014-0029.

IV. References Cited

- California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection. 2006. 2002–2004 Farmland Conversion Report. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.
- California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection. 2008. 2004 – 2006 Farmland Conversion Report. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.
- California Department of Justice. 2008. The California Environmental Quality Act: Addressing Global Warming Impacts at the Local Agency Level. Last revised: December 9, 2008. Available: <http://www.ag.ca.gov/globalwarming/pdf/GW_mitigation_measures.pdf>. Accessed: September 25, 2009.
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. 2005. Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins for the Control Program for Factors Contributing to the Dissolved Oxygen Impairment in the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel. Final staff report. February 23.
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. 2011. *Recommended Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program Framework Staff Report*. March. Rancho Cordova, CA. Available: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/irrigated_lands/new_waste_discharge_requirements/stakeholder_advisory_workgroup/recom_ilrp_framework/recomnd_framework_mar2011.pdf>.
- ICF International. 2011. *Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program Program Environmental Impact Report*. Final and Draft. March. (ICF 05508.05.) Sacramento, CA. Prepared for Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Sacramento, CA.
- ICF International. 2010. *Draft Technical Memorandum Concerning the Economic Analysis of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program*. July. (ICF 05508.05.) Sacramento, CA. Prepared for Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Sacramento, CA. Available: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/irrigated_lands/new_waste_discharge_requirements/program_environmental_impact_report/2010jul_draft_peir/econ_tech_rpt_draft.pdf>.
- Lehman, P.W., J. Sevier, J. Giulianotti, and M. Johnson. 2004. Sources of Oxygen Demand in the Lower San Joaquin River, California. *Estuaries* 27(3): 405–418.
- Mason, L.B., C. Amrhein, C. C. Goodson, M. R. Matsumoto, and M. A. Anderson. 2005. Reducing Sediment and Phosphorus in Tributary Waters with Alum and Polyacrylamide. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 34: 1998–2004.
- Sojka, R.E., R.D. Lentz, I. Shainberg, T.J. Trout, C.W. Ross, C.W. Robbins, J.A. Entry, J.K. Aase, D.L. Bjorneberg, W.J. Orts, D.T. Westermann, D.W. Morishita, M.E. Watwood, T.L. Spofford, and F.W. Barvenik. 2000. Irrigating with polyacrylamide (PAM): *Nine years and a million acres of experience*. P. 161-169 in R.G. Evans, B.L. Benham, and T.P. Trooien (eds.). Proceedings of the National Irrigation Symposium, 4th Decennial Symposium, Phoenix, Arizona, 14-16 November 2000. Publication 701P0004. St Joseph, MI: American Society of Agricultural Engineers.

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

**ATTACHMENT E TO ORDER R5-2014-0029
DEFINITIONS, ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS**

**WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS GENERAL ORDER
FOR
GROWERS WITHIN THE SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY AND DELTA AREA
THAT ARE MEMBERS OF A THIRD-PARTY GROUP**

The following definitions, acronyms and abbreviations apply to this Order as related to discharges of waste from irrigated lands. All other terms shall have the same definitions as prescribed by the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (California Water Code Division 7), unless specified otherwise.

1. Antidegradation Policy – State Water Board Resolution 68-16, "*Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality Waters in California*," requires existing high quality water to be maintained until it has been demonstrated that any change will be consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the state, will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial use of water, and will not result in water quality less than that prescribed in the Basin Plans. The Central Valley Water Board must establish standards in its orders for discharges to high quality waters that result in the implementation of best practicable treatment or control of the discharge necessary to avoid pollution or nuisance and to maintain the highest water quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the state. Resolution 68-16 has been approved by the USEPA to be consistent with the federal anti-degradation policy.
2. Aquifer – A geologic formation, group of formations, or portion of a formation capable of yielding usable quantities of groundwater to wells or springs (40 CFR Part 257.3-4).
3. Back flow prevention devices – Back flow prevention devices are installed at the well or pump to prevent contamination of groundwater or surface water when fertilizers, pesticides, fumigants, or other chemicals are applied through an irrigation system. Back flow prevention devices used to comply with this Order must be those approved by USEPA, DPR, DPH, or the local public health or water agency.¹
4. Basin Plan – Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins. The Basin Plan describes how the quality of the surface and groundwater in the Central Valley Region should be managed to ensure reasonable protection of beneficial uses. The Basin Plan includes beneficial uses, water quality objectives, and a program of implementation.
5. Certified Nitrogen Management Specialist – Certified nitrogen management plan specialists include Professional Soil Scientists, Professional Agronomists, Crop Advisers² certified by the American Society of Agronomy, or Technical Service Providers certified in nutrient management

¹ California Department of Public Health, Approved Backflow Prevention Devices List at <http://www.cdph.ca.gov/certlic/drinkingwater/pages/publications.aspx>. Requirements for backflow prevention for pesticide application are located in 6 CCR §6610.

² Should the California Department of Food and Agriculture and the California Certified Crop Advisers establish a specific nitrogen management certification, any Certified Crop Adviser who certifies a nitrogen management plan must have a nitrogen management certification.

in California by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), or other specialist approved by the Executive Officer.

6. Degradation – Any measurable adverse change in water quality.
7. Durov Diagrams – A graphical representation of water quality. The Durov diagram is an alternative to the Piper diagram. The Durov diagram plots the major ions as percentages of milli-equivalents in two base triangles. The total cations and the total anions are set equal to 100% and the data points in the two triangles are projected onto a square grid which lies perpendicular to the third axis in each triangle. This plot reveals useful properties and relationships for large sample groups. The main purpose of the Durov diagram is to show clustering of data points to indicate samples that have similar compositions.
8. Exceedance – For the purposes of this Order, an exceedance is a reading using a field instrument or detection by a California state-certified analytical laboratory where the detected result indicates an impact to the beneficial use of the receiving water when compared to a water quality objective for the parameter or constituent. Exceedances will be determined based on available data and application of the appropriate averaging period. The appropriate averaging period may be defined in the Basin Plan, as part of the water quality criteria established by the USEPA, or as part of the water quality criteria being used to interpret a narrative water quality objective. If averaging periods are not defined as part of the water quality objective or the water quality criteria being used, then the Central Valley Water Board Executive Officer may use its best professional judgment to determine an appropriate period.
9. Farming Operation – A distinct farming business, organized as a sole proprietorship, partnership, corporation, limited liability company, cooperative, or other business entity that owns or operates irrigated lands.
10. Farm Operator – The person or entity, including, but not limited to a farm/ranch manager, lessee or sub-lessee, responsible for or otherwise directing farming operations in decisions that may result in a discharge of waste to surface water or groundwater. If a person or entity rents land to others or has land worked on shares by others, the person or entity is considered the operator only of the land which is retained for their own operation.
11. Fertigation – The process of applying fertilizer through an irrigation system by injecting the fertilizer into the irrigation water.
12. Groundwater – Water in the ground that is in the zone of saturation. The upper surface of the saturate zone is called the water table.
13. High vulnerability area (groundwater) – Areas identified in the approved Groundwater Quality Assessment Report “...where known groundwater quality impacts exist for which irrigated agricultural operations are a potential contributor or where conditions make groundwater more vulnerable to impacts from irrigated agricultural activities.” (see section IV.A.3 of the MRP) or areas that meet any of the following requirements for the preparation of a Groundwater Quality Management Plan (see section VIII.H of the Order): (1) there is a confirmed exceedance³ (considering applicable averaging periods) of a water quality objective or applicable water quality trigger limit (trigger limits are described in section VII of the MRP) in a groundwater well and

³ A “confirmed exceedance of a water quality objective in a groundwater well” means that the monitoring data are determined to be of the appropriate quality and quantity necessary to verify that an exceedance has occurred.

irrigated agriculture may cause or contribute to the exceedance; (2) the Basin Plan requires development of a groundwater quality management plan for a constituent or constituents discharged by irrigated agriculture; or (3) the Executive Officer determines that irrigated agriculture may be causing or contributing to a trend of degradation of groundwater that may threaten applicable Basin Plan beneficial uses.

14. High vulnerability area (surface water) – Areas that meet any of the following requirements for the preparation of a Surface Water Quality Management Plan (see section VIII.H of the Order): (1) an applicable water quality objective or applicable water quality trigger limit is exceeded (considering applicable averaging periods) twice in a three year period for the same constituent at a monitoring location (trigger limits are described in section VII of the MRP) and irrigated agriculture may cause or contribute to the exceedances; (2) the Basin Plan requires development of a surface water quality management plan for a constituent or constituents discharged by irrigated agriculture; or (3) the Executive Officer determines that irrigated agriculture may be causing or contributing to a trend of degradation of surface water that may threaten applicable Basin Plan beneficial uses.
15. Hydraulic conductivity – The volume of water that will move through a medium (generally soil) in a unit of time under a unit hydraulic gradient through a unit area measured perpendicular to the direction of flow (a measure of a soils ability to transmit water).
16. Hydraulic gradient – The change in total hydraulic head per unit distance in a given direction yielding a maximum rate of decrease in hydraulic head.
17. Hydraulic head – The height relative to a datum plane (generally sea level) of a column of water that can be supported by the hydraulic pressure at a given point in a groundwater system. For a well, the hydraulic head is equal to the distance between the water level in the well and the datum plane (sea level).
18. Impaired water body – A surface water body that is not attaining water quality standards and is identified on the State Water Board's Clean Water Act section 303(d) list.
19. Irrigated lands – Land irrigated to produce crops or pasture for commercial purposes,⁴ nurseries, and privately and publicly managed wetlands.
20. Irrigation return flow/runoff – Surface and subsurface water which leaves the field following application of irrigation water.
21. Kriging – A group of geostatistical techniques to interpolate the value of a random field (e.g., contaminant level in groundwater) at an unobserved location from observations of its value at nearby locations.

⁴ For the purposes of this Order, commercial irrigated lands are irrigated lands that have one or more of the following characteristics:

- The landowner or operator holds a current Operator Identification Number/ Permit Number for pesticide use reporting;
- The crop is sold to a third-party including, but not limited to, (1) an industry cooperative, (2) harvest crew/company, or (3) a direct marketing location, such as farmers' markets;
- The landowner or operator files federal taxes using federal Department of Treasury Internal Revenue Service Form 1040, Schedule F *Profit or Loss from Farming*.

22. Low vulnerability area (surface and groundwater) – are all areas not designated as high vulnerability for either surface or groundwater.
23. Management practices to protect water quality – A practice or combination of practices that is the most effective and practicable (including technological, economic, and institutional considerations) means of controlling nonpoint pollutant sources at levels protective of water quality.
24. Member – Owners and operators of irrigated lands within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area that are members of a third-party group implementing this Order.
25. Monitoring – Monitoring undertaken in connection with assessing water quality conditions, and factors that may affect water quality conditions. Monitoring includes, but is not limited to, water quality monitoring undertaken in connection with agricultural activities, monitoring to identify short and long-term trends in water quality, nutrient monitoring, active inspections of operations, and management practice implementation and effectiveness monitoring. The purposes of monitoring include, but are not limited to, verifying the adequacy and effectiveness of the Order’s requirements, and evaluating each Member’s compliance with the requirements of the Order.
26. Nonpoint source waste discharge – The Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basin Plan states that “*A nonpoint source discharge usually refers to waste emanating from diffused locations.*” Nonpoint source pollution generally results from land runoff, precipitation, atmospheric deposition, drainage, seepage or hydrologic modification. The term “nonpoint source” is defined to mean any source of water pollution that does not meet the legal definition of “point source” in section 502(14) of the Clean Water Act. The Clean Water Act (CWA) defines a point source as a discernible, confined, and discrete conveyance, such as a pipe, ditch, or channel. Irrigated agricultural return flows and agricultural storm water runoff are excluded from the CWA’s definition of point source. Nonpoint pollution sources generally are sources of water pollution that do not meet the definition of a point source as defined by the CWA.
27. Nuisance – “Nuisance” is defined in section 13050 of the Water Code as “*...anything which meets all of the following requirements:*
 - (1) *Is injurious to health, or is indecent or offensive to the senses, or an obstruction to the free use of property, so as to interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life or property.*
 - (2) *Affects at the same time an entire community or neighborhood, or any considerable number of persons, although the extent of the annoyance or damage inflicted upon individuals may be unequal.*
 - (3) *Occur during, or as a result of, the treatment or disposal of wastes.*”
28. Nutrient – Any element taken in by an organism which is essential to its growth and which is used by the organism in elaboration of its food and tissue.
29. Nutrient consumption – A total quantity of a nutrient taken up by crop plants (to be distinguished from the total applied). Expressed as nutrient mass per land area, i.e., pounds/acre, nutrient consumption is typically described on an annual or crop cycle basis. Nutrients are contributed and lost from cropland through various human and natural processes⁵. Considering nitrogen as an example, sources of nitrogen available for plant consumption include applied fertilizers (including compost and animal manures), nitrogen fixed from the atmosphere in the roots of

⁵ Descriptions of sources and losses of plant nutrients are available through UC Davis and UC Cooperative Extension. For example see Peacock, B. Pub. NG2-96, UCCE Tulare County <http://cetulare.ucanr.edu/files/82026.pdf>

leguminous plants, nitrogen released through the decomposition of soil organic matter and crop residues, and nitrogen applied in irrigation water. Nitrogen can be removed from the field in harvested material, returned to the soil through crop residue incorporation, incorporated into permanent structures of perennial crops, leached beyond the root zone in irrigation or storm water, released to the atmosphere through denitrification, volatilization or crop residue burning.

30. Off-property discharge – The discharge or release of waste beyond the boundaries of the agricultural operation or to water bodies that run through the agricultural operation.
31. Perched groundwater – Groundwater separated from an underlying body of groundwater by an unsaturated zone.
32. Piper Diagram – A graphical representation of the chemistry of a water sample. The relative abundance of cations as percentages of milli-equivalents per liter (meq/L) of sodium, potassium, calcium, and magnesium are first plotted on the cation triangle. The relative abundance of chloride, sulfate, bicarbonate, and carbonate is then plotted on the anion triangle. The two data points on the cation and anion triangles are then combined into the quadrilateral field that shows the overall chemical property of the water sample.
33. Pollution – Defined in section 13050(l)(1) of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act as “...an alteration of the quality of the waters of the state by waste to a degree which unreasonably affects either of the following: (A) The waters for beneficial uses. (B) Facilities which serve these beneficial uses.”
34. Qualified scientist – A person who has earned a professional degree in a scientific discipline that relates to engineering, environmental science, or chemistry with additional experience related to pesticides and water quality. This person should be familiar with the related local, state, and federal regulations.
35. Receiving waters – Surface water or groundwater that receives or has the potential to receive discharges of waste from irrigated lands.
36. Requirements of applicable water quality control plans – Water quality objectives, prohibitions, total maximum daily load implementation plans, or other requirements contained in water quality control plans adopted by the Central Valley Water Board and approved according to applicable law.
37. Small Farming Operation – Refers to Farming Operations that operate less than 60 total acres of irrigated land within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area. A parcel is not part of a Small Farming Operation if the total acres of irrigated land within the San Joaquin County and Delta Area managed by the Farming Operation and any of its Subsidiary or Affiliated Operations is 60 acres or greater.
38. Stiff Diagram – A graphical representation of the chemistry of a water sample. A polygon shaped figure created from four parallel horizontal axes using the equivalent charge concentrations (meq/L) of cations and anions. Cations are plotted on the left of the vertical zero axis and anions are plotted on the right.
39. Stormwater runoff – The runoff of precipitation from irrigated lands.
40. Subsidiary or Affiliated Operation – a Subsidiary or Affiliated Operation of a specified Farming Operation means a Farming Operation of which the principal(s) of the specified Farming

Operation or the shares possessed by the specified Farming Operation have a controlling interest. A controlling interest is having 50 percent or more of the voting or management authority of the operation.

41. Subsurface drainage – Water generated by installing and operating drainage systems to lower the water table below irrigated lands. Subsurface drainage systems, deep open drainage ditches, or drainage wells can generate this drainage.
42. Surface water – Water pooled or collected at or above ground level. Surface waters include, but are not limited to, natural streams, lakes, wetlands, creeks, constructed agricultural drains, agricultural dominated waterways, irrigation and flood control channels, or other non-stream tributaries. Surface waters include all waters of the United States and their tributaries, interstate waters and their tributaries, intrastate waters, and all impoundments of these waters. For the purposes of this Order, surface waters do not include water in agricultural fields.
43. Tailwater – The runoff of irrigation water from an irrigated field.
44. Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) – From the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), 40 CFR 130.2(i), a TMDL is: *“The sum of the individual WLAs [wasteload allocations] for point sources and LAs [load allocations] for nonpoint sources and natural background. ... TMDLs can be expressed in terms of either mass per time, toxicity, or other appropriate measure. ...”*.
45. Toxicity – Refers to the toxic effect to aquatic organisms from waste contained in an ambient water quality sample.
46. Unsaturated Zone – The unsaturated zone is characterized by pore spaces that are incompletely filled with water. The amount of water present in an unsaturated zone varies widely and is highly sensitive to climatic factors.
47. Vadose Zone – See unsaturated zone.
48. Waste – Includes sewage and any and all other waste substances, liquid, solid, gaseous, or radioactive, associated with human habitation, or of human or animal origin, or from any producing, manufacturing, or processing operation, including waste placed within containers of whatever nature prior to, and for purposes of, disposal as defined in California Water Code section 13050(d). Wastes from irrigated lands that conform to this definition include, but are not limited to, earthen materials (such as soil, silt, sand, clay, rock), inorganic materials (such as metals, salts, boron, selenium, potassium, nitrogen, phosphorus), organic materials such as pesticides, and biological materials, such as pathogenic organisms. Such wastes may directly impact beneficial uses (e.g., toxicity of metals to aquatic life) or may impact water temperature, pH, and dissolved oxygen.
49. Waste discharges from irrigated lands – The discharge or release of waste to surface water or groundwater. Waste discharges to surface water include, but are not limited to, irrigation return flows, tailwater, drainage water, subsurface (tile) drains, stormwater runoff flowing from irrigated lands, aerial drift, and overspraying of pesticides. Waste can be discharged to groundwater through pathways including, but not limited to, percolation of irrigation or storm water through the subsurface, backflow of waste into wells (e.g., backflow during chemigation), discharges into unprotected wells and dry wells, and leaching of waste from tailwater ponds or sedimentation basins to groundwater.

A discharge of waste subject to the Order is one that could directly or indirectly reach waters of the state, which includes both surface waters and groundwaters. Direct discharges may include, for example, discharges directly from piping, tile drains, wells, ditches or sheet flow to waters of the state, or percolation of wastes through the soil to groundwater. Indirect discharges may include aerial drift or discharges from one parcel to another parcel and then to waters of the state. See also the definition for “waste”.

50. Waters of the State – Is defined in Water Code section 13050 as “*any surface water or groundwater, including saline waters, within the boundaries of the State.*”
51. Water Quality Criteria – Levels of water quality required under section 303(c) of the Clean Water Act that are expected to render a body of water suitable for its designated uses. Criteria are based on specific levels of pollutants that would make the water harmful if used for drinking, swimming, farming, fish production, or industrial processes. The California Toxics Rule adopted by USEPA in April 2000 sets numeric water quality criteria for non-ocean surface waters of California for a number of toxic pollutants.
52. Water Quality Objectives – Defined in Water Code section 13050 as “*limits or levels of water quality constituents or characteristics which are established for the reasonable protection of beneficial uses of water or the prevention of nuisance within a specified area.*” Water quality objectives may be either numerical or narrative and serve as water quality criteria for purposes of section 303 of the Clean Water Act.
53. Water quality problem – Exceedance of an applicable water quality objective or a trend of degradation that may threaten applicable Basin Plan beneficial uses.
54. Water Quality Standards – Provision of state or federal law that consist of the designated beneficial uses of a waterbody, the numeric and narrative water quality criteria that are necessary to protect the uses of that particular waterbody, and an antidegradation statement. Water quality standards include water quality objectives in the Central Valley Water Board’s two Basin Plans, water quality criteria in the California Toxics Rule and National Toxics Rule adopted by USEPA, and/or water quality objectives in other applicable State Water Board plans and policies. Under section 303 of the Clean Water Act, each state is required to adopt water quality standards.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

2014 Farm Bill	Agriculture Act of 2014
Basin Plans	<i>Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins (4th Ed.) and Water Quality Control Plan for the Tulare Lake Basin</i>
BPAW	Basin Plan Amendment Workplan
BPTC	best practicable treatment or control
CAC	county agricultural commissioner
CCA	Certified Crop Adviser
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDFA	California Department of Food and Agriculture
CEDEN	California Environmental Data Exchange Network
Central Valley Water Board	California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CHRIS	California Historical Resources Information System
COC	constituent of concern
CRHR	California Register of Historic Resources
CTR	California Toxics Rule
CV RDC	Central Valley Regional Data Center
CV-SALTS	Central Valley Salinity Alternatives for Long-Term Sustainability
CWC	California Water Code
DO	dissolved oxygen
DPH	California Department of Public Health
DPM	diesel particulate matter
DPR	California Department of Pesticide Regulation
DWR	California Department of Water Resources
EC	electrical conductivity
ECR	Existing Conditions Report
EDD	electronic data deliverable
EIR	environmental impact report
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
EQIP	Environmental Quality Incentives Program
ESA	federal Endangered Species Act
GAMA	Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment
GAR	Groundwater Quality Assessment Report
GeoTracker ESI	GeoTracker Electronic Submittal of Information Online System
GHG	greenhouse gases
GIS	Geographic Information System
GMAW	Groundwater Monitoring Advisory Workgroup
GPS	Global Positioning System
GQMP	groundwater quality management plan
GWPA	Groundwater Protection Area
HAPs	hazardous air pollutants

ILRP	Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program
MCL	maximum contaminant level
MDL	method detection limit
MMRP	mitigation monitoring and reporting program
MPEP	Management Practice Evaluation Program
MPER	Management Practices Evaluation Report
MRP	monitoring and reporting program
MRPP	monitoring and reporting program plan
MWICR	Monitoring Well Installation Completion Report
MWISP	Monitoring Well Installation and Sampling Plan
NAD83	North American Datum 1983
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NAVD88	North American Vertical Datum 1988
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOA	notice of applicability
NOC	notice of certification
NOI	notice of intent
NOT	notice of termination
NOV	notice of violation
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPS	nonpoint source
NPS Policy	State Water Board's Policy for Implementation and Enforcement of the Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NTR	National Toxics Rule
PAMs	polyacrylamides
PCPA	Pesticide Contamination and Prevention Act
PEIR	Long-Term Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program Final Program EIR (Final and Draft) (Certified by Resolution R5-2011-0017)
PRC	California Public Resources Code
PUR	pesticide use report, CA DPR
QAPP	quality assurance project plan
QA/QC	quality assurance and quality control
RCD	Resource Conservation District
RL	reporting limit
RWD	report of waste discharge
SAMR	Semi-Annual Monitoring Report
SB	Senate Bill
SIP	<i>Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of CA (State Implementation Plan)</i>
SJCDWQC	San Joaquin County and Delta Water Quality Coalition
SQMP	surface water quality management plan
State Water Board	State Water Resources Control Board
SWAMP	Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program

TAC	toxic air contaminant
TDS	total dissolved solids
TIE	toxicity identification evaluation
TMDL	total maximum daily load
TOC	total organic carbon
TRS	township, range, and section
TSS	total suspended solids
TST	test of significant toxicity (USEPA method)
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
WDRs	waste discharge requirements