

APPENDIX E

Completed Initial Question Forms

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 19

Issue Name: Beneficial Use Designations for RARE, BIOL, SPWN, & MIGR

Category: Beneficial Use

Submitted By: USEPA Region 9 and California Regional Water Quality Control Board

INITIAL QUESTIONS		Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

This issue was highlighted in USEPA's May 29, 2000 approval letter for the 1994 Basin Plan update as an issue to address during the next Triennial Review. The issue automatically receives a high ranking.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 38
Issue Name: Assimilative Capacity and Mixing Zones
Category: Implementation Policy
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

	INITIAL QUESTIONS	Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

<p>The Regional Board has determined that this administrative change is needed to improve the accuracy and completeness of the Basin Plan. The issue automatically receives a high ranking.</p>

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 4
Issue Name: Basin Plan Map
Category: Map
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

	INITIAL QUESTIONS	Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The Regional Board has determined that this administrative change is needed to improve the accuracy and completeness of the Basin Plan. The issue automatically receives a high ranking.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 37
Issue Name: California Toxics Rule
Category: Implementation Policy
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

INITIAL QUESTIONS		Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The Regional Board has determined that this administrative change is needed to improve the accuracy and completeness of the Basin Plan. The issue automatically receives a high ranking.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 36
Issue Name: Basin Plan Introduction
Category: Other
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

	INITIAL QUESTIONS	Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The Regional Board has determined that this administrative change is needed to improve the accuracy and completeness of the Basin Plan. The issue automatically receives a high ranking.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 41
Issue Name: SWAMP Narrative
Category: Implementation Monitoring Strategy
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

	INITIAL QUESTIONS	Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The Regional Board has determined that this administrative change is needed to improve the accuracy and completeness of the Basin Plan. The issue automatically receives a high ranking.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 21

Issue Name: Water Quality Objectives by Water Body

Category: Water Quality Objective

Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

INITIAL QUESTIONS		Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The Regional Board has determined that this administrative change is needed to improve the accuracy and completeness of the Basin Plan. The issue automatically receives a high ranking.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 8
Issue Name: Essential Text Updates
Category: Implementation Plan
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

	INITIAL QUESTIONS	Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The Regional Board has determined that this administrative change is needed to improve the accuracy and completeness of the Basin Plan. The issue automatically receives a high ranking.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 5
Issue Name: Source or Criteria for Water Quality Objectives
Category: Water Quality Objective
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

	INITIAL QUESTIONS	Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The Regional Board has determined that this administrative change is needed to improve the accuracy and completeness of the Basin Plan. Appendix C is difficult to keep updated due to the frequency with which water quality objective references change. Therefore, the references will be incorporated into the water quality objective chapter of the Basin Plan. The issue automatically receives a high ranking.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 15

Issue Name: Department of Water Resources Ground Water Basin Map

Category: Map

Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

INITIAL QUESTIONS		Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The Regional Board has determined that this administrative change is needed to improve the accuracy and completeness of the Basin Plan. The issue automatically receives a high ranking.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 13
Issue Name: Copper and Lead Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL)
Category: Water Quality Objective
Submitted By: Sierra Club

	INITIAL QUESTIONS	Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The Regional Board has determined that this administrative change is needed to improve the accuracy and completeness of the Basin Plan. The issue automatically receives a high ranking. Administrative update will include updating all the MCLs to incorporate new Department of Health Services (DHS) numbers. NOTE: The Basin Plan is written such that when DHS updates its MCLs the Basin Plan is automatically updated to include the updated MCLs.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 10

Issue Name: Water Quality Objective for Nitrate in Ground Water

Category: Water Quality Objective

**Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board,
Pauma Valley Community Service District, Fuog Water Resources
Inc., Watermaster Santa Margarita River Watershed**

INITIAL QUESTIONS		Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The Regional Board has determined that this administrative change is needed to improve the accuracy and completeness of the Basin Plan. The issue automatically receives a high ranking.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 17

Issue Name: Water Quality Objective for Fluoride

Category: Water Quality Objective

Submitted By: Metropolitan Water District of Southern California

INITIAL QUESTIONS		Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The Regional Board has determined that this administrative change is needed to improve the accuracy and completeness of the Basin Plan. The issue automatically receives a high ranking.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 9
Issue Name: Water Quality Objective for Dissolved Oxygen in Surface Waters
Category: Water Quality Objective
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

	INITIAL QUESTIONS	Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The text on page 3-8 of the Basin Plan under Dissolved Oxygen Water Quality Objective will be revised to clarify the application of a dissolved oxygen water quality objective to surface waters within the region. This issue will involve evaluation of the need for doing site specific dissolved oxygen water quality objectives as well. The Regional Board has determined that this administrative change is needed to improve the accuracy and completeness of the Basin Plan. The issue automatically receives a high ranking.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 40
Issue Name: Potential versus Existing Beneficial Uses
Category: Beneficial Use
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

	INITIAL QUESTIONS	Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

This issue includes evaluating the beneficial use tables to determine if any potential use should be updated to an existing use designation based on the actual use being supported in the receiving water. No designated use will be changed as part of this issue. Any recommended changes will be a part of a separate project. The Regional Board has determined that this administrative change is needed to improve the accuracy and completeness of the Basin Plan. The issue automatically receives a high ranking.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 39
Issue Name: Cleanup and Abatement Policy
Category: Implementation Policy
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

	INITIAL QUESTIONS	Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The Regional Board has determined that this administrative change is needed to improve the accuracy and completeness of the Basin Plan. The issue automatically receives a high ranking.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 14
Issue Name: Potable Water Releases to Land
Category: Implementation Policy
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

	INITIAL QUESTIONS	Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The Regional Board has determined that this administrative change is needed to improve the accuracy and completeness of the Basin Plan. The issue automatically receives a high ranking.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 29
Issue Name: Watershed Management Chapter
Category: Implementation Policy
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

	INITIAL QUESTIONS	Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

<p>The Regional Board has determined that this administrative change is needed to improve the accuracy and completeness of the Basin Plan. The issue automatically receives a high ranking.</p>

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 1
Issue Name: Electronic Format of Basin Plan
Category: Other
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

	INITIAL QUESTIONS	Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The Regional Board has determined that this administrative change is needed to improve the accuracy and completeness of the Basin Plan. The issue automatically receives a high ranking.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 16

Issue Name: Water Quality Objective for Chlorine

Category: Water Quality Objective

Submitted By: USEPA Region 9

INITIAL QUESTIONS		Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The Basin Plan does not have a water quality objective for chlorine. USEPA has criteria for chlorine. It is recommended that the Regional Board respond to USEPA's criteria and develop a water quality objective for chlorine. This issue automatically receives a high ranking.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 35

Issue Name: Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) Water Quality Objectives for Santa Margarita Hydrologic Unit

Category: Water Quality Objective

Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

INITIAL QUESTIONS		Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The Regional Board relaxed the TDS water quality objective in this basin based on the proposal that reverse osmosis treatment would be provided to the discharge from the Rancho California Water District and Eastern Municipal Water District WWTPs. Reverse Osmosis (RO) treatment facilities were never built, therefore the basin plan text must be changed back to what it was prior to this RCWD 1990 RO proposal.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 6

Issue Name: Compliance Time Schedules in NPDES Permits

Category: Implementation Policy

Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

INITIAL QUESTIONS		Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The Regional Board has determined that this administrative change is needed to improve the accuracy and completeness of the Basin Plan. The issue automatically receives a high ranking.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 2

Issue Name: Onsite Sewage Treatment Systems Regulations

Category: Implementation Plan

Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

INITIAL QUESTIONS		Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question B
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?	High Rank	
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

CWC section 13291(a), (b), and (e) requires the Regional Board to incorporate new regulations pertaining to onsite sewage treatment systems into the Basin Plan. The Regional Board has determined that this administrative change is needed to improve the accuracy and completeness of the Basin Plan. Currently the Governor directed state agencies to "stand down" from the rulemaking process. To comply with this directive the SWRCB is in the process of reevaluating the need for onsite sewage treatment system regulations.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 18

Issue Name: Beneficial Use RARE - Threatened and Endangered Species Found in Vernal Pools

Category: Beneficial Use

Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board and Sierra Club

INITIAL QUESTIONS		Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question B
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		Ask Question C
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

Vernal pools are unnamed waters of the State and should be specifically identified in the Basin Plan. The Regional Board has determined that this administrative change is needed to improve the accuracy and completeness of the Basin Plan. The issue automatically receives a high ranking.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 3
Issue Name: Unnamed or Unidentified Waterbodies and Table Corrections
Category: Beneficial Use
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

	INITIAL QUESTIONS	Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question B
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		Ask Question C
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?	High Rank	
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

<p>The Regional Board has determined that this administrative change is needed to improve the accuracy and completeness of the Basin Plan. The issue automatically receives a high ranking.</p>

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 49

Issue Name: Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for Laguna Canyon, Aliso, Salt & San Juan Creeks

Category: TMDL

Submitted By: Clean Water Now

INITIAL QUESTIONS		Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question B
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		Ask Question C
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question D
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?	Removed	
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The Regional Board is currently developing this TMDL using TMDL Program resources. This issue will not be ranked in the Triennial Review Process.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 51
Issue Name: Electronic Tracking System for 401 and 404 Permit Certification
Category: Implementation Policy
Submitted By: UCSD Natural Reserve System

	INITIAL QUESTIONS	Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question B
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		Ask Question C
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question D
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		Ask Question E
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?	Removed	
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The Regional Board is currently working with UCSD on developing an efficient method for converting data (maps, other information) that gets submitted to the Regional Board in a paper format to an electronic format. Currently, the team is scanning several section 401 Water Quality Certification files as a demonstration project. This preliminary project is one of the steps to a paperless office that will allow board members, staff, and the public equal access to common information through any computer. The demonstration project is the first part of a much larger, similar project the team will undertake with the award of other grant funds. The larger project will focus on electronically consolidating the germane environmental documents, permits, and databases (graphical and textual) for section 401 Water Quality Certification impacts and requisite compensatory mitigation within the San Diego River watershed. This issue has been initiated and therefore will not be ranked during the 2004 Triennial Review.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 52
Issue Name: Waste Discharge Requirement Policy - Waiver #4
Category: Implementation Discharge Prohibition
Submitted By: Sierra Club

	INITIAL QUESTIONS	Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question B
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		Ask Question C
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question D
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		Ask Question E
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?	Removed	
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

Table 4-4 waives waste discharge requirements for individual septic systems, where holding tank treatment chemicals are not used. The waiver does not cover campgrounds with multiple hookups. This issue is handled by the Regional Board under the Non Chapter 15 Program. This issue does not need a basin plan amendment.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 50
Issue Name: Interactive Database System with GIS Component for San Diego Ambient Monitoring Program (SDAMP)
Category: Implementation Monitoring Strategy
Submitted By: San Elijo Lagoon Conservancy, California Regional Water Quality Control Board

INITIAL QUESTIONS		Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question B
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		Ask Question C
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question D
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		Ask Question E
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?	Removed	
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

This issue can be accomplished without a basin plan amendment. Therefore, it was removed from the Triennial Review process.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 53

Issue Name: Water Quality Objectives for Flow

Category: Water Quality Objective

Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

INITIAL QUESTIONS		Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question B
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		Ask Question C
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question D
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		Ask Question E
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		Ask Question F
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?	Removed	
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

Weather or not the Regional Board has the legal authority to regulate conditions that do not involve discharges of waste or pollutants is unclear at this time. Although the Regional Board can establish water quality objectives for flow, necessary to support designated beneficial uses, the matter regarding implementing the flow water quality objective in waste discharge permits is still unclear. The court case on the San Diego MS-4 permit will be addressing this issue as well as many other topics. It is prudent for the Regional Board to review the courts decision on the matter before investing significant resources on this Triennial Review Issue. This issue will not be ranked during the 2004 Triennial Review process.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 54

Issue Name: Water Quality Objectives for Invasive Species

Category: Water Quality Objective

Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

INITIAL QUESTIONS		Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question B
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		Ask Question C
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question D
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		Ask Question E
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		Ask Question F
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?	Removed	
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The issue of ecosystem disruption by invasive exotic species is one that is better dealt with through the CEQA process, or by the application of wildlife and habitat protection statutes in the Fish & Game Code. This issue will not be ranked during the 2004 Triennial Review process.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 55
Issue Name: Water Quality Objective for Fish Tissue
Category: Water Quality Objective
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board and USEPA Region 9

	INITIAL QUESTIONS	Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question B
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		Ask Question C
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question D
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		Ask Question E
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		Ask Question F
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?	Removed	
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?		
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

<p>The primary agencies with responsibility for regulating pollutants in fish tissue is the Federal Drug Administration (FDA) and the San Diego County Department of Environmental Health (DEH). The FDA has jurisdiction over any fish and shellfish that is transported over state lines for commerce and the DEH has jurisdiction over locally consumed fish and for posting consumption advisories around San Diego Bay. This issue will not be ranked during the 2004 Triennial Review process.</p>
--

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 60

Issue Name: Factors Listed in California Water Code Section 13241

Category: Water Quality Objective

Submitted By: Construction Industry Coalition

INITIAL QUESTIONS		Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question B
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		Ask Question C
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question D
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		Ask Question E
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		Ask Question F
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		Ask Question G
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?	Removed	
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

When the Regional Board establishes or re-evaluates water quality objectives, factors listed in California Water Code Section 13241 are considered, including economics. Water quality objectives are set to protect the waterbodies designated beneficial uses. In its efforts to establish water quality standards, the Regional Board must comply with state and federal antidegradation policies and consider downstream beneficial uses. Re-evaluation of all water quality objectives based on economic considerations is complete and therefore was removed from the 2004 Triennial Review.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 58

Issue Name: Beneficial Uses in the Santa Margarita Hydrologic Unit

Category: Beneficial Use

Submitted By: Santa Margarita River Watershed - Watermaster

INITIAL QUESTIONS		Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question B
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		Ask Question C
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question D
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		Ask Question E
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		Ask Question F
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		Ask Question G
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?	Removed	
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The Regional Board considered this issue in March 1997 when the Regional Board evaluated the designation of COLD and SPWN beneficial use throughout the San Diego Region. Therefore, this issue was removed from the 2004 Triennial Review process.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 61

Issue Name: Procedures for Beneficial Use Designations and Dededesignation

Category: Beneficial Use

Submitted By: City of El Cajon and Industrial Environmental Association (IEA)

INITIAL QUESTIONS		Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question B
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		Ask Question C
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question D
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		Ask Question E
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		Ask Question F
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		Ask Question G
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?	Removed	
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

Procedures for removing beneficial use designations already exist in the Basin Plan. This issue is complete and therefore will not be ranked within the 2004 Triennial Review process.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 59

Issue Name: Water Quality Objectives for Seasonal Flow Conditions

Category: Water Quality Objective

Submitted By: County of Orange

INITIAL QUESTIONS		Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question B
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		Ask Question C
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question D
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		Ask Question E
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		Ask Question F
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		Ask Question G
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?	Removed	
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

Existing WQOs for turbidity and phosphorus allow for exceedance conditions 10% of the time. The 10% was derived from seasonal conditions being exceptional (heavy rains) 10% of the year in southern California. See Basin Plan Table 3-3 page 3-27. The basin plan contains a narrative objective for total suspended solids (TSS). The TSS narrative objective (Waters shall not contain suspended and settleable solids in concentrations of solids that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses) is written to allow the Regional Board a great deal of discretion and interpretation of its applicability on a case by case basis. The Regional Board exercised this discretion during its ranking of the 303(d) list. The Regional Board considers this issue complete and will not be ranking it during the 2004 Triennial Review process.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 57
Issue Name: Environmental Justice Policy
Category: Implementation Policy
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

INITIAL QUESTIONS		Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question B
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		Ask Question C
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question D
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		Ask Question E
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		Ask Question F
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		Ask Question G
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?	Removed	
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The Environmental Justice concept is one of the State Boards 27 key strategic projects described in the Strategic Plan. The State Board has already developed an Environmental Justice program. This issue is already underway and therefore will not be ranked during 2004 Triennial Review process.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 56

Issue Name: Prohibition of RV Wastes into Campground Septic Systems

Category: Implementation Discharge Prohibition

Submitted By: Sierra Club

INITIAL QUESTIONS		Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question B
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		Ask Question C
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question D
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		Ask Question E
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		Ask Question F
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		Ask Question G
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?	Removed	
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

CWC Section 13291 requires the Regional Board to incorporate the Onsite Sewage Treatment System regulations for permitting and operation of onsite sewage treatment systems into the Basin Plan by July 1, 2004. Although the regulations are currently in draft form the Governor has issued a directive to "stand down" from the rule making process and reevaluate the need for new regulations. Therefore, this issue was from the 2004 Triennial Review Process.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Initial Questions Form

Issue Number: 62
Issue Name: Non-Point Source Water Quality Objectives
Category: Water Quality Objective
Submitted By: Construction Industry Coalition

	INITIAL QUESTIONS	Yes	No
A.	Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question B
B.	Is the issue a SWRCB, USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by state or federal statute?		Ask Question C
C.	Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?		Ask Question D
D.	Is the issue a TMDL?		Ask Question E
E.	Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a basin plan amendment?		Ask Question F
F.	Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?		Ask Question G
G.	Is the issue currently underway or has it already been addressed or completed?	Removed	
H.	Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations?		

If the answer is "No" to each of the above questions, the issue will be evaluated using the Technical Ranking Form.

Discussion

The issue contends that because water quality objectives were originally developed to protect beneficial uses from point source discharges, regulating non-point source discharges like urban and stormwater runoff to meet these water quality objectives is not appropriate. However, urban and stormwater runoff are point source discharges under the Clean Water Act and are appropriately regulated under NPDES permits to ensure that water quality objectives are met. The issue also contends that the Basin Plan does not consider ambient processes and naturally occurring sources of contaminants (for example, the fresh water and ocean bacteria standards), and has not been updated since its original preparation in 1975. The entire Basin Plan was updated in 1994, and amended significantly in 1996. The issue of implementing provisions for wet weather exceedances of water quality objectives for bacteria indicators is being undertaken in the "Water Quality Objectives for Bacteria Indicators" issue. For the reasons cited above, this issue has been removed from the 2004 Triennial Review Process.