

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD  
SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION**

**RESOLUTION R2-2005-0063**

AMENDING THE WATER QUALITY CONTROL PLAN  
FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION  
TO ESTABLISH A WATER QUALITY ATTAINMENT STRATEGY  
AND TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD (TMDL)  
FOR DIAZINON AND PESTICIDE-RELATED TOXICITY  
IN BAY AREA URBAN CREEKS

WHEREAS an updated Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Region (Basin Plan) was adopted by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) on June 21, 1995, approved by the State Water Resources Control Board on July 20, 1995, and approved by the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) on November 13, 1995, and has since been revised; and

WHEREAS the Basin Plan may be amended in accordance with California Water Code § 13240, et seq.; and

WHEREAS Bay Area urban creeks are not consistently meeting the Basin Plan's narrative water quality objectives pertaining to toxicity, sediment, and population and community ecology; and

WHEREAS toxic discharges jeopardize aquatic life, impairing established beneficial uses, including warm and cold freshwater habitat; and

WHEREAS thirty seven (37) urban creeks have been identified under federal Clean Water Act § 303(d)(1) as impaired waters due to toxicity attributed to diazinon. They are, in *Alameda County*, Alameda Creek, Arroyo de la Laguna, Arroyo de las Positas, Arroyo del Valle, Arroyo Mocho, San Leandro Creek, and San Lorenzo Creek; in *Contra Costa County*, Mount Diablo Creek, Pine Creek, Pinole Creek, Rodeo Creek, San Pablo Creek, Walnut Creek, and Wildcat Creek; in *Marin County*, Arroyo Corte Madera del Presidio, Corte Madera Creek, Coyote Creek, Gallinas Creek, Miller Creek, Novato Creek, San Antonio Creek, and San Rafael Creek; in *San Mateo County*, San Mateo Creek; in *Santa Clara County*, Calabazas Creek, Coyote Creek, Guadalupe River, Los Gatos Creek, Matadero Creek, Permanente Creek, San Felipe Creek, San Francisquito Creek, Saratoga Creek, and Stevens Creek; in *Solano County*, Laurel Creek, Ledge wood Creek, and Suisun Slough; and in *Sonoma County*, Petaluma River; and

WHEREAS all Bay Area urban creeks are similarly impaired, including those not formally designated as impaired pursuant to Clean Water Act § 303(d)(1); and

WHEREAS the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) phased out residential end use diazinon products (i.e., essentially all urban diazinon uses) at the end of 2004, which has increased the use of alternative pesticides and encouraged new pesticides to enter the marketplace; and

WHEREAS some diazinon alternatives pose water quality concerns, and pyrethroids in particular may now cause sediment toxicity in some Bay Area urban creeks; and

WHEREAS under Clean Water Act § 303(d)(1) the Water Board is required and authorized to establish a total maximum daily load (TMDL) for those pollutants identified as causing impairment of waters on the § 303(d) list. Additionally, under Clean Water Act § 303(d)(3) the Water Board is authorized to establish the TMDL for pollutants not identified as causing impairment of waters on the § 303(d) list. Also, Water Code § 13241 authorizes the Water Board to adopt the TMDL to implement water quality objectives; and

WHEREAS a Basin Plan amendment has been prepared in accordance with California Water Code § 13240 et seq. to establish a water quality attainment strategy and TMDL to reduce diazinon and pesticide-related toxicity in urban creeks as a program of implementation to achieve water quality objectives under Water Code § 13242, to comply with the Clean Water Act's requirement for the Water Board to adopt a TMDL for § 303(d)(1) listed waters, and to restore and protect beneficial uses; and

WHEREAS the Basin Plan amendment addresses the Petaluma River watershed's urban pesticide discharges only and a future TMDL may be necessary to address Petaluma River agricultural sources, if any; and

WHEREAS the Basin Plan amendment, including specifications on its physical placement in the Basin Plan, is set forth in Exhibit A hereto; and

WHEREAS in addition to including a diazinon concentration target, the Basin Plan amendment includes generic pesticide-related toxicity targets to comply with the applicable narrative water quality objectives, which relate to toxicity; to account for potential effects of chemical mixtures; and to account for pesticide use changes over time; and

WHEREAS gaps in regulatory program implementation allow pesticides to be used in ways that result in discharges that threaten water quality. The water quality attainment strategy recognizes that the most efficient means of protecting water quality from potentially toxic pesticide discharges is for pesticide regulatory agencies, including U.S. EPA and the California Department of Pesticide Regulation, to assist the Water Board in ensuring that pesticide applications do not result in runoff that violates water quality standards; and

WHEREAS external peer scientists Dr. David Sedlak of the University of California, Berkeley, and Dr. Alan Felsot of Washington State University, TriCities, reviewed the regulatory elements of the Basin Plan amendment to ensure that the scientific portions are based on sound scientific knowledge, methods, and practices; and

WHEREAS the Basin Plan amendment, Staff Report, and Environmental Checklist were distributed for public review and comment for 45 days beginning August 5, 2005 in accordance with applicable state and federal laws and regulations; and

WHEREAS Water Board staff revised the Basin Plan amendment in response to the comments from the scientific peer reviewers and the public, or provided written explanations for making no changes; and

WHEREAS a Notice of Public Hearing was given to interested persons and was published in accordance with applicable state and federal laws and regulations. The Water Board held public hearings on October 19, 2005, and November 16, 2005, to consider the Basin Plan amendment and supporting documents, and the changes made thereto in response to comments; and

WHEREAS the basin planning process has been certified by the Secretary for Resources as exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code § 21000 et seq.) to prepare an Environmental Impact Report or Negative Declaration; and

WHEREAS the Water Board has duly considered the Environmental Checklist, Staff Report, and supporting documentation with respect to environmental impacts and finds that the Basin Plan amendment will have no significant adverse impact on the environment, including wildlife. The Water Board has also considered the environmental analysis contained in the Staff Report of the reasonably foreseeable methods of compliance with the Basin Plan amendment, including economics; and

WHEREAS the Water Board has carefully considered all comments and testimony received, including responses thereto, on the Basin Plan amendment, as well as the evidence in the administrative record; and

WHEREAS the Basin Plan amendment must be submitted for review and approval by the State Water Resources Control Board, OAL, and U.S. EPA. Once approved by the State Water Resources Control Board, the Basin Plan amendment will be submitted to OAL. Once approved by the OAL, the Basin Plan amendment will be submitted to U.S. EPA. The Basin Plan amendment will become effective upon U.S. EPA approval.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Water Board adopts the Basin Plan amendment, as set forth in Exhibit A hereto, that establishes the Water Quality Attainment Strategy and TMDL for Diazinon and Pesticide-Related Toxicity in Bay Area Urban Creeks; and


BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Executive Officer is directed to forward copies of the Basin Plan amendment to the State Water Resources Control Board in accordance with California Water Code § 13245; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Water Board requests that the State Water Resources Control Board approve the Basin Plan amendment in accordance with California Water Code § 13245 and § 13246, and forward it to OAL and U.S. EPA for approval; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if, during the approval process, the State Water Resources Control Board or OAL determines that minor, non-substantive corrections to the language of the amendment and supporting documentation are needed for clarity or consistency, the Executive Officer may make such changes, and shall inform the Water Board of any such changes; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that since the Basin Plan amendment will involve no potential for adverse effect, either individually or cumulatively, on wildlife, the Executive Officer is directed to sign a Certificate of Fee Exemption for a “De Minimis” Impact Finding and to submit the exemption in lieu of payment of the Department of Fish and Game CEQA filing fee.

I, Bruce H. Wolfe, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of a Resolution adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region, on November 16, 2005.

  
BRUCE H. WOLFE  
Executive Officer

Attachment

Exhibit A: Basin Plan Amendment—  
Water Quality Attainment Strategy and Total Maximum Daily Load  
(TMDL) for Diazinon and Pesticide-Related Toxicity in Bay Area Urban  
Creeks

# **EXHIBIT A: BASIN PLAN AMENDMENT**

---

*The following changes shown in double underline/strikeout apply to the section titled "TOXICITY" in Chapter 3.*

## **Toxicity**

All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that are lethal to or that produce other detrimental responses in aquatic organisms. Detrimental responses include, but are not limited to, decreased growth rate and decreased reproductive success of resident or indicator species. There shall be no acute toxicity in ambient waters. Acute toxicity is defined as a median of less than 90 percent survival, and less than 70 percent survival, 10 percent of the time, or test organisms in a 96-hour static or continuous flow test.

There shall be no chronic toxicity in ambient waters. Chronic toxicity is a detrimental biological effect on growth rate, reproduction, fertilization success, larval development, population abundance, community composition, or any other relevant measure of the health of an organism, population, or community. ~~Chronic toxicity generally results from exposures to pollutants exceeding 96 hours. However, chronic toxicity may also be detected through short-term exposure of critical life stages of organisms.~~

~~As a minimum, compliance will be evaluated using the bioassay requirements contained in Chapter IV.~~ Attainment of this objective will be determined by analyses of indicator organisms, species diversity, population density, growth anomalies, or toxicity tests (including those described in Chapter IV), or other methods selected by the Water Board. The Water Board will also consider other relevant information and numeric criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by other agencies as appropriate.

The health and life history characteristics of aquatic organisms in waters affected by controllable water quality factors shall not differ significantly from those for the same waters in areas unaffected by controllable water quality factors.

*The following double underline text, in its entirety, is to be inserted in Chapter 4, immediately after the introduction of the section titled “TOXIC POLLUTANT MANAGEMENT IN THE LARGER SAN FRANCISCO BAY ESTUARY SYSTEM.”*

### **Water Quality Attainment Strategy and TMDL for Diazinon and Pesticide-Related Toxicity in Urban Creeks**

The following sections establish a water quality attainment strategy and TMDL for diazinon and pesticide-related toxicity in the Region’s urban creeks, including actions and monitoring necessary to implement the strategy. The term “pesticides,” as used here, refers to substances (or mixtures of substances) intended for defoliating plants, regulating plant growth, or preventing, destroying, repelling, or mitigating pests that may infest or be detrimental to vegetation, humans, animals, or households, or be present in any agricultural or nonagricultural environment. The term “urban creeks,” as used here, refers to freshwater streams that flow through urban areas, including incorporated cities and towns and unincorporated areas with similar land use intensities. This strategy applies to all San Francisco Bay Region urban creeks.

The numeric targets, allocations, and implementation plan described below are intended to ensure that urban creeks meet applicable water quality standards established to protect and support beneficial uses. This strategy will also reduce pesticide concentrations in the Bay resulting from urban creek flows. The effectiveness of the implementation actions, the monitoring undertaken to track progress toward meeting the targets, and the most current scientific understanding pertaining to pesticide-related toxicity will be periodically reviewed, and the strategy will be adapted as necessary to reflect changing conditions and information.

### **Problem Statement**

In 1998, a number of the Region’s urban creeks were placed on the 303(d) list of impaired waters due to toxicity attributed to diazinon. In the early 1990s, many urban creek water samples collected from selected creeks throughout the Region were toxic to aquatic organisms. Studies found that pesticides, particularly diazinon, caused the toxicity. The 303(d) listings were based on observed toxicity, diazinon detections, and similarities among the Region’s urban pesticide use profiles.

When pesticide-related toxicity occurs in urban creek water, creeks do not meet the narrative toxicity objective. When pesticide-related toxicity occurs in sediment, the creeks also do not meet the narrative sediment objective. Likewise, when creek water or sediment is toxic, creeks do not meet the narrative population and community ecology objective. Urban creek waters that fail to meet these objectives are not protective of cold and warm freshwater habitats.

Although U.S. EPA phased out urban diazinon applications at the end of 2004, other pesticides may now pose potential water quality and sediment quality concerns because they are used as diazinon replacements and because pesticide regulatory programs, as currently implemented, allow pesticides to be used in ways that threaten water quality.

## **Numeric Targets**

The numeric targets below interpret the applicable narrative objectives in terms of quantitatively measurable water quality parameters. Meeting these pesticide-related toxicity and diazinon concentration targets will protect cold and warm freshwater habitats. These targets shall be met at all urban creek locations, including those near storm drain outfalls where urban runoff enters receiving waters.

### **Pesticide-Related Toxicity**

The toxicity targets are expressed in terms of acute toxic units ( $TU_a$ ) and chronic toxic units ( $TU_c$ ). The targets are as follows: pesticide-related acute and chronic toxicity in urban creek water and sediment, as determined through standard toxicity tests, shall not exceed 1.0  $TU_a$  or 1.0  $TU_c$ , where  $TU_a = 100/\text{NOAEC}$  and  $TU_c = 100/\text{NOEC}$ . “NOAEC” refers to the “no observed adverse effect concentration,” which is the highest tested concentration of a sample that causes no observable adverse effect (i.e., mortality) to exposed organisms during an acute toxicity test. For purposes of this strategy, “NOEC” refers to the “no observable effect concentration,” which is the highest tested concentration of a sample that causes no observable effect to exposed organisms during a chronic toxicity test. NOAEC and NOEC are both expressed as the percentage of a sample in a test container (e.g., an undiluted sample has a concentration of 100%). In both cases, an observable effect must be statistically significant. For purposes of this strategy, an undiluted ambient water or sediment sample that does not exhibit an acute or chronic toxic effect that is significantly different from control samples on a statistical basis shall be assumed to meet the relevant target.

The above definitions of  $TU_a$  and  $TU_c$  apply only to ambient conditions in the context of this diazinon and pesticide-related toxicity strategy. If toxicity exists in urban creeks but pesticides do not cause or contribute to the toxicity, these targets do not apply. Moreover, the numeric toxicity targets do not limit the Water Board’s authority to evaluate attainment of the narrative objectives through other appropriate means.

### **Diazinon**

The diazinon concentration target is as follows: diazinon concentrations in urban creeks shall not exceed 100 ng/l as a one-hour average. The target addresses both acute and chronic diazinon-related toxicity.

### **Sources**

Pesticides, including diazinon, enter urban creeks through urban runoff. Most urban runoff flows through storm drains owned and operated by the Region’s municipalities, industrial dischargers, large institutions (e.g., campuses), construction dischargers, and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Urban runoff contains pesticides as a result of pesticides being manufactured, formulated into products, and sold through distributors and retailers to businesses and individuals who apply them for structural pest control, landscape maintenance, agricultural, and other pest management purposes. Factors that affect pesticide concentrations in urban creeks include the amount used, the

chemical and physical properties of the pesticide and its product formulation, the sites of use (e.g., landscaping, turf, or paved surfaces), and irrigation practices and precipitation. In the San Francisco Bay Region, ants are the most common pest problem for which pesticides are used. Argentine ants are an introduced species. Pesticide use by structural pest control professionals and use of products sold over-the-counter can be among the greatest contributors of pesticides in urban runoff.

### **Total Maximum Daily Load**

The assimilative capacity of the Region’s urban creeks for diazinon and pesticide-related toxicity is the amount of diazinon and pesticide-related toxicity they can receive without exceeding water quality standards. For urban creeks to assimilate diazinon and other pesticide discharges and meet water quality standards, the targets must be met. Rather than establishing a mass-based TMDL to attain the targets, this TMDL is expressed in concentration units. The TMDL is equal to the targets.

The targets rely on a conservative approach that provides an implicit margin of safety to account for any lack of knowledge concerning the relationship between the allocations and water quality. Weather and seasons affect creek flows and pesticide loads, concentrations, and toxicity. By expressing the targets in terms of toxicity and diazinon concentrations, the inherent pesticide mass loads automatically reflect seasonal and other critical conditions as creek conditions change.

### **Allocations**

The TMDL is allocated to all urban runoff, including urban runoff associated with municipal separate storm sewer systems, Caltrans facilities, and industrial, construction, and institutional sites. The allocations are expressed in terms of toxic units and diazinon concentrations, and are the same as the numeric targets and the TMDL.

### **Implementation**

The cornerstone of this strategy is pollution prevention. Pesticide-related toxicity in the Region’s urban creeks is to be eliminated and prevented by using pest management alternatives that protect water quality and by not using pesticides that threaten water quality. This can best be accomplished through the rigorous application of integrated pest management techniques and the use of less toxic pest control methods. The term “integrated pest management,” as used here, refers to a process that includes setting action thresholds, monitoring and identifying pests, preventing pests, and controlling pests when necessary. Integrated pest management meets the following conditions:

- Pest control practices focus on long-term pest prevention through a combination of techniques, such as biological control, habitat manipulation, and modification of cultural practices;
- Pesticides are used only after monitoring indicates that they are needed;
- Treatments are made with the goal of removing only the target pest; and
- Pesticides are selected to minimize risks to human health, beneficial and non-target organisms, and the environment, including risks to aquatic habitats.



The term “less toxic pest control,” as used here, refers to the use of pest control strategies selected to minimize the potential for pesticide-related toxicity in water and sediment.

Strategy implementation will focus on three areas: (1) regulatory programs, (2) education and outreach, and (3) research and monitoring. Regulatory programs will prevent pollution by using existing regulatory tools to ensure that pesticides are not applied in a manner that results in discharges that threaten urban creek uses. Education and outreach programs will focus on decreasing demand for pesticides that threaten water quality, while increasing awareness of alternatives that pose less risk to water quality. Research will fill existing information gaps, and monitoring will be used to measure implementation progress and success. The actions described below are intended to address these strategic goals.

When pesticide-related toxicity occurs in urban creeks, many entities share responsibility for the discharge, and therefore many entities share responsibility for implementing actions to ensure that pesticide-related toxicity does not threaten water quality. Although the allocations apply to all urban runoff, responsibility for attaining the allocations is not the sole responsibility of urban runoff management agencies, whose authority to regulate pesticide use is constrained. Actions to be implemented by regulatory agencies, urban runoff management agencies, and other entities are listed below. The agencies with the broadest authorities to oversee pesticide use and pesticide discharges include U.S. EPA, the California Department of Pesticide Regulation, and the Water Board. Regulatory and non-regulatory actions are needed to ensure that pesticide use does not result in discharges that cause or contribute to toxicity in urban creeks. Implementing these actions is expected to ensure attainment of the allocations. Many entities are already implementing these actions. Actions that can be required through NPDES permits are already in some permits and shall be incorporated into all applicable NPDES permits when the permits are reissued or by other regulatory actions if appropriate. Voluntary actions should commence immediately, and inter-agency coordination is already underway.

### **Water Board Actions**

The role of the Water Board is to encourage, monitor, and enforce implementation actions, and to lead by example. The Water Board will implement the following actions related to regulatory programs:

- Track U.S. EPA pesticide evaluation and registration activities as they relate to surface water quality and share monitoring and research data with U.S. EPA;
- When necessary, request that U.S. EPA coordinate implementation of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Clean Water Act;
- Encourage U.S. EPA to fully address urban water quality concerns within its pesticide registration process;
- Work with the California Department of Pesticide Regulation, County Agricultural Commissioners, and the Structural Pest Control Board to ensure that pesticide applications result in discharges that comply with water quality standards;
- Interpret water quality standards for the California Department of Pesticide Regulation and County Agricultural Commissioners, and assemble available

information (such as monitoring data) to assist the California Department of Pesticide Regulation and County Agricultural Commissioners in taking actions necessary to protect water quality; and

- Use authorities (e.g., through permits or waste discharge requirements) to require implementation of best management practices and control measures to minimize pesticide discharges to urban creeks.

The Water Board will implement the following actions related to outreach and education:

- Encourage integrated pest management and less toxic pest management practices;
- Encourage grant funding for activities likely to reduce pesticide discharges, promote less toxic pest management practices, or otherwise further the goals of this implementation plan; and
- Encourage pilot demonstration projects that show promise for reducing pesticide discharges throughout the Region.

The Water Board will implement the following actions related to research, monitoring, and overall program coordination:

- Promote and support studies to address critical data needs (see Adaptive Implementation, below); and
- Assist municipalities and others implementing this strategy by convening stakeholder forums to coordinate implementation.

### **U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Actions**

U.S. EPA is responsible for implementing the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Clean Water Act. U.S. EPA is therefore responsible for ensuring that both federal pesticide laws and water quality laws are implemented. U.S. EPA should exercise its authorities to ensure that foreseeable pesticide applications do not cause or contribute to water column or sediment toxicity in the Region's waters. Because some pesticides pose water quality risks, U.S. EPA should implement the following actions:

- Continue internal coordination efforts to ensure that pesticide applications and resulting discharges comply with water quality standards and avoid water quality impairment (i.e., restrict uses or application practices to manage risks);
- Continue and enhance education and outreach programs to encourage integrated pest management and less toxic pest control; and
- Complete studies to address critical data needs (see Adaptive Implementation, below).

### **California Department of Pesticide Regulation Actions**

Like the Water Board, the California Department of Pesticide Regulation is part of the California Environmental Protection Agency. It regulates pesticide product sales and use within California pursuant to the California Food and Agricultural Code. When the

California Department of Pesticide Regulation evaluates whether to register a pesticide product, it must give special attention to the potential for environmental damage, including interference with attainment of water quality standards. The California Department of Pesticide Regulation is mandated to protect water quality from environmentally harmful pesticide materials, which should include pesticides used such that their runoff violates water quality standards. The California Department of Pesticide Regulation should also recognize pesticides used such that their runoff poses a reasonable potential to violate water quality standards to be potentially harmful and take preventive action to address foreseeable risks. The Water Board will assist the California Department of Pesticide Regulation in identifying pesticides that could harm water quality.

The California Department of Pesticide Regulation must endeavor to mitigate adverse effects of pesticides that endanger the environment, such as existing or reasonably foreseeable pesticide-related violations of water quality standards. If a pesticide product has a demonstrated serious uncontrollable adverse effect, mitigation may include canceling its registration. Mitigation is also warranted to avoid existing and reasonably foreseeable serious uncontrolled adverse effects. The Water Board will notify the California Department of Pesticide Regulation whenever it obtains information concerning actual or potential water quality standard violations so the California Department of Pesticide Regulation can implement appropriate protective actions.

To be effective, this strategy relies on the California Department of Pesticide Regulation to use its authorities in concert with the Water Board. Consistent with its authorities, the California Department of Pesticide Regulation should implement the following actions:

- Work with the Water Board to identify pesticides applied in urban areas in such a manner that runoff does or could cause or contribute to water quality standard violations;
- Condition registrations, as appropriate, to require registrants to provide information necessary to determine the potential for their products to cause or contribute to water quality standard violations and to implement actions necessary to prevent violations;
- Continue and enhance efforts to evaluate the potential for registered pesticide products to cause or contribute to water quality standard violations (the California Department of Pesticide Regulation need not wait for the Water Board to evaluate potential water quality effects);
- Implement actions to eliminate pesticide-related water quality standard violations caused by registered pesticides;
- Implement actions to prevent potential pesticide-related water quality standard violations before they occur;
- Notify U.S. EPA of potential deficiencies in product labels for products that threaten water quality;
- Continue and enhance education and outreach programs to encourage integrated pest management and less toxic pest control (work with County Agricultural Commissioners, urban runoff management agencies, and the University of California Statewide Integrated Pest Management Program to coordinate activities);
- Continue and enhance efforts to prevent the introduction of new exotic pests to the Region;  
and
- Complete studies to address critical data needs (see Adaptive Implementation, below).

**Collaboration within the California Environmental Protection Agency**

As sister agencies within the California Environmental Protection Agency, the Water Board and the California Department of Pesticide Regulation should coordinate pesticide and water quality regulation in the Region. In 1997, the California Department of Pesticide Regulation and the State Water Resources Control Board entered into a management agency agreement. The California Department of Pesticide Regulation agreed to ensure that compliance with numeric and narrative water quality objectives is achieved. The State and Regional Water Boards retained responsibility for interpreting compliance with narrative water quality objectives. In light of the agreement, the Water Board and the California Department of Pesticide Regulation should work together to eliminate recurrences of water quality standard violations and prevent potential future violations. In consultation with the California Department of Pesticide Regulation, the Water Board will implement the following actions:

- Gather and review available information to identify pesticides most likely to run off into urban creeks and cause or contribute to water quality standard violations;
- Identify evaluation criteria that can be used to discern whether water quality standards are met (e.g., water quality objectives, targets, monitoring benchmarks, or other criteria);
- Evaluate available information to determine whether water quality standards are met and, if so, whether circumstances suggest that future violations are likely; and
- Notify the California Department of Pesticide Regulation and County Agricultural Commissioners if water quality standard violations exist or are likely to exist in the future due to pesticide discharges, thereby enabling these agencies to implement appropriate actions and assisting them in ensuring that their regulatory programs adequately protect water quality.

In consultation with the Water Board, the California Department of Pesticide Regulation should implement the following actions:

- When available information is insufficient to conclude whether water quality standards are met, work with the Water Board to identify information needed to evaluate the potential for pesticide discharges to cause or contribute to water quality standard violations;
- Obtain information necessary to determine whether water quality standards are or are likely to be met from pesticide product registrants, U.S. EPA, and other sources (conservative [i.e., protective] assumptions may be used to fill information gaps);
- Evaluate whether water quality standards are likely to be met (e.g., consider pesticide use, toxicity, application sites and techniques, runoff potential, and environmental persistence; estimate foreseeable water and sediment pesticide concentrations; and consider Water Board evaluation criteria);
- When pesticide discharges are or are likely to cause or contribute to water quality standard violations, identify and evaluate possible corrective actions (using the Water Board's evaluation criteria) and implement those needed to ensure that water quality standards will be met; and

- When available information suggests that pesticide discharges appear likely to cause or contribute to water quality standard violations in the future (assuming standards are currently met), identify and evaluate possible preventive actions and, commensurate with the weight of the evidence, implement those actions needed to ensure that water quality standards will be met.

Sometimes, a pesticide-by-pesticide approach may be counterproductive, particularly if existing pesticide problems are likely to be replaced by new pesticide problems. As appropriate, the California Department of Pesticide Regulation may evaluate several pesticides at once if related to a specific application method, application site of concern, or other shared factor.

During adaptive implementation reviews (see “Adaptive Implementation,” below), the Water Board will consider the extent to which inter-agency collaboration is sufficient to address water quality concerns. If necessary, the Water Board will notify the California Department of Pesticide Regulation of deficiencies and could consider the need to use its own regulatory authorities to control pesticide discharges.

### **County Agricultural Commissioners Actions**

County Agricultural Commissioners are the local enforcement agents for the California Department of Pesticide Regulation. They provide local enforcement of applicable pesticide laws and, when necessary to address local circumstances (e.g., localized toxicity in an urban creek), can adopt local regulations (subject to California Department of Pesticide Regulation approval) that govern the conduct of pest control operations and the records and reports of those operations. County Agricultural Commissioners should implement the following actions:

- Continue and enhance enforcement related to illegal sale or use of pesticides, including pesticides sold over-the-counter;
- Continue to enforce the phase out of diazinon products and any new regulations affecting pesticide applications and their water quality risks;
- Continue and enhance efforts to prevent the introduction of new exotic pests to the Region;
- Provide outreach and training to pest control licensees regarding water quality issues as part of pest control business license registration and inspection programs; and
- Work with the California Department of Pesticide Regulation, urban runoff management agencies, and the University of California Statewide Integrated Pest Management Program to coordinate education and outreach programs to minimize pesticide discharges.

### **Structural Pest Control Board Actions**

The Structural Pest Control Board is responsible for licensing structural pest control professionals. The Structural Pest Control Board requires training and examinations to maintain a license to practice structural pest control, and regulates the advertising

practices of structural pest control businesses. The Structural Pest Control Board should implement the following actions:

- Through licensing and other authorities, work to ensure that structural pest control practices result in discharges that comply with water quality standards;
- Work to develop a mechanism through which consumers can determine which structural pest control providers offer services most likely to protect water quality; and
- Work to enhance initial and continuing integrated pest management training for structural pest control licensees.

### **University of California Actions**

The University of California Statewide Integrated Pest Management Program promotes pest management education and outreach throughout California. The University of California should implement the following actions:

- Continue and enhance educational efforts targeting urban pesticide users to promote integrated pest management and less toxic pest management practices;
- Continue to encourage and support efforts to identify and improve new less toxic pest management strategies for the urban environment;
- Continue to serve as a resource for information on alternative pest management practices that protect water quality and develop publications others can use to support outreach activities;
- Continue to train University of California Master Gardeners to help disseminate information about integrated pest management and pest management alternatives that protect water quality; and
- Work with the California Department of Pesticide Regulation, County Agricultural Commissioners, and urban runoff management agencies to coordinate education and outreach programs to minimize pesticide discharges.

### **Urban Runoff Management Agencies and Similar Entities Actions**

NPDES permits for urban runoff management agencies and similar entities responsible for controlling urban runoff (e.g., industrial facilities, construction sites, California Department of Transportation facilities, universities, and military installations) shall require implementation of best management practices and control measures. Requirements in each NPDES permit issued or reissued and applicable for the term of the permit shall be based on an updated assessment of control measures intended to reduce pesticides in urban runoff. Control measures implemented by urban runoff management agencies and other entities (except construction and industrial sites) shall reduce pesticides in urban runoff to the maximum extent practicable. Control measures for construction and industrial sites shall reduce discharges based on Best Available Technology Economically Achievable. All permits shall remain consistent with the section of this chapter titled “Surface Water Protection and Management—Point Source Control - Stormwater Discharges.” These requirements shall be included in permits no later than five years after the effective date of this strategy. If these requirements prove inadequate to meet the targets and allocations, the Water Board will require additional control measures or call for additional actions by others until the targets and allocations are attained.

The following general requirements shall be implemented through NPDES permits issued or reissued for urban runoff discharges:

1. Reduce reliance on pesticides that threaten water quality by adopting and implementing policies, procedures, or ordinances that minimize the use of pesticides that threaten water quality in the discharger's operations and on the discharger's property;
2. Track progress by periodically reviewing the discharger's pesticide use and pesticide use by its hired contractors;
3. Train the discharger's employees to use integrated pest management techniques and require that they rigorously adhere to integrated pest management practices;
4. Require the discharger's contractors to practice integrated pest management; and
5. Study the effectiveness of the control measures implemented, evaluate attainment of the targets, identify effective actions to be taken in the future, and report conclusions to the Water Board.

The following education and outreach requirements shall also be implemented through NPDES permits issued or reissued for urban runoff discharges:

1. Undertake targeted outreach programs to encourage communities within a discharger's jurisdiction to reduce their reliance on pesticides that threaten water quality, focusing efforts on those most likely to use pesticides that threaten water quality;
2. Work with the California Department of Pesticide Regulation, County Agricultural Commissioners, and the University of California Statewide Integrated Pest Management Program to coordinate education and outreach programs to minimize pesticide discharges.
3. Encourage public and private landscape irrigation management that minimizes pesticide runoff; and
4. Facilitate appropriate pesticide waste disposal, and conduct education and outreach to promote appropriate disposal.

The following monitoring and reporting requirements shall also be implemented through NPDES permits issued or reissued for urban runoff discharges:

1. Monitor diazinon and other pesticides discharged in urban runoff that pose potential water quality threats to urban creeks; monitor toxicity in both water and sediment; and implement alternative monitoring mechanisms, if appropriate, to indirectly evaluate water quality as described below (see Monitoring, below);
2. Disseminate monitoring data to appropriate regulatory agencies; and
3. Contribute to studies to address critical data needs (see Adaptive Implementation, below).

The following requirements related to regulatory programs shall also be implemented through NPDES permits issued or reissued for urban runoff discharges:

1. Track U.S. EPA pesticide evaluation and registration activities as they relate to surface water quality and, when necessary, encourage U.S. EPA to coordinate implementation of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the

- Federal Clean Water Act and to accommodate water quality concerns within its pesticide registration process;
2. Assemble and submit information (such as monitoring data) as needed to assist the California Department of Pesticide Regulation and County Agricultural Commissioners in ensuring that pesticide applications within the Region comply with water quality standards; and
  3. Report violations of pesticide regulations (e.g., illegal handling) to County Agricultural Commissioners.

The actions above may be implemented by individual urban runoff management entities, jointly by two or more entities acting in concert, or cooperatively through a regional approach, as appropriate.

NPDES permits issued or reissued for industrial, construction, and California Department of Transportation facilities shall implement the general requirements and education and outreach requirements listed above and monitoring requirements as appropriate.

### **Private Entities Actions**

Most pesticides do not occur naturally in the environment; they are manufactured. Pesticide manufacturers and formulators sell products to distributors and retailers, who sell them to the pesticide users who apply them. These private entities should implement the following actions to prevent pesticide-related toxicity in urban creeks:

- Pesticide manufacturers and formulators should minimize potential pesticide discharges by developing and marketing products designed to avoid discharges that exceed water quality standards. (Many manufacturers successfully market such products.) They should also undertake studies to address critical data needs (see Adaptive Implementation, below);
- Distributors and retailers should offer point-of-sale information on less toxic alternatives. They should also offer and promote less toxic alternatives to customers;
- Pest control advisors should recommend integrated pest management strategies so pesticides that could threaten water quality are used only as a last resort; and
- Pesticide users (e.g., private citizens, professional pesticide applicators, school districts, transit districts, and mosquito abatement and vector control districts) should adopt integrated pest management and less toxic pest control techniques so pesticide applications do not contribute to pesticide runoff and toxicity in urban creeks.

### **Monitoring**

Monitoring is needed to demonstrate target attainment and to track and evaluate the effectiveness of strategy implementation. Diazinon monitoring needs to demonstrate that diazinon concentrations meet the target. When the concentrations consistently drop below the target, such monitoring may no longer be needed. However, because other pesticides will continue to be applied in urban areas, the need to monitor for water and sediment toxicity—and sometimes specific pesticides—will likely remain well after achieving the diazinon concentration target.



A number of programs monitor pesticide concentrations and toxicity in the Region's waters, including the Water Board's Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program, the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's Surface Water Protection Program, and the Regional Monitoring Program for Trace Substances. Municipal storm water NPDES permits may also require dischargers to characterize their discharges and receiving waters. This can involve monitoring toxicity and specific pollutants, like diazinon, in storm drain systems and urban creeks.

### **Monitoring Requirements**

Monitoring requirements shall be implemented through NPDES permits issued or reissued for urban runoff discharges. Urban runoff management agencies shall undertake monitoring efforts related to pesticides and toxicity. They shall design and implement a monitoring program to answer the following questions:

- Is the diazinon concentration target being met?
- Are the toxicity targets being met?
- Is toxicity observed in urban creeks caused by a pesticide?
- Is urban runoff the source of any observed toxicity in urban creeks?
- How does observed pesticide-related toxicity in urban creeks (or pesticide concentrations contributing to such toxicity) vary in time and magnitude across urban creek watersheds, and what types of pest control practices contribute to such toxicity?
- Are actions already being taken to reduce pesticide discharges sufficient to meet the targets, and if not, what should be done differently?

The monitoring program may be developed by individual urban runoff management agencies, jointly by two or more agencies acting in concert, or cooperatively through a regional approach. Designing the program shall involve characterizing watersheds, selecting representative creeks, identifying sample locations, developing sampling plans, and selecting appropriate analytical tests of water and sediment. Chemical and toxicity tests shall be conducted on urban creek water and sediment. At a minimum, tests shall be used to measure the following:

- Water column toxicity;
- Sediment toxicity;
- Diazinon concentrations in water (until the diazinon concentration target is met consistently); and
- Concentrations of other pesticides that pose potential water quality and sediment quality threats, as feasible.

Sampling frequency, timing, and number of samples shall be adequate to answer the monitoring questions above and any others set forth for the monitoring program.

Additional types of monitoring tools may be used to support and optimize conventional water and sediment monitoring. For example, monitoring in storm drain systems or near application sites may be useful in selecting creek sampling strategies because pesticide concentrations are easier to detect nearer to the pesticide application site. Efforts to

monitor parameters that can serve as surrogates or indicators of pesticide-related water quality conditions may moderate the need for more comprehensive water quality monitoring. While some toxicity and pollutant monitoring will always be necessary, extensive monitoring will be less important if other information is collected that can be used to evaluate the potential for toxicity or specific pollutants to occur in water. Alternative monitoring information can also help focus water quality monitoring efforts and mitigation actions. Such monitoring could include reviewing pesticide sales and use data for the Region, pesticide fate and transport data, and public attitudes regarding pesticides and water quality. If undertaken, such monitoring may seek to answer the following questions:

- What pesticides pose the greatest water quality risks?
- How is the use of such pesticides changing?
- Are existing actions effective in reducing pesticide discharges that threaten water quality?
- What approach is best for monitoring toxicity and pesticides in urban creek water and sediment?

**Monitoring Benchmarks**

To determine whether measured or predicted pesticide concentrations in water are cause for concern, monitoring benchmarks are needed. Ideally, water quality criteria would be used; however, water quality criteria do not exist for most pesticides. In the absence of water quality criteria, a monitoring benchmark may be calculated as follows. Such a monitoring benchmark is not a water quality objective unless adopted as such by the Water Board. Where valid tests have determined four-day LC<sub>50</sub> values for aquatic organisms (the concentration that kills one half of the test organisms), a monitoring benchmark may be calculated by dividing the lowest LC<sub>50</sub> value measured by the appropriate benchmark factor from Table 4-x (typically 14 or less for a registered pesticide).

$$\text{Monitoring Benchmark} = \text{Lowest LC}_{50} \div \text{Benchmark Factor}$$

Where multiple LC<sub>50</sub> measurements are available, the lowest “genus mean acute value” may be used in place of the lowest LC<sub>50</sub>. The term “genus mean acute value,” as used here, refers to the geometric mean of the available “species mean acute values” within a

**TABLE 4-x**  
**Benchmark Factors**

<u>Number of Data Requirements Satisfied</u> <sup>a</sup>	<u>Benchmark Factor</u> <sup>b</sup>
<u>2</u>	<u>16</u>
<u>3</u>	<u>14</u>
<u>4</u>	<u>14</u>
<u>5</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>6</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>

<sup>a</sup> U.S. EPA water quality criteria guidelines require data for at least eight taxonomic families to derive water quality criteria.

<sup>b</sup> These values apply only when both daphnid and salmonid toxicity data are available. U.S. EPA typically requires such data to register a pesticide.

genus. The term “species mean acute value,” as used here, refers to the geometric mean of available four-day LC<sub>50</sub> values for each species. Other available information regarding the pesticide (such as its potential for sub-lethal effects) may also be considered to determine if lower monitoring benchmarks are appropriate to reflect attainment of the narrative objectives. Table 4-x is not intended for deriving monitoring benchmarks for sediment tests.

When monitoring data demonstrate that pesticide concentrations exceed monitoring benchmarks, the information will be considered during periodic reviews undertaken as part of adaptive implementation (see below). When pesticide concentrations exceed monitoring benchmarks, the Water Board may consider such information in determining compliance with the narrative toxicity, sediment, and population and community ecology objectives. The Water Board may also seek additional toxicity data to derive water quality criteria. The Water Board may inform other regulatory agencies (e.g., the California Department of Pesticide Regulation) about the potential threat to water quality and seek action to prevent water quality impairment.

### **ADAPTIVE IMPLEMENTATION**

Adaptive implementation entails taking immediate actions commensurate with available information, reviewing new information as it becomes available, and modifying actions as necessary based on the new information. Taking immediate action allows progress to occur while more and better information is collected and the effectiveness of current actions is evaluated. Table 4-y lists specific actions the Water Board will use to track its progress and an implementation timeframe. If the Water Board determines that expected actions by responsible parties are not occurring or are not sufficient to attain allocations and targets, the Water Board will consider appropriate response actions to improve implementation or otherwise consider revisions to the strategy.

**TABLE 4-y**  
**Water Board Implementation Measure Tracking**

<b><u>Action</u></b>	<b><u>Schedule</u></b>
<u>Summarize pesticide regulatory activities as they relate to water quality, and identify opportunities to advise pesticide regulatory oversight agencies regarding future actions</u>	<u>Annually</u>
<u>Summarize research and monitoring data for pesticide regulatory oversight agencies and others, and determine where to focus future monitoring efforts based on critical data needs</u>	<u>Annually</u>
<u>Describe urban pesticide use trends and identify pesticides likely to affect water quality</u>	<u>Annually</u>
<u>Notify pesticide regulatory oversight agencies if water quality standard violations exist or are likely to exist in the future due to pesticide discharges</u>	<u>At least annually</u>
<u>Identify waters impaired by pesticide-related toxicity and waters where there is a potential for impairment</u>	<u>Biannually</u>
<u>Meet or correspond with pesticide regulatory oversight agencies regarding their roles in protecting water quality</u>	<u>At least annually</u>
<u>Place required actions in NPDES stormwater permits</u>	<u>No later than five years from effective date of strategy</u>
<u>Report implementation status to Water Board</u>	<u>Annually</u>

### **Periodic Review**

The Water Board will review this strategy approximately every five years. The reviews will be coordinated through the Water Board's continuing planning program and will provide opportunities for stakeholder participation. If any modifications are needed, they will be incorporated into the Basin Plan. At a minimum, the following focusing questions will be used to conduct the reviews. Additional focusing questions will be developed in collaboration with stakeholders during each review.

1. Are changes in urban creek conditions moving toward improvements in water quality (e.g., toward target attainment)?
2. If it is unclear whether there is progress, how should monitoring efforts be modified to measure trends?
3. If there has not been adequate progress, how might the implementation actions or allocations be modified to improve progress?
4. Is there new information that suggests the need to modify the targets, allocations, or implementation actions?
5. If so, how should the strategy be modified?

During the periodic reviews, the Water Board will consider newly available information regarding such topics as market trends, monitoring results, tools for risk evaluation, outreach effectiveness, and regulatory actions.

### **Additional Sources**

As the strategy is implemented, additional sources of pesticide-related toxicity may emerge, either as the result of a new discharge or a new pesticide being applied. In such situations, the allocations for additional sources shall be the same as those for the existing sources unless the Water Board finds these allocations to be inappropriate or chooses to refine the strategy in some other manner.

### **Critical Data Needs**

Various types of information and tools are needed to adequately evaluate the risks associated with pesticide runoff. To the extent possible, the pesticide industry should shoulder the burden of collecting this information and developing appropriate tools. At times, however, the citizens of the Region (as represented by the Water Boards, the urban runoff management agencies, and others) should lead by example. Therefore, the pesticide industry should undertake and others should support and promote the following actions:

- Conduct surveillance monitoring of surface waters and sediment and publicly report the results;
- Develop publicly available and commercially viable analytical methods to detect ecologically relevant concentrations of pesticides that pose water quality risks;
- Develop procedures that can be used to identify potential causes of toxicity in water and sediment (e.g., Toxicity Identification Evaluation procedures);
- Complete publicly available studies that characterize the fate and transport of pesticides applied in urban areas;
- Develop and adopt evaluation methods (e.g., quantitative fate and transport models) for urban pesticide applications, including applications to impervious surfaces; and
- Complete publicly available studies to support the development of water quality criteria for pesticides in water and sediment.

**The following changes shown in double underline/strikeout apply to the section titled “CONTINUING PLANNING” in Chapter 4.**

**Regional Board Resource Allocation**

The items indicated below have been identified in this review as specific areas for which Water Board planning resources should be allocated. The items are divided into categories and each item is followed by an estimate of the frequency at which the item will be reviewed or the staff time and/or contract dollars needed to complete the item. Resolution of these items may result in future Basin Plan amendments.

TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD	
<u>Review the Water Quality Attainment Strategy and TMDL for Diazinon and Pesticide-Related Toxicity in Urban Creeks, and evaluate new and relevant information from monitoring, special studies, and scientific literature. Determine if modifications to the targets, allocations, or implementation plan are necessary.</u>	<u>Every 5 years</u>