

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

**RESOLUTION R2-2007-0011**

**AMENDING THE WATER QUALITY CONTROL PLAN FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY  
REGION TO ESTABLISH A TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD (TMDL) FOR SEDIMENT  
IN THE NAPA RIVER, AND AN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN TO ACHIEVE THE TMDL  
AND RELATED HABITAT ENHANCEMENT GOALS**

WHEREAS the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region (Water Board), finds that:

1. An updated Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Region (Basin Plan) was adopted by the Water Board on January 21, 2004, approved by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) on July 22, 2004, and approved by the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) on October 4, 2005.
2. The Basin Plan may be amended in accordance with California Water Code § 13240, et seq.
3. The Basin Plan amendment, including specifications on its physical placement in the Basin Plan, is set forth in Exhibit A. The Basin Plan amendment will establish the following: a) a sediment TMDL for the Napa River at 125 percent of natural background (185,000 metric tons/year); b) numeric targets for spawning gravel permeability and the depth of streambed scour; c) allocations for all significant sediment sources; and d) an implementation plan to achieve the TMDL and related habitat enhancement goals.
4. The Napa River is listed pursuant to Federal Clean Water Act § 303(d) requirements as an impaired waterbody due to fine sediment deposition.
5. The Napa River is not meeting narrative water quality objectives for sediment, settleable material, and population and community ecology, due to excess erosion and sedimentation in the Napa River watershed.
6. Under Clean Water Act § 303(d), the Water Board is required and authorized to establish the total maximum daily load (TMDL) for those pollutants identified as causing impairment of waters on the § 303(d) list. Additionally, under California Water Code § 13242 the Water Board is authorized to develop an implementation program for achieving water quality objectives.
7. The scientific basis for the TMDL was subjected to an independent, external peer review pursuant to the requirements of California Health and Safety Code § 57004. Water Board staff revised the proposed Basin Plan amendment in response to the comments provided by the reviewers, or provided a written response which explained the basis for not incorporating their comments. The peer reviewers' responses confirmed that the rule making portions of

the proposed TMDL and implementation plan are based on sound scientific knowledge, methods, and practices.

8. A draft Basin Plan amendment, Staff Report, and Environmental Checklist were prepared, publicly noticed, and distributed for public review and comment on June 30, 2006, in accordance with applicable state and federal laws and regulations.
9. On September 13, 2006, the Water Board held a public hearing to consider the Basin Plan amendment, after a 45-day public comment period.
10. On January 23, 2007, the Water Board held a second public hearing to consider the Basin Plan amendment, and the changes made thereto in response to public comments.
11. The process of basin planning 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. The Basin Plan amendment package includes a Staff Report, an Environmental Checklist, an assessment of the potential environmental impacts of the Basin Plan amendment, and a discussion of alternatives. The Basin Plan amendment, Environmental Checklist, Staff Report, and supporting documentation serve as a substitute environmental document under the Water Board's certified regulatory program. 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 not have any significant impact on the environment. The Water Board further finds, based on consideration of the record as a whole, that there is no potential for adverse effect, either individually or cumulatively, on wildlife as a result of the proposed Basin Plan amendment.
12. The Water Board has carefully considered all comments and testimony received, including responses thereto, on the Basin Plan amendment, as well as all of the evidence in the administrative record.
13. The Basin Plan amendment must be submitted for review and approval by the State Board, OAL, and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). Once approved by the State Board, the amendment will be submitted to OAL and USEPA. The Basin Plan amendment will become effective upon approval by OAL and USEPA.


NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. The Water Board adopts the Basin Plan amendment as set forth in Exhibit A hereto, that establishes the TMDL and Implementation Plan to achieve the TMDL and related habitat enhancement goals.
2. The Executive Officer is directed to forward copies of the Basin Plan amendment to the State Board in accordance with the requirement of California Water Code § 13245.
3. The Water Board requests that the State Board approve the Basin Plan amendment, in accordance with the requirements of California Water Code § 13245 and § 13246, and forward it to the OAL and USEPA for approval.
4. If, during the approval process, Water Board staff, the State 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.

5. Because 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 January 23, 2007.

  
BRUCE H. WOLFE  
Executive Officer

Attachment

Exhibit A - Basin Plan Amendment to Establish a Total Maximum Daily Load for Sediment in Napa River and an Implementation Plan to Achieve the TMDL and Related Habitat Enhancement Goals

*The following text is proposed for insertion into Chapter 7, Water Quality Attainment Strategies including Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs). Because this text would be added in its entirety, it is not shown below in underline/strikeout.*

## **Napa River Sediment Reduction and Habitat Enhancement Plan**

The goals of the Napa River Sediment Reduction and Habitat Enhancement Plan (Plan) are to:

- Conserve the steelhead trout population
- Establish a self-sustaining Chinook salmon population
- Enhance the overall health of the native fish community
- Enhance the aesthetic and recreational values of the river and its tributaries

To achieve these goals, specific actions are needed to:

- Attain and maintain suitable gravel quality and diverse streambed topography in freshwater reaches of Napa River and its tributaries
- Protect and/or enhance base flows in tributaries and the mainstem of the Napa River
- Reduce the number and significance of human-made structures in channels that block or impede fish passage
- Maintain and/or decrease summer water temperatures in tributaries to the Napa River

The following sections establish:

1. A sediment total maximum daily load (TMDL) defining the allowable amount of sediment that can be discharged into the Napa River, expressed as a percentage of the natural background sediment delivery rate to channels
2. An implementation plan to achieve the TMDL and related habitat enhancement goals

### **Problem Statement**

Steelhead and salmon populations in the Napa River and its tributaries have declined substantially since the late 1940s. Results of recent analyses of fisheries and sediment sources indicate that:

1. **Spawning and juvenile rearing habitat for salmon and steelhead are adversely affected by high concentrations of fine sediment (primarily sand) deposited in the bed of the Napa River and its tributaries.**

Successful reproduction by salmon and steelhead depends on adequate flow through streambed gravels (permeability) in order for eggs to hatch and larvae to grow. As the concentration of fine sediment (primarily sand) in the streambed increases, permeability decreases, which in turn increases egg and larval mortality, and ultimately causes a decrease in the number of young fish that emerge from the streambed. Similarly, as the concentration of sand in the streambed increases, the frequency and extent of streambed scour is intensified, further increasing mortality between spawning and emergence by washing eggs and/or larvae out of the bed during common high flow events.

Even small increases in the concentration of fine sediment in the streambed may degrade the quality of rearing habitat for juvenile steelhead and salmon. Young steelhead need open spaces between clusters of large cobbles and boulders in order to escape high flows and predation during the winter. Similarly, as the concentration of fine sediment in the streambed increases, growth and survival of juvenile steelhead and salmon decreases as a consequence of lower biomass of aquatic insect prey species, and increasing activity level, aggressive behavior, and attacks between juvenile salmon and steelhead as they compete for food.

- 2. Channel incision has greatly reduced the quantity and quality of spawning and rearing habitat for Chinook salmon in Napa River watershed. Habitat losses as a result of incision exert a significant negative influence on freshwater growth and survival of juvenile salmon, and therefore, on the number of Chinook salmon that ultimately return to spawn.**

Channel incision, the progressive lowering over time of streambed elevation as a result of net erosion, has lowered the streambed of the mainstem of the Napa River by more than two meters since the start of the current episode of incision, which began sometime after 1965. As a result, habitat is being degraded. The channel has become isolated from its flood plain and there has been a large reduction in the size and frequency of riffles, gravel bars, side channels, and sloughs. These habitats provide essential spawning and juvenile rearing habitat for Chinook salmon. Human activities that have contributed to channel incision in the River, including (but not necessarily limited to) levee building, development projects that have increased peak runoff during storms, construction of large tributary dams, straightening of some mainstem channel reaches, filling of side channels, historical gravel mining, dredging to reduce flood risk, and intensive removal of large woody debris.

- 3. Low flows and stressful water temperatures during the dry season, and fish migration barriers exert a significant negative influence on the number (and fitness) of juvenile steelhead that migrate to the ocean from the watershed, and as such, on the number of adults that successfully return to spawn.**

Drifting aquatic insects produced in riffles often are the primary source of food for juvenile steelhead. Low or no flow over riffles during the dry season greatly reduces this food source. An association between low and/or negative growth rates in juvenile steelhead and poor baseflow persistence was documented in the summer and fall of 2001 in Napa River watershed. Summer water temperatures in tributaries also are often stressful to juvenile steelhead, likely contributing to poor growth rates that were documented. If low growth rates in summer are not mitigated by high rates of growth during other times of the year, significant reductions in survival rates during all subsequent life stages may result.

Poor access to and from potential spawning and rearing habitat due to man-made structures built in channels (e.g., dams, road crossings, weirs, etc.) and human water uses have reduced the size of the steelhead run in the Napa River watershed. For

example, approximately 30 percent of the land area in Napa River watershed drains into over 400 reservoirs constructed on stream channels.

Due to excess erosion and sedimentation in the Napa River Watershed, the narrative water quality objectives for sediment and settleable material are not being met and cold freshwater habitat, wildlife habitat, fish spawning, recreation, and preservation of rare and endangered species beneficial uses are impaired. In addition, channel incision has reduced the quantity of gravel bars, riffles, side channels, and sloughs, which threatens Chinook salmon and other fish and aquatic wildlife species. Channel incision is a controllable water quality factor that is contributing to a violation of the narrative water quality objective for population and community ecology.

**Numeric Targets**

Meeting the numeric targets listed in Table 1 will allow water quality in the Napa River and its tributaries to achieve the Basin Plan’s narrative water quality objectives for sediment, settleable material, and population and community ecology.

**Table 1. TMDL sediment targets for the Napa River and its Tributaries**

Spawning gravel permeability	Median value $\geq 7000$ cm/hr <sup>a</sup>
Streambed scour	Mean depth of scour $\leq 15$ cm <sup>b</sup>
<p><sup>a</sup> Target applies to all potential spawning sites for steelhead and salmon in the Napa River and its tributaries, excluding those upstream of municipal water supply reservoirs.</p> <p><sup>b</sup> Target applies to the response of the streambed to peak flows less than the bankfull event at all potential spawning sites for salmon in gravel-bedded reaches of: 1) mainstem Napa River; and 2) alluvial reaches of tributaries where streambed slope is between 0.001 and 0.02. Potential spawning sites can be identified based on the following: 1) dominant substrate size in the streambed surface layer is between 8 and 128 mm; 2) minimum surface area of gravel deposit is 0.2 square meters in tributaries and 1.0 square meter in mainstem Napa River; or 3) located within mainstem Napa River at a riffle head, pool tail, and/or pool margin or in tributary reaches where streambed slope <math>&lt; 0.03</math>, or in tributary reaches where streambed slope <math>&gt; 0.03</math> in pool tails, backwater pools, and/or in gravel deposits associated with flow obstructions (e.g., woody debris, boulders, banks, etc.).</p>	

## Sources

Field inventories conducted throughout the watershed provide credible estimates of the rates and sizes of sediment delivered to Napa River watershed channels between 1994 and 2004. Based on this work, and application of channel and reservoir mapping, the Water Board concludes that:

1. More than half of fine sediment delivered to Napa River during the 1994–2004 period is associated with land use activities including roads, human-caused channel incision, vineyards, intensive historical livestock grazing, and urban stormwater runoff.
2. In addition to its prominence in the sediment budget, channel incision is the primary agent for isolation of the channel from its flood plain and a reduction in the quantity and frequency of spawning and rearing habitat for salmon and steelhead in Napa River and the lower reaches of its tributaries.
3. Channel sediment loads vary greatly depending upon nature of underlying bedrock or sediment deposits, land use activities, and the location of dams.
4. Thirty percent of the watershed drains into reservoirs constructed on tributary channels. These reservoirs capture all of the gravel and sand, and most of the finer sediment input to upstream channels. Nonetheless, anthropogenic activities, downstream of dams, are contributing enough sediment such that the fine sediment load is substantially elevated in the Napa River downstream of the reservoirs.

Mean annual sediment delivery rate to channels is estimated to have been 272,000 metric tons per year during the period from 1994 to 2004, which when considered in relation to the land area draining into the Napa River at Soda Creek (e.g., 584 km<sup>2</sup>), equals 466 metric tons per km<sup>2</sup> per year (Table 2). The natural background rate of sediment delivery during this period, absent dams and human-caused erosion is estimated to have been 252 metric tons per km<sup>2</sup> per year, which is calculated from Table 2 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &48,000 \text{ metric tons/year—sediment deposited in tributary reservoirs} \\ &7,000 \text{ metric tons/year—sediment discharged through dams on tributaries} \\ &92,000 \text{ metric tons/year—input to channels downstream of reservoirs} \\ &147,000 \text{ metric tons/year} \\ \\ &147,000 \text{ metric tons}/584 \text{ km}^2\text{—land area draining to Napa R. at Soda Creek} \\ &=252 \text{ metric tons}/\text{km}^2\text{/year} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore total sediment load in the Napa River at Soda Creek is estimated to have been 185 percent of natural background (e.g.,  $466/252 = 185\%$ ) during 1994-2004. Table 2 breaks down the sediment sources to the Napa River, with annual average rate calculated at Soda Creek over the 10-year study period.

**Table 2. Mean Annual Sediment Delivery to Napa River at Soda Creek (1994-2004)**

Source	Estimated Mean Annual Delivery Rate (metric tons/yr)
<b>Land areas upstream of dams</b> (fine sediment discharged from reservoirs)	
▪ Natural Processes	7,000
▪ Human Actions	11,000
<b>Land areas downstream of dams</b>	
▪ Natural Processes:	92,000
▪ Human actions:	
○ Channel incision and associated bank erosion	37,000
○ Road-related sediment delivery (all processes)	55,000
○ Surface erosion associated with vineyards and/or livestock grazing	37,000
○ Gullies and shallow landslides associated with vineyards, and/or intensive historical grazing	30,000
○ Urban Stormwater Runoff and Wastewater Discharges	2,500
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>272,000</b>
Notes: Drainage area for Napa River at Soda Creek = 584 km <sup>2</sup> . Estimates above do not include sediment deposited and retained in tributary reservoirs, which includes all gravel and sand, and most of the finer sediment input to channels located upstream of the reservoirs. Approximately 104,000 metric tons per year of sediment are deposited in tributary reservoirs, 48,000 metric tons per year of which is derived from natural processes. Above estimates are rounded to the nearest thousandth	

**Total Maximum Daily Load and Allocations**

The Napa River sediment TMDL is established at 185,000 metric tons per year, which is approximately 125 percent of natural background load (based on sediment load estimates from the 1994-2004 period) calculated at Soda Creek. Natural background load depends upon natural processes, and varies significantly. Therefore, the TMDL and allocations are expressed both in terms of sediment mass and percent of natural background. The percentage based TMDL, 125% of natural background, applies throughout the watershed. In order to achieve the TMDL, controllable sediment delivery resulting from human actions needs to be reduced by approximately 50 percent from current proportion of the total load (Tables 3a and 3b). TMDL attainment will be evaluated at the confluence of Napa River with Soda Creek, which approximates the downstream boundary of freshwater habitat for salmon and steelhead. Attainment of the TMDL will be evaluated over a 5-to-10-year averaging period.

Because dams trap almost all upstream sediment inputs to channels, natural sediment input to channels downstream of dams equals only 62 percent of the total natural background load (e.g. amount that would have been input to Napa River absent dams and human caused erosion). Almost 50 percent of the TMDL can be allocated to human-caused sources. The TMDL equal to

125 percent of natural background load, can be achieved if human-related sources are reduced to the level of the allocations shown in Tables 3a and 3b).

**Table 3a. Load Allocations**

Source category	Load during 1994-2004		Estimated reductions needed (percentage)	Load allocations	
	Metric tons/year	Percentage of Natural Background		Metric tons/year	Percentage of Natural Background
<b>Land areas upstream of dams</b>					
▪ Natural processes	7,000	4.8	0	7,000	4.8
▪ Human actions	11,000	7.5	51	5,000	3.6
<b>Land areas downstream of dams</b>					
▪ Natural processes	92,000	63	0	92,000	63
▪ Human actions:					
○ Channel incision and associated bank erosion	37,000	25	51	18,000	12
○ Roads	55,000	38	51	27,000	18
○ Surface erosion associated with vineyards and grazing	37,000	25	51	18,000	12
○ Gullies and shallow landslides associated with vineyards, and/or intensive historical grazing	30,000	20	51	15,000	10
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>269,000</b>			<b>182,000</b>	<b>123</b>
Note: Above estimates for loads, percent reductions, and allocations are rounded to two significant figures					

**Table 3b. Wasteload Allocations for Urban Runoff and Wastewater Discharges**

Point Source Category	Current Load		Reductions needed (percentage)	Wasteload Allocations	
	Metric tons/year	Percentage of Natural Background		Metric tons/year	Percent of Natural Background
Construction Stormwater-NPDES Permit No. CAS000002	500	0.3	0	500	0.3
Municipal Stormwater NPDES Permit No. CAS000004	800	0.5	0	800	0.5
Industrial Stormwater NPDES Permit No. CAS000001	500	0.3	0	500	0.3
Caltrans Stormwater-NPDES Permit No. CAS000003	600	0.4	0	600	0.4
<b>Wastewater Treatment Plant Discharges<sup>a</sup></b>					
City of St. Helena NPDES Permit No. CA0038016	30	<0.1	0	30	<0.1
Town of Yountville/CA Veteran's Home NPDES Permit No. CA0038121	30	<0.1	0	30	<0.1
City of Calistoga NPDES Permit No. CA0037966	40	<0.1	0	40	<0.1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2500</b>	<b>2</b>		<b>2500</b>	<b>2</b>
a. For wastewater treatment plant discharges, compliance with existing permit effluent limit of 30 mg/L of TSS is consistent with these wasteload allocations Note: Above estimates for loads, percent reductions, and allocations are rounded to two significant figures					

**IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

The Implementation actions described below are to achieve TMDL targets and allocations and habitat enhancement goals. In addition, actions specified in this plan are expected to enhance steelhead run size and facilitate establishment of a self-sustaining Chinook salmon run.

**Regulatory Tools**

The only point sources of sediment identified in Tables 2 and 3b are those associated with urban stormwater runoff (e.g., municipal stormwater, runoff from State highways, and industrial and construction discharges) and wastewater treatment plants, which are regulated by NPDES permits. Table 4.0 shows implementation required of these sources.

The state's Policy for Implementation and Enforcement of the Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program requires regulation of nonpoint source discharges using the Water Board's administrative permitting authorities, including waste discharge requirements (WDRs), waiver of WDRs, Basin Plan Discharge Prohibitions, or some combination of these. Consistent with this policy, Tables 4.1 – 4.4 specify actions and performance standards by nonpoint source category, as needed to achieve TMDL, sediment targets and allocations in Napa River watershed. The Water Board will consider adopting conditions for waiving WDRs that apply to the nonpoint sources (vineyards, grazing, roads, etc.) listed in Tables 4.1 – 4.4, address all pollutants of concern, protect all beneficial uses, and balance the agricultural, environmental, recreational, and residential needs of the watershed.

**Table 4.0 TMDL Implementation measures for Sediment Discharges Associated with Urban Stormwater Runoff and Wastewater Discharges**

Source Category	Actions	Implementing Parties
Urban Stormwater Runoff and wastewater discharges	Comply with applicable NPDES permits	Napa County, City of Napa, Town of Yountville, City of St. Helena, City of Calistoga, City of American Canyon, State of California, Department of Transportation, California Veterans' Home, owners or operators of industrial facilities and construction projects > 1 acre

Problems associated with channel incision, related rapid bank erosion, and loss of essential habitat features, reflect and integrate multiple historical and ongoing disturbances, some of which are local and direct, and others that are indirect and distal. Effectively addressing these issues will require cooperative and coordinated actions by multiple landowners, working with public agencies, over significant distances along the river. The most effective means of controlling channel incision and reducing related fine sediment delivery to the river is a channel restoration program that re-establishes width-to-depth ratios and sinuosity values conducive to formation of alternate bars and a modest flood plain. The Water Board will work with stakeholders along Napa River, through local stewardship groups, to implement such channel restoration/habitat enhancement projects. Tables 5.1 to 5.4 (Recommended Measures to Protect or Enhance Habitat), specify actions to address adverse impacts of channel incision on salmon habitat quantity and quality, and to accomplish habitat enhancement goals for flow, temperature, and fish passage for steelhead and salmon.

Individual landowners or coalitions may work with "third parties" to develop and implement sediment pollutant control programs. With regard to achievement of actions to protect or enhance baseflow, fish passage, habitat complexity, and stream temperature, the effectiveness of the recommended actions specified in Tables 5.1 through 5.4, will be evaluated as part of the adaptive implementation program.

**Table 4.1 Required and Trackable TMDL Implementation Measures for Sediment Discharges Associated with Vineyards<sup>1</sup>**

Land Use Category	Sources and Performance Standards	Actions	Implementing Parties	Completion Dates
Vineyards	<p><b>Surface Erosion associated with vineyards:</b> Comply with conservation regulations (County Code, Chapter 18.108); <b>and</b></p> <p><b>Roads:</b> Road-related sediment delivery to channels ≤ 500 cubic yards per mile per 20-year period; <b>and</b></p> <p><b>Gullies and/or shallow landslides:</b> Accelerate natural recovery and minimize human-caused increases in sediment delivery from unstable areas; <b>or</b></p> <p>Implement farm plan certified under Fish Friendly Farming Environmental Certification Program or other farm plan certification program approved as part of a WDRs waiver policy</p>	<p>Submit a Report of Waste Discharge<sup>2</sup> (RoWD) to the Water Board that provides, at a minimum, the following: a description of the vineyard; identification of site-specific erosion control measures needed to achieve performance standard(s) specified in this table; and a schedule for implementation of identified erosion control measures.</p>	<p>Vineyard owner and/or operator</p>	<p>October 2012</p>
		<p>Comply with applicable waste discharge requirements (WDRs) or waiver of WDRs.</p>	<p>Vineyard owner and/or operator</p>	<p>As specified in applicable WDRs or waiver of WDRs</p>
		<p>Report progress on implementation of site specific erosion control measures.<sup>3</sup></p>	<p>Vineyard owner and/or operator</p>	<p>As specified in applicable WDRs or waiver of WDRs</p>
<p><sup>1</sup> Does not apply to parcels upstream of municipal reservoirs, where measures required per Napa County Code (Chapter 18.108), are sufficient to achieve sediment load allocations, and/or parcels classified by Napa County as "rural residential" (2% of unincorporated area in Napa County), where Water Board will rely on education and outreach and participation in voluntary programs.</p> <p><sup>2</sup> Or compliance with applicable conditional waivers of WDRs that may be adopted by the Water Board.</p> <p><sup>3</sup> Reports may be submitted individually or jointly through a recognized third party.</p>				

**Table 4.2 Required TMDL Implementation Measures for Sediment Discharges Associated with Grazing<sup>1</sup>**

Land Use Category	Source(s) and Performance Standard(s)	Actions	Implementing Parties	Completion Dates
<b>Grazing</b>	<p><b>Surface erosion associated with livestock grazing:</b> Attain or exceed minimal residual dry matter values consistent with University of California Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources guidelines <b>and</b></p> <p><b>Roads:</b> Road-related sediment delivery to channels ≤ 500 cubic yards per mile per 20-year period <b>and</b></p>	<p>Submit a Report of Waste Discharge<sup>2</sup> to the Water Board that provides, at a minimum, the following: description of the property; identification of site-specific erosion control measures to achieve performance standard(s) specified in this table; and a schedule for implementation of identified erosion control measures.</p>	<p>Landowner and/or ranch operator</p>	<p>October 2012</p>
	<p><b>Gullies and/or shallow landslides:</b> Accelerate natural recovery and minimize human-caused increases in sediment delivery from unstable areas</p>	<p>Comply with applicable waste discharge requirements (WDRs) or waiver of WDRs.</p>		
		<p>Report progress on implementation of site specific erosion control measures.<sup>3</sup></p>	<p>Landowner and/or ranch operator</p>	<p>As specified in applicable WDRs or waiver of WDRs</p>
	<p><sup>1</sup> Does not apply to parcels upstream of municipal reservoirs, where measures required per Napa County Code (Chapter 18.108), are sufficient to achieve sediment load allocations, and/or parcels classified by Napa County as "rural residential" (2% of unincorporated area in Napa County), where Water Board will rely on education and outreach and participation in voluntary programs.</p> <p><sup>2</sup> Or compliance with applicable conditional waivers of WDRs that may be adopted by the Water Board.</p> <p><sup>3</sup> These reports may be prepared individually or jointly or through a recognized third party.</p>			

**Table 4.3 Required TMDL Implementation Measures for Sediment Discharges Associated with Rural Lands<sup>1, 3</sup>**

Land Use Category	Sources and Performance Standards	Actions	Implementing Parties	Completion Dates
Rural Lands	<p><b>Roads:</b> Road-related sediment delivery to channels <math>\leq</math> 500 cubic yards per mile per 20-year period; <b>and</b></p> <p><b>Gullies and/or shallow landslides:</b> Accelerate natural recovery, and minimize human caused increases in sediment delivery from unstable areas.</p>	<p>Submit a Report of Waste Discharge<sup>2</sup> to the Water Board that provides, at a minimum, the following: description of the property; identification of site-specific erosion control measures to achieve performance standard(s) specified in this table; and a schedule for implementation of identified erosion control measures.</p>	Landowners	October 2012
		<p>Comply with applicable Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) or waiver of WDRs.</p>	Landowners	As specified in applicable WDRs or waiver of WDRs
		<p>Report progress on implementation of-site specific erosion control measures.<sup>4</sup></p>	Landowners	As specified in applicable WDRs or waiver of WDRs
<p><sup>1</sup> Does not apply to parcels upstream of municipal reservoirs, where measures required per Napa County Code (Chapter 18.108), are sufficient to achieve sediment load allocations, and/or parcels classified by Napa County as "rural residential" (2% of unincorporated area in Napa County), where Water Board will rely on education and outreach and participation in voluntary programs.</p> <p><sup>2</sup> Or compliance with applicable conditional waivers of WDRs that may be adopted by the Water Board</p> <p><sup>3</sup> Rural lands, per Napa County definition include: non-farmed and non-grazing portions of parcels &gt;10-ac that contain one or more residences, and/or a winery; vacant residential parcels &gt;10-acres; and/or portions of 10-acre or larger parcels with secondary vineyard, orchard, and/or grazing</p> <p><sup>4</sup> These reports may be prepared individually or jointly or through a recognized third party.</p>				

**Table 4.4 Required TMDL Implementation Measures for Sediment Discharges associated with Parks and Open Space, and/or Municipal Public Works<sup>1</sup>**

Landowner Type	Sources and Performance Standards	Actions	Implementing Parties	Completion Dates
<b>PARKS AND OPEN SPACE AND PUBLIC WORKS</b>	<p><b>Roads:</b> Road-related sediment delivery to channels <math>\leq</math> 500 cubic yards per mile per 20-year period<sup>2</sup>; and</p> <p><b>Gullies and/or shallow landslides:</b> Accelerate natural recovery, and minimize human caused increases in sediment delivery from unstable areas.</p>	<p>Submit a Report of Waste Discharge<sup>2</sup> to Water Board that provides, at a minimum, the following: description of the road network and/or segments; identification of erosion and sediment control measures to achieve performance standard(s) specified in this table; and a schedule for implementation of identified control measures. For paved roads, erosion and sediment control actions could primarily focus on road crossings to meet the performance standard.</p> <p>Adopt and implement best management practices for maintenance of unimproved (dirt/gravel) roads, and conduct a survey of stream-crossings associated with paved public roadways, and develop a prioritized implementation plan for repair and/or replacement of high priority crossings/culverts to reduce road-related erosion and protect stream-riparian habitat conditions.</p>	<p>Napa County Stormwater Management Program</p> <p>State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation</p> <p>State of California, Department of Transportation</p>	October 2012
		<p>Comply with applicable Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) or waiver of WDRs.</p>	Landowners	As specified in applicable WDRs or waiver of WDRs, and/or the SWMP
		<p>Report progress on development and implementation of best management practices to control road-related erosion.<sup>3</sup></p>	Landowners	As specified in applicable WDRs or waiver of WDRs, and/or SWMP
<p><sup>1</sup> Does not apply to parcels upstream of municipal reservoirs, where measures required per Napa County Code (Chapter 18.108), are sufficient to achieve sediment load allocations, and/or parcels classified by Napa County as "rural residential" (2% of unincorporated area in Napa County), where Water Board will rely on education and outreach and participation in voluntary programs.</p> <p><sup>2</sup> Or compliance with applicable conditional waivers of WDRs that may be adopted by the Water Board.</p> <p><sup>3</sup> These reports may be prepared individually or jointly or through a recognized third party.</p>				

**Table 5.1 Recommended Actions to Reduce Sediment Load and Enhance Habitat Complexity in Napa River and its Tributaries**

Stressor	Management Objective(s)	Actions	Implementing Parties	Completion Dates and Notes
<p><b>Habitat degradation</b> as a result of mainstem Napa River and lower reaches of its larger tributaries incising.</p>	<p>Reduce rates of sediment delivery (associated with incision and accelerated bank erosion) to channels, by 50 percent</p> <p>Enhance channel habitat as needed to support self-sustaining run of Chinook salmon and enhance the overall health of the native fish community.</p>	<p>1.1 Develop and implement plans to enhance stream-riparian habitat conditions, and reduce fine sediment supply in mainstem Napa River and lower tributary reaches</p>	<p>Landowners and/or designated agents, and reach-based stewardships</p>	<p>Comply with conditions of Clean Water Act Section 401 certifications (implementation of Rutherford Project completed by fall 2015, other projects by 2025)</p>
<p><b>Habitat degradation</b> as a result of reduction in large woody debris in stream channels.</p>	<p>Enhance quality of rearing habitat for juvenile salmonids</p>	<p>1.2 Develop and implement performance standards for protection of ecologically significant large woody debris in stream channels.</p>	<p>Napa County Stormwater Management Program and State Department of Parks and Recreation</p>	<p>Fall 2008</p>

**Table 5.2 Recommended actions to protect or enhance baseflow**

Stressor	Management Objective	Action(s)	Implementing Parties	Schedule/Notes
Low flows during dry season	Maintain suitable conditions for juvenile rearing, and smolt migration to Napa River estuary	2.1. Establish guidelines to maintain in-stream flow to protect salmonids	State Water Board (Division of Water Rights)	By January 1, 2008
		2.2. Local, state, and federal agencies to participate in a cooperative partnership to develop a plan for joint resolution of water supply reliability and fisheries conservation concerns	Local municipalities working with Water Board, State Water Board (Division of Water Rights), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries Service (NOAA), and California Department Fish and Game (DFG)	Adopt plan by fall 2010.
		2.3. Install and maintain dial-up water-level gage programs and implement public education program in 10 key tributaries for steelhead	Local public agencies	Accomplish by Spring of 2010
		2.4. Develop water-level guidelines to support juvenile salmonid rearing and migration	Local public agencies	Adopt guidelines by spring of 2010
		2.5. Conduct water rights compliance survey to protect fish and water rights	State Water Board (Division of Water Rights)	Schedule per consultation with NOAA, DFG, and Water Board

**Table 5.3 Recommended Actions to Restore to Fish Passage**

Stressor	Management Objective(s)	Action(s)	Implementing Parties	Schedule/Notes
Structures in channels that block or impede fish migration (note: flow-related barriers are addressed above)	No significant structural impediments to salmonid migration in mainstem or in 10 key tributaries for steelhead (including but not limited to the following): Dry, Milliken, Redwood, Sulphur, and York  Designation of remaining tributaries will be determined in consultation with Napa County RCD, CDFG, NOAA Fisheries, and USEPA	3.1. Enhance conditions for adult and juvenile salmon and juvenile steelhead passage at Zinfandel Lane	Local public agencies and landowners	Project completed by fall of 2010
		3.2. Restore passage for adult and juvenile steelhead to-and-from York Creek upstream of Upper Dam	City of St. Helena	Schedule to be determined based on consultation with National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries Service (NOAA), and California Department Fish and Game (DFG)
		3.3. Identify and develop a plan-to remedy all significant structural impediments to salmonid migration in ten key steelhead tributaries (including York)	Local public agencies and landowners	Complete comprehensive fish passage surveys in 10 key tributaries by Fall 2010. Schedule for barrier remediation to be determined based on consultation with NOAA and DFG.

**Table 5.4 Recommended Actions to Protect and/or Enhance Stream Temperature**

Stressor	Management Objective(s)	Action(s)	Implementing Parties	Schedule/Notes
Stressful summer water temperatures in tributaries	Protect and/or enhance baseflow	4.1. As described in Table 5.2	As indicated in Table 5.2	As described in Table 5.2
	Enhance amount of ecologically significant large woody debris in channels	4.2. As described in Table 5.1	As indicated in Table 5.1	As described in Table 5.1
	Enhance potential shade along riparian corridors	4.3.-Implement management actions to accelerate recovery of native riparian tree species	As indicated in Tables 4.1 to 4.4.	As described in Tables 4.1 to 4.4.

### **Agricultural Water Quality Control Program Costs**

Implementation measures for grazing lands and vineyards constitute an agricultural water quality control program and therefore, consistent with California Water Code requirements (Section 13141), the cost of this program is estimated herein. This cost estimate includes the cost of implementing all actions to reduce sediment discharges and enhance habitat complexity as specified in the implementation plan, and is based on costs associated with technical assistance and evaluation, project design, and implementation of actions needed to achieve the TMDL. In estimating costs, the Water Board has assumed that owners of agricultural businesses (e.g., grape growers and ranchers), within the unincorporated area, own 75 percent of total land area on hillside parcels, and 95 percent of the land along Napa River and lower reaches of its tributaries. Based on these assumptions, we estimate total cost for program implementation for agricultural sources could be \$1.9-to-3.4 million per year throughout the 20-year implementation period. More than two-thirds of these potential costs are associated with reducing sediment discharges and enhancing habitat conditions (to address channel incision) in Napa River. Considering potential benefits to the public in terms of ecosystem functions, aesthetics, recreation, and water quality, it is anticipated that at least 75 percent of the cost of these actions will be paid for with public funds. Therefore, the total cost to agricultural businesses associated with efforts to reduce sediment supply and enhance habitat in Napa River is \$800,000 to \$1.7 million per year.

### **Evaluation and Monitoring**

Three types of monitoring are specified to assess progress toward achievement of numeric targets and load allocations for sediment:

- 1) Implementation monitoring to document that required sediment control and habitat enhancement actions are implemented
- 2) Upslope effectiveness monitoring to evaluate effectiveness of sediment control actions in reducing rates of sediment delivery to channels
- 3) In-channel effectiveness monitoring (e.g., spawning gravel permeability and redd scour) to evaluate channel response to management actions and natural processes

Implementation monitoring will be conducted by landowners or designated agents. The purpose of this type of monitoring is to document that sediment control and/or habitat enhancement actions specified herein actually occur.

The Water Board will conduct upslope effectiveness monitoring to evaluate sediment delivery to channels from landuse activities and natural processes. The first update will occur on or before the fall of 2017, when sediment delivery associated with land use activities should be reduced by 25 percent or more. A subsequent update may occur, assuming the numeric targets for sediment are not already achieved, on or before the fall of 2022, when sediment supply associated with land use activities should be reduced by 37 percent or more.

In-channel effectiveness monitoring should be conducted by local government agencies with scientific expertise and demonstrated capability in working effectively with private property owners (to gain permissions for access), as needed to develop a representative sample of stream

habitat conditions, in relation to sediment supply and transport within the watershed. In addition, the Water Board will conduct in-channel effectiveness monitoring as part of the Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program. In-channel effectiveness monitoring needs to include measurements of redd scour and spawning gravel permeability to evaluate attainment of water quality objectives for sediment, settleable material, and population and community ecology. To establish a high level of statistical confidence in estimated values, spawning gravel permeability will need to be measured at 150 or more potential spawning sites located in ten-or-more tributaries, and 50 or more potential spawning sites in the mainstem of the Napa River. Redd scour will need to be measured in the mainstem Napa River at approximately 30 or more potential spawning sites, with 4 or more scour measurements per spawning site. Desired frequency for measurement of permeability and redd scour is once every two to three years. At a minimum, repeat surveys will be conducted once every five years.

In addition to the above described monitoring program to evaluate attainment of numeric targets for sediment, the Water Board will monitor turbidity and residual pool volume. Monitoring will be conducted in a subset of the channel reaches where spawning gravel permeability and/or redd scour are measured. Stream temperature and baseflow persistence will be monitored as part of the Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program.

### **Adaptive Implementation**

In concert with the monitoring program, described above, the Napa River Sediment Reduction and Habitat Enhancement Plan and TMDL will be regularly updated. Results of in-progress or anticipated studies that enhance understanding of the population status of steelhead trout and Chinook salmon in Napa River watershed, and/or factors controlling those populations, may also trigger changes to the plan and TMDL. At a minimum, data in response to the following questions will be considered to guide research and monitoring efforts and focus each subsequent update of the TMDL.

#### **Key Questions to be considered in the course of Adaptive Implementation:**

*1. What is the population status of steelhead and salmon in the watershed?*

An improved understanding of the current status of steelhead and salmon populations in the Napa River watershed is essential for guiding adaptive updates to the management actions recognized in this plan.

Two types of monitoring data may be needed to evaluate the current population status of steelhead in the Napa River watershed: 1) "smolt" production and sizes, and 2) adult spawning run-size. Smolt refers to the life stage when juvenile salmon and trout migrate from freshwater to the ocean. Estimates of smolt production and sizes, and inter-annual variation in these parameters, can provide a strong basis for evaluating population status of ocean migrating species of trout and salmon, and influence of freshwater rearing habitat conditions on number of adults that successfully return to spawn. At least five years of monitoring (trapping) of ocean migrating smolts are needed to evaluate current steelhead population status. In addition to smolt trapping, three or more years of monitoring data are needed to estimate the number of

adult steelhead returning to spawn. This information, when combined with estimates of smolt production and sizes, would provide a basis for assessing the influences of ocean and freshwater habitat on steelhead run-size, for validating smolt production estimates and predictions regarding ocean survival, and ultimately for evaluating the status of the steelhead population in the watershed.

A similar monitoring program is needed to evaluate the current population status of Chinook salmon in Napa River watershed. Such a program might include the following elements: 1) adult spawning run-size and genetic structure; 2) smolt production; and 3) egg survival from spawning to emergence (emergence trapping). During the past two years, the Napa County Resource Conservation District has conducted surveys to estimate the number of adult salmon returning to spawn. These surveys should continue for at least three more years, both to estimate the number of spawners and inter-annual variations, and to collect fin clips, as needed to evaluate origins of the spawning adults (e.g., returning adults or strays from hatcheries or other streams). The hypothesis that Chinook salmon experience very high rates of mortality during all freshwater life stages in the Napa River watershed, could be confirmed or rejected through direct monitoring of egg survival to emergence (emergence trapping), fry survival and growth, and smolt trapping.

*2. What are expected benefits of various actions to enhance habitat for steelhead and salmon?*

For steelhead, the results of in-progress studies of juvenile growth and survival will enhance understanding of the significance of dry season base flow and temperature as potential limiters on steelhead run-size. Other information needed to refine understanding of primary constraints on steelhead population size includes the following: a) comprehensive fish passage evaluations in all key tributaries that provide potential habitat for steelhead; b) dry season water-level monitoring in the same tributaries conducted over two-or-more consecutive years; and c) field surveys to evaluate winter rearing habitat quantity and quality. Given the above sources of information, it may be possible to accurately predict relative increases (high, medium, low) in smolt production associated with various management actions (e.g., baseflow enhancement, fish passage enhancement, reduction in fine sediment supply, etc.) in various locations throughout the watershed.

Key information sources needed to refine understanding of primary controls on Chinook salmon population size include egg survival-to-emergence and controls (e.g., redd scour, gravel permeability), fry survival and growth, and number and sizes of juvenile salmon migrating to the ocean. To this end, pre-and-post project monitoring associated with the proposed Rutherford channel enhancement project may provide an opportunity to determine the amount and types of habitat enhancement actions needed to support a self-sustaining run of Chinook salmon, and to enhance the overall health of the native fish community within the watershed. Key parameters that might be monitored to evaluate fisheries' response to channel enhancement could include: a) changes in quantity, quality, and frequency of key habitat types (e.g., riffles, pools, side channels, gravel bars); b) spawning gravel permeability and scour; c) base flow persistence and temperature; and d) relative abundance of native and introduced fish species.