CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION

Draft Staff Report on Recommended Changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List

27 September 2001

State of California

California Environmental Protection Agency

REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION

Robert Schneider, Chair
Karl E. Longley, Vice Chair
Beverly Alves, Member
Alson Brizard, Member
Christopher Cabaldon, Member
Mark Salvaggio, Member

Gary M. Carlton, Executive Officer

3443 Routier Road, Suite A
Sacramento, California 95827-3003

Phone: (916) 255-3000
CalNet: 8-494-3000

DISCLAIMER

This publication is a technical report by staff of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region. No policy or regulation is either expressed or intended.

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION

Draft Staff Report on Recommended Changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List

September 2001

REPORT PREPARED BY:

JOE KARKOSKI, SR. LAND& WATER USE ANALYST
JERRY BRUNS, ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM MANAGER
GENE DAVIS, ASSOC. ENGINEERING GEOLOGIST
DEBBIE DANIELS, STUDENT ASSISTANT
MARK GOWDY, WATER RESOURCES CONTROL ENGINEER
GREG MARQUIS, SANITARY ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN TRAINEE
DANNY MCCLURE, WATER RESOURCES CONTROL ENGINEER
MARY MENCONI, ENVIRONMENTAL SPECIALIST III
RIK RASMUSSEN, ENVIRONMENTAL SPECIALIST III
CHRISTY SPECTOR, ENVIRONMENTAL SPECIALIST I
STACY STANISH, ENVIRONMENTAL SPECIALIST I
PAT VELLINES, ENGINEERING GEOLOGIST
MICHELLE WOOD, ENVIRONMENTAL SPECIALIST III

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region
Draft Staff Report on Recommended Changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List

Table of Contents

1 Executive Summary

Each of California's nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards has been asked to assist the State Water Resources Control Board in preparing an update to the State's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list (SWRCB, 2001). The 303(d) list identifies surface waters that do not or are not expected to attain water quality standards.

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) staff began the process for developing the 303(d) list by conducting a public solicitation for information, which lasted from 21 February 2001 to 15 May 2001 (CRWQCB-CVR, 2001b). Three public workshops were held during the public solicitation period. Over 70 documents were received from 28 individuals or groups.

Regional Board staff reviewed those documents, as well as over 200 other documents available in the Regional Board files. In reviewing the available information, Regional Board staff evaluated whether applicable water quality objectives adopted by the Regional Board, State Board, or U.S. Environmental Protection Agency were being attained. In those cases in which numeric water quality objectives were not available for a particular pollutant and/or waterbody, Regional Board staff interpreted narrative water quality objectives. Regional Board staff used applicable criteria and guidelines developed by other state and federal agencies, guidelines developed by the National Academy of Sciences and the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, and results of toxicity tests and bioassay to interpret the narrative water quality objectives.

In the absence of new information or criteria, Regional Board staff generally recommended keeping those currently listed water bodies on the 303(d) list. Fact sheets were developed to describe the basis for recommended additions, deletions, or changes to the 303(d) list.

The Regional Board staff recommended changes to the 303(d) list includes the addition of 56 new water bodies and pollutants to the list; removal of 3 water bodies and pollutants from list; and changes to the description of most other water bodies currently listed (e.g. refinement of identified impaired reaches, changes in priority, schedule etc). Regional Board staff has also identified some waters and pollutants that should be assessed further in order to determine whether water quality objectives are being met. The staff recommended 2002 303(d) list for waters in the Central Valley region is shown in Table 1. Recommended additions to the 303(d) list are in **bold** and recommended deletions are shown in strikethrough.

Regional Board staff will consider public comment on the draft staff recommendations until 2 November 2001.

Table 1. California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region Staff Recommended Changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List

Waterbody	Pollutant/Stressor	Affected Size[1]	Units	Priority	TMDL End Date (Year)[2]
American River, Lower	~~Group A Pesticides~~[3]	~~23~~	~~Miles~~	~~Low~~	~~12/11~~
	Mercury	23	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Unknown Toxicity	23	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Arcade Creek	Chlorpyrifos	10	Miles	~~Medium~~ **High**	~~12/11~~ **2003**
	Diazinon	10	Miles	~~Medium~~ **High**	~~12/11~~ **2003**
	Copper	**10**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
Avena Drain	**Ammonia**	**10**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
Bear Creek	**Mercury**	**28**	**Miles**	**High**	**2005**
Bear River, Lower	**Diazinon**	**18**	**Miles**	**Medium**	**2006**
Bear River, Upper	**Mercury**	**8**	**Miles**	**Medium**	**2015**
Berryessa Lake	Mercury	20,700	Acres	~~High~~	~~2005~~ **After 2015**
Black Butte Reservoir	**Mercury**	**4,500**	**Acres**	**Medium**	**2008**
Butte Slough	**Diazinon**	**7.5**	**Miles**	**Medium**	**2009**
	Molinate	**7.5**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
Cache Creek	Mercury	~~35~~ **81**	Miles	High	~~12/2005~~ **2004**
	Unknown Toxicity	~~35~~ **81**	Miles	Medium	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Calaveras River, Lower	**Diazinon**	**30**	**Miles**	**Medium**	**2012**
	Dissolved Oxygen	**5**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
	Pathogens	**8**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
Camanche Reservoir	**Aluminum**	**7,622**	**Acres**	**Low**	**After 2015**
	Copper[5]	**7,622**	**Acres**	**Low**	**After 2015**
	Zinc[5]	**7,622**	**Acres**	**Low**	**After 2015**
Camp Far West Reservoir	**Mercury**	**2,002**	**Acres**	**Medium**	**2015**

Waterbody	Pollutant/Stressor	Affected Size[1]	Units	Priority	TMDL End Date (Year)[2]
Chicken Ranch Slough	Chlorpyrifos	5	Miles	~~Medium~~ **High**	~~12/11~~ **2003**
	Diazinon	5	Miles	~~Medium~~ **High**	~~12/11~~ **2003**
Clear Lake	Mercury	43,000	Acres	High	~~12/2005~~ **2002**
	Nutrients	43,000	Acres	~~Low~~ **Medium**	~~12/11~~ **2008**
Clover Creek	**Fecal Coliform**	**10**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
Colusa Drain	**Azinphos Methyl**	**70**	**Miles**	**Medium**	**2015**
	Carbofuran/ Furadan	70	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Diazinon	**70**	**Miles**	**Medium**	**2015**
	Group A Pesticides	70	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Malathion	70	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Methyl Parathion	70	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Molinate	**70**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
	Unknown Toxicity	70	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	12/~~11~~ **After 2015**
Davis Creek Res	Mercury	290	Acres	~~Medium~~ **Low**	12/~~11~~ **After 2015**
Del Puerto Creek	**Chlorpyrifos**	**5**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
	Diazinon	**5**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
	Parathion	**5**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
Delta Waterways	Chlorpyrifos	~~480,000~~ **48,000**	Acres	High	~~12/2005~~ **2004**
	DDT	~~480,000~~ **48,000**	Acres	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Diazinon	~~480,000~~ **48,000**	Acres	High	~~12/2005~~ **2004**
	Electrical Conductivity	16,000	Acres	Medium	~~12/11~~ **2015**
	Group A Pesticides	~~480,000~~ **48,000**	Acres	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Mercury	~~480,000~~ **48,000**	Acres	High	~~12/2005~~ **2004**
	Organic Enrichment/ Low DO	~~75~~ **1461**	Acres	High	~~12/11~~ **2005**

Waterbody	Pollutant/Stressor	Affected Size[1]	Units	Priority	TMDL End Date (Year)[2]
Delta Waterways	Unknown Toxicity	~~480,000~~ **48,000**	Acres	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Dolly Creek	Copper	1	Miles	~~Medium~~ **High**	~~12/11~~ **2005**
	Zinc	1	Miles	~~Medium~~ **High**	~~12/11~~ **2005**
Don Pedro Lake	**Mercury**	**12,960**	**Acres**	**Low**	**After 2015**
Dunn Creek	Mercury	~~9~~ **1**	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Metals	~~9~~ **1**	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Elder Creek	Chlorpyrifos	10	Miles	Medium	~~12/2005~~ **2003**
	Diazinon	10	Miles	Medium	~~12/2005~~ **2003**
Elk Grove Creek	Diazinon	5	Miles	Medium	~~12/2005~~ **2003**
Fall River (Pit)	Sedimentation/ Siltation	~~25~~ **9.5**	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Feather River, Lower	Diazinon	60	Miles	High	~~12/2005~~ **2003**
	Group A Pesticides	60	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Mercury	60	Miles	Medium	12/2011
	Unknown Toxicity	60	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Five Mile Slough	Chlorpyrifos	1	Miles	Medium	~~12/11~~ **2012**
	Diazinon	1	Miles	Medium	~~12/11~~ **2012**
	Dissolved Oxygen	**1**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
	Pathogens	**5**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
French Ravine	Bacteria	1	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Grasslands	Electrical Conductivity	8,224	Acres	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Marshes	~~Selenium~~	~~8,224~~	~~Acres~~	~~High~~	~~12/98~~

Waterbody	Pollutant/Stressor	Affected Size[1]	Units	Priority	TMDL End Date (Year)[2]
Harding Drain (Turlock Irr Dist Lateral #5)	Ammonia	7	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Chlorpyrifos	7	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Diazinon	7	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Unknown Toxicity	7	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Harley Gulch	Mercury	8	Miles	~~Medium~~ **High**	~~12/11~~ **2005**
Horse Creek	Cadmium	~~2~~ **1**	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Copper	~~2~~ **1**	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Lead	~~2~~ **1**	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Zinc	~~2~~ **1**	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Humbug Creek	Copper	~~9~~ **3**	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Mercury	~~9~~ **3**	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Sedimentation/ Siltation	~~9~~ **3**	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Zinc	~~9~~ **3**	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Ingram/ Hospital Creek	**Chlropyrifos**	**2**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
	Diazinon	**2**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
	Parathion	**2**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
Jack Slough	**Diazinon**	**13**	**Miles**	**Medium**	**2006**
James Creek	Mercury	~~6~~ **8.5**	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Nickel	~~6~~ **8.5**	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Kanaka Creek	Arsenic	1	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**

Waterbody	Pollutant/Stressor	Affected Size[1]	Units	Priority	TMDL End Date (Year)[2]
Keswick Res	Cadmium	200	Acres	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Copper	200	Acres	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Zinc	200	Acres	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Kings River, Lower	Electrical Conductivity	30	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Molybdenum	30	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Toxaphene	30	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Lake Combie	**Mercury**	**360**	**Acres**	**Medium**	**2012**
Lake Englebright	**Mercury**	**815**	**Acres**	**Medium**	**2011**
Little Backbone Creek	Acid Mine Drainage	1	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Cadmium	1	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Copper	1	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Zinc	1	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Little Cow Creek	Cadmium	1	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Copper	1	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Zinc	1	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Little Deer Creek	**Mercury**	**4**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
Little Grizzly Creek	Copper	10	Miles	~~Medium~~ **High**	~~12/02~~ **2005**
	Zinc	10	Miles	~~Medium~~ **High**	~~12/02~~ **2005**
Lone Tree Creek	Ammonia	15	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Biological Oxygen Demand	15	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Electrical Conductivity	15	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**

Waterbody	Pollutant/Stressor	Affected Size[1]	Units	Priority	TMDL End Date (Year)[2]
Marsh Creek	Mercury	~~24~~ **16.5**	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Metals	~~24~~ **8.5**	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Marsh Creek Res	Mercury	375	Acres	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Merced River, Lower	Chlorpyrifos	60	Miles	High	~~12/05~~ **2006**
	Diazinon	60	Miles	High	~~12/05~~ **2006**
	Group A Pesticides	60	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Mokelumne River, Lower	**Aluminum**	**28**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
	Copper	28	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Zinc	28	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Morrison Creek	Diazinon	20	Miles	Medium	~~12/2005~~ **2003**
Mormon Slough	**Dissolved Oxygen**	**1**	**Mile**	**Low**	**After 2015**
	Pathogens	**4**	**Miles**	**Medium**	**2012**
Mosher Slough	Chlorpyrifos	2	Miles	Medium	~~12/11~~ **2012**
	Diazinon	2	Miles	Medium	~~12/11~~ **2012**
	Dissolved Oxygen	**2**	**Miles**	**Low**	**2030**
	Pathogens	**7**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
Mud Slough	Boron	16	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2005**
	Electrical Conductivity	16	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2005**
	Pesticides	16	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2005**
	Selenium	16	Miles	~~High~~ **Medium**	~~12/00~~ **2011**
	Unknown Toxicity	16	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Natomas East Main Drain	Diazinon	5	Miles	Medium	~~12/11~~ **2015**
	PCBs4	12	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Newman Wasteway	**Chlorpyrifos**	**9**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2005**
	Diazinon	**9**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2005**

Waterbody	Pollutant/Stressor	Affected Size[1]	Units	Priority	TMDL End Date (Year)[2]
Oak Run Creek	**Fecal Coliform**	**8**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
Orestimba Creek	**Azinphos Methyl**	**10**	**Miles**	**Medium**	**2010**
	Chlorpyrifos	10	Miles	Medium	~~12/11~~ **2010**
	Diazinon	10	Miles	Medium	~~12/11~~ **2010**
	DDE	**10**	**Miles**	**Low**	**2030**
	Parathion	**10**	**Miles**	**Low**	**2025**
	Unknown Toxicity	3	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Panoche Creek	Mercury	25	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Sedimentation/ Siltation	40	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Selenium	40	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Pit River	Nutrients	100	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Organic Enrichment/ Low Dissolved Oxygen	100	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Temperature	100	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Putah Creek, Lower	**Mercury**	**24**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
	Unknown Toxicity	**30**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
Putah Creek, Upper	**Unknown Toxicity**	**27**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
Rollins Reservoir	**Mercury**	**840**	**Acres**	**Medium**	**2010**
Sacramento River (Red Bluff to Delta)	Diazinon	30	Miles	High	~~12/2005~~ **2003**
	Mercury	30	Miles	~~High~~ **Medium**	~~12/05~~ **2006**
	Unknown Toxicity	185	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Sacramento River (Shasta Dam to Red Bluff)	Cadmium	40	Miles	High	12/01
	Copper	40	Miles	High	12/01
	Unknown Toxicity	50	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Zinc	40	Miles	High	12/01

Waterbody	Pollutant/Stressor	Affected Size[1]	Units	Priority	TMDL End Date (Year)[2]
Sacramento Slough	Diazinon	1	Miles	Medium	~~12/11~~ 2009
	Mercury	1	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Salt Slough	Boron	15	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2005**
	Chlorpyrifos	15	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2005**
	Diazinon	15	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2005**
	Electrical Conductivity	15	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2005**
	~~Selenium~~	~~15~~	~~Miles~~	~~High~~	~~12/98~~
	Unknown Toxicity	15	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
San Carlos Creek	Mercury	1	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
San Joaquin River	Boron	130	Miles	High	~~12/99~~ **2002**
	Chlorpyrifos	130	Miles	High	~~12/2005~~ **2003**
	DDT	130	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Diazinon	130	Miles	High	~~12/2005~~ **2003**
	Electrical Conductivity	130	Miles	High	~~12/99~~ **2002**
	Group A Pesticides	130	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Mercury	**60**	**Miles**	**Medium**	**2013**
	Selenium	50	Miles	High	~~12/00~~ **2001**
	Unknown Toxicity	130	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
San Luis Reservoir	**Copper**			**Low**	**After 2015**
Scott's Flat Reservoir	**Mercury**	**725**	**Acres**	**Medium**	**2012**
Shasta Lake	Cadmium	20	Acres	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Copper	20	Acres	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Zinc	20	Acres	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**

Waterbody	Pollutant/Stressor	Affected Size[1]	Units	Priority	TMDL End Date (Year)[2]
Smith Canal	**Dissolved Oxygen**	**2.5**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
	Organo-phosphorus Pesticides	**2.5**	**Miles**	**Medium**	**2015**
	Pathogens	**2.5**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
South Cow Creek	**Fecal Coliform**	**6**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
Spring Creek	Acid Mine Drainage	5	Miles	~~High~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Cadmium	5	Miles	~~High~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Copper	5	Miles	~~High~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Zinc	5	Miles	~~High~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Stanislaus River, Lower	Diazinon	48	Miles	High	12/~~2000~~ **2004**
	Group A Pesticides	48	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Mercury	**58**	**Miles**	**Low**	**After 2015**
	Unknown Toxicity	48	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Stockton Deep Water Channel	Dioxin	2	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	**After 2015**
	Furans	2	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	**After 2015**
	PCBs	2	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	**After 2015**
	Pathogens	**3**	**Miles**	**Medium**	**2014**
Strong Ranch Slough	Chlorpyrifos	5	Miles	~~Medium~~ **High**	~~12/2005~~ **2003**
	Diazinon	5	Miles	~~Medium~~ **High**	12/~~2005~~ **2003**
Sulfur Creek	Mercury	7	Miles	High	2005
Sutter Bypass	**Diazinon**	**25**	**Miles**	**Medium**	**2012**
Temple Creek	Ammonia	10	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Electrical Conductivity	10	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**

Waterbody	Pollutant/Stressor	Affected Size[1]	Units	Priority	TMDL End Date (Year)[2]
Town Creek	Cadmium	1	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Copper	1	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Lead	1	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Zinc	1	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Tuolumne River, Lower	Diazinon	32	Miles	High	~~12/05~~ **2006**
	Group A Pesticides	32	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Unknown Toxicity	32	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Walker Slough	**Diazinon**	**2**	**Miles**	**Medium**	**2012**
	Pathogens	**7**	**Miles**	**Medium**	**2014**
West Squaw Creek	Cadmium	2	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Copper	2	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Lead	2	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Zinc	2	Miles	~~Medium~~ **Low**	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Whiskeytown Res	High Coliform Count	100	Acres	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Willow Creek (Whiskeytown)	Acid Mine Drainage	3	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Copper	3	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
	Zinc	3	Miles	Low	~~12/11~~ **After 2015**
Wolf Creek	**Pathogens**			**Low**	**After 2015**

[1]Affected Size = Portion of the waterbody not meeting water quality standards.
[2]TMDL End Date = the date by which the TMDL and associated program of implementation are expected to be considered by the Regional Board, generally as part of a Basin Plan Amendment. The end date is considered a maximum based on the funding assumptions described below.
[3]Group A pesticides = One or more of the Group A pesticides. The Group A pesticides include: aldrin, dieldrin, chlordane, endrin, heptachlor, heptachlor epoxide, hexachlorocyclohexane (including lindane), endosulfan and toxaphene.
[4]PCBs = Polychlorinated biphenyls.
[5] The listing for copper and zinc in Camanche Reservoir had previously been included as part of the lower Mokelumne River. The Regional Board determined that separate identification of the Camanche Reservoir and the lower Mokelumne River is appropriate for 303(d) list purposes.

Scheduling Assumptions - 1) available TMDL funds for TMDL development and implementation ($1.7 MM/year for staff in 2001 dollars); 2) TMDL development cost (per listed water body and pollutant equals $250,000 - includes implementation planning and Basin Planning); 3) after 2004, 1/2 of TMDL staff funds will be used for implementation of adopted TMDLs.

Note – TMDLs for selenium in Salt Slough and selenium in the Grassland Marshes were approved by U.S. EPA in 1999 and 2000, respectively.

Regional Board staff identified a number of water bodies and pollutants that should be assessed further prior to making a recommendation to list (or delist) those water bodies (see Table 2 below). In general, further assessment is needed under one or more of the following conditions: 1) the number of data points available or number of years of sample collection does not allow staff to determine whether a potential water quality problem is recurring; 2) recent and historic studies are not directly comparable due to different sampling protocols (e.g. the type of fish collected differ); 3) a sufficient historic data set exists with few exceedances, but more recent information does not indicate exceedances; or 4) control measures are in place that should result in reduction of the pollutant below criteria.

Table 2 – Suggested Sites and Parameters for Further Assessment

Water body	Pollutant
American River, Lower	Pathogens
Arcade Creek	Malathion
Butte Slough	Malathion
Butte Slough	Thiobencarb
Colusa Basin Drain	Chlorpyrifos
Colusa Basin Drain	Dicamba
Del Puerto Creek	Malathion
Delta (lower San Joaquin River)	Pathogens
Delta Waterways	DDT
Delta Waterways	Group A Pesticides
Feather River	Group A Pesticides
French Camp Slough	Pathogens
Fresno River	Nutrients/Pathogens
Hensley Lake	Nutrients/Pathogens
Ingram/Hospital Creek	Carbaryl
Kaweah River	Nutrients/Pathogens
Kern River	Nutrients/Pathogens
Lake Isabella	Nutrients/Pathogens
Lake Kaweah	Nutrients/Pathogens
Lake Success	Nutrients/Pathogens
Merced River	Mercury
Merced River	Parathion
Mormon Slough	Diazinon
Orestimba Creek	Methidathion
Salt Slough	Malathion
San Luis Reservoir	Copper
Ten Mile Creek (South Fork Kings River)	Nutrients/Pathogens
Tule River	Nutrients/Pathogens
Tuolumne River	Mercury
Yuba River	Pathogens

2 Public Solicitation and Documents Reviewed

Regional Board staff distributed a letter to the public requesting information for the update of the 303(d) list on 21 February 2001. Approximately 3,500 letters were distributed. The Regional Board's Basin Planning and NPDES mailing lists were used, along with the mailing list for the Sacramento River Watershed Program. The solicitation notice was also posted on the Regional Board's web site. The public was given until 15 May 2001 to provide information for the update of the 303(d) list.

During the public solicitation time period, three work shops were held: 1) on 21 March in Fresno; 2) on 28 March in Sacramento; and 3) on 6 April in Redding. There were 2 members of the public at the Fresno meeting, 8 at the Sacramento meeting, and 6 at the Redding meeting.

By the 15 May 2001 deadline, the Regional Board had received over 70 documents from 28 different individuals and organizations.

Regional Board staff also reviewed over 200 documents/data sources readily available within the Regional Board offices. Staff working in the NPDES permit program (for both storm water and non-storm water permits) provided information on potential problems in surface waters receiving NPDES permitted discharges.

The documents reviewed, from both the public solicitation and internally, are listed in Section 10.

3 Factors Considered in Recommending Changes to the 303(d) List

The factors below were generally considered in recommending changes to the 303(d) list. The specific application of these factors can be found in the appropriate Fact Sheets in the appendix.

3.1 Listing Factors

Water bodies and associated pollutants were generally recommended for addition to the 303(d) list if any one of these factors were met:

1. Effluent limitations or other pollution control requirements [e.g., Best Management Practices (BMPs)] are not stringent enough to assure protection of beneficial uses and attainment of SWRCB and RWQCB objectives, including those implementing SWRCB Resolution Number 68-16 "Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California" [see also 40 CFR 130.7(b)(1)]. This does not apply to non-attainment related solely to discharge in violation of existing WDR's or NPDES permit.

2. Fishing, drinking water, or swimming advisory currently in effect. This does not apply to advisories related to discharge in violation of existing WDR's or NPDES permit.

3. Beneficial uses are impaired or are expected to be impaired within the listing cycle (i.e. in next four years). Impairment is based upon evaluation of chemical, physical, or biological integrity. Impairment will be determined by

"qualitative assessment", physical/ chemical monitoring, bioassay tests, and/or other biological monitoring. Applicable Federal criteria and the Regional Board's Basin Plan water quality objectives determine the basis for impairment status.

4. The water body is on the previous 303(d) list and either: (a) monitoring continues to demonstrate a violation of objective(s) or (b) monitoring has not been performed.

5. Data indicate tissue concentrations in consumable body parts of fish or shellfish exceed applicable tissue criteria or guidelines. Criteria or guidelines related to protection of human and wildlife consumption include, but are not limited to, U.S. Food and Drug Administration Action Levels, National Academy of Sciences Guidelines, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency tissue criteria.

3.2 Delisting Factors

Water bodies were generally removed from the list for specific pollutants or stressors if any one of these factors was met:

1. Objectives were revised (for example, Site Specific Objectives), and the exceedence is thereby eliminated.

2. Faulty data led to the initial listing. Faulty data include, but are not limited to, typographical errors, improper quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) procedures, or limitations related to the analytical methods that would lead to improper conclusions regarding the water quality status of the water body.

3. It has been documented that the objectives are being met and beneficial uses are not impaired based upon an evaluation of available monitoring data. This evaluation includes foreseeable changes in hydrology, land use, or product use and why such changes should not lead to future exceedance.

4. A TMDL has been approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for that specific water body and pollutant (see 40 CFR 130.7(b)(4)).

5. There are control measures in place which will result in protection of beneficial uses. Control measures include permits, clean up and abatement orders, and Basin Plan requirements which are enforceable and include a time schedule (see 40 CFR 130.7(b)(1)(iii)).

3.3 Other Changes

Other changes that have been recommended include:

1. Extent of impairment – a review of available data for existing listings may indicate that a change in the defined extent of impairment should be made. In some cases the miles (or area) of the impaired segment may be changed and in other cases the specific impacted segment is redefined.

2. Priority Ranking – a review of the Regional Board's priorities for TMDL development (based on the Regional Board's criteria discussed below) may result in a change to the existing priority ranking for a water body/pollutant combination.

4 Evaluation Criteria

Regional Board staff had a significant amount of information related to mercury, metals, pathogens, and pesticides. Fact sheets for each of the above categories of pollutant were prepared. The fact sheets describe the criteria used to evaluate the data and information and can be found in Appendix A.

For other pollutants not included in the above categories, Regional Board staff generally used the following hierarchy in evaluating data relative to applicable water quality objectives:

1. Applicable numeric water quality objectives (contained in the Basin Plan) or water quality standards (contained in the federal California and National Toxics Rules). Both the Basin Plan and federal rules governing a specific parameter were evaluated to determine any site specific applications or exceptions.

2. Criteria developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, California Department of Fish, and the California Department of Health Services and other applicable criteria developed by government agencies. Such criteria were used to interpret narrative water quality objectives. In those cases in which criteria were available from several agencies, preference was given to criteria developed for California or the most recently derived criteria. Toxicity test results and bioassay study results were also used to determine attainment of objectives.

3. Guidance or guidelines developed by agencies/entities such as the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, National Academy of Sciences, and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry and the California Department of Health Services. Guidelines developed by other agencies

were thoroughly reviewed before applied, since the assumptions and risk factors considered may not be consistent with Regional Board water quality objectives.

4. Criteria or standards developed in other states, regions, or countries. Such criteria were evaluated to determine if the environmental setting, assumptions, and risk factors considered were consistent with Regional Board water quality objectives.

Other than described for the pollutant fact sheets in Appendix A, there were no specific minimum data requirements or a specific frequency of exceedance for making a finding that water quality objectives are not attained. In general, more data was needed to interpret environmental results that are very specific to time and geography. Less data were needed to make a determination based on environmental results that serve as integrators over space or time. For example, more water column chemistry data would generally be needed to determine impairment than fish tissue chemistry data. Also less water column chemistry data may be needed to make an impairment determination (or lack of impairment determination) if there is other information (e.g. correlations could be made between pesticide use patterns and the presence of pesticides in surface water).

Regional Board staff generally limited their consideration of environmental data to those organizations that conduct monitoring studies using documented quality assurance/quality control procedures. For data produced by citizen monitoring groups, Regional Board staff considered data from those groups whose sampling programs and protocols had been reviewed by the State Water Resource Control Board's citizen monitoring coordinators.

5 Priority Ranking

A priority ranking is required for listed waters to guide TMDL planning pursuant to 40 CFR 130.7. TMDLs were ranked into high (H), medium (M), and low (L) priority categories based on:

1. water body significance (such as importance and extent of beneficial uses, threatened and endangered species concerns and size of water body)

2. degree of impairment or threat (such as number of pollutants/stressors of concern, and number of beneficial uses impaired)

3. conformity with related activities in the watershed (such as existence of watershed assessment, planning, pollution control, and remediation, or restoration efforts in the area)

4. potential for beneficial use protection or recovery

5. degree of public concern and involvement
6. availability of funding and information to address the water quality problem
7. overall need for an adequate pace of TMDL development for all listed waters
8. other water bodies and pollutants have become a higher priority

The Regional Board identified water body/pollutant combinations as a high priority for TMDL development for those instances in which activities are currently underway to develop TMDLs. In most cases, the water bodies identified as high priority are significant waters of the State providing critical environmental, recreational, municipal, industrial, and agricultural uses. The degree of impairment is also significant with multiple stressors impacting the high priority waters. In general, the potential for beneficial use protection or recovery is high and there is a great deal of public involvement. In some cases, the overall need for an adequate pace of TMDL development is considered. A high priority is given to some water bodies that are less significant from a state-wide perspective, but are either well characterized or tributary streams to other high priority water bodies that will be addressed as a single water quality management strategy.

The Regional Board identified water body/pollutant combinations as a medium priority for TMDL development for water bodies that are tributary to, and/or have a similar impairment as, a high priority water body. The tributaries are often significant water bodies and have a greater degree of impairment, since they are often the primary source of pollutant loads. The Regional Board will be able to take advantage of information developed to address the high priority water bodies in developing TMDLs for medium priority water bodies and, in general, efforts will already be underway in the tributary water bodies to reduce pollutant loads to the main stem river or stream.

The Regional Board identified water body/pollutant combinations as a low priority for all other water body/pollutant combinations. In many cases, the water body may have a high priority for further assessment or regulatory activity through other Regional Board programs, which lessens the immediate need to begin TMDL development. For water bodies impaired by "Unknown Toxicity", a low priority is given since identification of the toxicant(s) causing impairment is expected prior to the initiation of the TMDL development process.

It should also be noted that for both medium and low priority water body/pollutant combinations, the priority (and schedule) might change during the next 303(d) list update.

6 Scheduling

As part of the preparation of the 303(d) list, Regional Board staff prepared a proposed schedule for the completion of TMDLs for all listed water bodies. For scheduling purposes, the completion date represents the date that Regional Board staff will present a Basin Plan Amendment for Regional Board consideration.

In most cases, the Basin Plan Amendment will describe a comprehensive water quality management strategy to correct the problems associated with the listed waters and pollutants. The comprehensive strategy will include a program of implementation, water quality objectives (if necessary), new or refined beneficial use designations (if necessary), and elements of the TMDL. The work load associated with a more comprehensive strategy, together with the administrative procedural requirements of basin planning, require a greater investment of time and resources than would be required to solely address federal Clean Water Act requirements for a TMDL.

The schedule provided is based on receiving a similar level of staff and contract resources as is currently available for both TMDL development and implementation of the adopted Basin Plan Amendment. The amount of funds currently available for TMDL development and implementation is $1.7 MM. For purposes of projecting TMDL timelines, it is assumed that those funds will be available primarily for TMDL development, implementation planning and Basin Planning through 2004. After 2004, it is assumed that half of the funds will be needed for implementation of the adopted Basin Plan Amendments. It is also assumed that the average cost of developing a water quality management strategy for each listed water body and pollutant is $250,000. Based on these funding and cost assumptions, the time to complete water quality management strategies for all listed waters and pollutants is approximately 50 years.

Federal regulations (40 CFR §130.7(b)(4)) require the identification of "...waters targeted for TMDL development in the next two years." All waterbody/pollutant combinations identified for completion by 2004 are targeted for TMDL development over the next two years.

Schedules for water bodies and pollutants that are to be completed after 2004 are tentative. Regional Board staff has not reviewed the data and information available for those water bodies, so the actual scope and timeline for completing the water quality management strategy is not known.

In general, Regional Board staff assigned a high priority (and near term schedule) to water bodies and pollutants for which TMDLs are currently being developed (i.e. information is being collected and analyzed for those water body/pollutant combinations-factors 1-7 from Section 5 apply). Medium priority was assigned (and schedules up to 2015) to those TMDLs that can most effectively build on the experience gained through development of the high priority TMDLs. In many cases, the medium priority TMDLs are tributaries to the water bodies that have been assigned a high priority for TMDL development.

Regional Board staff did not provide specific dates for low priority water bodies, which would be scheduled for completion after 2015. The 303(d) list will likely be revised several times between now and 2015, so providing dates for TMDL completion for currently listed water bodies would be highly speculative. Also Regional Board staff anticipates some gain in efficiency in completely both the technical and administrative aspects of TMDL development, but that efficiency improvement is difficult to gauge at this time.

It should be noted that a water body that is a low priority for TMDL development might be a high priority for the Regional Board for: further assessment, funding of watershed activities that can contribute to addressing the beneficial use impairment, or other regulatory action.

7 Documentation

A 303(d) update fact sheet was prepared for each discrete 303(d) listing or delisting recommendation. The fact sheets can be found in Appendix B.

Fact Sheets for Listing Decisions

Each fact sheet for decisions to add water bodies and pollutants to the 303(d) list includes the following information: Waterbody name, hydrologic unit number, total water body size, pollutant(s)/stressor(s) causing impairment, likely sources; the latitude and longitude of the upstream and downstream impaired stream segment and/or a specific narrative description of the impaired segment; a description of the characteristics of the watershed; the specific water quality objective(s) not being met; a summary of the data assessment that led to the decision to list; the criteria applied to the decision to list.

Fact Sheets for Delisting Decisions

Each fact sheet for decisions to delete water bodies and pollutants from the 303(d) list includes the following information: the water body name, pollutant(s)/stressor(s) previously identified as having caused an impairment; a summary of the data or information that lead to the decision to delist; and the criteria applied to the decision to delist.

Fact Sheets to Document Changes to Currently Listed Water bodies/Pollutants

Fact sheets were used to document changes to currently listed water body/pollutant combinations. A single fact sheet is used, in some cases, to document changes that are common to a group of water bodies.

8 Public Participation

Regional Board staff conducted 3 workshops during the time frame for solicitation of information. The workshops were in Fresno, Sacramento, and Redding. It is anticipated that there will be several more opportunities for public participation after staff has prepared its draft recommendations. Prior public participation and the anticipated schedule for Regional Board action on the 303(d) list are described below:

303(d) Update Step	Public Outreach
Solicitation of Information	Mailing to 3,500 people/groups on 21 February 2001
Solicitation of Information	Workshops held in Fresno, Sacramento, and Redding
Solicitation of Information	Receive data/information through 5/15/01
Draft 303(d) List Staff Report	Release mid-September
Draft 303(d) List Staff Report	Information Item at October Regional Bd. Meeting
Final 303(d) List	Release final staff report in December/January

9 Response to Comments Received During the Solicitation of Information

In addition to data and information, the Regional Board received some comments recommending additions to or deletions from the 303(d) list. The responses to those comments which recommended specific changes to the 303(d) list are given below.

Commenter 1: Julie Roth, Executive Director, Davis South Campus Superfund Oversight Committee

"We request that the CVRWQCB list Putah Creek as impaired because of excessive mercury concentrations in some of the fish that are used as food."

Response 1: Regional Board staff has reviewed the data in the reports submitted by the commenter. Based on this review, Regional Board staff recommends the addition of lower Putah Creek to California's 303(d) list for impairment due to elevated mercury levels in fish. The basis for this determination can be found in the "Lower Putah Creek, Mercury" fact sheet in Appendix B.

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region
Draft Staff Report on Recommended Changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List
Commenter 2: Barbara Vlamis, Executive Director, Butte Environmental Council

The commenter recommended the addition of several waterbodies to the 303(d) list, including:

1. Butte Creek based on "one toxic reading" from NAWQA [the U.S. Geological Survey's National Water Quality Assessment];
2. Comanche Creek based on measurements by the local Isaac Walton League "exceeding State standards for copper, lead, and zinc";
3. Little Chico Creek based on monitoring conducted by Metcalf & Eddy in a storm drain system of total suspended solids, nutrients, total copper, and total zinc;
4. Dead Horse Slough based on elevated levels of lead in the sediment relative to Little Chico Creek to which it is tributary; and
5. Little Butte Creek based on a toxicity test result showing fathead minnow mortality.

Response 2:

1. Regional Board staff contacted U.S. Geological Survey NAWQA staff (Domagalski, Personal Communication, 2001) and found that Butte Creek was not sampled, although Butte Slough was sampled. Based on data available for Butte Slough, Regional Board staff are recommending the addition of Butte Slough to the 303(d) list due to elevated levels of diazinon, molinate, and thiobencarb.
2. No data was supplied to support the recommended listing and Regional Board staff are not aware of the availability of the referenced data in Regional Board files.
3. The Metcalf and Eddy study was referenced, but was not provided. The comment references the results from the study of a storm drainage system. Regional Board staff is not recommending listing drains constructed for the specific purpose of conveying storm water drainage.
4. Regional Board staff is currently investigating the Humboldt Road Burn Dump, the site that appears to be impacting Dead Horse Slough. The investigation is following the National Contingency Plan with the Regional Board as the Administering Agency. The Remedial Investigation Reports have been submitted and are being reviewed. Since the source of the lead is likely from the site under investigation, the Regional Board should have sufficient regulatory authority to oversee clean-up at that site and in the slough (should such clean-up be needed). Based on the above information, Regional Board staff believes, identification of Dead Horse Slough on the 303(d) list is not necessary.
5. Regional Board staff is following up on the issue of fathead minnow toxicity test results as a part of a CALFED funded study. The goal of the study is to determine the cause and significance of pathogen related toxicity that has been observed in fathead minnow toxicity tests. Until the CALFED study is completed, no recommendations for additions to the 303(d) list will be made based on pathogen-related fathead minnow toxicity test results.

Commenter 3: Stephan Orme, Data Specialist, Pesticide Action Network North America (PANNA)

"I am writing to submit the enclosed data from the Department of Pesticide Regulation's (DPR) Pesticide Surface Water Database for your consideration in updating the 303(d) list. Each of the records attached below documents an exceedence of a water quality guideline by a pesticide detection in California surface waters."

The documents provided by the commenter included records of exceedances as determined by the commenter as well as a description of the methodology as to how the U.S. EPA AQUIRE database was used to establish criteria.

Response 3: A description of how Regional Board staff considered water column pesticide data is included in the "Pesticide Numeric Criteria Fact Sheet" in Appendix A. That description identifies the criteria or guidelines used to interpret the Regional Board's narrative toxicity and pesticide water quality objectives. Regional Board staff used DPR's surface water database, as well as other data sources, to make a determination as to whether a water body and associated pesticide should be added to the 303(d) list. Regional Board staff review of the data resulted in the recommended addition of a number of water bodies to the 303(d) list as not attaining water quality objectives for certain pesticides (see Table 1). In general, PANNA identified exceedances did result in a recommended listing under the following conditions: 1) the exceedances identified were for water bodies not already currently listed; 2) the identified exceedances were not for storm drains specifically constructed to convey urban runoff or drainage canals specifically constructed to convey agricultural drainage; 3) greater than one exceedance was identified; 4) sufficient total sampling events were available to determine whether a potential water quality problem is recurring; and 5) criteria applied by the Regional Board to interpret exceedance of the narrative toxicity objective were exceeded.

Commenter 4: Phil Chang, Watershed Coordinator, Sierra Nevada Alliance

The commenter recommended that a number of Sierran watersheds be added to the "Priority Category I Watersheds" list. The commenter mentions some potential mercury and arsenic problems in the middle fork of the American River watershed and the south fork of the Feather River watershed. The commenter also states that the "surrounding watersheds in the Feather, Yuba, Bear, and American River basins have been listed in part for these same concerns." Based on a recommendation to create Aquatic Diversity Management Areas as part of the Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project, the commenter recommends that "that the Middle Fork Feather, Upper Kern, Upper Merced, Upper Kings, Upper Merced, Upper Tuolumne, Upper Stanislaus, and Upper Mokelumne watersheds be prioritized in the 303(d) list development in 2001." Based on their importance as a drinking water source, the commenter recommends that "the upper Feather, American, Mokelumne, and Tuolumne watersheds should also be on the Priority Category I list."

Response 4: The commenter appears to be referring to the Unified Watershed Assessment process conducted in 1997 (see http://www.ca.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/cwap.html). The Federal government used the results of that process to prioritize funding of work related to watershed protection and restoration. Although the 303(d) list was used as a criteria to identify "Category I priority" watersheds, other criteria were also applied. Regional Board staff has reviewed the mercury information referred to by the commenter that is available for several Sierran streams and reservoirs. Based on that review, Regional Board staff are recommending the addition a number of waterbodies to the 303(d) list due to high levels of mercury in fish tissue. The recommended designation of Aquatic Diversity Management Areas does not appear to identify specific pollutants causing exceedances of water quality objectives, so Regional Board staff do not recommend adding the identified watersheds to the 303(d) list. The importance of a watershed as a drinking water source is not a sufficient basis for listing a waterbody, so Regional Board staff does not recommend adding to the 303(d) list those watersheds identified as important drinking water sources.

Commenter 5: Alexander R. Coate, Manager of Regulatory Compliance, East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD)

"Data to recommend delisting of the Lower Mokelumne River for impairment due to copper and zinc and listing Rich Gulch as impaired for arsenic are provided for your consideration."

Response 5: Regional Board staff reviewed the data provided by EBMUD and are recommending that the Lower Mokelumne River remain on the 303(d) list for impairment due to copper and zinc. The 1998 303(d) list included Camanche Reservoir as part of the Lower Mokelumne River. The data does indicate that substantive improvements in water quality have occurred and that it is likely that water quality objectives are being attained for zinc in the Lower Mokelumne River and Camanche Reservoir as well as copper in Camanche Reservoir. The limited data set (1 year) available for Camanche Reservoir (post-remediation) is not sufficient to demonstrate that objectives are being met over a variety of water year types. Copper data for the Lower Mokelumne River still indicates that there are periodic exceedances. No recent data on zinc levels in the Lower Mokelumne River is available. A more detailed review of the data provided can be found in the Fact Sheets for the Lower Mokelumne River and Camanche Reservoir. Regional Board staff is not recommending the addition of Rich Gulch to the 303(d) list for impairment due to arsenic. The data provided was for a single storm event. Regional Board staff has learned that the Gwin Mine was the most likely source of the arsenic and that the mine portal was open for an exploratory survey in January 1997. The portal has since been closed, so storm water discharges from the mine are unlikely.

Commenter 6: William E. Teplin

"I am especially interested in any information that might help me understand the observations I have made for the past 2 years in early spring runoff (pre-peak) in the South Fork Kings River and Ten Mile Creek, both in the Sequoia National Forest, down stream of Sequoia-Kings Canyon National Park. We have observed major algal blooms and phosphate pillows (2 foot tall soap suds) in areas that would seem to be relatively pristine."

Response 6: No other data or information was provided, so no recommended changes to the 303(d) list are being made. Regional Board staff in Fresno will be conducting nutrient and pathogen monitoring in Ten Mile Creek (see Table 2). The comment has been forwarded to the Fresno office of the Regional Board for follow-up.

Commenter 7: Will Doleman, A Call for Water Sanity! Monitoring Group

The commenter provided information on issues in a number of creeks and ditches in Nevada County.

Response 7: No recommendations for changes to the 303(d) list were made based on the information provided in the letter. Based on the information in the report provided, Regional Board staff was not able to determine the quality assurance/quality control and sample collection procedures used. The commenter did provide some information that could indicate a potential water quality problem. Regional Board NPDES staff will follow-up and sample a number of the creeks identified by the commenter.

Commenter 8: Mary Berglund, President, Kern County Neighbors for Quality Air, Water and Growth

The commenter provided information and observations related to the Kern River, Buena Vista Lake, Caliente Creek, and Tehachapi Creek, as well as the EPC – Eastside Landfill. The commenter requests that the Regional Board investigate the sites mentioned.

Response 8: No recommendations for changes to the 303(d) list were made based on the information provided in the letter. The information was limited to a few observations, but no data was provided. The letter has been forwarded to the Fresno office for follow-up.

Commenter 9: Lynell Garfield, River Science Dir., South Yuba River Citizen's League (SYRCL)

The commenter recommends listing Shady Creek for excessive sediment. Information was also provided on E. coli levels in Humbug Creek and the Upper Yuba River.

Response 9: The commenter states that SYRCL has no data for the recommended listing of Shady Creek. Regional Board staff does not recommend listing water bodies based

solely on anecdotal information. Regional Board staff has reviewed the information provided on E. coli levels in Humbug Creek and the Upper Yuba River. Analytical results for total coliform and E. coli do not indicate exceedances of Department of Health Services criteria, therefore, Regional Board staff do not recommend listing Humbug Creek and the Upper Yuba River.

Commenter 10: Bill Jennings, DeltaKeeper

Response 10

The commenter recommended approximately 101 additions to California's 303(d) list for non-attainment of standards in Central Valley waters. In addition to the specific waterbodies and pollutants identified in the table below, DeltaKeeper recommended adding a number of specific waterbodies to the 303(d) List for temperature.

Staff recommends that waterbodies not be added to the 303(d) List for temperature. The Regional Board's Basin Plan includes the following temperature narrative objective "The natural receiving water temperature of intrastate waters shall not be altered unless it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Regional Water Board that such alteration in temperature does not adversely affect beneficial uses. ....At no time or place shall the temperature of COLD or WARM intrastate waters be increased more than 5°F above natural receiving water temperature. Temperature changes due to controllable factors shall be limited for the water bodies specified as described in Table III-4. To the extent of any conflict with the above, the more stringent objective applies. In determining compliance with the water quality objectives for temperature, appropriate averaging periods may be applied provided that beneficial uses will be fully protected."

As stated, the temperature objective would require the Regional Board to determine the "natural receiving water temperature" in order to determine whether the temperature has been altered in a manner that affects beneficial uses or to determine whether temperature has been increase by greater than 5°F above natural receiving water temperature. The determination of the "natural receiving water temperature" for the Central Valley streams and rivers would require a scientific investigation and modeling effort that is beyond the scope of the 303(d) list update process. Staff, therefore, does not recommend the addition of any water bodies to the 303(d) list as impaired due to temperature.

Appendix A of this report describes how Regional Board staff evaluated available information for metals, mercury, pathogens, and pesticides. Based on information submitted by the commenter, other readily available information, and the procedures outlined in Appendix A, Regional Board staff determined whether water quality objectives were being attained for the recommended additions to the 303(d) list. Regional Board staff evaluation of recommended additions for other contaminants (other than metals, mercury, pathogens, and pesticides) is described below.

The commenter recommended addition of the Delta to the 303(d) list for impairment due to exotic species. Regional Board staff agree that exotic species are a problem in the Delta, but do not believe that exotic species are a "pollutant" as defined by the Clean

Water Act and therefore should not be included on the 303(d) list. Regional Board staff will consider identifying exotic species on the 305(b) report.

The commenter also recommended the addition of a number of parameters and water bodies to the 303(d) list based on exceedance of certain drinking water guidelines. Regional Board staff will be developing a proposed drinking water policy for Central Valley waters. That policy will identify both the relevant drinking water criteria as well as the appropriate point of application of those criteria. Regional Board staff believes that additions to the 303(d) list based on exceedance of criteria other than primary MCLs (maximum contaminant levels) would be premature.

The commenter recommended the addition of the Sacramento River to the 303(d) list as impaired by dieldrin. Dieldrin is an organo-chlorine pesticide that is considered to have an additive toxic effect with a number of other organo-chlorine pesticides (see footnote 3 to Table 1). This group of organo-chlorine pesticides is referred to as Group A pesticides. Regional Board staff applied the National Academy of Sciences (NAS, 1973) guidelines for Group A pesticides and the Food and Drug Administration guidelines (USFDA, 1984) of 100 ng/g and 300 ng/g respectively in evaluating the available information. Based on those guidelines and the available information, Regional Board staff does not recommend adding the Sacramento River to the 303(d) list for impairment by dieldrin.

The commenter recommended the addition of the Sacramento River, North Delta, South Delta and Smith Canal to the 303(d) list for impairment by PCBs. Regional Board staff applied the National Academy of Sciences (NAS, 1973) guidelines and the Food and Drug Administration guidelines (USDA-FDA, 1984) of 500 ng/g and 2000 ng/g respectively in evaluating the available information. Based on those guidelines and the available information, Regional Board staff does not recommend adding the Sacramento River, North Delta, South Delta and Smith Canal to the 303(d) list for impairment by PCBs.

The commenter recommended the addition of Mosher Slough, Five-Mile Slough, the Calaveras River, Smith Canal, Mormon Slough, and French Camp Slough to the 303(d) list as impaired by low dissolved oxygen. Regional Board staff recommends adding Mosher Slough, Five-Mile Slough, the Calaveras River, Smith Canal, and Mormon Slough to the 303(d) list as impaired by dissolved oxygen. The limited data set for French Camp Slough did not indicate the potential for a recurring dissolved oxygen problem.

The commenter recommended adding the Colusa Basin Drain to the 303(d) list as impaired by high electrical conductivity. The commenter states that the 90th percentile of the available data is above an agricultural water quality goal of 700 µmhos/cm. Electrical conductivity is an indicator of pollutants (e.g. sodium, chloride) that can impact salt sensitive crops at high enough levels. Regional Board staff are not aware of any information from users of the Colusa Basin Drain that the salinity levels are impacting

crops, therefore, Regional Board staff do not recommend adding the Colusa Basin Drain to the 303(d) list as impaired by high electrical conductivity.

The commenter recommended adding the San Joaquin River to the 303(d) list for impairment due to high ammonia levels. Regional Board staff believe that ammonia issues will be addressed by NPDES permits that are currently in place and, therefore, do not recommend adding the San Joaquin River to the 303(d) list for impairment due to high ammonia levels.

10 References

10.1 Documents and References Used to Support Recommended Changes to the 303(d) List

Alpers, C.N., and M.P. Hunerlach. 2000. *Mercury Contamination from Historic Gold Mining in California.* U.S. Geological Survey. Fact Sheet FS-061-00. May 2000.

Bailey, H.C., L. Deanovic, E. Reyes, T. Kimball, K. Larsen, K. Cortwright, V. Connor, and D. Hinton. 2000. *Diazinon and Chlorpyrifos in Urban Waterways in Northern California.* USA. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry (19) 82-87.

Bailey, H.C., J.L. Miller, M.J. Miller, L.C. Wiborg, L. Deanovic, and T. Shed. 1997. *Joint Acute Toxicity of Diazinon and Chlorpyrifos to Ceriodaphnia dubia.* Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry (16) 2304-2308.

Brodberg, R. K., and G. A. Pollock. 1999. *Prevalence of Selected Target Chemical Contaminants in Sport Fish from Two California Lakes: Public Health Designed Screening Study.* California Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment.

Buer, S.M., S.R. Phillippe, and T.R. Pinkos. 1979. *Inventory and Assessment of Water Quality Problems related to Abandoned and Inactive Mines in the Central Valley Region of California.* CRWQCB-CVR (California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region).

California Rice Commission. 2001. *CA Rice.* www.calrice.org/environment/balance-cheet/chap3.html

CDM (Camp Dresser & McKee Inc). 1999. *Assessment of Water Quality Data from Smith Canal.* July 27, 1999. (Appendix B-2 to City of Stockton & San Joaquin County Storm Water Management Program).

CCR (California Code of Regulations). Title 17 §7958 *Bacteriological Standards.*

CDFG (California Department of Fish and Game). 1991. *Lower Mokelumne River Fisheries Plan.* The Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Streamflow Requirements Program. November 1991.

CDHS (California Department of Health Services). 2000. *Draft Guidance for Fresh Water Beaches.* July 27, 2000.

CDPR (California Department of Pesticide Regulation). 2000a. *DPR Surface Water Database (SWDB),* as of July 15, 2000.

CDPR. 2000b. *Pesticide Use Report (PUR) Database.* Preliminary 2000 Pesticide Use Data.

CDWR (California Department of Water Resources). 1993. *Dams within Jurisdiction of the State of California.* DWR Bulletin 17, as presented by the Berkeley Digital Library Project. Accessed on August 23, 2001. Accessed: (http://elib.cs.berkeley.edu/dams/about.html).

CDWR. 1998. *Aquatic Monitoring and Assessment for the Upper Fall River, Memorandum Report.* May 1998.

Chen C. Tsai W. 1999. *Application of Stockton's Water Quality Model to Evaluate Stormwater Impact on Smith Canal.* February 23, 1999. (Attachment to March 17, 1999 letter from City of Stockton, G. Birdzell)

Chilcott, J. 1992. *Agenda Item #11 for Meeting of California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region.* September 25, 1992. Fresno, CA. Staff Report on Consideration of Water Body Designations to Comply with Provisions of the Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters of California. Appendix B.

CH2MHILL. 2000a. *Closure Report: Penn Mine Environmental Restoration Project.* Prepared for: East Bay Municipal Utility District and Regional Water Quality Control Board-Central Valley Region. Oakland, California. December 2000.

CH2MHILL. 2000b. *(Draft) Post-Restoration Final Effectiveness Report: Penn Mine Environmental Restoration Project.* Prepared for: East Bay Municipal Utility District and Regional Water Quality Control Board-Central Valley Region. Oakland, California. September 2000.

City of Grass Valley. 2000. *Discharger self-monitoring reports (DSMRs) for Grass Valley Waste Water Treatment Plant.*

City of Grass Valley. 2001. *Discharger self-monitoring reports (DSMRs) for Grass Valley Waste Water Treatment Plant.*

Cortright, K., L. Deanovic, H. Bailey, and D. Hinton. 1995. *Stockton Urban Runoff April 1995-June 1995* Report- *Prepared for: Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.*

CRWQCB- CVR (California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region). 1978. *Waste Discharge Requirements for Mount Diablo Quicksilver Mine, Contra Costa County.* Sacramento, Ca: CRWQCB.

CRWQCB-CVR. 1995. *Futures Foundation, New Idria Mine File.* 1971-1995 Electronic database of all water sampling results for San Carlos Creek and New Idria Mine drainage. Mercury data for water samples collected June 1971 to December 1995.

CRWQCB-CVR. 1998. *The Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region — The Sacramento River Basin and the San Joaquin River Basin.* Fourth Edition. CRWQCB-CVR, Sacramento, Ca.
http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf

CRWQCB-CVR. 1999a. (Enclosure 5) *Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) Order No. 99-052, Madera County Maintenance District 22A, Oakhurst Wastewater Treatment Facility, Madera County,* (with Supporting Data and Analyses). 30 April 1999 (Rescinded on 17 April 2000).

CRWQCB-CVR. 1999b. (Enclosure 6), January 1996-January 2000, *Fresno River Water Quality Data from Self-Monitoring Reports, Madera County Maintenance District 22A, Oakhurst Wastewater Treatment Facility, Madera County.*

CRWQCB-CVR. 2001a. *Avena Drain File.* File Containing Regional Board Staff Field notes and lab results from Avena Drain and surrounding dairies.

CRWQCB-CVR. 2001b. Letter dated 21 February 2001. *Public Solicitation of Water Quality Information.*

CRWQCB-SFB (San Francisco Bay), State Water Resources Control Board, and California Department of Fish and Game. 1995. *Contaminant Levels in Fish Tissue from San Francisco Bay: Final Report.* San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board, Oakland, CA.

CRWQCB-SFB (San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board), State Water Resources Control Board, and California Department of Fish and Game. 1995. *Contaminant Levels in Fish Tissue from San Francisco Bay: Final Report.* San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board, Oakland, CA.

Davis, J.A., and M.D. May. 2000. *Contaminant Concentrations in Fish from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and Lower San Joaquin River – 1998.* San Francisco Estuary Institute report. Richmond, California. September 2000.

Davis, J.A., M.D. May, G. Ichikawa, and D. Crane. 2000. *Contaminant Concentrations in Fish from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and Lower San Joaquin River, 1998.* San Francisco Estuary Institute, Richmond, CA.

DeLorme. 1998. *Northern California Atlas and Gazetteer- Detailed Topographic Maps.* 1:150,000 Scale. Fourth Edition. (http://www.delorme.com.)

Dileanis, P.D., and J.L. Domagalski. 2000. *Occurrence and Transport of Diazinon in the Sacramento River and its Tributaries During Three Winter Storms, January-February 2000.* Draft, 3-3-01.

Dileanis, P.D., J.L. Domagalski, and K.P. Bennett. 2000. *Occurrence and Transport of Diazinon in the Sacramento River and its Tributaries During Three Winter Storms, January-February 2000.* Water-Resources Investigations Draft Report. U.S. Geological Survey. Sacramento, CA., as presented in CDPR, 2001.

Dileanis, P.D., J.L. Domagalski, and K.P. Bennett. 2001. *Occurrence and Transport of Diazinon in the Sacramento River and its Tributaries During Three Winter Storms, January-February 2000.* U.S. Geological Survey Water Resources Investigations Report, Draft. Sacramento, CA

Domagalski, J.L. 2000. *Pesticide Monitoring in the Sacramento River Basin, Ca. 2/96-9/98,* report in prep. USGS. July 2000.

Domagalski, J.L., 2001. Telephone conversation between Joe Domagalski (Sacramento River Basin NAWQA Study Unit, Chief, U.S. Geological Survey) and Joe Karkoski (Sacramento River Watershed TMDL Unit, Chief, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region) on 4 September 2001, regarding sampling sites included in NAWQA studies.

EBMUD (East Bay Municipal Utility District). 2000. *All About EBMUD.* EBMUD Public Affairs Office publication. http://www.ebmud.com/pubs/annual/allaboutebmud_2000.pdf. Last accessed: August 2, 2001.

EBMUD (East Bay Municipal Utility District). 2001. Unpublished dissolved copper concentration data for the lower Mokelumne River downstream of Camanche Dam, generated as part of EBMUD's NPDES requirements. Provided electronically by Alexander R. Coate (Manger of Regulatory Compliance, EBMUD) to Michelle L. Wood (Environmental Specialist, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board) on August 2, 2001.

EDAW, Inc. 1992. *Draft EIS/EIR for the Updated Water Supply Management Program, Volume III, Technical Appendices B1 and B2.* Prepared for: East Bay Municipal Utility District. Oakland, California. December 1992.

Foe, C. 1995. *Insecticide Concentrations and Invertebrate Bioassay Mortality in Agricultural Return Water from the San Joaquin Basin.* Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. Sacramento, CA December 1995.

Foe, C. and W. Croyle. 1998. *Mercury Concentrations and Loads from the Sacramento River and from Cache Creek to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary.* California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region Report. Sacramento, Ca. June 1998.

Fujimura, R. 1993a. *Chemical Analyses and Bioassay Test Results for Samples Collected from December 29 to February 25,, 1993.* Memorandum to Brian Finlayson, Pesticide Investigations Unit, California Department of Fish and Game. Rancho Cordova, CA. March 26, 1993. As presented in CDPR, 2001.

Fujimura, R. 1993b. *Chemical Analyses and Bioassay Test Results for Samples Collected from July 9 to September 9, 1992.* Memorandum to Brian Finlayson, Pesticide Investigations Unit, California Department of Fish and Game. Rancho Cordova, CA. March 23, 1993. As presented in CDPR, 2000.

Fujimura, R. 1993c. *Chemical Analyses and Bioassay Test Results for Samples Collected from March 16 to April 30, 1992.* Memorandum to Brian Finlayson, Pesticide Investigations Unit, California Department of Fish and Game. Rancho Cordova, CA. March 22, 1993. As presented in CDPR, 2000.

Fujimura, R. 1993d. *Chemical Analyses and Bioassay Test Results for Samples Collected from December 23, 1991 to February 27, 1992.* Memorandum to Brian Finlayson, Pesticide Investigations Unit, California Department of Fish and Game. Rancho Cordova, CA. February 23, 1993. As presented in CDPR, 2000.

Fujimura, R. 1991a. *Chemical and Toxicity Test Results from the San Joaquin River at Three Sites from July 2 to September 13, 1991.* Memorandum to Lisa Ross, Department of Pesticide Regulation. Sacramento, CA. November 6, 1991. As presented in CDPR, 2000.

Fujimura, R. 1991b. *Chemical and Toxicity Test Results from the San Joaquin River and Tributaries During March 4 to April 26, 1991.* Memorandum to Lisa Ross, Department of Pesticide Regulation. Sacramento, CA. November 6, 1991. As presented in CDPR, 2000.

Gregorio, D. 2000 *Field Report, Kings River Sampling*, State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Quality.

Gorder, N.K.N., J.M. Lee, and K. Newhart. 1995. *Information on rice pesticides submitted to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Valley Region.* Environmental Monitoring and Pest Management Branch, Department of Pesticide Regulation, Sacramento, CA. December 28, 1995. As presented in CDPR, 2000.

Gorder, N.K.N., J.M. Lee, and K. Newhart. 1996. *Information on rice pesticides submitted to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Valley Region.* Environmental Monitoring and Pest Management Branch, Department of Pesticide Regulation, Sacramento, CA. December 31, 1996. As presented in CDPR, 2000.

Gorder, N.K.N., J.M. Lee, and K. Newhart. 1997. *Information on rice pesticides submitted to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Valley Region.* Environmental Monitoring and Pest Management Branch, Department of Pesticide Regulation, Sacramento, CA. December 31, 1997. As presented in CDPR, 2000.

Gorder, N.K.N., J.M. Lee, and K. Newhart. 1998. *Information on rice pesticides submitted to the*

California Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Valley Region. Environmental Monitoring and Pest Management Branch, Department of Pesticide Regulation, Sacramento, CA. December 31, 1998. As presented in CDPR, 2000.

Hannaford M.J., and North State Institute for Sustainable Communities. 2000. Preliminary Water Quality Assessment of Cow Creek Tributaries. Department of Fish and Game. May 15, 2000. (http://www.delta.dfg.ca.gov/afrp/documents/cowcrk.rpt.pdf).

Harrington, J.M. 1990. *Hazard Assessment of the Rice Insecticides Molinate and Thiobencarb to Aquatic Life in the Sacramento River System.* California Department of Fish and Game. Environmental Services Division. Administrative Report 90-1. Sacramento, CA

Holmes, R. 2001. Personal Communication with C. Spector. CVRWQCB. August 28, 2001.

Holmes, R., C. Foe, and V. de Vlaming. 2000. *Sources and Concentrations of Diazinon in the Sacramento Watershed During the 1994 Orchard Dormant Spray Season.* California Regional Water Quality Control Board – Central Valley Region. Sacramento, CA., as presented in CDPR, 2000.

Horizons Technology, Inc. 1997. Sure! MAPS® RASTER Map Sets (U.S. Geological Survey 7.5' Topographic Quadrangles), Version 2.1.2.

Horning, W.B., and C.I. Weber, eds. 1985. *Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organism*; second edition. US EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) document #: 600/4-85/014. US EPA, Office of Research and Development, Cincinnati, OH.

Iovenitti, J.L., Weiss Associates, and J. Wessman. 1989. *Mount Diablo Mine: Surface Impoundment Technical Report.* Pleasant Hill, Ca.

Jennings, B. 2001. *Letter from Bill Jennings (DeltaKeeper A Project of San Francisco BayKeeper) to Mr. Jerry Bruns and Mr. Joe Karkoski (California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region) dated May 14, 2001, regarding DeltaKeeper comments on section 303(d) list update.* May 14, 2001.

Larry Walker Associates, 2001A. SRWP 99-00 Database. Unpublished Data.

Larry Walker Associates, 2001B. *Sacramento River Watershed Program Annual Monitoring Report: 1999-2000.* Prepared for the Sacramento River Watershed Program by Larry Walker Associates, Davis, California.

Larsen K., K.A. Cortright., P.Young, V. Connor, L.A.Deanovic, D.E. Hinton. 1998. *Stockton Fish Kills Associated With Urban Storm Runoff: The Role of Low Dissolved Oxygen.* CVRWQCB. June 1998.

Larsen K., M. McGraw, V. Connor, L. Deanovic, T. Kimball, and D. Hinton. 2000. *Cache Creek and Smith Canal Watersheds Toxicity Monitoring Results: 1998-1999* Final Report. November 2000.

Lee G.F, and A. Jones-Lee. 2000a. *Dissolved Oxygen Depletion in the Stockton Sloughs.* August 2000. (Prepared for DeltaKeeper)

Lee G.F, and A. Jones-Lee. 2000b. *Issues in Developing the San Joaquin River Deep Water Ship Channel DO TMDL.* Report to San Joaquin River Dissolved Oxygen Total Maximum Daily Load Steering Committee and the CVRWQCB. August 17, 2000.

Lee, G.F., and A. Jones-Lee. 2001. *Review of the City of Stockton Urban Stormwater Runoff Aquatic Life Toxicity Studies Conducted by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, DeltaKeeper,*

and the University of California, Davis, Aquatic Toxicology Laboratory between 1994 and 1999. G. Fred Lee & Associates. El Macero, CA. (Prepared for DeltaKeeper).

Marshack, J.B. 2000. *A Compilation of Water Quality Goals.* California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region Report. August 2000, updated October 11, 2000; December 5, 2000; February 8, 2001; April 18, 2001; and July 26, 2001.

May, J.T., R.L. Hothem, C.N. Alpers, and M.A. Law. 2000. *Mercury Bioaccumulation in Fish in a Region Affected by Historic Gold Mining: The South Yuba River, Deer Creek, and Bear River Watersheds, California, 1999.* U.S. Geological Survey. Sacramento, CA. 2000.

McKee and Wolf. 1971. *Water Quality Criteria.* Publication 3-A. California State Water Control Board. Sacramento, California.

Menconi, M., and S. Gray. 1992. *Hazard Assessment of the Insecticide Carbofuran to Aquatic Organisms in the Sacramento River System.* California Department of Fish and Game, Environmental Services Division. Administrative Report 92-3. Sacramento, CA.

Menconi, M., and J. M. Harrington. 1992. *Hazard Assessment of the Insecticide Methyl Parathion to Aquatic Life in the Sacramento River System.* California Department of Fish and Game. Environmental Services Division. Administrative Report 92-1. Sacramento, CA

Montoya, B, and X Pan. 1992. *Inactive Mine Drainage in the Sacramento Valley, California.* California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region Report. July 1992.

NAS (National Academy of Science). 1973. *A Report of the Committee on Water Quality: Water Quality Criteria, 1972.* U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Academy of Science-National Academy of Engineers (NAS). EPA R3-73-033.

NCWA (Northern California Water Association). 2001.*The Lower Butte Creek Project.* (http://norcalwater.org/lower_butte_creek_project.htm). Last updated Sept 4, 2001.

Nevada County. 2000. *Press Release, Three County Environmental Health Agencies Issue Interim Public Health Notification on Mercury in Fish.* Nevada County, Department of Environmental Health. (http://www.co.nevada.ca.us/ehealth/hg/press_release_10-03-00.htm)

Newhart, K., D. Jones, and S. Ceesay. 2000. *Information on Rice Pesticides-Submitted to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board.* California Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Pesticide Regulation. Environmental Monitoring and Pest Management Branch. Environmental Hazards Assessment Program. December 31, 2000.

Nordmark, C. 2000, In prep. *Preliminary Results of Acute and Chronic Toxicity Testing of Surface Water Monitored in the Sacramento River Watershed, Winter 1999-00.* Memorandum to Don Weaver, Environmental Monitoring and Pest Management, Department of Pesticide Regulation. Sacramento, CA., as presented in CDPR, 2001.

Nordmark, C. 1999. *Preliminary Results of Acute and Chronic Toxicity Testing of Surface Water Monitored in the Sacramento River Watershed, Winter 1998-99.* Memorandum to Don Weaver, Environmental Monitoring and Pest Management, Department of Pesticide Regulation, Sacramento, CA. May 26, 1999., as presented in CDPR, 2000.

Nordmark, C. 1998. *Preliminary Results of Acute and Chronic Toxicity Testing of Surface Water Monitored in the Sacramento River Watershed, Winter 1998-99.* Memorandum to Don Weaver, Environmental Monitoring and Pest Management, Department of Pesticide Regulation. Sacramento, CA. July 31, 1998, as presented in CDPR, 2000.

Nordmark, C.E., K.P. Bennett, H. Feng, J. Hernandez, and P. Lee. 1998. *Occurrence of aquatic toxicity and dormant spray pesticide detections in the Sacramento River watershed.* Winter 1996-97. Environmental Hazards Assessment Program, Environmental Monitoring and Pest Management Branch. Department of Pesticide Regulation. Sacramento, CA. Report EH98-01. February, 1998. as presented in CDPR, 2000.

North State Resources and T Holmes (prepared for the Fall River Resource Conservation District). *A study of the Habitat Characteristics of the Aquatic Vegitation of the Upper Fall River: Final Report.* Redding, Ca. December 8, 1997.

Nichols, J., S. Bradbury, and J. Swartout. 1999. *Derivation of wildlife values for mercury* in *Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health*: 325-355.

OEHHA (Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment). 1987. *Methyl Mercury In Northern Coastal Mountain Lakes: Guidelines for Sport Fish Consumption For Clear Lake (Lake County), Lake Berryessa (Napa County), And Lake Herman (Solano County).* James W. Stratton, Daniel Smith, Anna M. Fan, and Steven Book. Hazard Evaluation Section and the Epidemiological Studies and Surveillance Section, Berkeley, California.

OEHHA (Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment). 2000. *Draft Evaluation of Potential Health Effects of Eating Fish From Black Butte Reservoir (Glenn and Tehama Counties): Guidelines for Sport Fish Consumption*, Pesticide and Environmental Toxicology Section, California Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment.

OEHHA (Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment). 1999. *Health Risk Categories and Cancer Risk. Values for Chemicals without California Public Health Goals*: molinate. www.oehha.ca.gov/risk/ChemicalDB/withoutPHG.asp?name=molinate&number=221267

OMR. 2000. *California's Abandoned Mines – A Report on the Magnitude and Scope of the Issue in the State.* California Department of Conservation, Office of Mine Reclamation, Abandoned Mine Lands Unit (OMR). Sacramento, CA. June 2000.

PANNA. 2000. *DPR surface water database with exceedances indicated.* 9/24/00. PANNA

PANNA. 2001. *DPR surface water database with exceedances indicated.* 6/29/01. PANNA

Panshin, S.Y., N.M. Dubrovsky, J.M. Gronberg and J.L. Domagalski. 1998. *Occurrence and distribution of dissolved pesticides in the San Joaquin River Basin, California.* U.S. Geological Survey. Water Resources Investigations Report 98-4032. National Water Quality Assessment Program., as presented in CDPR, 2000.

Ross, L. 1992. *Preliminary Results of the San Joaquin River Study; Summer, 1991.* Memorandum to Kean Goh. Environmental Hazards Assessment Program, Environmental Monitoring and Pest Management Branch. California Department of Pesticide Regulation. Sacramento, CA. May 21, 1992.

Ross, L. 1993. *Preliminary Results of the San Joaquin River Study; Summer, 1992.* Memorandum to Kean Goh. Environmental Hazards Assessment Program, Environmental Monitoring and Pest Management Branch. California Department of Pesticide Regulation. Sacramento, CA. September 22, 1993. As presented in CDPR, 2000.

Ross, L., J. Stein, J. Hsu, J. White, and K. Hefner. 1996. *Distribution and Mass Loading of Insecticides in the San Joaquin River, California: Winter 1991-92 and 1992-93.* Environmental Hazards Assessment Program, Environmental Monitoring and Pest Management Branch. California Department of Pesticide Regulation. Sacramento, CA. Report EH 96-02. November, 1996., as presented in CDPR, 2000.

Ross, L., J. Stein, J. Hsu, J. White, and K. Hefner. 1999. *Distribution and Mass Loading of Insecticides in the San Joaquin River, California: Spring 1991 and 1992.* Environmental Hazards Assessment Program, Environmental Monitoring and Pest Management Branch. California Department of Pesticide Regulation. Sacramento, CA. Report EH 99-01. April, 1999, as presented in CDPR, 2000.

Russick, K. 2001. *Characterization of OP Pesticides in Sacramento Urban Runoff and Receiving Waters.* Unpublished Draft CALFED Repot. Russik Environmental Consultant, Elk Grove, California.

SCH EIR. 1996. *Draft EIR for The Penn Mine Site, Long-Term Solution Project.* Prepared for: East Bay Municipal Utility District and Regional Water Quality Control Board-Central Valley Region. SCH EIR No. 95103036. May 1996.

Siepmann, S., and Finlayson, B.J. 2000. *Water Quality Criteria for Diazinon and Chlorpyrifos.* California Department of Fish and Game. Office of Spill Prevention and Response. Administrative Report 00-3. Sacramento, CA

Siepmann, S., and M.J. Jones. 1998a. *Hazard Assessment of the Insecticide Carbanyl to Aquatic Life in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River System.* California Department of Fish and Game. Office of Spill Prevention and Response. Administrative Report 98-1. Sacramento, CA.

Siepmann, S., and S.B. Slater. 1998b. *Hazard Assessment of the Insecticide Malathion to Aquatic Life in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River System.* California Department of Fish and Game. Office of Spill Prevention and Response. Administrative Report 98-2. Sacramento, CA.

Slotton, D.G., S.M. Ayers, J.E. Reuter, and C.R. Goldman. 1995. *Gold mining impacts on food chain mercury in northwestern Sierra Nevada streams.* Technical Completion Report for the University of California Resources Center, Project W-816. University of California, Davis, Division of Environmental Studies, August 1995.

Slotton, D.G., S.M. Ayers, and J.E. Reuter. 1996a. *Marsh Creek Watershed: 1995 Mercury Assessment Project—Final Report March 1996.* Report Prepared for Contra Costa County, March 1996.

Slotton, D.G., S.M. Ayers, J.E. Reuter, and C.R. Goldman. 1996b. *Gold Mining Impacts on Food Chain Mercury in Northwestern Sierra Nevada Streams (1996 Revision).* Division of Environmental Studies, University of California, Davis. December 1996.

Slotton, D.G., S.M. Ayers, J.E. Reuter, and C.R. Goldman. 1997. *Cache Creek Watershed Preliminary Mercury Assessment, Using Benthic Macro-Invertebrates – Final Report, June 1997.* University of California, Davis, Division of Environmental Studies, June 1997.

Slotton, D.G., S.M. Ayers, J.E. Reuter, C.R. Goldman. 1999. *Lower Putah Creek 1997-1998 Mercury Biological Distribution Study. February 1999.* Dept. of Environmental Science and Policy, University of California, Davis. February 1999.

Slotton, D.G., T.H. Suchanek, and S.M. Ayers. 2000. *Delta Wetlands Restoration and the Mercury Question: Year 2 Findings of the CALFED UC Davis Mercury Study. IEP Newsletter.* 13(4): 34-44.

SWRCB (State Water Resources Control Board). 1990. *Water Quality Problems Associated with Operation of Pardee and Camanche Reservoir.* State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Quality staff report.

SWRCB (State Water Resources Control Board). 1999. *1998 California 303(d) List and Priority Schedule.* Approved by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9. May 12, 1999. (http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/docs/303d98.pdf).

SWRCB. 2001. Undated memorandum from Stan Martinson, Chief, Division of Water Quality. *Solicitation of Water Quality Information.* E-mail sent 14 February 2001.

SWRCB-DWQ (State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Quality). 1995. *Toxic Substances Monitoring Program: Freshwater Bioaccumulation Monitoring Program: Data Base (Metals_Wet).*

Templin, B. 2000, *Photo-documentation of Ten Mile Creek*, Friends of the South Fork Kings River, April 28, 2000. (http://www.fix.net/sfkings.com)

Tetra Tech, Inc (for the Fall River Resource Conservation District). 1998. *Analysis of Sedimentation and Action Plan Development for the Upper Fall River, Shasta County, California.* San Francisco, Ca. May 20, 1998.

USBR (U.S. Bureau of Reclamation). 2001. *U.S. Bureau of Reclamation DataWeb: Power Plants, Dams & Reservoirs.* Accessed on August 22, 2001 (http://dataweb.usbr.gov/).

USACOE (US Army Corps of Engineers) October 1996, *Sanitary Survey of The Hensley Lake Watershed,* Sacramento District

USACOE (US Army Corps of Engineers) 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, *Annual Water Quality Report, Lake Monitoring Program,* Sacramento District (Enclosures 1, 2, 3, and 4)(Also accessible on the internet at http://www.spk.usace.army.mil/cespk-ed/env)

USACOE (US Army Corps of Engineers) 8 May 2001, Armbruester, Edward, Park Manager Hensley Lake. Verbal communication with Jack Yamauchi, CRWQCB-CVR.

USDA (United States Depatment of Agriculture), River Basin Planning Staff, in cooperation with Fall River Resource Conservation District. 1983. *Fall River Watershed Area Study, Summary Report.* Davis, Ca. June 1983.

USDHHS-ATSDR (US Department of Health and Human Services, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry). 1994. *Public Health Statement for DDT, DDE, and DDD.* May 1994. (http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/ToxProfiles/phs8908.html)

USDHHS-ATSDR (US Department of Health and Human Services, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry). 1995. *ToxFAQs - DDT, DDE, and DDD.* September 1995. (http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/tfacts35.html)

USDHHS-ATSDR (US Department of Health and Human Services, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry). 1997. *Fish Sampling in Putah Creek, 1996, Laboratory for Energy Related Health Research, Davis, Yolo County California, Cerclis No. CA2890190000.* Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry (ATSDR). April 1997.

USDHHS-ATSDR. 1998. *Health Consolation, Fish Sampling in Putah Creek (Phase II), Laboratory for Energy Related Health Research, Davis, Yolo County California, Cerclis No. CA2890190000.* Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry. September 1998.

USEPA (Environmental Protection Agency). 1976. *Quality Criteria for Water (The Red Book).*

USEPA. 1986a. Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Bacteria. EPA # 44015-84-002.

USEPA. 1986b. *Ambient Aquatic Life Water Quality Criteria: Chlorpyrifos - 1986.* EPA# 440/5-86-005

USEPA. 1991. *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control*; second edition. US EPA document #: 505/2-90/001. US EPA, Office of Water, Washington DC.

USEPA. 1995. *Great Lakes Water Quality Initiative Technical Support Document for Wildlife Criteria.* EPA-820-B-95-009. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water. March 1995.

USEPA. 1997a. *Mercury Study Report to Congress, Vol. 6. An Ecological Assessment for Anthropogenic Mercury Emissions in the United States.* U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air Quality Planning & Standards and Office of Research and Development. Washington, DC.

USEPA (Office of Water). 1997b. *National Clarifying Guidance For 1998 State and Territory Clean Water Act Section 303(d) Listing Decisions.* August 17, 1997. (http://www.epa.gov/owow/tmdl/lisgid.html)

USEPA. 1998a. *Bacterial Water Quality Standards Status Report.* EPA-823-R-98-003. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water Report. May 1998.

USEPA. 1998b. *Ambient Aquatic Life Water Quality Criteria: Diazinon.* Office of Water Draft Document. September 1998.

USEPA. 1999. *National Recommended Water Quality Criteria – Correction.* EPA 822-Z-99-001. April 1999. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water. Washington, DC. (http://www.epa.gov/ost/pc/revcom.pdf).

USEPA. 2000a. *Water Quality Standards; Establishment of Numeric Criteria for Priority Toxic Pollutants for the State of California; Rule.* U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR, Part 131, *in* Federal Register, Volume 65, No. 97. Thursday, May 18, 2000.

USEPA. 2000b. *Guidance for Assessing Chemical Contaminant Data for Use in Fish Advisories. Volume 1, Fish Sampling and Analysis, Third Edition.* U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water. EPA 823-B-00-007. November, 2000.

USEPA. 2001a. *Protocol for Developing Pathogen TMDLs.* EPA 841-R-00-002. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water Report. January 2001.

USEPA. 2001b. *Water Quality Criterion for Protection of Human Health: Methylmercury.* EPA-823-R-01-001. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Science and Technology. January 2001.

USFDA (U.S. Food and Drug Administration). 1984. *Shellfish Sanitation Interpretation: Action Levels for Chemical and Poisonous Substances.* USFDA, Shellfish Sanitation Branch. Washington, DC. June 1984.

USFWS (U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service). 1992. *Before the State Water Resources Control: In the Matter of the Water Rights Hearing for the Lower Mokelumne River – Closing Statement, Enclosure 2 (EBMUD Data – Aluminum, Cadmium, Zinc, Iron and Zinc).* Prepared by J.W. Burke, III (Regional Solicitor, USFWS Pacific Southwest Region) and Lynn Cox (Assistant Regional Solicitor, USFWS Pacific Southwest Region).

USGS (United States Geological Survey). 2001. *National Water Information System.* http://water.usgs.gov/nwis/ (August 28, 2001)

USGS. 1958-2000. California 7.5' Topographic Quadrangle, as presented by TopoZone.com (© 2000 Maps a la carte, Inc.). Accessed on March 13, 2001 (http://www.topozone.com/default.asp) *Ciervo Mountain* (1969), *Idria* (1969), *San Benito Mountain* (1981), and *Tumey Hills* (1971), La Grange (1987), Westley (1991), and Brush Lake (1969), *Chiles Valley*(1980), *Aetna Springs* (1987), *Walter Springs* (1987b.), *Desert Reservoir* (1997).

Weber, C.I., W.H. Peltier, *et al.* 1989. *Short-term Methods for estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms*, second edition. US EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) document #: 600/4-89/001. US EPA, Office of Research and Development, Cincinnati, OH.

Westcot, D.W., C.A. Enos, and P.A. Lowry, 1991. Preliminary Estimate of Salt and Trace Element Loading to the San Joaquin River by Ephemeral Streams Draining the Eastern Slope of the Coast Range (Diablo Range). Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.

WHO (World Health Organization). 1993. *Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality*, 2nd edition. Geneva, WHO. www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/GDWQ/Chemicals/molinatesum.htm

Woodward-Clyde. 1992. *Source Identification and Control Report, December 1, 1992.* Report prepared for the Santa Clara Valley Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program by Woodward-Clyde Consultants, Oakland, California

Wyels, W. 1987. *Regional Mercury Assessment.* California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region. March 1987.

10.2 Documents and References Reviewed that Did Not Provide Information to Support Changes to the 303(d) List

Alpers, Anweiler, Howard. 1998. *Metals Transport in the Sacramento River, California, 1996-97*: Vol 2 Interpretation of Metals Loads. USGS

Alpers C.N., H.E. Taylor, and J.L. Domagalski. 2000. *Metals Transport in the Sacramento River, California, 1996-1997*, Volume 1: Methods and Data. USGS.

Alpers C.N., Antweiler, H.E. Taylor, P.D. Dileanis, and J.L. Domagalski. 2000. *Metals Transport in the Sacramento River, California, 1996-1997*, Volume 2: Interpretation of Metal Loads. USGS.

Ames, M. 001. *Cover letter from M. Ames to Joe Karkoski.* Redding, City of. 5/14/01.

Amy, G., R. Bull, K. Kerri, and S. Regli. 1998. *Bay Delta Driking Water Quality Bromide Ion (Br) and Formation of Brominated Disinfections By-Products (DBPs).* CALFED

Archibald & Wallberg Consultants. 1997. *Sacramento Stormwater Management Program: 1996 / 1997 Annual Monitoring Report.* Sacramento Stormwater Management Program

Archibald & Wallberg Consultants, Montgomery Watson. 1998. *American River Watershed Sanitary Survey: 1998 Update.* City of Sacramento

Austin, S.A. 1999. *Update on the Tradable Loads Program in the Grasslands Drainage Area, To all interested parties, Re: Econimic Incentives Project to Improve Water Quality in the Grasslands.* San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority. 25-Aug-99.

Azimi-Gaylon, S. 2000. *Quality Assurance Project Plan: Monitoring Organophosphorus Pesticides in the Lower San Joaquin Basin.* RWQCB. 1-Feb-00.

Barry, T. 1999. *Ecological Risk Assessment: Key Concepts/California Examples.* DPR

Bennett K.P., N. Singhasemanon, N. Miller, and R. Gal. 1998. *Rice Pesticides Monitoring in the Sacramento Valley, 1995.* DPR

Bennett, K. P., C. E. Nordmark, J. Schuette, H. Feng, J. Hernandez, and P. Lee. *Occurrence of aquatic toxicity and dormant-spray pesticide detections in the San Joaquin River watershed, Winter 1996-97.*

Bialy, H. 1998. *Data Report: Acute Copper Toxicity to Salmonids in Surface Waters in the Vicinity of the Iron Mountain Mine, California* - Vol 1. California office of the Attorney General

Block Environmental Services (BES). Grasslands Bypass Project (GBP). *Toxicity Program laboratory toxicity testing program.* (www. blockenviron. com/gbp/)

Brodberg, R. K., G. A Pollock. 1999. *Prevalence of Selected Target Chemical Contaminants in Sport Fish from Two California Lakes: Public Health Designed Screening Study.* Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, Pesticide and Environmental Toxicology Section. June 1999.

Brown, L. R. 1997. *Concentrations of Chlorinated Organic Compounds in Biota and Bed Sediment in Streams of the San Joaquin Valley, California* in Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology. USGS. May-97.

Brown, L. R. 1998. *Assemblage of Fishes and Their Associations with Environmental Variables, Lower San Joaquin River Drainage, California*: USGS Open File Report 98-77. USGS

Brown, L. R. 1998. *Concentrations of Chlorinated Organic Compounds in Biota and Bed Sediment in Streams of the Lower San Joaquin River Drainage, California.* USGS

Brown L. and J. May. 1999. *Macroinvertebrate Assemblages On Woody Debris and their Relationships with Environmental Variables In the Lower Sacramento and San Joaquin River Drainages, California.* USGS

Brown L. and J. May. 2000. *Benthic Macroinvertebrate Assemblages and their Relationships with Environmental Variables In the Lower Sacramento and San Joaquin River Drainages, California.* USGS

Brunetti J. 1999. *Pesticide Use Report Data For 1990 Through 1998.* DPR Dec, 1999.

Burke, J.W. and L. Cox. *In the Matter of the Water Rights Hearing for the Lower Mokelumne River, Closing Statement US FWS for the SWR Controls.* USFWS

Cain D.J., J.L. Cater, S.V. Fend, Sa. *Metal Exposure to a Benthic Invertebrate, Hydrpsyche californica, in the Sacramento River Downstream of Keswick Reservoir, California.* 1998. USGS

Cal EPA, Department of Toxic Substances Control. Abandoned Mine Lands Preliminary Assessment Handbook. 1998. Cal EPA, Department of Toxic Substances Control

CALFED. 1999. *Watershed Program Plan: Draft Programmatic EIS/EIR Technical Appendix.* CALFED Bay-Delta Program. June, 1999.

CALFED. 2000. *Science Conference 2000: Abstracts.* CALFED

CALFED. 2000. *Sources And Magnitudes Of Water Quality Constituents Of Concern In Drinking Water Supplies Taken From The Sacramento - San Joaquin Delta.* Sept 2000. CALFED

CALFED. 2000. *Water Quality Program Plan: Final Programmatic EIS/EIR Technical Appendix.* CALFED. Jul-00.

CCME (Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment). 1991. Appendix IX- A protocol for the derivation of water quality guidelines for the protection of aquatic life (April 1991). In: Canadian water quality guidelines, Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers, 1987. Prepared by the Task

Force on Water Quality Guidelines. [Updated and reprinted with minor revisions and editorial changes in Canadian environmental quality guidelines, Chapter 4, Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, 1999, Winnipeg.]

CDFG (California Department of Fish and Game). 1998. *Test 132: 96-hour acute Ceriodaphnia dubia test for diazinon.* Aquatic Toxicology Laboratory, Elk Grove.

CDFG. 1999. *Identification and Control of Pollution Sources in the Upper Sacramento River.* Feb, 1999. CVRWQCB

CDFG. 2000. *Biological Assessment Of Auburn Ravine, Placer County, California.*

CDHS. 1997. *Health Consultation: McCormick and Baxter Creosoting Company, Stockton, San Joaquin County, California, Cerclis No. CAD009106527.* 15-Jan-97.

CDPR. 1997. *Memo dated 6 June 1997.*

CDPR. 1997. *Toxicity Testing of Surface Water Monitored in the San Joaquin River and Sacramento River Watersheds, Winter 1996-97.* CDPR. Jun-97.

CDPR. 1998. *SWDB Study 32.* Environmental Hazards Assessment Program, Environmental Monitoring and Pest Management Branch, Department of Pesticide Regulation, Sa. February-98.

CDPR. *Preliminary Results of Acute and Chronic Toxicity Testing of Surface Water Monitored in the Sacramento River Watershed.* Memorandum, *Winter 1998-1999.*

CDPR. *Surface Water Monitoring in San Joaquin River Watershed.* 1996-1997.

CDPR. 2000. *Surface Water Database* (CD-Rom). July, 2000. CalEPA, Department of Pesticide Regulation.

CDPR. 2001. *Memo to RWQCB*, with a series of web sites to visit. Apr-01.

CDPR. *Preliminary Results of Acute and Chronic Toxicity Testing of Surface Water Monitored in the Sacramento River Watershed.* Memorandum.

CDWR (Department of Water Resources). 1998. *Municipal Water Quality Investigation Program. Aquatic Monitoring and Assessment for the Upper Fall River*, Memorandum Report. CDWR. May-98.

CDWR. *Clear Lake Sampling data* (core sampling). Submitted by: County of Lake.

CDWR. 2000. *Impacts of the South Delta Temporary Barriers Project, Year 2000 Operations on Steelhead, Spring- and Winter-run Chinook Salmon.* CDWR. Jan-00.

Chen, C. W. and Tsai, W. *Evaluation of Alternatives to Meet the Dissolved Oxygen Objectives of the Lower San Joaquin River.* San Ramon, CA

Chen, C. W., and Tsai, W. 2000. *Rough Loading Calculation for Dissolved Oxygen Sinks in Lower San Joaquin River.* RWQCB. Jan-00.

Chilcott, J. 2000. *Review of Selenium Concentrations in Wetland Water Supply Channels in the Grassland Watershed.* RWQCB. May-00.

Chilcott J.E., L.F. Grober, J.L. Eppinger, and A. Ramirez. 1998. *Water Quality of the Lower San Joaquin Rivers: Lander Avenue to Vernalis October 1995 - September 1997 (Water Years 1996-1997).* RWQCB. Dec-98.

Chilcott, J.E., L.F. Grober, J.L. Eppinger, and A. Ramirez. 1998. *Agricultural Drainage Contribution to Water Quality in the Grassland Watershed of Western Merced County, California: October 1995 - September 1997. (Water Years 1996 and 1997).* RWQCB. Dec-98.

Chilcott, J.E., L.F. Grober, A. Vargas, and J.L. Eppinger. 2000. *Agricultural Drainage Contribution to Water Quality in the Grassland Watershed of Western Merced County, California: October 1997 - September 1999.* RWQCB. May-00.

Chilcott, J.E., L.F. Grober, A. Vargas, and J.L. Eppinger. 2000. *Water Quality of the Lower San Joaquin Rivers: Lander Avenue to Vernalis October 1997 - September 1998.* RWQCB. May-00.

Clark, S.L., J. Bruns, V. Connor, and Jan. 1998. Metal Concentrations, Loads, and Toxicity Assessment in the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta: 1993 - 1995. CVRWQCB

Coate, A.R. 2001. *Cover letter to Mr Karkoski, from Coate, AR.* East Bay Municipal Utility District. Apr-01.

Colusa Co Resource Conservation District. 2000. *Sand and Salt Creek Watershed Project: Final Report.* Colusa Co Resource Conservation District. Feb. 2000.

Colusa, City of. 2001. *Powell Slough Water Sample Data, 1993-1997.* City of Colusa. Mar-01.

Colusa, City of. 2001. *Report of Waste Discharge Application for the City of Colusa (Submitted to Kyle Erickson, CRWQCB).* City of Colusa. Mar-01.

Commandatore A.M., Herren, Main, Santillan, Connor, Grovhoug, and Horford. 1998. 1997 *Compendium of Water Quality Investigations in the Sacramento River Watershed, Sacramento-SJ Delta, and SFBay Area.* CDWR

Connor, V. *Diazinon and Chlorpyrifos in Urban Creeks and Sloughs.* In prep.

Contra Costa Water District. 1997. *Salinity Survey of the Contra Costa Canal, Report to DHS.* Contra Costa Water District. 5/30/97.

Contra Costa Water District. 1997. *Your Drinking Water, Annual Water Quality Report 1997.* Contra Costa Water District.

Contra Costa Water District. 1998. *Your Drinking Water, A Report on the Quality of Your Tap Water, Annual Water Quality Report 1998.* Contra Costa Water District

Contra Costa Water District. 1999. *Your Drinking Water, Annual Water Quality Report 1999.* Contra Costa Water District

Contra Costa Water District. 2001. *Adverse impacts to CCWD caused by increased salinity and concentrations of organic carbon and other constituents of concern at CCWD's intakes.* Contra Costa Water District. 5/15/01.

Contra Costa Water District. 2001. *Municipal water quality investigation, independent data at a variety of CCWD locations.* Contra Costa Water District. 5/15/01.

Cooke, J., and V. Connor. 1998. *Toxicants in Surface Waters of the Sacramento River Watershed.* CVRWQCD

Cortright, K.; L. Deanovic, and D. Hilton. 1998. *Sacramento River Watershed Program Toxicity Testing Results: Quarterly Report October 1997 - December 1997.* CVRWQCB, UC Davis Aquatic Toxicology Laboratory.

Cortright, K., L. Deanovic, and D. Hilton. 1998. *Sacramento River Watershed Program Toxicity Testing Results: Quarterly Report January - February 1998.* CVRWQCB, UC Davis Aquatic Toxicology Laboratory.

Coulston, P.J. 1997. *Interagency Ecological Program for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Estuary: 1993 Annual Report.* DWR

CRA (California Resources Agency). 1998. *California Watershed Information Technical System – A Project of CERES: Geographic Information by Hydrologic Region, Watershed Data and Information for the lower Feather River Basin.* August 21, 1998 (Copyright © 1997).

CRMP (Panoche/Silver Creek Coordinated Resource Management Plan) TRC (Technical Review Committee). 1996. *Draft Water Quality Report.* . February 29, 1996.

CRWQCB- CVR (California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region). 1997. *Upper Fall River Water Quality Monitoring* . RWQCB. Summer 1997.

CRWQCB- CVR. 1997. Memo: Metal Toxicity To EPA Bioassey Species In Water Samples Collected Downstream From Keswick Reservoir (1988 - 93). CRWQCB- CVR. Jan 1997.

CRWQCB- CVR. 2000. *Clear Lake TMDL for Mercury Numeric Target Report- Preliminary Draft.* CRWQCB- CVR. Aug-00.

CRWQCB- CVR. 2000. *Selenium TMDL for Grasslands Marshes.* RWQCB

Davis, J.A., M.D. May, G. Ichikawa, and D. Crane. 1998. *Contaminant Concentrations in Fish from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and Lower San Joaquin River, 1998.* San Francisco Estuary Institute, Richmond, CA. Sep-98.

de Vlaming, V., V. Connor, DiGiorgio, Bailey, L. Deanovic, and Hinton. 2000. Journal In Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, vol. 19: pp 42-62.

Deanovic, L. 1997. *Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta bioassay monitoring report. 1994-1995.* Aquatic toxicity Laboratory, UC Davis.

Deanovic, L. 1998. *Sacramento- San Joquin Delta Bioassay Monitoring Report 1994-1995*, In Prep.

Deanovic L, K. Cortright, K. Larsen, E. Reyes, H. Bailey, and D. Hinton. 1998. *Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, Bioassey Monitoring Report: 1994-1995, Second Annual Report to the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.*

Deanovic L, K. Larson, V. Connor, and D. Hinton. 1998. *Sacramento River Watershed Program Toxicity Testing Results: Quarterly Report January-February 1998.* CVRWQCB, UC Davis Aquatic Toxicology Laboratory

Deanovic L, K. Cortright, K. Larsen, and E. Reyes, Bailey, and Hinton. 1998. *Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Bioassay Monitoring Report 1994-1995 (Draft).* UC Davis Aquatic Toxicology Laboratory

Deanovic L, K. Cortright, K. Larsen, and Da. 1998. *Stockton Fish Kills Associated with Urban Storm Runoff: The Role of Low Dissolved Oxygen (Draft) June 1998.* CVRWQCD, UC Davis Aquatic Toxicology Laboratory

Deanovic L,, D. Hilton, and K. Larson. 1998. *Sacramento River Watershed Program Toxicity Testing Results: Quarterly Report March - May 1998.* CVRWQCB, UC Davis Aquatic Toxicology Laboratory

DeltaKeeper. *Appendix F: Summary Statistics for Monitoring Data: SRWP, USGS NAWQA, Sacramento River CMP, and City of Redding .*

DeltaKeeper. 1998. *Pollution Alert, to Louis Pratt, Dairy Discharge- high EC reading.* Delta Keeper. 1-Jun-98.

Doleman, W. 2001. *Letter from Doleman, W to Joe Karkoski.* Will Doleman, ACFWS monitoring. May-01.

Doleman, W. 2001. Various reports in paper form. May-01.

Domagalski, J.L. 1997. *Results of a Prototype Surface Water Network Design for Pesticides Developed for the San Joaquin River Basin, California* in Journal of Hydrology. USGS

Domagalski, J.L. 1998. *Occurrence of Transport of Total Mercury and Methyl Mercury in the Sacramento River Basin, California* in Journal of Geochemical Exploration. Jun-98.

Domagalski, J.L. 2000. *Pesticides in Surface Water Measured at Selected Sites in the Sacramento River Basin, California, 1996-1998.* USGS, NAWWA

Domagalski J.L., and L. Brown. 1998. *National Water Quality Assessment Program-The Sacramento River Basin.* USGS

Domagalski, J.L., and P.D. Dileanis. *Water-Quality Assessment of the Sacramento River Basin, California- - Water Quality of Fixes Sites, 1996-1998.* USGS

Domagalski, J.L., P.D. Dileanis, D.L. Knifong, C.M. Munday, J.T. May, B. J. Dawson, J.L. Shelton, and C.N. Alpers. 2000. *National Water-Quality Assessment: Water-Quality, Sediment and Tissue Chemistry, and Biological Data, 1995-1998.* U. S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 00-391. http://ceres. ca. gov/watershed/geographic/sacramento. html

Domagalski, J.L., P.D. Dileanis, D.L. Knifong, C.M. Munday, J.T. May, B.J. Dawson, J.L. Shelton, and C.N. Alpers. 2000. *Water-Quality Assessment of the Sacramento River Basin, Water-Quality, Sediment and Tissue Chemistry and Biological Data*, 1995-1998. USGS- water.wr.usgs.gov/sac_nawqa/waterindex.html

Domagalski, J.L., N.M. Dubrovski, and C.R. Kratzer. 1997. *Pesticides in the San Joaquin River, CA: Inputs from Dormant Sprayed Orchards.* J. of Environ. Quality, 26:454-465.

Domagalski, J.L., D.L. Knifong, P.D. Dileanis, L.R. Brown, J.T. May, V. Connor, and C.N. Alpers. 2000. *Water Quality in the Sacramento River Basin, California, 1994–98*: Circular 1215. USGS

Domagalski, J.L., Knifong, D.L., MacCoy, D.E., Dileanis, P.D., Dawson, B.J., and M.S. Majewski,. 1998. *Water Quality Assessment of the Sacramento River Basin, California - Environmental Setting and Study Design.* USGS

Dubrovski, N.M., C.R. Kratzer, L. Brown, J. Gronberg, and K. Burow. 1998. *Water Quality in the San Joaquin-Tulare Basins, California, 1992-95.* USGS: Circular 1159.

Foe, C. 2000. *Progress report for CALFED Task 1A: Methyl mercury budget for the freshwater side of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary.* In *Mid-Project Meeting of the Scientific Review Committee for the CALFED Project: An Assessment of Ecological and Human Health I.* December 2000.

Foe C., L. Deanovic, and D. Hilton. 1998. *Toxicity Identification Evaluations of Orchard Dormant Spray Storm Runoff.* CVRWCB. Dec-98.

Fox Environmental Management, Archibald & Wallberg. 1997. *Aquatic Toxicity and Pesticides in Surface Waters of the Central Valley: Final Report.* California Urban Water Agencies

Friends of Deer Creek. 2001. *Deer Creek Monitorin Program, Dec 2000- April 2001.* Friends of Deer Creek.

Friends of Deer Creek. 2001. *Letter in response to RWQCB request for information.*

Fuji, Ranalli, Aiken, and Bergamaschi. 1998. *Dissolved Organic Carbon Concentrations and Compositions, and Trihalomethane Formation Potentials* in *Waters from Agricultural Peat Soils, Sac-SJ Delta, Ca: Implications for Drinking-Water Quality* (Report 98-4147). UGSG, DWR

Ganapathy, C. 1999. *Preliminary Results of Acute and Chronic Toxicity Testing of Surface Water Monitored in the Sacramento River Watershed, Winter 1997-98.* DPR. 5-Jan-99.

Ganapathy, C. 1999. *Preliminary results of acute and chronic toxicity testing of surface water monitored in the San Joaquin River watershed, winter 1997-98.* Memorandum to Don Weaver, Environmental Monitoring and Pest Management, Department of Pesticide Regulation, Sacramento. January 5, 1999.

Ganapathy, C. 1999. *Preliminary results of acute and chronic toxicity testing of surface water monitored in the San Joaquin River watershed, winter 1998-99.* Memorandum to Don Weaver, Environmental Monitoring and Pest Management, Department of Pesticide Regulation, Sacramento. July 20, 1999.

Ganapathy, C., C. Nordmark, K. Bennett, A. Bradley, H. Feng, J. Hernandez, and J. White. 1997. *Temporal distribution of insecticide residues in four California Rivers.* Report EH97-06. Environmental Hazards Assessment Program, Environmental Monitoring and Pest Management Branch, California Department of Pesticide Regulation, Sacramento, CA.

Ganguli, P., R.P. Mason, K.E. Abu-saba, R.S. Anderson, and R. Flegal. 2000. *Mercury speciation in mine drainage from the New Idria Quicksilver Mine, California* in *Environmental Science and Technology.*

Goodbred, S. L.,R.J. Gilliom, T.S. Gross, N.P. Denslow, W.L. Bryant, and T.R. Schoeb. 1997. *Reconnaissance of 17b-Estradiol, 11-Ketotesterone, Vitellogenin, and Gonad Histopathology in Common Carp of United States Streams: Potential for Contaminant-Induced Endocrine Disruption.*

Grassland Bypass Project Oversight Committee. 1998. *Grassland Bypass Project Annual Report.* Grassland Bypass Project Oversight Committee. 12-May-98.

Grassland Bypass Project Oversight Committee. 1999. *Project Description and Update.* 1-Mar-99.

Grassland Bypass Project Oversight Committee. 1999. *Grassland Bypass Project.* 1-Jun-99.

Grasslands Basin Steering Committee. 1999. *Rule Enforcing Selenium Load Allocation and Establishing a Tradeable Loads Program for Water Year 1999* DRAFT. 6-Jan-99. RWQCB, Grasslands Basin Steering Committee

Gronberg, J.M., N.M. Dubrovski, Brown, and Burow. 1998. *Environmental Setting of the San Joaquin-Tulare Basins, California.* USGS

Grover, J. 2000. *Dormant Spray Project Quarterly Report Data Appendix: December 1999 - February 2000.* UC Davis Aquatic Toxicology Laboratory. Jun, 2000.

Harrington J.M., P. Ode, A. Montalvo, D. Post, and C. *A Water Quality Inventory Series: Biological and Physical/Habitat Assessment of California Water Bodies; Russian River Index of Biological Integrity (RRIBI) for First to Third Order Tributary Streams.* May 1999.

Hilton D.E. 1998. *Multiple Stressors in the Sacramento River Watershed.* UC Davis Aquatic Toxicology Laboratory.

Holmes R., V. De Vlaming, and C. Foe. 2000. Sources And Concentrations Of Diazinon In The Sacramento Watershed During The 1994 Orchard Dormant Spray Season. July 2000. CVRWQCB

Holmes, T., and North State Resources, Inc. 1997. *A Study of the Habitat Characteristics of the Aquatic Vegetation of the Upper Fall River, Final Report.* Dec-97.

Hunt J.W., B.S. Anderson, B.M. Phillips, and R.S. Tjee. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment: Patterns of Aquatic Toxicity in an Agriculturally Dominated Coastal Watershed in California.* Institute of Marine Sciences, UC Santa Cruz; Calif. Mar, 1999.

IEP. IEP *Newsletter*, VOL 13, NO 3. 2000.

IEP. IEP *Newsletter*, VOL 13, NO 4. 2000.

Jardini R., and L. Deanovic. 1999. *SRWP Toxicity Monitoring & CALFED Fathead Minnow Mortality And Algae Toxicity Investigation: Sept - Nov 1999.* UC Davis Aquatic Toxicity Laboratory. Nov 1999.

Jardini R., and L. Deanovic. 2000. Sacramento River Watershed Program Toxicity Monitoring and CALFED Fathead Minnow Mortality and Algae Toxicity Investigation. Mar. 2000. UC Davis - Aquatic Toxicology Laboratory

Jones, D. 2000. *Preliminary results of acute and chronic toxicity testing of surface water monitored in the San Joaquin River watershed, winter 1999-00.* Memorandum to Don Weaver, Environmental Monitoring and Pest Management, Department of Pesticide Regulation, Sacramento.

Jones & Stokes Associates. 2000. *Submission of Stockton Regional Water Control Facility Data Collected for Fall 1999.* Jan-00.

Kern County Neighbors for Quality Aire, Water and Growth. 2001. *Public comments on water quality information.* Kern County Neighbors for Quality Aire, Water and Growth. May-01.

Kern County Water Agency. *LETTER and DISK with information in response to the RWQCBs request for information.* Apr-01. Kern County Water Agency

Kratzer, C. R. 1997. *Transport of Diazinon in the San Joaquin River Basin, California.* USGS National Water-Quality Assessment Program, open-file report 97-411.

Kratzer, C. R. 1998. *Pesticides in storm runoff from agricultural and urban areas in the Tuolumne River basin in the vicinity of Modesto, California.* USGS National Water-Quality Assessment Program, water-resources investigations report 98-4017.

Kratzer, C. R. 1999. *Transport of Sediment-Bound Organochlorine Pesticides to the San Joaquin River, California in Journal of the American Water Resources Association.* USGS. Aug-99.

Kratzer, C. R. 1999. *Transport of diazinon in the San Joaquin River Basin, California* in Journal of the American Water Resources Association 35(2): 379-395.

Kratzer, C.R., and Jennifer L. Shelton. 1998. *Water Quality Assessment of the San Joaquin - Tulare Basins, California: Analysis of Availability Data on Nutrients and Suspended Sediment in Surface Water, 1972 - 1990.* USGS

Lake, County of. 1997. *Scotts Creek Watershed Project (319h)* (not enclosed).

Lake, County of. 1999. *Clear Lake Watershed Analysis (205j)* (not enclosed).

Lake, County of. 1999. *Clear Lake Watershed Assurance (QA) Plan for the Clear Lake Basin Watershed Assessment (205j) Project* (not enclosed).

Lake, County of. *Clear Lake Core Data from DWR Clear Lake Sampling Sites.*

Lake, County of. *Creek Water Quality Samples/Stream Sampling Data for Lake County, Ca.*

Lake, County of. *Lake County 303(d) information: D:\water\lakedata\lakedata. mdb.*

Lake, County of. *Methods and Information about the County Clear Lake Database : D:\water\lakedata\lakedata. mdb Access 97.*

Lake, County of, and Mendocino National Forest. *Watershed Analysis Report, Upper Lake Watershed* (only part included).

Larry Walker Associates. 1997. *Sacramento River Mercury Control Planning Project: Final Project Report.* Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District

Larry Walker Associates. 1997. *Sacramento River Mercury Control Planning Project.* March 1997.

Larry Walker Associates. 2000. *Sacramento River Watershed Program Annual Monitoring Report: 1998-1999.* June 23, 2000.

Larry Walker Associates. 2000. *Annual Monitoring Report: 1998 - 1999* (Final). SRWP, Larry Walker Associates. JUN 2000.

Larry Walker Associates. 2000. *Sacramento River Coordinated Monitoring Program, 1999-2000 Annual Report.* SRWP, Larry Walker Associates. Nov 2000.

Larsen, K. 1998. *Sacramento River Watershed Project Toxicity Monitoring Results: 1997-98. Final Report.* Prepared for the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District. November 1998.

Larsen, K. 1998. *Sacramento River Watershed Program Toxicity Testing Results: 1997-1998.* CVRWQCB, UC Davis Aquatic Toxicology Laboratory

Larsen K, and V. Connor. 1998. *SRWP: Toxicity Monitoring Results: 1996 - 1997.* UC Davis Aquatic Toxicology Laboratory, CVRWQCB

Larsen K., and L. Deanovic. 1999. *Deltakeeper Project Quarterly Report Data Appendix: March - May 1999.* UC Davis Aquatic Toxicology Laboratory

Larsen K., L. Deanovic, and D.E. Hinton. 1999. *Cache Creek and Putah Creek Project Quarterly Report Reference Toxicant Data and Data Appendix: January - March 1999.* UC Davis Aquatic Toxicology Laboratory

Larsen K., and J. Perez. 2000. *Sacramento River Watershed Program Toxicity Testing Data Results Summary: 1998-99.* CVRWQCB. Feb, 2000.

Larsen, S. J., Capal, and Majewski. 1997. *Pesticides in Surface Waters: Distribution, Trends, and Governing factors.* Chelsea, Michigan

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. Report and DISK with information, mailed in response to the RWQCBs request for information for the 303(d) list.

Lee G.F., and A. Jones-Lee. 1997. *Comments on Follow up Sampling and Analysis Guidelines for Fish, Sediment, and Water Sampling from the Putah Creek Adjacent to the Former Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research, Davis, CA, Draft 2, dated September 17,1997.* Prepared by B Lloyd and ??. G. F. Lee & Assoc. Oct. 1997.

Lee G.F., and A. Jones - Lee. 1998. *Comments on US Department of Health and Human Services Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry, Draft Health Consultation, Fish Sampling of Putah Creek (Phase II) for the LEHR National Superfund Site.* G. FRED LEE & ASSOC. 16-Sep-98.

Lee G.F., and A. Jones-Lee. 1998. *Letter to Gary Carlton, Executive Director, CVRWQCB from G. Fred Lee.* G. G. F. Lee & ASSOC. Oct, 1998.

Lee, G.F. and A. Jones-Lee. 1999. *Preliminary report: Conclusions from review of the City of Stockton Urban Stormwater Runoff Aquatic Life Toxicity Studies Conducted by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, DeltaKeeper, City of Stockton and UCD Aquatic Toxicology Lab.* G. FRED LEE & ASSOC. June 4, 1999.

Lee G.F., and A. Jones-Lee. 1999. "*To individuals interested in hazardous chemical bioassumulation in Putah Creek fish*". G. FRED LEE & ASSOC. April, 1999.

Lee G.F., and A. Jones-Lee. 2000. G. Fred Lee & Assoc Publications On Drinking Water (Various Studies). G. F. Lee & ASSOC

Litton, G.M. 2000. *Summary Report for: Sediment Oxygen Demand, Sediment Deposition Rates, Biochemical Oxygen Demand Kinetics.* Jan-00. UOP

Lucas, R. 2000. *Report of Dissolved Oxygen Steering Committee to the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Board.* Aug-00. RWQCB

Maccoy, D.E. and J.L. Domagalski. 1999. *Trace Elements and Organic Compounds in Streambed Sediment and Aquatic Biota for the Sacramento River Basin, California, October and November 1995.* National Water-Quality Assessment Program.

Majewski, M. 2000. *Atmospheric Transport of Pesticides into and from an Urban Environment: Project Update for 1996.* Draft Report to the California Department of Pesticide Regulation. 23-Aug-00.

Malacha Hydro Limited Partnership. 2000. *Much Valley Hydroelectric Project: Water Surfacec Records, Monthly Summary, Pit River/Afterbay H2O quality Averages for 1994-1995 to 1997 to 1998. Jun-99.* Malacha Hydro Limited Partnership, provided to the RWQCB in 2000.

Miller J., and M. Miller. 2000. *Identification Of Diazinon And Chlorpyrifos Toxicity To Ceriodrapnia In Samples Of Surface Water Using Antibody – Mediated Chemical – Specific Removal Processes: VOL. 1 OF 3: Report And Appendacies.* Sept 2000. SWRCB, CALEPA, Aqua – Sciences

Montoya, B.L. 1999. *Water Quality Assessment of the State Water Project, 1996-1997.* DWR

Montoya, B.L. 2000. *Water Quality Assessment of the State Water Project, 1998-99.* DWR

Municipal Water Quality Investigations Program. 1999. *Compendium of Water Quality Investigations in the Sacramento River Watershed, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, and San Francisco Bay Area. California Department of Water Resources.* August 1999.

MWD. 2000. *MTBE Survery Results* (Data and Memo to Mike Paulucci). MWD. May-00.

Nordmark, C. 1997. *Preliminary Results of Acute and Chronic Toxicity Testing of Surface Water Monitored in the San Joaquin River Watershed, Winter 1996-97.* CDPR. 6-Jun-97.

Nordmark, C. 1998. *Preliminary results of acute and chronic toxicity testing of surface water monitored in the Sacramento River watershed, winter 1997-98.* Memorandum to Don Weaver, Environmental Monitoring and Pest Management, Department of Pesticide Regulation, Sacramento. July 31, 1998.

Nordmark, C. 1999. *Preliminary Results of Acute and Chronic Toxicity Testing of Surface Water Monitored in the Sacramento River Watershed, Winter 1998-99.* CDPR. 26-May-99.

Nordmark, C., K.P. Bennett, H. Feng, J. Hernandez, P. Lee. 1998. *Occurrence of Aquatic Toxicity and Dormant-Spray Pesticide Detections in the Sacramento River Watershed, Winter 1996-97.* CDPR. Feb-98.

Nordmark C.E., K.P. Bennett, H. Feng, and J.Hernandez. 1999. *Memorandum to Don Weaver, Preliminary Results of Acute and Chronic Toxicity Testing of Surface Water Monitored in The Sacramento River Watershed, Winter 1998-99.* CDPR. May-99.

Novartis Crop Protection, Inc. 1997. *An Ecological Risk Assessment of Diazinon in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins.* Novartis Crop Protection, Inc. , Greensboro, NC, Environmental and Public Affairs Department. Oct-97.

Oakhurst WWTF. 1999. *WDR Order No. 99-052*, Madera County Maintenance District No 22A, Oakhurst WWFT, Madera County. RWQCB

Poletika, N.N., and Robb, C.K. 1998. *Monitoring Study to Charactorize Chlorpyrifos Concentration Patterns and Ecological Risk in an Agriculturally Dominated Tributary of the San Joaquin River.* Dow AgroSciences. Nov-98.

Poletika, N.N., and Robb, C.K. 1999. *A Monitoring Study to Characterize Chlorpyrifos Concentration Patterns and Ecological Risk in an Agriculturally Dominated Tributary of the San Joaquin River: Part 2.* Dow AgroSciences LLC. Dec-99.

Redding, City of. 2001. *Data Set: Ca, Cu, and Zn in Sacramento River (graphs and data).* City of Redding. 5/14/01.

Reuter, J.E. , D.G. Slotton, S. M. Ayers, and C.R. Goldman. 2000. *Mercury Distribution in the Sediment and Biota of Davis Creek and Davis Creek Reservoir – McLaughlin Gold Mine Project, Yolo County, CA..* Aug-00.

Reyes E., H. Bailey, D. Hinton, V. Connor. 1998. The Role Of Microorganisms and Zinc In the Cerodaphnia Morality Observed in Sacramento River Bioassay in VM Medicine and Epidemiology

Ross L., R. Stein, J. Hsu, J. White, and K. Hefner. 2000. *Insecticide Concetrations in the San Joaquin River Watershed, California Summer 1991 and 1992.* DPR. AUG 2000.

Roth, J. 1997. *Letter to Gary Carlton from Julie Roth.* Oct. 1997. DSCSOC

Roth, J. 1998. *Letter to William Taylor, PhD, Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry, from Julie Roth.* Sept. 1998. DSCSOC

Roth, J. 2000. *Letter to Mr. and Mrs. Corsella from Julie Roth.* Feb. 2000. DSCSOC

Roth, J. 2001. *Cover letter to Joe Karkoski from Julie Roth.* April 2001. DSCSOC

Roth D.A., H.E. Taylor, J. Domagalski, and P. Dileanis. 1998. *Distribution of Inorganic Mercury in Sacramento River Water and Sediment.*

Sacramento, City of. 2000. *Toxicity of Arcade Creek Stormwater to Ceriodaphnia dubia.*

San Joaquin River Exchange, Contractors Water Authority. *Special Issue Exchange Perspective: Unreasonable Water Quality Standards Proposed* (and letter preface).

SFEI. 1997. *San Francisco Estuary Regional Monitoring Program for Trace Substances: 1996 Annual Report. San Francisco Estuary Institute, Richmond, CA.* December-97.

SFEI. 1999. *San Francisco Estuary Regional Monitoring Program for Trace Substances: 1997 Annual Report.* San Francisco Estuary Institute, Richmond, CA. June-99.

SFEI. 1999. *Annual Monitoring Report: San Francisco Estuary Regional Monitoring Program for Toxic Substances. Report, Chapter 8.* http://www.sfei.org/rmp/1997/

SFEI. 2000. *Contaminant Concentrations in Fish from the Sac-SJ Delta and Lower SJR, 1998.* Sep-00.

SFEI. *Grassland Bypass Project, monthly monitoring report from October 1996 to February 2001.* http://www.sfei.org/grassland/reports/gbppdfs.htm.

SFEP (SF Estuary Project)/CALFED. 2000. *State of the Estuary 2000, Restoration Primer, SF Bay-Sac-SJ Delta Estuary.*

Sierra Nevada Alliance. 2001. *Disk/letter of information in response to the RWQCBs request for information for the 303(d) list.*

South Yuba River Citizens' League. 2001. Letter of recommendations from SYRCL *in response to the RWQCBs request for information for the 303(d) list.* Aug-00. South Yuba River Citizens' League

South Yuba River Citizens' League. *Water Monitoring Quality Assurance Project Plan (and letter summary).* Aug-00. South Yuba River Citizens' League

State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). *Consolidated Toxic Hot Spots Cleanup Plan.* Volume II: Regional Cleanup Plans. 1999.

Steensen, Chilcott, Grober, Eppinger, and Ranirez. 1998. *Compilation of Electrical Conductivity, Boron, and Selenium Water Quality Data for the Grassland Watershed and SJR, May 1985- September 1995.* RWQCB. Feb, 1998.

Stockton, City of. 1997. *NPDES, Ambient Water Quality Monitoring Program: Results of sampling Sutter Basin agricultural drain for suspected phenoxy compounds.* City of Stockton, Sutter County Department of Agriculture. Sutter County Department of Agriculture (personal communication). June 26, 1997.

Tetra Tech, Inc. 1998. *Analysis of Sedimentation and Action Plan Development for the Upper Fall River, Shasta County, California* (for Fall River Resources Conservation District). May 1998.

Thibeau, D. 1997. *Quality Assurance Project Plan (Category III) Clear Lake Basin Watershed Assessment.*

Thomas, C., and T. Maurer. 1999. *Contaminant Concentrations in Water Samples from Selected Sites on the San Joaquine River National Wildlife Refuge.* USFW. Nov-99.

Thompson B., R. Hoenicke, J. Davis, and A. Gunther. 2000. *An Overview Of Contaminant-Related Issues Identified by Monitoring in San Francisco Bay.* San Francisxo Estuary Regional Monitoring Program.

Tierney D., J. Giddings, L. Hall, Ke. *An Ecological Risk Assessment of Diazinon in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins.* Novartis Crop Production, Inc.

Tomko, J. J. and K.M. Russick. 2000. *Evaluation of Effects of Existing Diazinon and Chlorpyrifos Levels Within Arcade Creek in Sacramento, CA.* Report to the Sacramento Area Stormwater Permittees. September 2000

Truong P., and S. Dabney. 2000. *Cache Creek Pollution Solution Forum.* Agricultural Research Service of USDA. May 2000.

UC Davis (UCD), Division of Environmental Studies. 1997. *Cache Creek Watershed Preliminary Mercury Assessment, Using Benthic Macro-Invertebrates.* CVRWQCB

UCD, Aquatic Toxicology Laboratory. 1999. *Toxicity of urban runoff in Modesto, California.* May 25, 1999. SWDB study 49

USDHHS-ATSDR (US Department of Health and Human Services, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry). 1997. *Health Consultation, Fish Sampling in Putah Creek 1996, Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research, Davis, California* dated April 4, 1997. Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry. April, 1997.

USDHHS-ATSDR. 1998. *Health Consultation, Fish Sampling in Putah Creek 1996, Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research, Davis, California* dated September 17, 1998. Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry. Sept. 1998.

USEPA (US Environmental Protection Agency (Office of Standards and Permits)). 1997. *Chlorpyrifos and Diazinon Contamination of Surface Waters to EPA Region IX.* EPA Office of Standards and Permits. July 1997.

USEPA (Office of Water, Office of Science and Technology). 1999. *1999 Update of Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Ammonia.* Dec, 1999. USEPA

USGS. 1998. *Occurrence and Distribution of Dissolved Pesticides in the San Joaquin River Basin, California.*

USGS. 1998. *Water Quality in the San Joaquin-Tulare Basins: California 1992-95.*

USGS. 2000. *Pesticides in Surface Water Measured at Select Sites in the Sacramento River Basin, California, 1996-1998.* Water-Resources Investigations Report 00-4203.

USGS. 2000. *Metals Transport in the Scramento River, CA, 1996 - 97, Vol 1: Interpretation of Metals Loads.*

USGS-NAWQA (National Water Quality Association). *Water-Quality Assessment of the Sacramento River Basin, California: Water-Quality, Sediment and Tissue Chemistry, and Biological Data, 1995-1998, Sacramento River Trace Metals Study.* (http://ca.water.usgs.gov/sac_nawqa/sacmetals.html)

vanderVeen, J. *Report of Storm Drain Data Fall/Winter of 99/00.* Friends of Deer Creek.

Vorster, A. 1990. *Water Quality Problems Associated with Operation of Pardee and Camanche Reservoir.* July 1990 (faxed). SWRCB.

Walker, W.J. 1997. *Notice of Emergency Remediation Measures Preliminary Report.* SECOR Internation, Inc. Jan-97.

William Abbott and Assoc. 1997. *Letter to Greg Vaughn, CVRWQCB, Re; Notice of Emergency Remediation Measures Gwin Mine, Calaveras County, California.* Jan-97.

Yuba City, City of. 2001. *Report Prepared for Water Treatment Plant.* 5/7/01.

Draft Staff Report on Recommended Changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List

Appendix A

Numeric Criteria Fact Sheets

Table of Contents

A Appendix - Numeric Criteria Fact Sheets

Regional Board staff developed "Fact Sheets" to describe the criteria used to interpret data for certain categories of pollutants. The Numeric Criteria Fact Sheets were developed for pollutants for which the Regional Board had a significant amount of information. For a category of pollutant, the Numeric Criteria Fact Sheets identify the beneficial uses that are likely impacted, the water quality objectives that are relevant to that pollutant, the criteria used to assess attainment of the water quality objectives, and a general description of how data were interpreted. Numeric Criteria Fact Sheets were developed for mercury, metals, pathogens, and pesticides.

A.1 Mercury Numeric Criteria Fact Sheet

A.1.1 Introduction

This fact sheet describes the basis for the Regional Board staff's evaluation of mercury information available for surface waters within the Central Valley region. The applicable beneficial uses and water quality objectives are described (as identified in the Regional Board's Basin Plan), the criteria used to interpret narrative water quality objectives are identified, and a summary of how data are generally evaluated relative to those criteria is provided.

A.1.2 Applicable Beneficial Uses

The following beneficial uses will most often apply in the evaluation of potential mercury impacts in surface waters (from pages II-1 and II-2 of the Basin Plan).

Cold Freshwater Habitat (COLD) - Uses of water that support cold water ecosystems including, but not limited to, preservation or enhancement of aquatic habitats, vegetation, fish, or wildlife, including invertebrates.

Commercial and Sport Fishing (COMM) – Uses of water for commercial or recreational collection of fish, shellfish, or other organisms including, but not limited to, uses involving organisms intended for human consumption or bait purposes.

Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN) - Uses of water for community, military, or individual water supply systems including, but not limited to, drinking water supply.

Warm Freshwater Habitat (WARM) - Uses of water that support warm water ecosystems including, but not limited to, preservation or enhancement of aquatic habitats, vegetation, fish, or wildlife, including invertebrates.

Water Contact Recreation (REC-1) – Uses of water for recreational activities involving body contact with water, where ingestion of water is reasonably possible. These uses include, but are not limited to, swimming, wading, water-skiing, skin and scuba diving, surfing, white water activities, fishing, or use of natural hot springs.

Wildlife Habitat (WILD) – Uses of water that support terrestrial or wetland ecosystems including, but not limited to, preservation and enhancement of terrestrial habitats or wetlands, vegetation, wildlife (e.g., mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, invertebrates), or wildlife water and food sources.

A.1.3 Applicable Water Quality Objectives

The following narrative objectives potentially apply in the evaluation of mercury impacts in surface waters under the heading of toxicity from Section III of the Basin Plan:

Under the heading of **Chemical Constituents:**

> Waters shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses. At a minimum, water designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) specified in the following provisions of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations, which are incorporated by reference into this plan: Tables 64431-A (Inorganic Chemicals) and 64431-B (Fluoride) of Section 64431, Table 64444-A (Organic Chemicals) of Section 64444, and Tables 64449-A (Secondary Maximum Contaminant Levels-Consumer Acceptance Limits) and 64449-B (Secondary Maximum Contaminant Levels-Ranges) of Section 64449. This incorporation-by-reference is prospective, including future changes to the incorporated provisions as the changes take effect.

Under the heading of **Toxicity:**

> The narrative water quality objective for toxicity in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the USEPA, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective." (CVRWQCB, 1998)

In addition to the narrative toxicity objective, the USEPA promulgated numeric water quality standards as part of the California Toxic Rule (CTR) in April 2000 (USEPA, 2000b). The CTR criterion of 0.05 µg/L (50 ng/L) total recoverable mercury protects humans from exposure to mercury in drinking water and contaminated fish. The standard is enforceable for all waters with a municipal and domestic water supply and/or any aquatic beneficial use designation. The federal rule did not specify duration or frequency terms; however, researchers have previously employed a 30-day averaging interval with an allowable exceedance frequency of once every three years for protection of human health, which is recommended for this effort (Marshack, personal communication).

A.1.4 Numeric Criteria Used

Various government entities have developed numeric criteria for mercury in fish tissue and water for both human health and wildlife protection. The following describes some of the criteria that could be used to interpret the Regional Board's narrative toxicity water quality objective.

Mercury in Fish Tissue

The National Academy of Sciences (NAS) numeric mercury guideline of 0.5 µg/g (parts per million [ppm]) (NAS, 1973) applies to whole, freshwater fish and marine shellfish. The NAS criterion was developed for the purpose of wildlife protection. The USEPA has also established wildlife criteria for the Great Lakes Water Quality Initiative (USEPA, 1995) and the Mercury Study Report to Congress (USEPA, 1997a). These USEPA criteria suggest that a range of mercury in fish tissue of 0.08 ppm (trophic level 3 [TL3] fish) to 0.35 ppm (trophic level 4 [TL4] fish) should be protective of wildlife. Because wildlife generally consume lower trophic level (and smaller) fish, the human health and wildlife criteria are not directly comparable.

The United States Food and Drug Administration (USFDA) action level for fish tissue of 1.0 ppm (USFDA, 1984) applies to the edible portion of commercially caught freshwater and marine fish for the protection of human health. Action levels are health-based advisory levels for chemicals for which primary maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) have not been adopted.

The USEPA recently established a criterion of 0.3 ppm methylmercury in the edible portions of fish for protection of human health (USEPA, 2001). For 303(d) fact sheet development, USEPA's criterion of 0.3 ppm is applied. This criterion is the most conservative and the most recently established.

Mercury in Surface Water

The USEPA and the California Department of Health Services determined that a MCL of 2.0 micrograms per liter (µg/L) (2,000 ng/L) be established for mercury in drinking water (Marshack, 2000). The CTR criterion, which also applies to mercury in surface waters, is discussed above.

All available criteria are summarized in Table A-1.

Table A-1. Mercury Criteria		
Agency	**Hg in fish tissue (mg/kg)**	**Hg in Surface Water (µg/L)**
USEPA Criterion, Methyl Mercury	0.3	
NAS Guideline for Wildlife Protection	0.5	
USFDA Action Level for Human Consumption	1.0	
CDHS & USEPA Primary MCL (inorganic Hg)		2
USEPA CTR Human Health – (Drinking Water & Aquatic Organism Consumption-inorganic mercury)		0.05

A.1.5 Data Interpretation

Mercury in Fish Tissue

The mercury criterion for fish tissue derived by USEPA is based on an average allowable intake of mercury by humans per day and an average consumption rate. The criterion is based on human consumption and accumulation of mercury over time. Mercury tends to accumulate in fish that are at top trophic levels and concentrations typically increase with fish age and size. When evaluating mercury fish tissue data, staff compared the average mercury concentrations in fish tissue samples of top trophic level fish (trophic level 4 fish – including mostly bass and catfish) to the USEPA human health criterion of 0.3 mg/kg (ppm). Average concentrations of mercury in trophic level 3 fish (e.g., trout, suckers, carp, and pikeminnow) were evaluated when there were limited data for trophic level 4 fish.

This approach may be conservative because people may eat a mix of trophic level 3 and 4 fish. In contrast to the potentially conservative approach of considering only trophic level 4 fish, the USEPA default consumption rate may not be representative of fishing populations in Central Valley waters (i.e consumption rates may be higher in the Central Valley). Staff calculated a weighted average based on the number of fish in the composite sample analyzed.

Exceptions to the general approach for evaluating mercury in fish tissue are described in the specific fact sheets.

Mercury in Surface Water

In contrast to fish tissue data, data from water samples are location and time specific. An initial screening of available water quality data was performed by determining whether a minimum of ten water samples was available and whether there was a minimum of two exceedances of the CTR criterion of 0.05 µg/L. If the minimum amount of data were available, staff then performed a more intensive review of the available data to determine whether the CTR criterion was being attained. Staff considered the CTR exceedance frequency of once every three years when evaluating the data.

A.2 Metals Numeric Criteria Fact Sheet

A.2.1 Introduction

This fact sheet describes the Regional Board staff's evaluation of metals information available for surface waters within the Central Valley Region. The applicable beneficial uses and water quality objectives are described (as identified in the Regional Board's Basin Plan), the criteria used to interpret narrative water quality objectives are identified, and a summary of how data are generally evaluated relative to those criteria given.

A.2.2 Applicable Beneficial Uses

The following beneficial uses will most often apply in the evaluation of potential metals impact in surface waters (from pages II-1 and II-2 of the Basin Plan).

Agricultural Supply (AGR) - Uses of water for farming, horticulture, or ranching including, but not limited to, irrigation (including leaching of salts), stock watering, or support of vegetation for range grazing.

Cold Freshwater Habitat (COLD) - Uses of water that support cold water ecosystems including, but not limited to, preservation or enhancement of aquatic habitats, vegetation, fish, or wildlife, including invertebrates.

Commercial and Sport Fishing (COMM) – Uses of water for commercial or recreational collection of fish, shellfish, or other organisms including, but not limited to, uses involving organisms intended for human consumption or bait purposes.

Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN) - Uses of water for community, military, or individual water supply systems including, but not limited to, drinking water supply.

Warm Freshwater Habitat (WARM) - Uses of water that support warm water ecosystems including, but not limited to, preservation or enhancement of aquatic habitats, vegetation, fish, or wildlife, including invertebrates.

Water Contact Recreation (REC-1) – Uses of water for recreational activities involving body contact with water, where ingestion of water is reasonably possible. These uses include, but are not limited to, swimming, wading, water-skiing, skin and scuba diving, surfing, white water activities, fishing, or use of natural hot springs.

Wildlife Habitat (WILD) – Uses of water that support terrestrial or wetland ecosystems including, but not limited to, preservation and enhancement of terrestrial habitats or wetlands, vegetation, wildlife (e.g., mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, invertebrates), or wildlife water and food sources.

A.2.3 Applicable Water Quality Objectives

The following narrative objectives potentially apply in the evaluation of metals impact in surface waters under the heading of toxicity from Section III of the Basin Plan:

Under the heading of **Chemical Constituents:**

> Waters shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses. At a minimum, water designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) specified in the following provisions of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations, which are incorporated by reference into this plan: Tables 64431-A (Inorganic Chemicals) and 64431-B (Fluoride) of Section 64431, Table 64444-A (Organic Chemicals) of Section 64444, and Tables 64449-A (Secondary Maximum Contaminant Levels-Consumer Acceptance Limits) and 64449-B (Secondary Maximum Contaminant Levels-Ranges) of Section 64449. This incorporation-by-reference is prospective, including future changes to the incorporated provisions as the changes take effect.

Under the heading of **Toxicity**:

> The narrative water quality objective for toxicity in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the USEPA, and

other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective." (CVRWQCB, 1998)

In addition to the narrative toxicity objective, the USEPA promulgated numeric water quality standards as part of the California Toxic Rule (CTR) in April 2000 (USEPA, 2000b). The applicable CTR criteria are described in Table A-2 below.

A.2.4 Numeric Criteria Used

Several numeric criteria have been developed by state and federal agencies to assess surface water impairment by metals toxicity. The following describes some of the criteria that could be used to interpret the Regional Board's narrative water quality objectives. For waters with both drinking water and aquatic life beneficial uses, the most stringent criterion was applied.

Department of Health Services (DHS) and United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) develop Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) as part of their drinking water standards. Primary MCLs are derived from health-based criteria (e.g., cancer risk) and secondary MCLs are derived from human welfare considerations (e.g., taste, odor, and laundry staining). Primary and secondary MCLs can be applied to both surface and groundwater and may be used to interpret narrative objectives to prohibit toxicity in drinking water.

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations published *Water Quality for Agriculture* in 1985, which contains criteria protective of agricultural uses of water.

The California Water Code and Section 303 of the Clean Water Act requires the preparation and adoption of a Basin Plan. The Basin Plan identifies the beneficial uses of navigable waters and provides water quality objectives based on those uses. Since federal law defines the combination of beneficial uses and water quality objectives as water quality standards, the Basin Plan is a regulatory reference for meeting the state and federal requirements for water quality control. Metals objectives provided in the Basin Plan are based on a water hardness of 40 mg/L (as $CaCO_3$). The Basin Plan also contains equations to derive objectives for hardness other than 40 mg/L.

The California Toxics Rule (CTR) was promulgated in April 2000 when USEPA developed water quality criteria for priority toxic pollutants in California's inland surface waters (USEPA, 2000). Together the CTR criteria and the Basin Plan beneficial uses are applied to water quality standards. All CTR metals criteria presented in Table A-2 are based on 40 mg/L hardness (as $CaCO_3$). Since the continuous and maximum criteria vary with hardness, the CTR provides equations to derive the adjusted criteria for water samples with a hardness other than 40 mg/L.

Regional Board staff did not use the aluminum 4-day average recommended criterion published by USEPA. In a recent document that included corrections to a number of criteria developed by USEPA, the following footnote was included for the aluminum 4-day average criterion:

"There are three major reasons why the use of Water-Effect Ratios might be appropriate. (1) The value of 87 μg/l is based on a toxicity test with the striped bass in water with pH= 6.5-6.6 and hardness <10 mg/L. Data in "Aluminum Water-Effect Ratio for the 3M Plant Effluent Discharge, Middleway, West Virginia" (May 1994) indicate that aluminum is substantially less toxic at higher pH and hardness, but the effects of pH and hardness are not well quantified at this time. (2) In tests with the brook trout at low pH and hardness, effects increased with increasing concentrations of total aluminum even though the concentration of dissolved aluminum was constant, indicating that total recoverable is a more appropriate measurement than dissolved, at least when particulate aluminum is primarily aluminum hydroxide particles. In surface waters, however, the total recoverable procedure might measure aluminum associated with clay particles, which might be less toxic than aluminum associated with aluminum hydroxide. (3) EPA is aware of field data indicating that many high quality waters in the U.S. contain more than 87 μg aluminum/L, when either total recoverable or dissolved is measured."

Based on the significant qualifications associated with the aluminum 4-day average criteria, Regional Board staff believes that site specific evaluation of potential chronic effects of aluminum are necessary prior to making a determination to add waters to the 303(d) list based on chronic aluminum impairment. Central Valley waters in general do not have the combination of low pH and hardness that the toxicity test had, upon which the criterion was based. Additionally, a portion of the aluminum observed in Central Valley waters is likely to be associated with clay particles, which, as stated by USEPA, may be less toxic than aluminum associated with aluminum hydroxide. Regional Board staff did apply the acute aluminum criterion, because USEPA did not make a similar qualification regarding the applicability of the acute criterion.

Regional Board staff did not apply the secondary MCL for iron in its evaluation of iron water quality data. Regional Board staff will be developing a proposed drinking water policy for Central Valley waters. That policy will identify both the relevant drinking water criteria as well as the appropriate point of application of those criteria. For this reason, Regional Board staff believes that additions to the 303(d) list based on exceedance of the iron secondary MCL would be premature. Regional Board staff did apply the site-specific iron water quality objective identified in the Basin Plan in the evaluation of iron water quality data.

All applicable water quality objectives and numeric criteria are summarized in Table A-2.

Table A-2. Metals Criteria (µg/L)							
	Chemical Constituents				CTR Criteria		
Metal	Primary MCL	Secondary MCL	Ag Water Quality Goals	Numeric Objective (Basin Plan)	Freshwater Aquatic Life 4-Day Avg Concentration (Dissolved)	Freshwater Aquatic Life 1-Hr Avg Concentration (Dissolved)	Human Health – (Drinking Water & Aquatic Organism Consumption)
Al	1000[a]	200[a]	5000		87[f,h]	750[f]	
As	50[a,b]		100	10[c]	150	340	
Cd	5[b]		10	0.22[d]	1.1	1.6	
Cu	1300[a,b]	1000[a]	200	5.6[d], 10[c]	4.1	5.7	1300
Fe		300[a,i]	5000	300[c]		1000[f,g]	
Pb	15[a,b]		5000		0.92	24	
Mn		50[a]	200	50[c]			
Ni	100[a]		200		24	220	610
Zn		5000[a]	2000	100[c], 16[d]	54	54	9100[f]
pH		6.5-8.5[b]		6.5-8.5[e]		6.5-9.0[g]	

a California Department of Health Services criterion
b U.S. Environmental Protection Agency criterion
c Applies only to Sacramento River from Keswick Dam to the I Street Bridge at City of Sacramento; American River from Folsom Dam to the Sacramento River; Folsom Lake; and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta expressed as a dissolved concentration.
d Applies only to Sacramento River and its tributaries above State Hwy 32 bridge at Hamilton City
e *Or a change of 0.5, Goose Lake criteria range 7.5-9.5*
f Total recoverable concentration. USEPA National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria; CTR and NTR values have not been promulgated.
g Instantaneous maximum. National Ambient Water Quality Criteria, not CTR value.
h Not used in evaluation of aluminum data. See discussion in main text above.
i Not used in evaluation of iron data. See discussion main text above.

A.2.5 Data Interpretation

Data from water samples are both location and time specific. In recognition of the discrete nature of water quality sample results, Regional Board staff considered the following factors in reviewing available data: 1) total number of samples collected; 2) total number of exceedances of criteria; 3) magnitude of exceedances of criteria; and 4) frequency of exceedance of criteria. An initial screening of available water quality data was performed by determining whether a minimum of ten water samples was available and whether there was a minimum of two exceedances. If the minimum amount of data were available, staff then performed a more intensive review of the available data to determine whether the applicable criteria were being attained. Staff considered the CTR exceedance frequency of once every three years when evaluating the data.

If exceedances appeared to occur infrequently (e.g., less than once every three years), then no recommendation for listing was made. In evaluating exceedances of chronic water quality criteria (often expressed as a four-day average), data over consecutive days were often not available. Regional Board staff evaluated the available data to determine whether exceedance of the chronic criteria could be inferred based on the magnitude of the exceedance or based on data collected prior to and after the data point being evaluated. A significant exceedance of a chronic criterion on a single day (e.g. by a factor of 4) would imply exceedance of the 4-day average criterion. Exceedance of the

chronic criteria over successive (although non-consecutive) sampling events would also imply exceedance of the criteria.

In general, waters were listed as impaired due to a particular metal when the available information indicated that the criteria would likely be exceeded on a periodic basis (i.e., the exceedance is not a unique event). A few data points with consistent (and/or substantial) exceedances could provide evidence of impairment in one case, whereas, more data points would be needed in another instance in which infrequent exceedances occurred. A specific description of how data were interpreted is contained in the fact sheets for each 303(d) list recommendation.

If available water quality data did not indicate exceedances of criteria, if few data points were available (e.g., less than 10 sampling events), or if an exceedance appeared to be a unique event, no recommendation for adding the water and pollutant to the 303(d) list was made. In some cases, the information available indicated that there may be an impairment, but not enough data were available to indicate that the exceedances occurred on a periodic basis. For those waters, a recommendation for further assessment is made.

The extent of impairment is based on the location of samples and evidence of relevant metal sources. The extent of impairment would be minimally defined as the distance between sampling points at which exceedances of criteria were found. Land use information, and the relative location of potential dilution flows were also considered in identifying the extent of impairment.

A.3 Pathogen Numeric Criteria Fact Sheet

A.3.1 Introduction

This fact sheet describes the basis for the Regional Board's evaluation of pathogen information available for surface waters within the Central Valley Region. The applicable beneficial uses and water quality objectives are described (as identified in the Regional Board's Basin Plan), the criteria used to interpret narrative water quality objectives are identified, and a summary of how data is generally evaluated relative to those criteria is given.

A.3.2 Applicable Beneficial Uses

The following beneficial uses will most often apply in the evaluation of potential pathogen impacts in surface waters (from pages II-1 and II-2 of the Basin Plan):

> **Agricultural Supply (AGR)** - Uses of water for farming, horticulture, or ranching including, but not limited to, irrigation (including leaching of salts), stock watering, or support of vegetation for range grazing.

Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN) - Uses of water for community, military, or individual water supply systems including, but not limited to, drinking water supply.

Shellfish Harvesting (SHELL) - Uses of water that support habitats suitable for the collection of filter-feeding shellfish (e.g., clams, oysters, and mussels) for human consumption, commercial, or sports purposes.

Water Contact Recreation (REC-1) - Uses of water for recreational activities involving body contact with water, where ingestion of water is reasonably possible. These uses include, but are not limited to, swimming, wading, water-skiing, skin and scuba diving, surfing, white water activities, fishing, or use of natural hot springs.

A.3.3 Applicable Water Quality Objectives

The most sensitive beneficial use for pathogen impairment is contact recreation. The Basin Plan contains a specific objective for fecal coliform bacteria. (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf). The Basin Plan states, "In waters designated for contact recreation (REC-1), the fecal coliform concentration based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period shall not exceed a geometric mean of 200/100 ml, nor shall more than ten percent of the total number of samples taken during any 30-day period exceed 400/100 ml.

For Folsom Lake (50), the fecal coliform concentration based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period, shall not exceed a geometric mean of 100/100 ml, nor shall more than ten percent of the total number of samples taken during any 30-day period exceed 200/100 ml."

In addition to the specific Basin Plan objective for bacteria the narrative toxicity objective also is applicable. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states the " the Regional Water Board will also consider...numerical criteria and guidelines developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services...the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective."

A.3.4 Numeric Criteria Used

Pathogen guidelines and criteria have been developed for the protection of human health by the California Department of Health Services (DHS) (Title 17 California Code of Regulation section 7958). DHS has also published draft guidelines for posting/closure of freshwater beaches DHS, July 2000 http://www.dhs.ca.gov/ps/ddwem/beaches/freshwater.htm) . USEPA has also issued criteria for bacteria (*Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Bacteria* (USEPA, 1986)). USEPA has requested that states adopt E. coli and enterococci indicators, rather than total or fecal coliforms by federal fiscal year 2003. The recommendation is based on studies that indicate that *E. coli* and enterococci show a strong correlation between swimming-associated illness and the microbiological quality of the waters used by recreational bathers (USEPA, 1986).

Table A-3. Bacteria Water Quality Standards

California Department of Health Services Standards Criteria are expressed as Most Probable Number (MPN) per 100 milliliters					
	Total Coliform	**Fecal Coliform**	**enterococcus**		***E. coli***
30 day log mean[1]	1,000	200	35		126[2]
Single Sample	10,000	400	104	61[2]	235[2]
USEPA Standards Criteria are expressed as Most Probable Number (MPN) per 100 milliliters					
	Total Coliform	**Fecal Coliform**	**enterococcus**		***E. coli***
30 day geometric mean[1]			33		126
Single Sample[3]			61		235
CVRWQCB Basin Plan Criteria Criteria are expressed as Most Probable Number (MPN) per 100 milliliters					
30 day		200			
10% of the samples shall not exceed		400			

1. The geometric mean and the log mean statistical methods are equivalent for non-zero, positive data sets.
2. Draft guidelines for posting/closure of freshwater beaches DHS, July 2000.
3. Single sample values for posting/closing beaches are statistically derived. The values presented in the tables are for "designated bathing beach" areas. Less restrictive numbers may be calculated for areas with lower frequency of contact recreational use. (USEPA 1986)

A.3.5 Data Interpretation

Pathogen criteria differ from other pollutant types in that the pollutant is not measured directly but uses indicator organisms to assess the likelihood of a water body being impaired. The criteria, adopted by U.S.EPA, used a risk level value of no more than eight illnesses per 1,000 swimmers for fresh waters, and no more than 19 illnesses per 1,000 swimmers for marine waters (USEPA 2001). The numerical values are "steady state" geometric mean values. U.S. EPA recommends a sampling protocol of a minimum of not less than five samples taken over not more than a 30-day period (USEPA 1986). DHS standards and recommended criteria are similar to EPA's and are also based on a statistically significant sample sizes. The primary difference between DHS and USEPA is the statistical methods used to derive the steady state number. USEPA uses a geometric mean calculation and DHS uses a log-mean calculation. The statistical methods are equivalent with non-zero positive data sets.

Monitoring studies of the indicator organisms for pathogens outside of designated swimming areas are variable in scope and frequently contain a limited number of samples. Data sets that include multiple sampling events per month (weekly or bi-weekly for example) and that span multiple months will be statistically evaluated and compared to the EPA standards. If the geometric means exceed the criteria a recommendation for listing for impairment by pathogens will be made. Single samples that exceed the recommendations for beach closure may not, in the absence of additional monitoring, be evidence of an ongoing, or seasonal, problem that would justify the listing of the water body.

A.4 Pesticide Numeric Criteria Fact Sheet

A.4.1 Introduction

This fact sheet describes the basis for the Regional Board's evaluation of pesticide information available for surface waters within the Central Valley Region. The applicable beneficial uses and water quality objectives are described (as identified in the Regional Board's Basin Plan), the criteria used to interpret narrative water quality objectives are identified, and a summary of how data is generally evaluated relative to those criteria is given.

A.4.2 Applicable Beneficial Uses

The following beneficial uses will most often apply in the evaluation of potential pesticide impacts in surface waters (from pages II-1 and II-2 of the Basin Plan):

> **Water Contact Recreation (REC-1)** - Uses of water for recreational activities involving body contact with water, where ingestion of water is reasonably possible. These uses include, but are not limited to, swimming, wading, water-

skiing, skin and scuba diving, surfing, white water activities, fishing, or use of natural hot springs.

Warm Freshwater Habitat (WARM) - Uses of water that support warm water ecosystems including, but not limited to, preservation or enhancement of aquatic habitats, vegetation, fish, or wildlife, including invertebrates.

Cold Freshwater Habitat (COLD) - Uses of water that support cold water ecosystems including, but not limited to, preservation or enhancement of aquatic habitats, vegetation, fish, or wildlife, including invertebrates.

Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN) - Uses of water for community, military, or individual water supply systems including, but not limited to, drinking water supply.

A.4.3 Applicable Water Quality Objectives

The following narrative objectives potentially apply in the evaluation of potential pesticide impacts in surface waters (from Section III of the Basin Plan).

Under the heading of **Chemical Constituents:**

> Waters shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses. At a minimum, water designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) specified in the following provisions of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations, which are incorporated by reference into this plan: Tables 64431-A (Inorganic Chemicals) and 64431-B (Fluoride) of Section 64431, Table 64444-A (Organic Chemicals) of Section 64444, and Tables 64449-A (Secondary Maximum Contaminant Levels-Consumer Acceptance Limits) and 64449-B (Secondary Maximum Contaminant Levels-Ranges) of Section 64449. This incorporation-by-reference is prospective, including future changes to the incorporated provisions as the changes take effect.

Under the heading of **Pesticides:**

- No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.
- Discharges shall not result in pesticide concentrations in bottom sediments or aquatic life that adversely affect beneficial uses.
- Total identifiable persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides shall not be present in the water column at concentrations detectable within the accuracy of analytical methods approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Executive Officer.

- Pesticide concentrations shall not exceed those allowable by applicable antidegradation policies(see State Water Resources Control Board Resolution No. 68-16 and 40 C.F.R. Section 131.12.).
- Pesticide concentrations shall not exceed the lowest levels technically and economically achievable.
- Waters designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of pesticides in excess of the Maximum Contaminant Levels set forth in California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Division 4, Chapter 15.
- Waters designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of thiobencarb in excess of 1.0 mg/l.

Where more than one objective may be applicable, the most stringent objective applies. For the purposes of this objective, the term pesticide shall include: (1) any substance, or mixture of substances which is intended to be used for defoliating plants, regulating plant growth, or for preventing, destroying, repelling, or mitigating any pest, which may infest or be detrimental to vegetation, man, animals, or households, or be present in any agricultural or nonagricultural environment whatsoever, or (2) any spray adjuvant, or (3) any breakdown products of these materials that threaten beneficial uses. Note that discharges of "inert" ingredients included in pesticide formulations must comply with all applicable water quality objectives.

Under the heading of **Toxicity:**

All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life. This objective applies regardless of whether the toxicity is caused by a single substance or the interactive effect of multiple substances. Compliance with this objective will be determined by analyses of indicator organisms, species diversity, population density, growth anomalies, and biotoxicity tests of appropriate duration or other methods as specified by the Regional Water Board. The Regional Water Board will also consider all material and relevant information submitted by the discharger and other interested parties and numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective.

The survival of aquatic life in surface waters subjected to a waste discharge or other controllable water quality factors shall not be less than that for the same water body in areas unaffected by the waste discharge, or, when necessary, for

> other control water that is consistent with the requirements for "experimental water" as described in *Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater*, latest edition. As a minimum, compliance with this objective as stated in the previous sentence shall be evaluated with a 96-hour bioassay.

Further explanation of the interpretation of surface water monitoring information can be found in section IV (Implementation) of the Basin Plan, as follows:

Under *Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives*

> Where multiple toxic pollutants exist together in water, the potential for toxicologic interactions exists. On a case by case basis, the Regional Water Board will evaluate available receiving water and effluent data to determine whether there is a reasonable potential for interactive toxicity. Pollutants which are carcinogens or which manifest their toxic effects on the same organ systems or through similar mechanisms will generally be considered to have potentially additive toxicity. The following formula will be used to assist the Regional Water Board in making determinations:
>
> $$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{[\text{Concentration of Toxic Substance}]_i}{[\text{Toxicologic Limit for Substance in Water}]_i} < 1.0$$
>
> The concentration of each toxic substance is divided by its toxicologic limit. The resulting ratios are added for substances having similar toxicologic effects and, separately, for carcinogens. If such a sum of ratios is less than one, an additive toxicity problem is assumed not to exist. If the summation is equal to or greater than one, the combination of chemicals is assumed to present an unacceptable level of toxicologic risk.

Under the heading of **Pesticide Discharges from Nonpoint Sources**

> In conducting a review of pesticide monitoring data, the Board will consider the cumulative impact if more than one pesticide is present in the water body. This will be done by initially assuming that the toxicities of pesticides are additive. This will be evaluated separately for each beneficial use using the following formula:
>
> $$\frac{C1}{O1} + \frac{C2}{O2} + \ldots + \frac{Ci}{Oi} = S$$
>
> Where:
> C = The concentration of each pesticide.
> O = The water quality objective or criterion for the specific beneficial use for each pesticide present, based on the best available information. Note that the

numbers must be acceptable to the Board and performance goals are not to be used in this equation.
S = The sum. A sum exceeding one (1.0) indicates that the beneficial use may be impacted.

For most pesticides, numerical water quality objectives have not been adopted. USEPA criteria and other guidance are also extremely limited. Since this situation is not likely to change in the near future, the Board will use the best available technical information to evaluate compliance with the narrative objectives. Where valid testing has developed 96 hour LC50 values for aquatic organisms (the concentration that kills one half of the test organisms in 96 hours), the Board will consider one tenth of this value for the most sensitive species tested as the upper limit (daily maximum) for the protection of aquatic life. Other available technical information on the pesticide (such as Lowest Observed Effect Concentrations and No Observed Effect Levels), the water bodies and the organisms involved will be evaluated to determine if lower concentrations are required to meet the narrative objectives.

In addition to the narrative toxicity objective, the USEPA promulgated numeric water quality standards as part of the California Toxic Rule (CTR) in April 2000 (USEPA, 2000b). The applicable CTR criteria are described in Table A-5 below.

A.4.4 Numeric Criteria Used

Regional Board staff used the following hierarchy to determine the applicable criteria for use in evaluating potential impacts on aquatic life: 1) Regional Board adopted performance goals (numeric performance goals are described for some rice pesticides); 2) the most recently developed USEPA/Department of Fish & Game criteria; and 3) Canadian water quality guidelines.

Regional Board staff used the following hierarchy to determine the applicable criteria for use in evaluating potential drinking water impacts: 1) Regional Board adopted performance goals (a numeric water quality objective for thiobencarb has been established for MUN uses); 2) the most recently developed USEPA/Department of Health Services criteria; and 3) Canadian drinking water quality guidelines.

For waters with both drinking water and aquatic life beneficial uses, the most stringent criterion was applied.

The table below describes some of the criteria that could be used to interpret the Regional Board's narrative water quality objectives. The numbers in **bold** are the criteria used to evaluate available data on pesticide levels in surface waters for the purpose of providing recommendations to the State Board on changes to the 303(d) list. The DDT and DDE criteria were adopted by the USEPA as part of the California Toxics Rule and therefore

are the applicable standards where fishing (i.e.. REC 1) is a beneficial use of water. The thiobencarb water quality objective is identified in the Regional Board's Basin Plan for use where drinking water (i.e. MUN) is a designated use.

In general, the criteria presented are contained in the report and associated database *A Compilation of Water Quality Goals* (Marshack, 2000). The report includes criteria developed by the USEPA, California Department of Fish and Game, California Department of Health Services, and California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. In general, the criteria were developed either to protect human health through consumption of drinking water or to protect aquatic life. The criteria for DDT and DDE, although water column criteria, were derived in part to protect humans from consumption of contaminated fish.

Regional Board staff also used water quality guidelines from the Canadian Council of Environmental Ministers, the Canadian national environmental agency, when criteria derived in the U.S. were not available. The Canadian protocol for derivation of water quality guidelines to protect aquatic life includes a minimum toxicological data set for fish, invertebrates, and plants. (CCME, 1991). The guideline for a given pollutant is preferably derived based on the lowest-observable-effect level (LOEL) of the most sensitive stage of the most sensitive organism. The LOEL is multiplied by a safety factor of 0.1 to derive the guideline value. Alternatively, the guideline can be derived from studies of acute toxicity. In this case, the acute/chronic (i.e. LC50/ no-observed-effect concentration) ratio is applied by dividing the most sensitive LC50 by the acute to chronic ratio (ACR). If an ACR is not available universal application factors are applied for non persistent (0.05) vs. persistent (0.01) pollutants. The Canadian protocol is comparable to the methodology employed by the USEPA and California Department of Fish and Game.

Regional Board staff also considered criteria derived by the Pesticide Action Network from the AQUIRE database (Pesticide Action Network (PAN), 2001a, 2001b). The AQUIRE database is managed by USEPA and provides results from tens of thousands of toxicity tests. From the AQUIRE database, PAN derived an acute value by calculating the average LC50 (lethal concentration to 50% of the organisms) for the most sensitive species. PAN derived a chronic value by calculating the average concentration of the most sensitive non-lethal endpoint for the most sensitive species. For example, if reproduction for a particular invertebrate species was most sensitive to a pesticide, PAN averaged the toxicity endpoints of all the studies for that particular species and effect.

Regional Board staff is not recommending the use of the PAN criteria. The quality control and quality assurance (QA/QC) procedures for studies contained in the AQUIRE database are not consistent. The experimental conditions of the various studies may also vary. It is beyond the scope of the update of the 303(d) list to make a determination as to adequacy of the studies upon which the PAN criteria are based. The PAN criteria are displayed for comparative purposes only.

Table A-4. Aquatic Life Protection - Criteria are in µg/L					
Pesticide	**EPA Criteria**	**DFG Criteria**	**Canadian**	**PAN**	**Regional Board**
2,4-D				1.0	
Alachlor	**76**[a]			5.0	
Atrazine	12[b]		**1.8**	2.0	
Azinphos	**0.01**			0.024	
Bromacil			**5**	97	
Carbaryl		**2.53** (CCC & CMC)	0.20	1.0	
Carbofuran		0.5 (max)	1.8	2.0	**0.4**
Chlorpyrifos	0.041/0.083 (CCC/CMC)	**0.014/0.020** (CCC/CMC)	0.0035	0.003	
Cyanazine			**2.0**	0.1	
DDE				0.0018	
DDT	**0.01/1.1**[c] (CCC/CMC)			0.0055	
Diazinon	0.09 (draft CMC)	**0.05/0.08** (CCC/ CMC)		0.0018	
Diazoxon				8.9	
Dicamba	200		**0.06** (Irrigation water)		
Dieldrin	**0.056/0.24**[c] (CCC/CMC)			0.01	
Dimethoate			**6.2**	1.0	
Diuron				7.03	
Endosulfan II Beta	**0.056/0.22** (CCC/CMC)		0.02	0.1	
Endosulfan Sulfate	**0.056/0.22** (CCC/CMC)		0.02	212	
Fonofos				0.08	
Malathion	0.1	0.43 (CMC)		0.001	**0.1**
MCPA, dimethylamine salt			**2.6**	6.0	
Methidathion				0.3	
Methyl Parathion		0.08 (max)		0.0003	**0.13**
Molinate		13 (max)		3.0	**10**
Parathion	**0.013/0.065** (CCC/CMC)			0.0006	
Prometryn				0.75	
Propanil				0.5	

Table A-4. Aquatic Life Protection - Criteria are in µg/L					
Pesticide	**EPA Criteria**	**DFG Criteria**	**Canadian**	**PAN**	**Regional Board**
Simazine	**10**		10	0.6140	
Thiobencarb		3.1 (max)		6.2	**1.5**

Bold – are the criteria used to evaluate available data on pesticide levels in surface waters for the purpose of providing recommendations to the State Board on changes to the 303(d) list.
EPA Criteria – Criteria are from criteria documents published by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as described in Marshack, 2000.
DFG Criteria – Criteria are from hazard assessment criteria documents published by the California Department of Fish and Game (Harrington, 1990;Menconi an Gray, 1992; Menconi and Harrington, 1992; Siepmann and Slater, 1998; Siepmann and Jones, 1998; Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000)
Canadian - Criteria are from guidelines published by the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME, 1991).
PAN – Criteria are contained in the Pesticide Action Network's 303(d) list submittal to the Central Valley Regional Board (PAN, 2001).
Regional Board – Criteria come from performance goals contained in the Central Valley Regional Board's Basin Plan (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998).
[a] USEPA Water Quality Advisory
[b] Draft criterion
[c] California Toxics Rule (CTR) or National Toxics Rule (NTR) criterion

Table A-5. Drinking Water Protection - Criteria are in µg/L				
Pesticide	**EPA Criteria**	**Regional Board**	**OEHHA/DHS**	**Canadian**
2,4-D	**70** (MCL), 100[a]		**70** (MCL)	
Alachlor	**2** (MCL)		**2** (MCL)/ 4(PHG)	
Atrazine	3 (MCL)		**0.15** (OEHHA)/ 3 (MCL)	0.005
Azinphos	87.5 (NAS)			**0.02**
Bromacil	**90** (HA)			
Carbaryl	700 (IRIS)		700 (DHS AL)	
Carbofuran	40 (MCL)/ 35 (IRIS)		18 (MCL)/ **1.7 (PHG)**	
Chlorpyrifos	21 (IRIS)			
Cyanazine	**1** (HA)			
DDE	**0.00059**[b] (drinking water/ consumption)		0.1 (OEHHA)	
DDT	**0.00059**[b] (drinking water/ consumption)		0.1 (OEHHA)	
Diazinon	0.6 (HA)		6 (DHS AL)	
Diazoxon				
Dicamba	**210** (IRIS)			
Dieldrin	**0.00014** (drinking water/ consumption)		0.002 (DHS AL)	
Dimethoate	1.4 (IRIS)		**1.0** (DHS AL)	
Diuron	**14** (IRIS)			
Endosulfan II Beta	110[b] (drinking water/ consumption)			
Endosulfan Sulfate	110[b] (drinking water/ consumption)			
Fonofos	**14** (IRIS)			
Malathion	160 (IRIS)		**160** (DHS AL)	
MCPA, dimethylamine salt	**11** (IRIS)			
Methidathion	**0.7** (IRIS)			
Methyl Parathion	1.8 (IRIS)		**2** (DHS AL)	
Molinate	14 (IRIS)		**20** (MCL)	
Parathion	4.2 (IRIS)		**40** (DHS AL)	
Prometryn	**28** (IRIS)			
Propanil	**35** (IRIS)			
Simazine	3.5 (IRIS)		**0.4** (OEHHA PHG)/ 4 (MCL)	

Table A-5. Drinking Water Protection - Criteria are in µg/L				
Pesticide	**EPA Criteria**	**Regional Board**	**OEHHA/DHS**	**Canadian**
Thiobencarb	1 (secondary MCL)/ 70 (primary MCL)	**1.0**		

Bold – are the criteria used to evaluate available data on pesticide levels in surface waters for the purpose of providing recommendations to the State Board on changes to the 303(d) list.
DHS AL – California Department of Health Services Action Level for drinking water.
EPA Criteria – Criteria are from criteria documents published by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as described in Marshack, 2000.
HA – Health Advisory for drinking water.
IRIS – USEPA Integrated Risk Information System.
NAS – National Academy of Sciences recommended level for protection of health for drinking water.
OEHHA/DHS – Criteria are from guidelines and criteria published by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and California Department of Health Services as described in Marshack, 2000.
Canadian - Criteria are from guidelines published by the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME, 1991).
PAN – Criteria are contained in the Pesticide Action Network's 303(d) list submittal to the Central Valley Regional Board (PAN, 2001).
PHG – Public Health Goal for drinking water (OEHHA).
Regional Board – Criteria come from performance goals contained in the Central Valley Regional Board's Basin Plan (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998).
[a] USEPA National Recommended Ambient Water Quality criterion to protect human health from water and fish/shellfish consumption.
[b] California Toxics Rule criterion for protection for drinking water and consumption of fish/shellfish.

A.4.5 Data Interpretation

Data from water samples are both location and time specific. In recognition of the discrete nature of water quality sample results, Regional Board staff considered the following factors in reviewing available data: 1) total number of samples collected; 2) total number of exceedances of criteria; 3) magnitude of exceedance of criteria; and 4) frequency of exceedance of criteria. An initial screening of available water quality data was performed by determining whether a minimum of ten water samples was available and whether there was a minimum of two exceedances. If the minimum amount of data were available, staff then performed a more intensive review of the available data to determine whether the applicable criteria was being attained.

In addition, Regional Board staff also considered factors such as the season of sample collection, the likely pesticide use patterns, and when the studies were conducted (e.g. comparisons were made between past studies and recent studies). When data were evaluated, sampling events conducted at different sites for the same water body were considered together.

In evaluating exceedance of chronic water quality criteria (often expressed as a four-day average), data over consecutive days was often not available. Regional Board staff evaluated the available data to determine whether exceedance of the chronic criteria could be inferred based on the magnitude of the exceedance or based on data collected prior to and after the data point being evaluated. A significant exceedance of a chronic criteria on a single day (e.g. by a factor of 4) would imply exceedance of the 4-day average criteria. Exceedance of the chronic criteria over successive (although non-consecutive) sampling events would also imply exceedance of the criteria.

In general, waters were listed as impaired due to a particular pesticide when the available information indicated that the criteria would likely be exceeded on a periodic basis (i.e. the exceedance is not a unique event). Few data with consistent (and/or significant) exceedances could provide evidence of impairment in one case, whereas, more data would be needed in another instance in which infrequent exceedances occurred.

If available water quality data did not indicate exceedances of criteria, if little data were available (e.g. less than 10 sampling events), or if the exceedance appeared to be a unique event, no recommendation for adding the water and pollutant to the 303(d) list was made.

In some cases, the information available indicated that there may be an impairment, but not enough data were available to indicate that the exceedances occurred on a periodic basis. For those waters, a recommendation for further assessment is made.

The extent of impairment is based on the location of samples and evidence of relevant sources. The extent of impairment would be minimally defined as the distance between sampling points at which exceedances of criteria were found. Land use information, as well as the relative location of potential dilution flows, was also considered in identifying the extent of impairment.

A specific description of how data were interpreted is contained in the fact sheets for each 303(d) list recommendation.

Draft Staff Report on Recommended Changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List

Appendix B

Fact Sheets for Recommended Changes to the 303(d) List

Table of Contents

B Appendix – Fact Sheets for Recommended Changes to the 303(d) List

Regional Board staff developed "Fact Sheets" to describe the basis for recommended changes to California's Clean Water Act 303(d) list (303(d) list). Separate Fact Sheets were developed for each recommended change to the 303(d) list, except for recommended changes in priority and schedule, which are discussed in the main staff report. The Fact Sheets for recommended additions or deletions include descriptions of watershed characteristics, water quality objectives not attained, evidence of impairment, extent of impairment, and potential sources. Fact Sheets supporting recommended changes in total water body size or size affected contain include descriptions of watershed characteristics and the relevant information supporting the recommended change.

B.1 Fact Sheets Supporting Addition to the 303(d) List

B.1.1 Arcade Creek, Copper

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (Regional Board) recommends the addition of Arcade Creek to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by copper. Information available to the Regional Board on copper levels in water samples indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained in Arcade Creek. The description of the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Arcade Creek	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Copper
Hydrologic Unit	519.21	**Sources**	Urban runoff/Storm sewers
Total Waterbody Size	10 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	10 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	All of Arcade Creek	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	38° 40' 28"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 13' 58"
Downstream Extent Latitude	38° 36' 11"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 30' 52"

Watershed Characteristics

The Arcade Creek watershed covers approximately 50 square miles. Arcade Creek proper generally flows from east to west starting near the intersection of Sunrise Boulevard and Greenback Lane and flowing into the Natomas East Main Drainage Canal in Sacramento (Russick, 2001). Watershed elevations range from 20 to about 270 feet above sea level.

Land use is predominately residential and commercial. The entire watershed lies within the urbanized parts of the Sacramento metropolitan area extending from the northeastern corner of the City of Citrus Heights on the east to the Natomas East Main Drain on the west. Flows and water quality in Arcade Creek are characteristic of a stream dominated by urban runoff. Typical dry weather flows at the USGS gauging station at Watt Avenue are less than 3 cubic feet per second (cfs) but may increase rapidly during rainfall events and have exceeded 1,900 cfs.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) California Toxic Rule (CTR) freshwater aquatic life criteria for dissolved copper are not being attained. The CTR Criteria Continuous Concentration (CCC) ranges from 2.7 to 29.3 µg/L and the Criteria Maximum Concentration (CMC) ranges from 3.6 to 49.6 µg/L, depending on hardness. The USEPA numeric primary maximum contaminant levels (MCL) to protect drinking water is 1,300 µg/L (Marshack, 2000). Copper data were compared to the hardness adjusted CTR criteria, as well as the drinking water MCL.

Evidence of Impairment
Water samples collected from Arcade Creek by the US Geological Survey (USGS) and the City of Sacramento indicate that Arcade Creek is impaired by copper. These data are summarized in Table 2, below. The USGS collected water samples from Arcade Creek from February 1996 through April 1998. Of the 28 samples collected by the USGS in that time period, 4 samples (approximately 14 %) exceeded the CTR Criteria Continuous Concentration for dissolved copper and 2 samples (approximately 7%) exceeded CTR Criteria Maximum Concentration (USGS, 2001). The City of Sacramento, as a participant in the Sacramento River Watershed Program (SRWP), collected copper samples from Arcade creek from June 1999 through May 2000. Of the 12 samples collected during that time period[1], 4 samples (approximately 33%) exceeded the CTR Criteria Continuous Concentration for dissolved copper and one sample (approximately 8%) exceeded the CTR Criteria Maximum Concentration (Larry Walker Associates, 2001A). Of the 40 total samples from both of these data sources, 8 (20 %) exceeded the CTR Criteria Continuous Concentration for dissolved copper (Larry Walker Associates, 2001B) and 3 samples (approximately 8%) exceeded the CTR Criteria Maximum Concentration. None of the samples exceeded the USEPA drinking water MCL.

Table B-2. Summary of Copper Data for Arcade Creek

Data Source	*USGS*	*SRWP*	*Total*
Dates of Sampling	2/96 – 4/98	8/99 – 5/00	2/96 – 5/00
Number of Samples	28	12[1]	40[1]
Median Cu Concentration (µg/L)	4.0	2.3	4.0
Range of Cu Concentrations (µg/L)	1.8-9.0	0.2-9.0	0.2-9.0
Number Above USEPA CCC	4 (14%)	4 (33%)	8 (20%)
Number Above USEPA CMC	2 (7%)	1 (8%)	3 (8%)

[1] There were 13 samples collected by the City of Sacramento for the SRWP. One of the 13 samples from the SRWP data was excluded from this analysis due to a lack of the hardness data needed to assess compliance with Water Quality Standards.

Potential Sources
The most likely source of copper to Arcade Creek is urban runoff. Urban runoff has been shown to contain copper from automotive sources (brakes and tires), urban source water and water delivery systems, and atmospheric emissions (Woodward-Clyde, 1992).

B.1.2 Avena Drain, Ammonia

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (Regional Board) recommends the addition of the Avena Drain to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by ammonia. Information available to the Regional Board on ammonia levels indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. The basis for this recommendation is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Avena Drain	Pollutants/Stressors	Ammonia
Hydrologic Unit		Sources	Agriculture/Dairies
Total Length	10 Miles	TMDL Priority	Low
Size Affected	2.5 Miles	TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)	
Extent of Impairment		TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)	
Upstream Extent Latitude		Upstream Extent Longitude	
Downstream Extent Latitude		Downstream Extent Longitude	

Watershed Characteristics
Avena Drain is a modified natural channel approximately 10 miles in length. The Avena Drain is tributary to Lone Tree Creek, which is tributary to the Delta. Storm water runoff (mainly from cropland) and irrigation tail water are the main sources of water. Due to the flow of tail water, the drain is no longer ephemeral during the dry season. Although there are few trees growing along the drain, there is some riparian vegetation.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The narrative objectives toxicity are not being attained for ammonia in the Avena Drain. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf)."

Ammonia levels in Avena Drain frequently exceed the Basin Plan objective for toxicity. To maintain healthy aquatic life in fresh water, the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) has determined that ammonia levels (measured as NH_3) should not exceed 0.02 mg/L undissociated ammonia (CRWQCB-CVR, 2001). Acute toxicity (96 hour LC_{50}) of ammonia to various freshwater fish ranges from 0.1 to 4.0 mg/L (McKee and Wolf, 1971).

Evidence of Impairment
There are 12 dairies that have the potential and propensity to discharge wastewater containing manure into Avena Drain. These discharged arise from the inability to retain wastewater during the winter months, and from irrigation with wastewater during the spring, summer and fall. Over a period of 10 years, samples collected from water entering the drain have shown undissociated ammonia levels ranging from 0.97 to 3.03 mg/L, with an average undissociated ammonia level of 1.73 mg/L (CRWQCB-CVR, 2001). Samples collected from the drain at Van Allen Road in 1998 contained undissociated ammonia levels of 0.24 and 0.31 mg/L (CRWQCB-CVR, 2001). A sample taken from the drain near Brennan Avenue in 1999 showed an undissociated ammonia level of 0.54 mg/L (CRWQCB-CVR, 2001). All of the samples contained undissociated ammonia levels above the CDFG criterion, and all of the samples exceed some to most of the LC_{50}'s for various freshwater fish species.

Extent of Impairment
Avena Drain begins on a dairy farm east of Brennan Avenue in San Joaquin County. Ten of the 12 dairies along the drain are located on the first 2 ½ miles. Most of the sampling has been done in that upper 2 ½ miles.

Potential Sources
The source of the ammonia in Avena Drain is from manure carried in dairy wastewater. The samples were taken during known discharges of wastewater.

B.1.3 Bear Creek, Mercury

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of Bear Creek to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by mercury. Information available to the Regional Board on mercury levels in water indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained in Bear Creek. The description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Bear Creek	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Mercury
Hydrologic Unit	513.20	**Sources**	Resource extraction (abandoned mines)
Total Waterbody Size	39 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	28 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	From the unnamed creeks to Cache Creek	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude		**Upstream Extent Longitude**	
Downstream Extent Latitude		**Downstream Extent Longitude**	

Watershed Characteristics
Bear Creek is in Colusa County, east of Clear Lake. The creek is approximately 39 miles long from its headwaters (just north of Indian Valley Reservoir) to its confluence with Cache Creek (Foe and Croyle, 1998; Montoya and Pan, 1992). It receives water from numerous tributaries, including Sulfur Creek (the largest tributary) and Hamilton Creek.

The Bear Creek watershed receives inflow from several mines, including the Sulfur Creek Mining District. Six inactive mercury mines are located in the Bear Creek watershed: Elgin Mine along the upper West Fork tributary of Sulfur Creek, Rathburn Mercury Mine along an unnamed tributary to Bear Creek, and Central, Wide Awake, Empire, and Manzanita mines along the main stem of Sulfur Creek (Montoya and Pan, 1992; Foe and Croyle, 1998). In addition, the area has several active geothermal springs that also may be sources of mercury (Foe and Croyle, 1998). These waters flow directly into Bear Creek, impacting the water quality.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) California Toxic Rule (CTR) criterion for mercury is not being attained. The California Toxics Rule (CTR) lists a criterion of 50 nanograms per liter (ng/L, or parts per trillion [ppt]) of mercury for freshwater sources of drinking water (for human consumption of water and/or aquatic organisms) (USEPA, 2000a).

Evidence of Impairment
Water quality data indicates that Bear Creek is impacted by mercury. Water samples were collected on thirteen days between April 1996 and February 1998. Four locations were sampled along Bear Creek: (1) at Culvert Road (above the confluence with any of the unnamed creeks or Sulfur or Hamilton Creeks), (2) between the confluence of Hamilton and Sulfur Creeks (below the confluence with the unnamed and Hamilton Creeks and above the confluence with Sulfur Creek), (3) at Highway 20 (downstream from the confluence with Sulfur Creek and above the confluence with Thompson Creek), and (4) just upstream from the confluence with Cache Creek (the furthest downstream point). Table 2 summarizes the data.

Table B-2. Mercury Concentrations in Bear Creek Water[1]

Sampling Location (Listed from upstream to downstream.)	Number of Samples	Range in Concentrations (Total Hg, ng/L)	Percent of Samples with Mercury Concentrations above USEPA Criterion (50 ng/L)
1. At Culver Road	2	13.29 – 30.09	0%
2. Between Hamilton and Sulfur Creeks	3	62.65 – 254.0	100%
3. Highway 20	2	328.2 – 1,595.9	100%
4. Just upstream of Cache Creek	12	18.53 – 1,290.2	67%

[1] Data from Foe C. and W. Croyle, 1998.

Table 2 indicates that above the unnamed creeks (sampling location #1), mercury concentrations are relatively low. By sampling location #2, mercury concentrations increase to levels above the CTR criterion. This indicates that mercury enters Bear Creek at or above Hamilton Creek, most likely at the unnamed creek that passes along Rathburn Mercury Mine. The levels of mercury increase between locations #2 and #3, by approximately 50 times, indicating that high levels of mercury enter Bear Creek at Sulfur Creek. Below Sulfur Creek, mercury concentrations decrease due to the inflow of additional water. Water quality data indicate that mercury enters Bear Creek primarily from Sulfur Creek and, to a lesser degree, from the unnamed upstream creeks and possibly other creeks.

Extent of Impairment
Water quality data indicate that mercury concentrations exceed the criteria at or above Hamilton Creek, most likely beginning at the unnamed creek that passes along Rathburn Mercury Mine. This indicates that, although Sulfur Creek probably contributes the most mercury, Bear Creek is listed as impaired from its confluence with the unnamed creek that flows along Rathburn Mercury Mine to its confluence with Cache Creek.

Potential Sources
The primary source of mercury is resource extraction (abandoned mines) from the mines located in the Sulfur Creek watershed and along the unnamed creek upstream from Bear Creek.

B.1.4 Lower Bear River, Diazinon

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (Regional Board) recommends the addition of the lower Bear River to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by diazinon. Information available to the Regional Board on diazinon levels indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. The basis for this recommendation is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Lower Bear River	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Diazinon
Hydrologic Unit	516.33	**Sources**	Agriculture
Total Length	18 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	18 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	From Camp Far West Reservoir to the mouth of the Bear River.	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	39° 08' 02"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	120° 57' 14"
Downstream Extent Latitude	39° 01' 52"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 01' 48"

Watershed Characteristics

The Bear River basin comprises more than 232,800 acres. Water uses include recreation, agriculture, municipal, and others. The Bear River basin is bounded by the Yuba River basin on the north, the Little Truckee River basin on the east, and the American River basin on the south. The headwaters are located in the Sierra Nevada snowfields at elevations ranging up to 9,100 feet above sea level. The lower section of the Bear River flows from Camp Far West Reservoir to its confluence with the Feather River south of Marysville. Extensive acreage in this lower part of the watershed is used to grow almonds and stone fruits, especially south of the Bear River downstream from State Highway 65.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objectives for pesticides and toxicity are not being attained for diazinon in the Bear River. The narrative objective for pesticides states, "No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses." The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf)." The California Department of Fish and Game has established freshwater numeric acute (1-hour average) and chronic (4-day average) criteria for diazinon of 0.08 µg/L and 0.05 µg/L, respectively, for the protection of aquatic life (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000).

Evidence of Impairment

Between 1994 and 2000, two studies analyzed a total of 14 ambient water samples collected in the Bear River for diazinon. The results indicate that the CDFG chronic criteria was exceeded 29% of the time overall and the acute criteria was exceeded 21% of the time. Samples were collected during the dormant spray season. Table 2 summarizes the available data.

Table B-2. Diazinon in Water Samples Collected from the Lower Bear River at Berry Road

Data Source	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of Diazinon Concentration	Criteria[a]			Number of Samples Equal to or	Percent Samples Equal to or Above
Holmes et al., 2000	1994	8	nd - 0.14 µg/L	chronic	0.05	µg/L	3	37.5%
				acute	0.08	µg/L	2	25%
Dileanis et al, 2000	2000	6	nd - 0.195 µg/L	chronic	0.05	µg/L	1	17%
				acute	0.08	µg/L	1	17%
Summary	1994 & 2000	14	nd – 0.195 µg/L	chronic	0.05	µg/L	4	29%
				acute	0.08	µg/L	3	21%

a) California Department of Fish and Game Water Quality Criteria for Diazinon (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000)
nd = not detected

Extent of Impairment
The lower Bear River runs for approximately eighteen miles between Camp Far West Reservoir and its confluence with the Feather River. Samples were collected at Berry Road near the confluence of the Bear and Feather Rivers. The lower section of the Bear River watershed contains extensive acreage of almond and stone fruit orchards. Diazinon is commonly used as a dormant spray on almonds and stonefruits during the winter months, and these applications are the most likely source of diazinon in the lower Bear River. Grasshopper and Yankee Sloughs, and Dry Creek flow into the lower Bear River, and these tributaries also drain orchard lands and are likely to contribute diazinon to the lower Bear River.

Potential Sources
The almond and stone fruit orchards are the most likely sources of diazinon runoff to the Bear River, therefore, agriculture has been identified as the source of diazinon.

B.1.5 Upper Bear River, Mercury

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of the upper Bear River to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by mercury. Information available to the Regional Board on mercury levels in fish tissue samples indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained in the upper Bear River between Rollins Reservoir and Lake Combie. The description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Upper Bear River	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Mercury
Hydrologic Unit	516.33	**Sources**	Resource Extraction (abandoned mines)
Total Length	70 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	8 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	Rollins Reservoir to Lake Combie	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	N 39° 08' 02"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	W 120° 57' 14"
Downstream Extent Latitude	N 39° 01' 52"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	W 121° 01' 48"

Watershed Characteristics
The Bear River basin has over 232,800 watershed acres. The river extends approximately 70 miles from its headwaters near Emigrant Gap in the Sierra Nevada Mountains to its confluence with the Feather River north of the town of Nicholaus. From upstream to downstream, the Bear River is intersected by three reservoirs: Rollins Reservoir, Lake Combie, and Camp Far West Reservoir. Water uses include hydroelectric generation, recreational, agricultural, and municipal uses, among others. The Bear River basin is bound by the Yuba River basin on the north, the Little Truckee River basin on the east, and the American River basin on the south. The headwaters are located in the Sierra Nevada snowfields at elevations ranging up to 9,100 feet above sea level. The impaired section of the upper Bear River extends approximately eight miles, from Rollins Reservoir to Lake Combie.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for mercury in the upper Bear River between Rollins Reservoir and Lake Combie. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services (OEHHA), the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective" (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf).

Numeric criteria for mercury in fish tissue have been developed for both human health and wildlife protection. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) recently established a human health protection criterion of 0.3 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg; equivalent to parts per million [ppm]) methylmercury in the edible portions of fish (USEPA, 2001b). This criterion is used to determine attainment with the narrative toxicity objective.

Evidence of Impairment
The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) collected fish tissue samples on September 23, 1999 from the upper Bear River at Dog Bar Road (May et al., 2000). Only trophic level 3 fish were collected by the study. Trophic level 3 fish feed on zooplankton, phytoplankton, and benthic invertebrates. Trophic level 4 fish consume trophic level 3 fish as part of their diet. Methylmercury and total mercury bioaccumulates in aquatic organisms and tends to increase with increasing trophic levels (USEPA, 1997a). The USGS sampled three trophic level 3 fish (two brown trout and one rainbow trout). The TL3 fish had a range of mercury concentrations from 0.38 to 0.43 ppm, and an average mercury concentration of 0.40 ppm, which exceeds the USEPA criterion of 0.3 ppm. Placer, Yuba, and Nevada counties have issued an interim public health notification for all lakes and watercourses within these counties based on the USGS data. OEHHA is in the process of developing a state advisory (Nevada County, 2000).

Extent of Impairment
The upper Bear River flows for eight miles between Rollins Reservoir and Lake Combie. The entire eight-mile section is impaired by mercury.

Potential Sources
The upper Bear River watershed was historically mined extensively for its hardrock and placer gold deposits and has been affected by hydraulic mining (Alpers, 2000). Several inactive gold mines exist upstream of Rollins Reservoir in the upper Bear River watershed (Montoya and Pan, 1992).

B.1.6 Black Butte Reservoir, Mercury

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of Black Butte Reservoir to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due

to impairment by mercury. Information available to the Regional Board on mercury levels in fish tissue samples indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained in Black Butte Reservoir. The description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Black Butte Reservoir	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Mercury
Hydrologic Unit	522.12	**Sources**	Resource Extraction (abandoned mines)
Total Waterbody Size	4,500 acres	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	4,500 acres	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	All of Black Butte Reservoir	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	

Watershed Characteristics

Black Butte Reservoir is located on Stony Creek along the eastern side of the California Coast Ranges. The reservoir straddles Glenn and Tehama Counties, which are primarily agricultural counties in the Central Valley. Black Butte Reservoir is operated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Water storage in this reservoir began in 1963. The reservoir covers a maximum of about 4,500 acres of water (Brodberg and Pollock, 1999). This is a warm water reservoir that supports primarily largemouth bass, crappie, catfish, and bluegill. Sport fishing is popular on the reservoir.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for mercury in Black Butte Reservoir. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective" (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf).

Numeric criteria for mercury in fish tissue have been developed for both human health and wildlife protection. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) recently established a human health protection criterion of 0.3 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg; equivalent to parts per million [ppm]) methylmercury in the edible portions of fish (USEPA, 2001a). This criterion is used to determine attainment of the narrative toxicity objective.

Evidence of Impairment

The Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (Brodberg and Pollock, 1999) collected trophic level 3 (carp, crappie and channel catfish) and level 4 (largemouth bass) fish tissue samples for Black Butte Reservoir. Trophic level 3 fish feed on zooplankton, phytoplankton, and benthic invertebrates. Trophic level 4 fish consume trophic level 3 fish as part of their diet. Methylmercury and total mercury bioaccumulate in aquatic organisms and tend to be present in higher concentrations with increasing trophic levels (USEPA, 1997a).

Fish were collected from three regions of the reservoir: Burris Creek Arm, Stony Creek Arm, and Angler's Cove (the area including Fisherman's Cove and extending to the dam). Samples were collected on November 25, and December 4 and 5, 1997. Muscle tissues from individual fish were combined into composite samples for chemical analysis. One composite sample of carp (three fish) and one composite sample of crappie (three fish) were prepared. Nine composite samples of largemouth bass (three fish each) were prepared- two from Angler's Cove, four from Stony Creek Arm and three from Burris Creek Arm. Eight composite samples of channel catfish (four fish each) were prepared-- one was from Angler's Cove, four were from Stony Creek Arm, and three were from Burris Creek Arm.

Mercury concentrations in the carp and crappie composite samples were 0.3 and 0.34 ppm, respectively. The average mercury concentration in the channel catfish composite samples was 0.4 ppm. The eight catfish composite samples had mercury values ranging from 0.34 to 0.5 ppm. The average mercury concentration in the largemouth bass composite samples was 0.7 ppm. The nine bass composite samples had mercury values ranging from 0.37 to 1.3 ppm (Brodberg and Pollock, 1999). See Table 2 for a summary of mercury concentrations in the composite samples based on trophic level.

In 2000, OEHHA issued a draft health advisory for Black Butte Reservoir and guidelines for fish consumption due to elevated mercury levels in fish (OEHHA, 2000).

Table B-2. Summary of Mercury Concentrations in Fish Tissue Composite Samples from Black Butte Reservoir

Data Source	Brodberg and Pollock, 1999
Sample Date	11/25/97, 12/4-5/97
Trophic Level 3 Fish	
Number of Composite Samples	38
Mean Mercury Concentration (ppm)	0.39
Range of Mercury Concentrations (ppm)	0.30 – 0.50
Percent of Samples at or above USEPA Criterion (0.3 ppm)	100%
Trophic Level 4 Fish	
Number of Composite Samples	27
Mean Mercury Concentration (ppm)	0.70
Range of Mercury Concentrations (ppm)	0.37 – 1.3
Percent of Samples at or above USEPA Criterion (0.3 ppm)	100%

Extent of Impairment
Since fish were sampled in various parts of the reservoir and all samples were above the USEPA mercury criterion (0.3 ppm), the evidence suggests the entire waterbody (4,500 acres) is impaired by mercury.

Potential Sources
The predominant sources of mercury in Black Butte Reservoir were from cinnabar deposits, which were mined for mercury in the Black Butte Reservoir watershed.

B.1.7 Butte Slough, Diazinon

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (Regional Board) recommends the addition of Butte Slough to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by diazinon. Information available to the Regional Board on concentrations of these pesticides indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. The basis for this recommendation is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Butte Slough	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Diazinon
Hydrologic Unit	520.30	**Major Sources**	Agriculture
Total Length	7.5 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	7.5 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	The entire slough	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	39° 11' 55"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 55' 42"
Downstream Extent Latitude	39° 08' 53"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 50' 18"

Watershed Characteristics

The drainage basin of Butte Slough lies east of the Sacramento River, south of Big Chico Creek, and north of the Sutter Buttes. Natural streams in the area either originate in the Sierra foothills or are former flood channels for the Sacramento River. Historically, all the streams were ephemeral and only carried runoff or flood flows for two to four months of the year. As these channels reached the low-lying areas along the east side of the Sacramento River, they branched into numerous sloughs and meandering waterways, creating extensive wetland habitat. All flows converged in the southwest corner of the basin and drained into Butte Slough (Chilcott, 1992).

Currently, the majority of the low-lying land within this basin is in rice production, and the sloughs and channels have been extensively reconstructed to carry irrigation water. Almond and stonefruit orchards, pasture, and rangeland dominate the uplands along the northern and eastern edges of the basin. However, important wetland habitat still exists in the basin, including the Butte Sink and the Gray Lodge Waterfowl Management Area, just north of the Sutter Buttes.

Butte Slough begins near the confluence of Butte Creek and the Sacramento River, and flows approximately six miles before it empties into the Sutter Bypass, just south of State Highway 20. Butte Slough receives large volumes of agricultural runoff during winter storm events and during rice field releases in April and May. During the summer irrigation season for orchard crops, Butte Slough is dominated by agricultural return flows (Chilcott, 1992).

The interconnected waterway and wetland system that includes Butte Creek, Butte Sink, Butte Slough , and the Sutter Bypass are part of the main migration corridor for spring-run salmon, and also provide habitat for numerous other aquatic and wetland species, particularly waterfowl. The Nature Conservancy and several reclamation districts and irrigation companies have formed the Lower Butte Creek Project to reduce fish passage and entrainment problems because of this waterway's key habitat values (NCWA, 2001; http://norcalwater.org/lower_butte_creek_project.htm).

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objectives for pesticides and toxicity are not being attained for diazinon in Butte Slough. The narrative objective for pesticides states, "No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses." The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf)." The California Department of Fish and Game has established freshwater numeric acute (1-hour average) and chronic (4-day average) water quality criteria for diazinon of 0.08 µg/L and 0.05 µg/L, respectively, for the protection of aquatic life (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000).

Evidence of Impairment

Table 2 summarizes the results from two key studies conducted by the Regional Board (Holmes et al, 2000) and the US Geological Survey (Dileanis et al., 2000). Samples were collected during January and February in each year.

Table B-2. Diazinon Concentrations in Water Samples Collected from Butte Slough at Lower Pass Road

Data Source	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of Diazinon Concentration	Criteria[a]		Number of Samples Equal to or Above Criteria	Percent Samples Equal to or Above Criteria
Holmes et al, 2000	1994	27	nd to 1.0 µg/L	chronic	0.05 µg/L	24	89%
				acute	0.08 µg/L	17	63%
Dileanis, 2001	2000	9	nd to 0.082 µg/L	chronic	0.05 µg/L	3	33%
				acute	0.08 µg/L	0	0%
Sum	1994 – 2000	36	nd to 1.0 µg/L	chronic	0.05 µg/L	27	75%
				acute	0.08 µg/L	17	47%

a) California Department of Fish and Game Water Quality Criteria for the Protection of Aquatic Life (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000)
nd = not detected

Extent of Impairment
Butte Slough extends for approximately six miles, from the confluence of Butte Creek and the Sacramento River to the Sutter Bypass. Samples were collected at one site only, at Lower Pass Road near Meridian. However, the Butte Slough watershed contains extensive acreage of almonds and stonefruits, and Butte Slough receives substantial amounts of runoff from these orchards during winter storm events. Therefore, the entire six miles are proposed for listing on the 303(d) list.

Potential Sources
Diazinon is commonly used as a dormant spray on almonds and stonefruits during the winter months, and these applications are the most likely source of diazinon in Butte Slough.

B.1.8 Butte Slough, Molinate

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of Butte Slough to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by molinate. Information available to the Regional Board on concentrations of this pesticide indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. The basis for this recommendation is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Butte Slough	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Molinate
Hydrologic Unit	520.30	**Major Sources**	Agriculture
Total Length	7.5 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	7.5 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	The entire slough	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	N 39° 11' 55"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	W 121° 55' 42"
Downstream Extent Latitude	N 39° 08' 53"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	W 121° 50' 18"

Watershed Characteristics
The drainage basin of Butte Slough lies east of the Sacramento River, south of Big Chico Creek, and north of the Sutter Buttes. Natural streams in the area either originate in the Sierra foothills or are former flood channels for the Sacramento River. Historically, all the streams were ephemeral and only carried runoff or flood flows for two to four months of the year. As these channels reached the low-lying areas along the east side of the Sacramento River, they branched into numerous sloughs and meandering waterways, creating extensive wetland habitat. All flows converged in the southwest corner of the basin and drained into Butte Slough (Chilcott, 1992).

Currently, the majority of the low-lying land within this basin is in rice production, and the sloughs and channels have been extensively reconstructed to carry irrigation water. The uplands along the northern and eastern edges of the basin are dominated by almond and stonefruit orchards, pasture, and rangeland. However, important wetland habitat still exists in the basin, including the Butte Sink and the Gray Lodge Waterfowl Management Area, just north of the Sutter Buttes.

Butte Slough begins near the confluence of Butte Creek and the Sacramento River, and flows approximately six miles before it empties into the Sutter Bypass, just south of State Highway 20. Butte Slough receives large volumes of agricultural runoff during winter storm events and during rice field releases in April and May. During the summer irrigation season for orchard crops, Butte Slough is dominated by agricultural return flows (Chilcott, 1992).

The interconnected waterway and wetland system that includes Butte Creek, Butte Sink, Butte Slough , and the Sutter Bypass are part of the main migration corridor for spring-run salmon, and also provide habitat for numerous other aquatic and wetland species, particularly waterfowl. The Nature Conservancy and several reclamation districts and irrigation companies have formed the Lower Butte Creek Project to reduce fish passage and entrainment problems because of this waterway's key habitat values (NCWA, 2001. http://norcalwater.org/lower_butte_creek_project.htm).

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objective for pesticides and toxicity are not being attained for molinate in Butte Slough. The narrative objective for pesticides states, "No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses." The narrative objective for toxicity states, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states "The Regional Water Board will also consider...numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective." (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf). The Regional Board performance goal to protect freshwater habitat is 10 µg/L or 10 ppb (micrograms per liter or parts per billion) (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998).

Evidence of Impairment

Between 1994 and 2000, multiple studies analyzed a total of 93 ambient water samples collected in Butte Slough for molinate. Samples were generally collected during the time period of application of molinate to rice (generally May and June). Sixteen of 93 samples (about 17%) exceeded the Regional Board performance goal of 10 ppb.

Table B-2. Molinate in Water Samples Collected from Butte Slough at Lower Pass Road

Study	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of Molinate Concentrations	Criteria	Number of Samples Equal to or Above Criteria	Percent Samples Equal to or Above Criteria
Gorder et al, 1995	1994	16	nd - 0.15 ppb	10 ppb	0	0.00%
Gorder et al, 1995	1995	18	nd - 8.5 ppb	10 ppb	0	0.00%
Gorder et al, 1996	1996	19	nd - 15.7 ppb	10 ppb	7	37%
Gorder et al, 1997	1997	17	nd - 16.42 ppb	10 ppb	6	35%
Gorder et al, 1999	1998	17	nd - 12.17 ppb	10 ppb	1	7%
Newhart et al, 2000	2000	6	nd - 11.5 ppb	10 ppb	2	33%
Sum	1994 - 2000	93	nd - 16.42 ppb	10 ppb	16	17%

Extent of Impairment
Butte Slough extends approximately 7.5 miles, from the confluence of Butte Creek and the Sacramento River to the Sutter Bypass. Samples were collected from one site only, at Lower Pass Road near Meridian. However, the Butte Slough watershed contains extensive rice acreage, and Butte Slough flows are frequently dominated by runoff from these fields, particularly during April and May. Therefore, the entire 7.5 miles is proposed for listing on the 303(d) list. The most likely source of molinate is from rice fields draining into the Butte Slough waterways.

Potential Sources
Molinate is applied on rice fields to control broad-leaved and grassy weeds (WHO, 1993). Agricultural runoff from rice fields and drift of molinate during aerial application onto rice fields contributes to surface water contamination adjacent rice fields (California Rice Commission, 2001). The occurrence of molinate in Butte Slough water column samples indicates that the most likely source of molinate is from agriculture, specifically rice fields.

B.1.9 Lower Calaveras River, Diazinon

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of the lower Calaveras River to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by diazinon. Information available to the Regional Board on diazinon concentrations in the lower Calaveras River indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. The basis for this recommendation is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Lower Calaveras River	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Diazinon
Hydrologic Unit	531.30	**Sources**	Agriculture, Urban
Total Waterbody Size	50 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	30 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	Lower Calaveras River	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	37° 59' 38"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 16' 47"
Downstream Extent Latitude	37° 57' 59"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 22' 5"

Watershed Characteristics

The Calaveras River flows out of New Hogan Lake in western Calaveras County, and joins the San Joaquin River approximately 40 miles downstream in Stockton. A major portion of the river is located in San Joaquin County, and flows through extensive acreage dominated by orchards. The lower portion of the Calaveras River flows through the City of Stockton, and is dominated by urban runoff.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objectives for pesticides and toxicity are not being attained for diazinon in the lower Calaveras River. The narrative objective for pesticides states, "No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses." The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective" (California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf). The California Department of Fish and Game has established freshwater numeric acute (1-hour average) and chronic (4-day average) criteria for diazinon of 0.08 µg/L and 0.05 µg/L, respectively, for the protection of aquatic life (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000).

Evidence of Impairment

Between 1994 and 1998, 22 samples from the lower Calaveras River were analyzed for diazinon; most of these samples were collected during or immediately after wet weather events (Table 2). Eighteen of the 23 samples (78%) exceeded the acute and chronic criteria for diazinon developed by the California Department of Fish and Game for the protection of aquatic organisms (Lee, G.F., and A. Jones-Lee, 2000; CDM, 1999; Lee and Jones-Lee, 2001).

Table B-2. Diazinon in Water Samples Collected from the Lower Calaveras River

Data Source	Location	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of Diazinon Concentrations	Criteria[a]		Number of Samples Equal to or Above Criteria	Percent Samples Equal to or Above Criteria
Lee, G.F., and A. Jones-Lee. 2000	Pacific Ave	1996	1	0.036 µg	chronic	0.05 µg/L	0	0%
					acute	0.08 µg/L	0	0%
CDM, 1999; Lee and Jones-Lee, 2001	Sutter Street	1996 - 1998	8	nd - 1.7 µg	chronic	0.05 µg/L	6	75%
					acute	0.08 µg/L	6	75%
CDM, 1999; Lee and Jones-Lee, 2001	West Lane	1996 - 1998	9	nd - 1.3 µg	chronic	0.05 µg/L	4	44%
					acute	0.08 µg/L	4	44%
Lee and Jones-Lee, 2001	Not identified	1994 - 1998	5	nd - 0.45 µg	chronic	0.05 µg/L	4	80%
					acute	0.08 µg/L	4	80%
Sum	Sum	1994 - 1998	23	nd - 1.7 µg	chronic	0.05 µg/L	18	78%
					acute	0.08 µg/L	18	78%

a) California Department of Fish and Game Water Quality Criteria for Diazinon (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000)
nd = not detected

Extent of Impairment
Approximately 30 miles of the Calaveras River lies in San Joaquin County and receives orchard and urban runoff. Most of the samples were collected from sites within the City of Stockton, but it is likely that the entire lower Calaveras River is impaired by diazinon.

Potential Sources
Diazinon is commonly used as a dormant spray on almonds and stonefruits during the winter months, and on urban landscapes year-round. It is likely that these applications are the source of diazinon in the lower Calaveras River.

B.1.10 Lower Calaveras River, Low Dissolved Oxygen

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board-Central Valley Region, Regional Board, recommends the addition of the lower Calaveras River to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by low dissolved oxygen. Information available to the Regional Board on dissolved oxygen levels in the lower Calaveras River indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. A description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Lower Calaveras River	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Low Dissolved Oxygen
Hydrologic Unit	531.30	**Sources**	Urban Runoff/Storm Sewers
Total Waterbody Size	50 river miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	5 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	Between the Stockton Diversion Canal and the San Joaquin River	**TMDL End Date (Mo Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	37° 59' 38.5"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 16' 47.9"
Downstream Extent Latitude	37° 57' 59.6"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 22' 5.4"

Watershed Characteristics
The lower Calaveras River is located within the San Joaquin Delta Hydrologic Unit, flows through central Stockton, California, and joins the San Joaquin River near Rough and Ready Island.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins contains a numeric objective applicable to the Calaveras River which requires dissolved oxygen (DO) not be reduced below 5 milligrams per liter (mg/l) (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf).

Evidence of Impairment
A report of DeltaKeeper data collected between 8 November 1999 and 7 February 2000 found DO concentrations in the lower Calaveras River below the Basin Plan objective in 10 of 32 samples. Data in the same report collected between 15 October 1996 and 8 November 1996 found DO concentrations below the Basin Plan objective in 8 of 12 samples (Lee and Jones-Lee, 2000).

Table B-2. Dissolved Oxygen Concentrations in Water Samples Collected from Lower Calaveras River

Data Source	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of DO Concentrations	Number of Samples Below Criterion
Lee and Jones-Lee, 2000 (DeltaKeeper)	October/November 1996; November 1999 to February 2000	44	0.9 – 11.7 mg/L	18

Extent of Impairment
Dissolved oxygen concentrations in the lower Calaveras River (measured in Stockton, California) have been documented to fall below the Basin Plan objective of 5 mg/l, as demonstrated by the DeltaKeeper data discussed above. Data for the lower Calaveras River is limited to one sampling point approximately in the middle of the Stockton urban area. The sampling point is likely representative of DO levels in the portion of the Calaveras River surrounded by Stockton. The Regional Board is therefore recommending listing the lower Calaveras River for DO between the Stockton Diversion Canal and the San Joaquin River.

Potential Sources
The impaired reach of the lower Calaveras River is wholly within the Stockton urban area. The most likely source of oxygen demanding substances is from runoff from the urban area.

B.1.11 Lower Calaveras River, Pathogens

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (Regional Board) recommends the addition of the lower Calaveras River to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by pathogens. Information available to the Regional Board on pathogens levels in the lower reach of the Calaveras River indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. A description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Lower Calaveras River	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Pathogens
Hydrologic Unit	531.30	**Sources**	Urban runoff, Recreation
Total Waterbody Size	50 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	8 Miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	The lower 8 miles of the Calaveras River (urban Stockton)	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	38° 00' 45"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 14' 22"
Downstream Extent Latitude	37° 58' 00"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 22' 04"

Watershed Characteristics

The Delta is characterized by tidal waters with limited flushing flows during the dry seasons. The lower Calaveras River has much of its flow diverted upstream of Stockton and the downstream area is dominated by urban runoff. The lower Calaveras River supports recreational uses, including boating, fishing, water skiing and swimming. The predominant land use in this portion of the watershed is urban. Additionally, there are recreational uses of the waters, including boating facilities near the confluence with the San Joaquin River.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for pathogens in the lower Calaveras River. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states the " the Regional Water Board will also consider...numerical criteria and guidelines developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services...the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective." The Basin Plan also contains a specific objective for fecal coliform bacteria (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf).

Guidelines and criteria have been developed for the protection of human health. The California Department of Health Services (CDHS) has adopted regulations for recreational waters and beaches for single samples of total coliform bacteria of 10,000 Most Probable Number (MPN) per 100 milliliters and of 1,000 MPN per 100 ml for 30-day log mean of sample levels (Title 17 California Code of Regulation section 7958). CDHS has also published draft guidelines that include limits for single samples of *E. coli* of 235 MPN per 100 milliliters (CDHS, July 2000 http://www.dhs.ca.gov/ps/ddwem/beaches/freshwater.htm). USEPA guidelines for bacteria contained in *Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Bacteria* (USEPA, 1986a) state "Based on a statistically sufficient number of samples (generally not less than 5 samples equally spaced over a 30-day period), the geometric mean of the indicated bacterial densities should not exceed one or the other of the following: *E. coli* 126 MPN per 100 ml; or Enterococci 33 MPN per 100 ml." A methodology for determining exceedances based on single samples is also included in the standards.

Evidence of Impairment
DeltaKeeper submitted bacteria data for water samples collected from two locations on the lower Calaveras River (Jennings, 2001). One sampling location is near the mouth of the river and the other is approximately four miles upstream. A total of 26 samples collected at the upstream location over during 10 months in 2000-2001, and a total of 11 samples collected at the downstream location during seven months in 2000, were analyzed. Geometric means of the bacteria counts have been calculated using the data submitted by DeltaKeeper. The geometric mean for *E. coli* is 322 MPN per 100 ml for samples collected at the upstream location (exceeding the USEPA criterion of 126 MPN per 100 ml). The geometric mean for *E. coli* for samples collected at the downstream location is 76 MPN per 100 ml. However, individual *E. coli* measurements at the downstream site have exceeded the USEPA single sample criterion of 235 MPN per 100 ml.

Extent of Impairment
The lower eight miles of the Calaveras River is recommended for listing as impaired due to pathogen contamination. The extent of impairment is extrapolated upstream from the sampling location based on land use patterns. Both sampling locations are within the urban Stockton area. The lower eight miles of the Calaveras River have similar land use patterns and it is expected that sampling will show high levels of bacteria in the urban portion of the river.

Potential Sources
In urban settings, the USEPA has identified sources of pathogen pollution to include urban litter, contaminated refuse, domestic pet and wildlife excrement and failing sewer lines (USEPA 2001a). In their pathogen TMDL Guide, the USEPA states "In a study of bacterial loading in urban streams, Young and Thackston (1999) found that fecal bacteria densities were directly related to the density of housing, population, development, percent impervious area, and domestic animal density. Additionally, recreational areas may have high bacteria counts. This can be due to improper disposal of waste from boats, lack of sanitary facilities in the area of recreation and children in diapers using the water."

B.1.12 Camp Far West Reservoir, Mercury

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of Camp Far West Reservoir to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by mercury. Information available to the Regional Board on mercury levels in fish tissue samples indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained in Camp Far West Reservoir. The description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Camp Far West Reservoir	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Mercury
Hydrologic Unit	516.31	**Sources**	Resource extraction (historic mines)
Total Length	2,002 surface acres	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	2,002 surface acres	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	All of Camp Far West Reservoir	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	

Watershed Characteristics
The Bear River flows into Rollins Reservoir and Lake Combie before reaching Camp Far West Reservoir. The South Sutter Water District constructed Camp Far West Reservoir as a partial surface water supply in response to declining ground water resources. The Bear River basin has covers over 232,800 acres. Water usage in the basin includes recreational, agricultural, municipal, and hydroelectric generation. The Bear River basin is bounded by the Yuba River basin on the north, the Little Truckee River basin on the east,

and the American River basin on the south. The headwaters are located in the Sierra Nevada snowfields at elevations ranging up to 9,100 feet above sea level.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for mercury in Camp Far West Reservoir. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective" (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf).

Numeric criteria for mercury in fish tissue have been developed for both human health and wildlife protection. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) recently established a human health protection criterion of 0.3 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg; equivalent to parts per million [ppm]) methylmercury in the edible portions of fish (USEPA, 2001b). This criterion is used to determine attainment with the narrative toxicity objective.

Evidence of Impairment
The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and Toxic Substances Monitoring Program (TSMP) collected fish tissue samples from the midsection, the dam area, and the Bear River and Rock Creek Arms of Camp Far West Reservoir. Both studies collected trophic level 3 and 4 fish. Trophic level 3 fish feed on zooplankton, phytoplankton, and benthic invertebrates. Trophic level 4 fish consume trophic level 3 fish as part of their diet. Methylmercury and total mercury bioaccumulate in aquatic organisms and tend to increase with increasing trophic levels (USEPA, 1997a). The TSMP and USGS sampled 36 trophic level (TL) 4 fish (largemouth bass, smallmouth bass, spotted bass, and channel catfish) between 1987 and 1999. The TL4 fish had an average mercury concentration of 0.69 ppm, which exceeds the USEPA criterion of 0.3 ppm. Placer, Yuba, and Nevada counties have issued an interim public health notification for all lakes and watercourses within these counties based on the USGS data. OEHHA is in the process of developing a state advisory (Nevada County, 2000).

Extent of Impairment
Camp Far West Reservoir covers 2,002 surface acres. Fish collected throughout the reservoir had mercury levels exceeding the USEPA criterion. The entire waterbody is impaired by mercury.

Potential Sources
The Bear River watershed was historically mined extensively for its hardrock and placer gold deposits and has been affected by hydraulic mining (Alpers and Hunerlach, 2000). Several inactive gold and copper mines exist upstream of Camp Far West Reservoir in the Bear River watershed. The Dairy Farm Mine is located along the reservoir's southern shoreline. It is an inactive copper, gold, and silver mine that used underground and open pit mining methods. An open adit has been observed when reservoir levels are low (Montoya and Pan, 1992). Despite being associated with acid mine drainage, Dairy Farm Mine does not discharge perennially.

B.1.13 Clover Creek, Fecal Coliform

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board-Central Valley Region, Regional Board, recommends the addition of Clover Creek to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by fecal coliform. Information available to the Regional Board on pathogens levels in Clover Creek indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. A description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Clover Creek	Pollutants/Stressors	Fecal Coliform
Hydrologic Unit	507.33	Sources	Human and/or livestock sources
Total Waterbody Size	27.5 miles	TMDL Priority	
Size Affected	10.5 miles	TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)	
Extent of Impairment	The lower 10.5 miles	TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)	
Upstream Extent Latitude	N 40° 38' 46"	Upstream Extent Longitude	W 122° 01' 10"
Downstream Extent Latitude	N 40° 33' 17"	Downstream Extent Longitude	W 122° 11' 15"

Watershed Characteristics
Clover Creek is located in Shasta County and flows from the foothills of Mount Lassen southwest to the Sacramento River, east of Anderson. Clover Creek is part of the Cow Creek watershed. Land use within the Cow Creek watershed previously included use by indigenous peoples and historic mining, and currently includes ranches, timberlands, and towns (Montoya and Pan, 1992; Hannaford and North State Institute for Sustainable Communities, 2000).

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The numeric objective for bacteria is not being attained in Clover Creek. The bacteria objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "In waters designated for contact recreation (REC-1), the fecal coliform concentration based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period shall not exceed a geometric mean of 200/100 ml, nor shall more than ten percent of the total number of samples taken during any 30-day period exceed 400/100 ml (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf)." The bacteria objectives are presented in terms of Most Probable Number (MPN) per 100 milliliters (ml). The bacteria objectives were evaluated for Clover Creek by comparing fecal coliform concentrations measured in Clover Creek to Basin Plan objectives.

Evidence of Impairment
Water samples were collected from the lower reach of Clover Creek between June and October 1999. The average fecal coliform levels in the water samples were above 300 MPN/100ml. The fecal coliform levels exceeded the geometric mean Basin Plan criterion (200 MPN/100ml) for at least five months in 1999. Many of samples were also above the 30-day Basin Plan criterion (400 MPN/100 ml) (Hannaford and North State Institute for Sustainable Communities, 2000).

Extent of Impairment
Clover Creek flows for approximately 27.5 miles. The lower reach of Clover Creek, from 10 miles upstream of its confluence to its confluence with the main stem of Cow Creek, is impacted by fecal coliform.

Potential Sources
Hannaford and North State Institute for Sustainable Communities (2000) concluded that Clover Creek contained "at least the wildlife input" and potentially low levels of livestock and human inputs of bacteria. The levels contributed by these sources are considered to be the background levels for the area. Since the impaired Clover Creek site is not known to contain more wildlife than the other areas, the excess bacteria "probably originated from livestock or human sources," including septic systems and/or sewage lines leaching into the streams (Hannaford and North State Institute for Sustainable Communities, 2000).

B.1.14 Colusa Basin Drain, Azinphos-methyl

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (Regional Board) recommends the addition of the Colusa Basin Drain (CBD) to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by azinphos-methyl. Information available to the Regional Board on azinphos-methyl concentrations in the CBD indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. The basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Colusa Basin Drain	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Azinphos-methyl
Hydrologic Unit	520.21	**Sources**	Agriculture
Total Waterbody Size	70 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	70 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	The entire waterbody	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	39° 37' 31"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	122° 04' 07"
Downstream Extent Latitude	38° 48' 6.4"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 43' 18.1"

Watershed Characteristics

The CBD flows for approximately 70 miles along the west side of the Sacramento River, from Colusa to the CBD's confluence with the Sacramento River at Knights Landing. The CBD receives runoff from hundreds of thousands of acres of agricultural fields during rain events and from irrigation return flow.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objectives for pesticides and toxicity are not being attained for azinphos-methyl in the CBD. The narrative objective for pesticides states. "No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses." The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective" (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf). The US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) has established an ambient water quality criterion for azinphos-methyl for the protection of freshwater aquatic life of 0.01 µg/L (USEPA, 1976).

Evidence of Impairment

The CBD was sampled at least once a month between November 1996 and April 1998 and a total of 21 water samples were analyzed for azinphos-methyl (Table 2). Seven of the 21 samples (about 33%) contained azinphos-methyl concentrations at or above US Environmental Protection Agency instantaneous maximum water criterion of 0.01 ug/L (USEPA, 1976). The highest concentrations were generally detected between December and April, and during August and September. High levels of azinphos-methyl often co-occurred with high levels of diazinon.

Table B-2. Azinphos-methyl in Water Samples from the Colusa Basin Drain at Road 99E near Knight's Landing

Data Source	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of Azinphos -methyl Concentrations	Criteria[a]	Number of Samples Equal to or Above Criteria	Percent Samples Equal to or Above Criteria
Domagalski, 2000	1996	2	nd	0.01 µg/L	0	0%
Domagalski, 2000	1997	15	nd - 0.05 µg/L		6	40%
Domagalski, 2000	1998	4	nd - 0.01 µg/L		1	25%
Sum	1996-1998	21	nd - 0.05 µg/L		7	33%

a) USEPA, 1976
nd = not detected

Extent of Impairment
Azinphos-methyl is used to control insects on almonds, walnuts and other crops grown throughout the region drained by the CBD. Therefore, it is likely that the entire length of the CBD is impaired by azinphos-methyl.

Potential Sources
The extensive agricultural areas drained by the CBD are the most likely sources of azinphos-methyl.

B.1.15 Colusa Basin Drain, Diazinon

Summary of Proposed Actions
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of the Colusa Basin Drain (CBD) to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by diazinon. Information available to the Regional Board on diazinon concentrations in the Colusa Basin Drain (CBD) indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. The basis for this recommendation is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Colusa Basin Drain	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Diazinon
Hydrologic Unit	520.21	**Sources**	Agriculture
Total Waterbody Size	70 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	70 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	The entire Drain	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	39° 37' 31"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	122° 04' 07"
Downstream Extent Latitude	38° 48' 6.4"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 43' 18.1"

Watershed Characteristics
The CBD flows for approximately 70 miles along the west side of the Sacramento River, from Colusa to the CBD's confluence with the Sacramento River at Knights Landing. The CBD receives runoff from hundreds of thousands of acres of agricultural fields during rain events, and from irrigation return flow in the dry season.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objectives for pesticides and toxicity are not being attained for diazinon in the CBD. The narrative objective for pesticides states "No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses." The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective." (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf) The California Department of Fish and Game has established freshwater numeric acute (1-hour average) and chronic (4-day average) criteria for diazinon of 0.08 µg/L and 0.05 µg/L, respectively, for the protection of aquatic life (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000).

Evidence of Impairment

Between 1994 and 1998, multiple studies analyzed a total of 59 ambient water samples collected in the CBD for diazinon (Table 2). Most samples were collected during the orchard dormant spray season. Overall, 17 of 59 samples (about 29%) contained diazinon concentrations at or above CDFG chronic water quality criterion of 0.050 µg/L and 11 of 59 (about 19%) samples exceeded CDFG acute water quality criterion of 0.080 µg/L.

Table B-2. Diazinon Concentrations in Water Samples from Colusa Basin Drain near Knight's Landing

Data Source	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of Diazinon Concentrations	Criteria[a]		Number of Samples Equal to or Above Criteria	Percent Samples Equal to or Above Criteria
Domagalski, 2000	1994	29	nd - 0.33 µg/L	chronic	0.05 µg/L	11	38%
				acute	0.08 µg/L	8	27%
Holmes et al., 2000	1996	2	nd	chronic	0.05 µg/L	0	0%
				acute	0.08 µg/L	0	0%
Holmes et al., 2000	1997	15	nd - 0.07 µg/L	chronic	0.05 µg/L	2	13%
				acute	0.08 µg/L	0	0%
Holmes et al., 2000	1998	4	0.01 - 0.1 µg/L	chronic	0.05 µg/L	1	25%
				acute	0.08 µg/L	1	25%
Dileanis, et al., 2001	2000	9	nd - 1.02 µg/L	chronic	0.05 µg/L	3	33%
				acute	0.08 µg/L	2	22%
Sum	1994 - 2000	59	nd - 1.02 µg/L	chronic	0.05 µg/L	17	29%
				acute	0.08 µg/L	11	19%

a) California Department of Fish and Game Water Quality Criteria for the Protection of Aquatic Life (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000)

nd = not detected

Extent of Impairment

Diazinon is used to control insects on almonds, walnuts, stone fruits and other crops grown throughout the region drained by the CBD. Therefore, it is likely that the entire length of the CBD is impaired by diazinon.

Potential Sources

The extensive agricultural areas drained by the CBD are the most likely sources of diazinon.

B.1.16 Colusa Basin Drain, Molinate

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of the Colusa Basin Drain (CBD) to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by molinate. Information available to the Regional Board on concentrations of this pesticide indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. The basis for this recommendation is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Colusa Basin Drain	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Molinate
Hydrologic Unit	520.21	**Sources**	Agriculture
Total Waterbody Size	70 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	70 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	The entire Drain	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	39° 37' 31"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	122° 04' 07"
Downstream Extent Latitude	38° 48' 06"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 43' 18"

Watershed Characteristics

The Colusa Basin Drain (CBD) flows for approximately 70 miles along the west side of the Sacramento River, from close to the Sacramento River, at Colusa, to its confluence with the Sacramento River at Knights Landing. The CBD receives runoff from hundreds of thousands of acres of agricultural fields during rain events and from irrigation return flow.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objective for pesticides and toxicity are not being attained for molinate in the CBD. The narrative objective for pesticides states, "No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses." The narrative objective for toxicity states, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states "The Regional Water Board will also consider...numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective." (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf). The Regional Board performance goal to protect freshwater habitat is 10 ug/L or 10 ppb (micrograms per liter or parts per billion) (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998).

Evidence of Impairment

Between 1994 and 2000, multiple studies analyzed a total of 138 ambient water samples collected in the CBD for molinate. Samples were collected during the time period of application of molinate to rice (generally May/June). Forty-eight of 138 samples (about 35%) exceeded the Regional Board performance goal of 10 ppb (Gorder et al, 1995 through 1998; Domagalski, 2000; Holmes et al., 2000; Newhart et al, 2000). Table 2 summarizes the available data.

Table B-2. Molinate in Water Samples Collected from Colusa Basin Drain

Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of Molinate Concentrations	Criteria	Number of Samples Equal to or Above Criteria	Percent Samples Equal to or Above Criteria
1994	21	nd - 0.153 µg/L	10 µg/L	0	0.00%
1995	21	nd - 28.95 µg/L	10 µg/L	11	52%
1996	23	nd - 41.25 µg/L	10 µg/L	13	57%
1997	21	nd - 27.335 µg/L	10 µg/L	9	43%
1998	21	nd - 44.09 µg/L	10 µg/L	8	38%
1996 - 1998	20	0.009 - 19.2 µg/L	10 µg/L	1	5%
2000	11	nd - 22.0 µg/L	10 µg/L	6	33%
1994 - 2000	138	nd - 44.09 µg/L	10 µg/L	48	35%

Extent of Impairment
Molinate is used to control aquatic weeds on rice grown throughout the region drained by the CBD. Therefore, it is likely that the entire length of the CBD is impaired by molinate.

Potential Sources
The extensive agricultural areas drained by the CBD are the most likely sources of molinate.

B.1.17 Del Puerto Creek, Chlorpyrifos

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (Regional Board) recommends the addition of the lower portion of Del Puerto Creek to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by chlorpyrifos. Information available to the Regional Board on chlorpyrifos levels indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. The basis for this recommendation is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Del Puerto Creek	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Chlorpyrifos
Hydrologic Unit	541.10	**Sources**	Agriculture
Total Length	27 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	5 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	Lower 5 miles, from Rogers Road to the SJR	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	37° 29' 56"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 10' 37"
Downstream Extent Latitude	37° 32' 29"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 06' 56"

Watershed Characteristics
Del Puerto Creek originates on the eastern slope of the Coast Range, near the intersection of San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Alameda Counties. The creek flows northeast approximately 27 miles to its confluence with the San Joaquin River, south of Laird Park. Extensive acreage in the lower part of the watershed is used to grow orchard and field crops, especially southeast of Interstate Highway 5. Several lateral drains that carry tailwater from fields located along the west side of the San Joaquin Valley also drain into Del Puerto Creek.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objectives for pesticides and toxicity are not being attained for chlorpyrifos in Del Puerto Creek. The narrative objective for pesticides states, "No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses." The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective" (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf). The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) has established freshwater numeric acute (1-hour average) and chronic (4-day average) criteria for chlorpyrifos of 0.02 µg/L and 0.014 µg/L, respectively, for the protection of aquatic life (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000).

Table B-2. Chlorpyrifos in Water Samples Collected from Del Puerto Creek

Data Source	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of Chlorpyrifos Concentrations	Criteria[a]		Number of Samples Equal to or Above Criteria	Percent Samples Equal to or Above Criteria
Ross 1992, 1993; Ross et al., 1996, 1999; Fujimura, 1991a,b, 1993a,b,c,d	1991-1993	8	nd	chronic	0.014 µg/L	0	0%
				acute	0.02 µg/L	0	0%
Foe, 1995	1991	8	nd - 0.063 µg/L	chronic	0.014 µg/L	2	25%
				acute	0.02 µg/L	2	25%
Foe, 1995	1992	14	nd - 0.023 µg/	chronic	0.014 µg/L	3	21%
				acute	0.02 µg/L	1	7%
Sum	1991-1993	30	nd - 0.063 µg/	chronic	0.014 µg/L	5	17%
				acute	0.02 µg/L	3	10%

a) California Department of Fish and Game Water Quality Criteria for Diazinon and Chlorpyrifos (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000)
nd = not detected

Extent of Impairment

The lower section of Del Puerto Creek extends for approximately five miles between Interstate 5 and the San Joaquin River. Extensive acreage in the lower part of the watershed is used to grow orchard and field crops, and chlorpyrifos is used as on these crops during the dormant and the growing seasons.

Potential Sources

Applications of chlorpyrifos to orchards and field crops are the most likely source of chlorpyrifos in Del Puerto Creek.

B.1.18 Del Puerto Creek, Diazinon

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (Regional Board) recommends the addition of the lower portion of Del Puerto Creek to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by diazinon. Information available to the Regional Board on diazinon concentrations in Del Puerto Creek indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. The basis for this recommendation is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Del Puerto Creek	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Diazinon
Hydrologic Unit	541.10	**Sources**	Agriculture
Total Length	27 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	5 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	Lower 5 miles, from Rogers Road to the SJR	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	37° 29' 56"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 10' 37"
Downstream Extent Latitude	37° 32' 29"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 06 '56"

Watershed Characteristics

Del Puerto Creek originates on the eastern slope of the Coast Range, near the intersection of San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Alameda Counties. The creek flows northeast approximately 27 miles to its confluence with the San Joaquin River, south of Laird Park. Extensive acreage in the lower part of the watershed is used to grow almonds and stone fruits, especially southeast of Interstate Highway 5. Several lateral drains that carry tailwater from orchards located along the west side of the San Joaquin Valley also drain into Del Puerto Creek.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objectives for pesticides and toxicity are not being attained for diazinon in Del Puerto Creek. The narrative objective for pesticides states, "No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses." The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective" (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf). The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) has established freshwater numeric acute (1-hour average) and chronic (4-day average) criteria of 0.08 µg/L and 0.05 µg/L, respectively, for the protection of aquatic life (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000).

Evidence of Impairment

Several studies have measured diazinon concentrations in Del Puerto Creek (Table 2). The samples analyzed for these studies were collected between January and June, 1991 to 1993. Ten of the 30 samples (33%) analyzed for diazinon exceeded the CDFG chronic water quality criterion for diazinon, and six of the 30 samples (20%) exceeded the CDFG acute criterion.

Table B-2. Diazinon in Water Samples Collected from Del Puerto Creek

Data Source	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of Diazinon Concentrations	Criteria[a]		Number of Samples Equal to or Above Criteria	Percent Samples Equal to or Above Criteria
Ross 1992, 1993; Ross et al., 1996, 1999; Fujimura, 1991a,b, 1993a,b,c,d	1991-1993	8	nd	Chronic	0.05 µg/L	0	0%
				Acute	0.08 µg/L	0	0%
Foe, 1995	1991	8	nd - 0.2 µg/L	Chronic	0.05 µg/L	3	37.5%
				Acute	0.08 µg/L	1	12.5%
Foe, 1995	1992	14	0.007 - 1.3 µg/L	Chronic	0.05 µg/L	7	50%
				Acute	0.08 µg/L	5	36%
Sum	1991-1993	30	nd - 1.3 µg/L	Chronic	0.05 µg/L	10	33%
				Acute	0.08 µg/L	6	20%

a) California Department of Fish and Game Water Quality Criteria for Diazinon (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000)
nd = not detected

Extent of Impairment
The lower section of Del Puerto Creek extends for approximately five miles between Interstate 5 and the San Joaquin River. Extensive acreage in the lower part of the watershed is used to grow almonds and stone fruits, and diazinon is applied to many of these orchards during the winter dormant season.

Potential Sources
The application of diazinon to orchards is the most likely source of diazinon in Del Puerto Creek.

B.1.19 Del Puerto Creek, Parathion

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (Regional Board) recommends the addition of the lower portion of Del Puerto Creek to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by parathion. Information available to the Regional Board on parathion concentrations in Del Puerto Creek indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. The basis for this recommendation is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Del Puerto Creek	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Parathion
Hydrologic Unit	541.10	**Sources**	Agriculture
Total Length	27 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	5 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	Lower 5 miles, from Rogers Road to the SJR	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	37° 29' 56"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 10' 37"
Downstream Extent Latitude	37° 32' 29"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 06' 56"

Watershed Characteristics
Del Puerto Creek originates on the eastern slope of the Coast Range, near the intersection of San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Alameda Counties. The creek flows northeast approximately 27 miles to its confluence

with the San Joaquin River, south of Laird Park. Extensive acreage in the lower part of the watershed is dominated by agriculture, including orchard crops. Several lateral drains that carry tailwater from agricultural land located along the west side of the San Joaquin Valley also drain into Del Puerto Creek.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objectives for pesticides and toxicity are not being attained for parathion in Del Puerto Creek. The narrative objective for pesticides states, "No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses." The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective" (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf). The US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established freshwater numeric acute (1-hour average) and chronic (4-day average) criteria of 0.065 µg/L and 0.013 µg/L, respectively, for the protection of aquatic life (Marshack, 2000).

Evidence of Impairment

Several studies have measured parathion concentrations in Del Puerto Creek (Table 2). The samples analyzed for these studies were collected between January and June, 1991 to 1993. Nine of the 30 samples (30%) analyzed for parathion exceeded the EPA continuous water quality criterion for parathion, and eight of the 30 samples (27%) exceeded the EPA maximum criterion.

Table B-2. Parathion in Water Samples Collected from Del Puerto Creek

Data Source	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of Parathion Concentrations	Criteria[a]		Number of Samples Equal to or Above Criteria	Percent Samples Equal to or Above Criteria
Ross 1992, 1993; Ross et al., 1996, 1999; Fujimura, 1991a,b, 1993a,b,c,d	1991-1993	8	nd	continuous	0.013 µg/L	0	0%
				maximum	0.065 µg/L	0	0%
Foe, 1995	1991	8	nd - 2.1	continuous	0.013 µg/L	5	62.5%
				maximum	0.065 µg/L	4	50%
Foe, 1995	1992	14	nd - 0.51 µg/L	continuous	0.013 µg/L	4	29%
				maximum	0.065 µg/L	4	29%
Sum	1991 - 1993	30	nd - 2.1 µg/L	continuous	0.013 µg/L	9	30%
				maximum	0.065 µg/L	8	27%

a) US EPA maximum and continuous criteria for parathion for the protection of freshwater aquatic life (Marshack, 2000)
nd = not detected

Extent of Impairment

The lower section of Del Puerto Creek extends for approximately five miles between Interstate 5 and the San Joaquin River. Extensive acreage in the lower part of the watershed is used to grow almonds and stone fruits, and parathion is applied to some of these orchards during the winter dormant season.

Potential Sources

The source of parathion is from agricultural use.

B.1.20 Don Pedro Lake, Mercury

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of Don Pedro Lake to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by mercury. Information available to the Regional Board on mercury levels in fish tissue samples indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained in Don Pedro Lake. The description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Don Pedro Lake	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Mercury
Hydrologic Unit	536.32	**Sources**	Resource Extraction (abandoned mines)
Total Waterbody Size	12,960 acres	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	12,960 acres	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	Entire reservoir	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	

Watershed Characteristics

The New Don Pedro Dam creates Don Pedro Lake on the Tuolumne River in Tuolumne County, approximately 54 miles upstream from the Tuolumne River – San Joaquin River confluence (USGS, 1958-2000). The Don Pedro Dam was constructed in 1971 with a reservoir area of 12,960 acres; the Turlock Irrigation District operates the dam (CDWR, 1993). Numerous abandoned gold mines and other historic mine features are present in the watershed upstream of the Don Pedro Dam (OMR, 2000).

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for mercury in Don Pedro Lake. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective." (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf).

Numeric criteria for mercury in fish tissue have been developed for both human health and wildlife protection. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) recently established a human health protection criterion of 0.3 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg; equivalent to parts per million [ppm]) methylmercury in the edible portions of fish (USEPA, 2001b). This criterion is used to determine attainment with the narrative toxicity objective.

Evidence of Impairment

The Toxic Substances Monitoring Program (TSMP) analyzed composite samples of trophic level 3 and 4 fish from the northernmost arms of Don Pedro Lake (Moccasin Creek, Tuolumne River, and Woods Creek) (SWRCB, 1995). Trophic level (TL) 3 fish (e.g., bluegill, carp, and sucker) feed on zooplankton, phytoplankton, and benthic invertebrates. Trophic level 4 fish (e.g., largemouth bass) consume trophic level 3 fish as part of their diet. The TSMP sampled 32 TL 4 fish (largemouth bass) between 1981 and 1987. The TL4 fish had an average mercury concentration of 0.54 ppm, which exceeds the USEPA criterion of 0.3 ppm.

Extent of Impairment
Data are available only for the northernmost arms of Don Pedro Lake. However, the entire 12,960-acre lake is probably impaired because there are other tributaries to the lake that may act as mercury inputs.

Potential Sources
The principal source of mercury in the Tuolumne River watershed is historic gold mining sites (OMR, 2000).

B.1.21 Five Mile Slough, Low Dissolved Oxygen

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board-Central Valley Region, Regional Board, recommends the addition of Five Mile Slough to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by low dissolved oxygen. Information available to the Regional Board on dissolved oxygen levels in Five Mile Slough indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. A description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Five Mile Slough	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Low Dissolved Oxygen
Hydrologic Unit	544.00	**Sources**	Urban Runoff/Storm Sewers
Total Waterbody Size	5 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	1 mile	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	From Plymouth Road bridge to the confluence with Fourteen-Mile Slough.	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	38° 0' 49"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 21' 08"
Downstream Extent Latitude	38° 0' 49"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 22' 10"

Watershed Characteristics
Five Mile Slough is located within the San Joaquin Delta Hydrologic Unit, in the primarily residential northwest side of Stockton, California and is tributary to Fourteen-Mile Slough at the western edge of the city limits.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins contains a numeric objective applicable to Five Mile Slough which requires dissolved oxygen (DO) not be reduced below 5 milligrams per liter (mg/l). (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf).

Evidence of Impairment
A report of DeltaKeeper data collected between 8 November 1999 and 7 February 2000 found DO concentrations in Five Mile Slough below the Basin Plan objective in 19 of 32 samples. Data collected between 15 October 1996 and 8 November 1996 found DO concentrations below the Basin Plan objective (5 mg/l) in 5 of 9 samples (Lee and Jones-Lee, 2000a).

Table B-2. Dissolved Oxygen Concentrations in Water Samples Collected from Five Mile Slough

Data Source	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of DO Concentrations	Number of Samples Below Criterion
Lee and Jones-Lee, 2000 (DeltaKeeper)	October/November 1996; November 1999 to February 2000	41	0.25 – 10.6 mg/L	24

Extent of Impairment
The available data for Five Mile Slough is limited to the area near the transition of Five Mile Slough from an urban creek (relatively narrow) to a slough (relatively wide). The sampling point may, therefore, not be representative of DO levels in the narrower portion of the Slough. The Regional Board is therefore recommending listing Five Mile Slough from near the sampling point at Plymouth Road bridge to the confluence with Fourteen-Mile Slough.

Potential Sources
The impaired reach of Five Mile Slough receives runoff from the Stockton urban area. The most likely source of oxygen demanding substances is from runoff from the urban area.

B.1.22 Five Mile Slough, Pathogens

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (Regional Board) recommends the addition of Five Mile Slough in the Delta to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by pathogens. Information available to the Regional Board on pathogens levels in Five Mile Slough indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. A description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Five Mile Slough	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Bacteria
Hydrologic Unit	544.00	**Sources**	Urban runoff, Recreation
Total Waterbody Size	5 Miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	2 Miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	From the head of the slough to the confluence with Fourteen Mile Slough.	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	38° 00' 51"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 19' 52"
Downstream Extent Latitude	38° 00' 50"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 22' 10"

Watershed Characteristics
Five Mile Slough is located in the Delta and extends through urban Stockton and is bordered by residential housing, schools, a park, and a golf course. The Delta is characterized by tidal waters with limited flushing flows during the dry seasons. Five Mile Slough supports recreational uses, including boating, fishing, and swimming.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for pathogens in Five Mile Slough. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life."

The narrative toxicity objective further states the " the Regional Water Board will also consider...numerical criteria and guidelines developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services...the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective." The Basin Plan also contains a specific objective for fecal coliform bacteria (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf).

Guidelines and criteria have been developed for the protection of human health. The California Department of Health Services (CDHS) has adopted total coliform bacteria guidelines, applicable to recreational waters and beaches, of 10,000 Most Probable Number (MPN) per 100 milliliters (ml) for single samples and of 1,000 MPN per 100 ml for 30-day log mean of sample levels (Title 17 California Code of Regulation section 7958). CDHS has also published draft guidelines that include limits for single samples of *E. coli* of 235 MPN per 100 milliliters (CDHS, July 2000 http://www.dhs.ca.gov/ps/ddwem/beaches/freshwater.htm). U.S. EPA guidelines for bacteria are contained in *Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Bacteria* (USEPA, 1986a). The U.S. EPA standards are stated as "Based on a statistically sufficient number of samples (generally not less than 5 samples equally spaced over a 30-day period), the geometric mean of the indicated bacterial densities should not exceed one or the other of the following: *E. coli* 126 MPN per 100 ml; or Enterococci 33 MPN per 100 ml." A methodology for determining exceedances based on single samples is also included in the standards.

Evidence of Impairment
DeltaKeeper submitted bacteria data for Five Mile Slough from two sampling locations (DeltaKeeper, 2001a). One sampling location (downstream) is near the mouth of the slough (at the confluence with Fourteen Mile Slough) and the other sampling location (upstream) is near the beginning of the constructed portion of the slough, approximately five miles upstream of the mouth of the slough. A total of 29 samples collected from Five Mile Slough during 10 months in 2000-2001 were analyzed for *E. coli* and total coliform. Geometric means of the bacteria counts have been calculated using the data submitted by DeltaKeeper. The geometric means for *E. coli* and total coliform levels measured at the downstream sampling location are 38 MPN per 100 ml and 8,728 MPN per 100 ml, respectively. However, the sampling at the downstream sampling location was limited to three sampling events (one each month for April 2000, August 2000 and February 2001). One *E. coli* measurement at the downstream site was 244 MPN per 100 ml, which exceeds the CDHS single-sample criterion of 235 MP per 100 ml. The geometric mean for *E. coli* levels measured at the upstream sampling location is 147 MPN per 100 ml, which exceeds the U.S. EPA criterion of 126 MPN per 100 ml.

Extent of Impairment
Regional Board staff recommends listing Five Mile Slough as impaired due to pathogen contamination. Both sampling locations are within the urban Stockton area. The entire reach of Five Mile Slough has similar land use patterns and it is expected that sampling would show high levels of bacteria throughout the urban portion of the slough.

Potential Sources
In urban settings, the U.S. EPA has identified sources of pathogen pollution to include urban litter, contaminated refuse, domestic pet and wildlife excrement and failing sewer lines (USEPA, 2001). In their pathogen TMDL Guide, the U.S. EPA states "In a study of bacterial loading in urban streams, Young and Thackston (1999) found that fecal bacteria densities were directly related to the density of housing, population, development, percent impervious area, and domestic animal density. Additionally, recreational areas may have high bacteria counts. This can be due to improper disposal of waste from boats, lack of sanitary facilities in the area of recreation and children in diapers using the water."

B.1.23 Ingram/Hospital Creek, Chlorpyrifos

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of the Ingram/Hospital Creek to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list

due to impairment by chlorpyrifos. Information available to the Regional Board on chlorpyrifos concentrations in Ingram/Hospital Creek indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. The basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Ingram/Hospital Creek	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Chlorpyrifos
Hydrologic Unit	541.10	**Sources**	Agriculture
Total Waterbody Size	2 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	2 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	2 miles	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	37° 05' 61"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 12' 08"
Downstream Extent Latitude	37° 38' 10"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 12' 17"

Watershed Characteristics

Ingram and Hospital Creeks are ephemeral streams that originate in the Coast Range and flow northeast from Ingram Canyon and Hospital Canyon, respectively, to the San Joaquin Valley west of Modesto. The creeks join near Dairy Road and subsequently flow into the San Joaquin River. Upstream of Interstate 5, in Ingram and Hospital Canyons, the creeks are open waterways that transport rainwater runoff during the winter. However, in the agricultural region downstream of Interstate 5 and in the Valley, Ingram and Hospital Creeks are dominated by agricultural return flows. (Westcot et al., 1991).

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objectives for pesticides and toxicity are not being attained for chlorpyrifos in the Ingram/Hospital Creek. The narrative objective for pesticides states, "No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses." The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective" (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf). The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) has established freshwater numeric acute (1-hour average) and chronic (4-day average) criteria of 0.014 µg/L and 0.02 µg/L, respectively, for the protection of aquatic life (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000).

Evidence of Impairment

Between 1991 and 1993, multiple studies analyzed a total of 33 water samples collected from Ingram/Hospital Creek for chlorpyrifos. Samples were collected from December through June. In 1991 and 1992, three of ten (about 30%) and two of 14 (about 14%), respectively, contained chlorpyrifos concentrations at or above the CDFG chronic water quality criterion (Table 2). The CDFG acute water quality criterion of 0.020 ug/l was exceeded in two of 10 (20%) and two of 14 (14%) samples in 1991 and 1992, respectively. Overall, more than 12% of the samples analyzed for chlorpyrifos exceeded the CDFG acute and chronic water quality criteria (Ross 1992, 1993; Ross et al., 1996, 1999; Fujimura, 1991a,b, 1993a,b,c,d).

Table B-2. Chlorpyrifos in Water Samples Collected from Ingram/Hospital Creek

Data Source	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of Chlorpyrifos Concentrations	Criteria[a]		Number of Samples Equal to or Above Criteria	% Samples Equal to or Above Criteria
Ross 1992, 1993; Ross et al., 1996, 1999; Fujimura, 1991a,b, 1993a,b,c,d	1991-1993	9	nd	Chronic	0.014 µg/L	0	0%
				Acute	0.02 µg/L	0	0%
Foe, 1995	1991	10	nd - 0.29 µg/L	Chronic	0.014 µg/L	3	30%
				Acute	0.02 µg/L	2	20%
Foe, 1995	1992	14	nd - 0.03 µg/L	Chronic	0.014 µg/L	2	14%
				Acute	0.02 µg/L	2	14%
Sum	1991 - 1993	33	nd - 0.24 µg/L	Chronic	0.014 µg/L	5	15%
				Acute	0.02 µg/L	4	12%

Extent of Impairment
Chlorpyrifos impairment exists in Ingram/Hospital Creek from their confluence, east of Dairy Road, to the San Joaquin River, due to chlorpyrifos in agricultural return flows (Foe, 1995). Ingram Creek and Hospital Creek also receive agricultural return flows upstream from their confluence and west toward Interstate 5, however the extent of chlorpyrifos impairment upstream from their confluence is not currently known.

Potential Sources
Agricultural return flows are the most likely source of chlorpyrifos in Ingram/Hospital Creek.

B.1.24 Ingram/Hospital Creek, Diazinon

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of the Ingram/Hospital Creek to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by diazinon. Information available to the Regional Board on diazinon concentrations in Ingram/Hospital Creek indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. The basis for this recommendation is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Ingram/Hospital Creek	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Diazinon
Hydrologic Unit	541.10	**Sources**	Agriculture
Total Waterbody Size	2 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	2 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	2 miles	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	37° 05' 61"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 12' 08"
Downstream Extent Latitude	37° 38' 10"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 12' 17"

Watershed Characteristics
Ingram and Hospital Creeks are ephemeral streams that originate in the Coast Range and flow northeast from Ingram Canyon and Hospital Canyon, respectively, to the San Joaquin Valley west of Modesto. The creeks join near Dairy Road and subsequently flow into the San Joaquin River. Upstream of Interstate 5, in

Ingram and Hospital Canyons, the creeks are open waterways that transport rainwater runoff during the winter. However, in the agricultural region downstream of Interstate 5 and in the Valley, Ingram and Hospital Creeks are dominated by agricultural return flows (Westcot et al., 1991).

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objectives for pesticides and toxicity are not being attained for diazinon in Ingram/Hospital Creek. The narrative objective for pesticides states, "No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses." The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective" (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf). The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) has established acute and chronic water quality criteria for diazinon for the protection of aquatic life of 0.08 and 0.05 µg/L, respectively (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000).

Evidence of Impairment

Between 1991 and 1993, several studies analyzed a total of 34 water samples collected in Ingram/Hospital Creek for diazinon (Table 2). The sampling was distributed throughout the year, except for the month of November. Thirteen out of 34 (about 38%) exceeded the CDFG chronic criterion of 0.05µg/L, and 12 out of 34 (about 35%) exceeded the CDFG acute criterion of 0.08 µg/L. Overall, diazinon concentrations in samples collected from Ingram/Hospital Creek ranged from less than one to more than 18 times the CDFG chronic water quality criterion and exceeded chronic and acute water quality criterion in more than 35% of the samples.

Table B-2. Diazinon Concentrations in Ingram/Hospital Creek

Data Source	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of Diazinon Concentrations	Criteria		Number of Samples Equal to or Above Criteria	Percent Samples Equal to or Above Criteria
Foe, 1995; Ross 1992, 1993; Ross et al., 1996, 1999; Fujimura, 1991a,b, 1993a,b,c,d	1991	13	nd - 0.41 µg/L	Chronic	0.05 µg/L	4	31%
				Acute	0.08 µg/L	4	31%
Foe, 1995; Ross et al., 1999, 1996, 1993, 1992; Fujimura, 1993a,b,c,d, 1991a,b	1992	19	nd - 0.903 µg/L	Chronic	0.05 µg/L	7	37%
				Acute	0.08 µg/L	6	32%
Ross et al., 1999, 1996, 1993, 1992; Fujimura, 1993a,b,c, d, 1991a,b	1993	2	0.16 - 0.41 µg/L	Chronic	0.05 µg/L	2	100%
				Acute	0.08 µg/L	2	100%
Sum	1991 - 1993	34	nd - 0.903 µg/L	Chronic	0.05 µg/L	13	38%
				Acute	0.08 µg/L	12	35%

Extent of Impairment

Diazinon impairment exists in Ingram/Hospital Creek from their confluence, east of Dairy Road, to the San Joaquin River, due to diazinon in agricultural return flows. Ingram Creek and Hospital Creek also receive

agricultural return flows upstream from their confluence and west toward Interstate 5, however the extent of diazinon impairment upstream from their confluence is not currently known.

Potential Sources
Agricultural return flows are the most likely source of diazinon in Ingram/Hospital Creek.

B.1.25 Ingram/Hospital Creek, Parathion

Summary of Proposed Actions
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of the Ingram/Hospital Creek to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by parathion. Information available to the Regional Board on parathion levels indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. The basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Ingram/Hospital Creek	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Parathion
Hydrologic Unit	541.10	**Sources**	Agriculture
Total Waterbody Size	2 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	2 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	The entire creek	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	37° 05' 61"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 12' 08"
Downstream Extent Latitude	37° 38' 10"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 12' 17"

Watershed Characteristics
Ingram and Hospital Creeks are ephemeral streams that originate in the Coast Range and flow northeast from Ingram Canyon and Hospital Canyon, respectively, to the San Joaquin Valley west of Modesto. The creeks join near Dairy Road and subsequently flow into the San Joaquin River. Upstream of Interstate 5, in Ingram and Hospital Canyons, the creeks are open waterways that transport rainwater runoff during the winter. However, in the agricultural region downstream of Interstate 5 and in the Valley, Ingram and Hospital Creeks are dominated by agricultural return flows. (Westcot et al., 1991).

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for parathion in the Ingram/Hospital Creek. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective" (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf). The US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established water quality criteria for parathion for the protection of freshwater aquatic life of 0.013 µg/L for a continuous (4-day average) concentration and 0.065 µg/L for a maximum (1-hour average) concentration (Marshack, 2000).

Evidence of Impairment
Between 1991 and 1993, several studies analyzed a total of 33 water samples collected in Ingram/Hospital Creek for parathion (Table 2). The sampling was distributed throughout the year, except for the month of November. Thirteen of the 33 samples (about 38%) exceeded the EPA chronic criterion of 0.013 µg/L, and 12 (about 35%) exceeded the EPA acute criterion of 0.065 µg/L.

Table B-2. Parathion Concentrations in Ingram/Hospital Creek

Data Source	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of Parathion Concentrations	Criteria[a]		Number of Samples Equal to or Above Criteria	Percent Samples Equal to or Above Criteria
Ross, 1993, 1992; Ross et al 1996, 1999; Fujimura, 1991 a,b, 1993a,b,c,d	1991-1993	9	nd	Chronic	0.013 µg/L	0	0%
				Acute	0.065 µg/L	0	0%
Foe, 1995	1991	10	nd - 0.91 µg/L	Chronic	0.013 µg/L	4	40%
				Acute	0.065 µg/L	3	30%
Foe, 1995	1992	14	nd - 0.12 µg/L	Chronic	0.013 µg/L	3	21%
				Acute	0.065 µg/L	1	7%
Sum	1991 - 1993	33	nd - 0.91 µg/L	Chronic	0.013 µg/L	7	21%
				Acute	0.065 µg/L	4	12%

a) EPA water quality criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life (Marshack, 2000)
nd = not detected

Extent of Impairment
Ingram/Hospital Creek is impaired from the confluence of the two creeks, east of Dairy Road, to the San Joaquin River due to parathion in agricultural return flows and tailwater (Foe, 19995). Upstream of the confluence and west toward Interstate 5, Ingram Creek and Hospital Creek also receive agricultural return flows and tailwater; therefore, parathion impairment is likely in Ingram Creek and in Hospital Creek but its extent is currently unknown.

Potential Sources
Because other pesticides, such as diazinon and chlorpyrifos, are known to enter surface waters from agricultural return flows and tailwater, the main source of parathion in Ingram/Hospital Creek is likely agriculture.

B.1.26 Jack Slough, Diazinon

Summary of Proposed Actions
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of the Jack Slough to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by diazinon. Information available to the Regional Board on diazinon levels in Jack Slough indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. A description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Jack Slough	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Diazinon
Hydrologic Unit	515.40	**Sources**	Agriculture
Total Waterbody Size	17 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	13 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	13 miles	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	39° 14' 59"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 29' 01"
Downstream Extent Latitude	39° 10' 06"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 35' 24"

Watershed Characteristics

Located in the Feather River watershed, Jack Slough originates in the foothills of northern Yuba County and flows south/southwest to its confluence with the Feather River, northwest of Marysville. Jack Slough meanders as a natural channel, through riparian zones, in the upstream portion of the watershed and is channelized in the downstream portion of the watershed, where intensive agriculture and year-round irrigation management occurs. In the Sacramento Valley, land use adjacent Jack Slough is predominately agriculture with rice fields located near the upper part of Jack Slough drainage and dense fruit and nut orchards located near the lower part of Jack Slough drainage.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objectives for pesticides and toxicity are not being attained for diazinon in the Jack Slough. The narrative objective for pesticides states, "No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses." The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." It further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective...As a minimum, compliance with this objective...shall be evaluated with a 96-hour bioassay (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf)." The California Department of Fish and Game has established freshwater numeric acute (1-hour average) and chronic (4-day average) criteria for diazinon of 0.08 µg/L and 0.05 µg/L, respectively, for the protection of aquatic life (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000).

Evidence of Impairment

Between 1994 and 2000, the Regional Board and the USGS monitoring studies analyzed a total of 26 ambient water samples collected in Jack Slough, during rain events, for diazinon. Overall, 26 out of 26 samples (100%) exceeded the CDFG chronic water quality criteria of 0.05 parts per billion (ppb) and the acute water quality criteria of 0.08 ppb in January and February, coinciding with the orchard dormant spray season. Pollutant concentrations in ambient water samples collected from Jack Slough ranged up to more than 22 times the CDFG chronic water quality criteria. Table 2 summarizes the available data.

Table B-2. Diazinon in Water Samples Collected from Jack Slough

Data Source	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of Diazinon Concentrations	Criteria		Number of Samples Equal to or Above Criteria	Percent Samples Equal to or Above Criteria
Holmes et al., 2000	1994	9	0.137 - 0.803 µg/L	Chronic	0.05 µg/L	9	100%
				Acute	0.08 µg/L	9	100%
Dileanis et al, 2000	2000	17	0.167 - 1.108 µg/L	Chronic	0.05 µg/L	17	100%
				Acute	0.08 µg/L	17	100%
Sum	1994 - 2000	26	0.137 - 1.108 µg/L	Chronic	0.05 µg/L	26	100%
				Acute	0.08 µg/L	26	100%

Extent of Impairment

Based on California Department of Pesticide Regulation preliminary 2000 Pesticide Use Report (PUR) data, diazinon use (primarily on peach, prune and cherry trees and less on walnut trees) occurs as far as 11 miles upstream from the Regional Board and USGS Jack Slough monitoring study sites (near Highway 70), where 100% of the collected ambient water samples equaled or exceeded CDFG acute and chronic water quality criteria during the orchard dormant spray season. Therefore, diazinon impairment in Jack Slough is likely to extend approximately 11 miles upstream from the two monitoring study sites and also

approximately 2 miles downstream from the monitoring study sites, prior to the confluence of Jack Slough and the Feather River.

Potential Sources

Agriculture is the predominant land use near Jack Slough, specifically fruit and nut orchards and rice fields. Diazinon is applied to orchards, primarily during the dormant spray season to control pests. Seasonal rainfall events in the Sacramento Valley coincide with the orchard dormant spray season and, as a result, residual diazinon migrates with surface runoff from orchards and enters Jack Slough during winter rainstorms. Irrigation return water can also transport diazinon to Jack Slough. Since agriculture is the predominant land use near Jack Slough and diazinon is the primary pesticide used on nearby orchards, the main source of diazinon in Jack Slough is likely from agriculture, particularly from orchards during the orchard dormant spray season.

B.1.27 Lake Combie, Mercury

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of Lake Combie to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by mercury. Information available to the Regional Board on mercury levels in fish tissue samples indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained in Lake Combie. The description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Lake Combie	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Mercury
Hydrologic Unit	516.33	**Sources**	Resource Extraction (abandoned mines)
Total Length	360 acres	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	360 acres	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	All of Lake Combie	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	

Watershed Characteristics

The Bear River basin has over 232,800 watershed acres. Water uses include hydroelectric generation, recreational, agricultural, and municipal uses, among others. The basin is bound by the Yuba River on the north, the Little Truckee River basin on the east, and the American River basin on the south. The headwaters are located in the Sierra Nevada snowfields at elevations ranging up to 9,100 feet above sea level. The Bear River flows into Rollins Reservoir before reaching Lake Combie.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for mercury in Lake Combie. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective." (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf).

Numeric criteria for mercury in fish tissue have been developed for both human health and wildlife protection. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) recently established a human health protection criterion of 0.3 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg; equivalent to parts per million [ppm]) methylmercury in the edible portions of fish (USEPA, 2001b). This criterion is used to determine attainment with of the narrative toxicity objective.

Evidence of Impairment
The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) collected trophic level 3 and 4 fish tissue samples for Lake Combie. Trophic level 3 fish feed on zooplankton, phytoplankton, and benthic invertebrates. Trophic level 4 fish consume trophic level 3 fish as part of their diet. Methylmercury and total mercury bioaccumulates in aquatic organisms and tends to increase with increasing trophic levels (USEPA, 1997a). The USGS sampled nine trophic level 4 fish (largemouth bass) in 1999. The trophic level 4 fish had an average mercury concentration of 0.91 ppm, which exceeds the USEPA criterion of 0.3 ppm. Placer, Yuba, and Nevada counties have issued an interim public health notification for all lakes and watercourses within these counties based on the USGS data. OEHHA is in the process of developing a state advisory (Nevada County, 2000).

Extent of Impairment
Lake Combie covers 360 surface acres. The entire waterbody is impaired by mercury.

Potential Sources
The Bear River watershed was historically mined extensively for its hardrock and placer gold deposits and has been affected by hydraulic mining (Alpers and Hunerlach, 2000). Several inactive gold mines exist upstream of Lake Combie in the Bear River watershed (Montoya and Pan, 1992).

B.1.28 Lake Englebright, Mercury

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of Lake Englebright to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by mercury. Information available to the Regional Board on mercury levels in fish tissue samples indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained in Lake Englebright. The description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Lake Englebright	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Mercury
Hydrologic Unit	517.14	**Sources**	Resource extraction (abandoned mines)
Total Length	815 acres	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	815 acres	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	All of Lake Englebright	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	

Watershed Characteristics
The Yuba River basin has over 12,700 watershed acres and over 1,900 total river miles. Water usage includes recreational, agricultural, hydroelectric generation, and municipal uses, among others. The basin is bound by the Feather River basin on the north, by the Little Truckee River basin on the east, and by the Bear River and American River basins on the south. The headwaters are in the Sierra Nevada snowfields at elevations ranging up to 9,100 feet above sea level. The North Fork of the Yuba River flows into Bullard's Bar Reservoir. Water is released at the Bullard's Bar Dam and goes downstream to join flows from the Middle and South Forks of the Yuba River, which flow into Lake Englebright. From the Englebright Dam some water is diverted to a North and South Irrigation ditch but the majority of discharge continues downstream through Marysville and flows into the Feather River. Englebright Dam is located in the Sierra foothills 21 miles east of Marysville on State Highway 20. Englebright Dam was constructed primarily to prevent upstream hydraulic mining debris from moving downstream into the Yuba River floodplain.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for mercury in Lake Englebright. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California

Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective." (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf).

Numeric criteria for mercury in fish tissue have been developed for both human health and wildlife protection. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) recently established a human health protection criterion of 0.3 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg; equivalent to parts per million [ppm]) methylmercury in the edible portions of fish (USEPA, 2001b). This criterion is used to determine attainment with the narrative toxicity objective.

Evidence of Impairment
The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and University of California, Davis Division of Environmental Studies (UCD) collected fish tissue samples from the midsection, the South Yuba River Arm, and Hogsback Ravine Arm of Lake Englebright (May et al., 2000; Slotton et al., 1996b). Both studies collected trophic level 3 and 4 fish. Trophic level 3 fish feed on zooplankton, phytoplankton, and benthic invertebrates Trophic level 4 fish consume trophic level 3 fish as part of their diet. Methylmercury and total mercury bioaccumulates in aquatic organisms and tends to increase with increasing trophic levels (USEPA, 1997a). The USGS and UCD sampled 21 trophic level 4 fish (largemouth bass, smallmouth bass, and spotted bass) and 9 trophic level 3 fish (carp, green sunfish, hardhead, and Sacramento sucker) between 1996 and 1999. The TL4 fish and TL3 fish had average mercury concentrations of 0.55 ppm and 0.51 ppm, respectively, which exceed the USEPA criterion of 0.3 ppm. Placer, Yuba, and Nevada counties have issued an interim public health notification for all lakes and watercourses within these counties based on the USGS data. OEHHA is in the process of developing a state advisory (Nevada County, 2000).

Extent of Impairment
Lake Englebright is about 227 feet deep at the dam and covers 815 surface acres. It is 9 miles in length and has 24 miles of shoreline. Fish collected throughout the lake had mercury levels above the USEPA criterion. The entire waterbody is impaired by mercury.

Potential Sources
Several inactive and partially active gold mines exist upstream of Englebright Dam in the Yuba River watershed. The Yuba watershed was historically mined extensively for its hardrock and placer gold deposits and has been affected by hydraulic mining (Alpers and Hunerlach, 2000).

B.1.29 Little Deer Creek, Mercury

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of Little Deer Creek to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by mercury. Information available to the Regional Board on mercury levels in fish tissue samples indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained in Little Deer Creek. The description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Little Deer Creek	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Mercury
Hydrologic Unit	517.20	**Sources**	Resource extraction (abandoned mines)
Total Length	4 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	4 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	All of Little Deer Creek	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	N 39° 15' 13"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	W 120° 57' 00"
Downstream Extent Latitude	N 39° 15' 44"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	W 121° 00' 58"

Watershed Characteristics

Little Deer Creek is in the Sierra foothills directly east of Nevada City within the Yuba River basin. The Yuba River basin has over 12,700 watershed acres and over 1,900 total river miles. Water usage ranges from recreational to agricultural and municipal to hydroelectric generation, among others. The Yuba River basin is bound by the Feather River basin on the north, by the Little Truckee River basin on the east, and by the Bear River and American River basins on the south. Little Deer Creek flows for approximately 4 miles from its headwaters at approximately 3,500 feet above mean sea level (msl) to its confluence with Deer Creek at approximately 2,600 feet above msl in Nevada City. Deer Creek flows into the Yuba River downstream of Lake Englebright.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for mercury in Little Deer Creek. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services (OEHHA), the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective" (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf).

Numeric criteria for mercury in fish tissue have been developed for both human health and wildlife protection. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) recently established a human health protection criterion of 0.3 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg; equivalent to parts per million [ppm]) methylmercury in the edible portions of fish (USEPA, 2001b). This criterion is used to determine attainment with the narrative toxicity objective.

Evidence of Impairment

The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) collected fish tissue samples from Little Deer Creek at Pioneer Park. Only trophic level 3 fish were collected in the study. Trophic level 3 fish feed on zooplankton, phytoplankton, and benthic invertebrates. Methylmercury and total mercury bioaccumulates in aquatic organisms and tends to increase with increasing trophic levels (USEPA, 1997a). The USGS sampled six brown trout on October 6, 1999. These TL3 fish had an average mercury concentration of 0.32 ppm, which exceeds the USEPA criterion of 0.3 ppm. Placer, Yuba, and Nevada counties have issued an interim public health notification for all lakes and watercourses within these counties based on the USGS data. OEHHA is in the process of developing a state advisory (Nevada County, 2000).

Extent of Impairment

Little Deer Creek runs for approximately 4 miles and drains into the mainstem of Deer Creek. The entire waterbody is impaired by mercury.

Potential Sources
The inactive Banner Mine is within the watershed of Little Deer Creek, about 2.5 miles upstream from the confluence with Deer Creek. Several inactive and partially active gold mines exist within the Yuba River watershed. The Yuba watershed was historically mined extensively for its hardrock and placer gold deposits and has been affected by hydraulic mining (Alpers and Humerlach, 2000).

B.1.30 Lower Mokelumne River, Aluminum

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (Regional Board) recommends the addition of the lower Mokelumne River to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by aluminum. Information available to the Regional Board on aluminum levels in water samples indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained in the lower Mokelumne River. A description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Mokelumne River, Lower	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Aluminum
Hydrologic Unit	535.00	**Sources**	Resource extraction (abandoned mines)
Total Waterbody Size	28 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	28 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	Camanche Dam to Delta	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	38° 13' 35"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 1' 21"
Downstream Extent Latitude	38° 12' 36"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 21' 55"

Watershed Characteristics
The lower Mokelumne River flows 28 miles from Camanche Dam to the legal Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta boundary in San Joaquin County. Camanche Reservoir, working in tandem with the upstream Pardee Reservoir, stores water for irrigation and stream-flow regulation, providing flood control, water to the meet the needs of downstream water rights holders, and water for fisheries and riparian habitat (EBMUD, 2000). The East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) completed the Camanche Reservoir Project (downstream of Pardee) in 1964. EBMUD built a fish hatchery (the Mokelumne River Fish Installation) immediately downstream of Camanche Dam on the lower Mokelumne River, which the California Department of Fish and Game operates. In addition, a power plant at the base of the dam was placed in service in 1983.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for aluminum in the lower Mokelumne River. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf)."

The toxicity objective was evaluated for the lower Mokelumne River by comparing aluminum concentrations measured in the lower Mokelumne River downstream of Camanche Dam to water quality guidelines and criteria developed for human health and wildlife protection. Available data were compared to the numeric United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria (NRAWQ) maximum (1-hour average) total recoverable aluminum criterion for freshwater aquatic life protection of 750 micrograms per liter (µg/L) (Marshack, 2000). The USEPA maximum contaminant level (MCL) for drinking water protection is 1,000 µg/L of total recoverable aluminum (Marshack, 2000).

Evidence of Impairment
Between 1988 and 1992, EBMUD measured total recoverable aluminum concentrations at three locations on the Mokelumne River downstream of Camanche Dam (USFWS, 1992). Table 2 summarizes the available EBMUD aluminum data. The 1988-1992 data indicate that exceedances of the MCL and NRAWQ criteria occurred in the lower Mokelumne River immediately downstream of Camanche Dam. More recent aluminum data are not available.

Table B-2. Summary of Available Total Recoverable Aluminum Concentration Data for the Lower Mokelumne River (Data source: USFWS, 1992)

Location [a]	# of Samples (Dates Collected)	Range of Concentrations (µg/L)	# (%) of Samples Exceeding Objectives [b]	
			MCL (1,000 µg/L)	NRAWQ Maximum Criterion (750 µg/L)
CamC	146 (9/88 – 11/92)	<10 – 4,800	12 [8%] [c]	19 [13%] [d]
CamD	90 (5/88 – 11/92)	<10 –2,900	10 [11%]	14 [16%]
VAPK	21 (6/88-11/92)	20 – 1,900	2 [10%]	2 [10%]

(a) CamC: Discharge from Camanche Dam to the Mokelumne River.
CamD: Camanche Reservoir lower outlet to the Mokelumne River
VAPK: Mokelumne River at Van Assen Park, downstream of Camanche Dam.
(b) MCL: California Drinking Water Standards Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) of 1,000 µg/l for total recoverable aluminum concentrations.
NRAWQ: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria (NRAWQ) for Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection; maximum criterion is a 1-hour average, for pH values of 6.5 to 9.
(c) The twelve samples with aluminum concentrations above 1,000 µg/l were collected within a 7-day period in March 1989.
(d) Eighteen of the 19 samples with aluminum concentrations above 750 µg/l were collected within an 8-day period in March 1989.

Extent of Impairment
The lower Mokelumne River flows 28 miles from Camanche Dam to the Delta. Data are available only for approximately one mile downstream of Camanche Dam. However, the entire 28-mile reach is probably impaired because there are no substantial input flows.

Potential Sources
Several historic copper and gold mines (including Argonaut, Newton, and Penn) are within the lower Mokelumne River watershed. Penn Mine, which historically operated for copper extraction from 1861 to 1956, impacted the water quality of both Camanche Reservoir and the lower Mokelumne River downstream of Camanche Dam. The Penn Mine site occupies a 22-acre area near the southeastern shore of Camanche Reservoir approximately 1.5 miles from the town of Campo Seco in Calaveras County. Penn Mine historically discharged to the reservoir via Mine Run Creek. Metal loading from Penn Mine led to fishery declines and fish kills in Camanche Reservoir, in the Mokelumne River Fish Installation

downstream of Camanche Dam, and in the lower Mokelumne River; problems with toxic discharges from the Penn Mine continued through the 1960s and 1970s (Buer et al., 1979; SRWCB, 1990; CDFG, 1991; EDAW, Inc., 1992; EBMUD, 2000). Beginning in 1978, several abatement and restoration projects were conducted to decrease the impact of Penn Mine on Camanche Reservoir and the lower Mokelumne River; the most recent abatement project was completed in late 1999 (Buer et al., 1979; SCH EIR, 1996; CH2MHill, 2000a and 2000b).

B.1.31 Mormon Slough, Low Dissolved Oxygen

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board-Central Valley Region, Regional Board, recommends the addition of Mormon Slough to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by low dissolved oxygen. Information available to the Regional Board on dissolved oxygen levels in Mormon Slough indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. A description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Mormon Slough	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Low Dissolved Oxygen
Hydrologic Unit	544.00	**Sources**	Urban Runoff/Storm Sewers
Total Waterbody Size	6 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	1 mile	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	From Commerce Street to the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel.	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	37° 56' 43"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 17' 26"
Downstream Extent Latitude	37° 57' 09"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 18' 22"

Watershed Characteristics

Mormon Slough is located within the San Joaquin Delta Hydrologic Unit in south-central Stockton, California and flows into the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel near the Port of Stockton.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins contains a numeric objective applicable to Mormon Slough which requires dissolved oxygen (DO) not be reduced below 5 milligrams per liter (mg/l). (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf).

Evidence of Impairment

A report of DeltaKeeper data collected between 8 November 1999 and 7 February 2000 found DO concentrations in Mormon Slough below the Basin Plan objective in 27 of 30 samples (Lee and Jones-Lee, 2000).

Table B-2. Dissolved Oxygen Concentrations in Water Samples Collected from Mormon Slough

Data Source	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of DO Concentrations	Number of Samples Below Criterion
Lee and Jones-Lee, 2000a (DeltaKeeper)	November 1999 to February 2000	30	0.5 – 9.6 mg/L	27

Extent of Impairment
Dissolved oxygen concentrations in Mormon Slough near Stockton have been documented to fall below the Basin Plan objective of 5 mg/l as demonstrated by the DeltaKeeper data discussed above. The data is limited to a sampling point in Mormon Slough near the transition of Mormon Slough from an urban creek (relatively narrow) to a slough (relatively wide). The sampling point may, therefore, not be representative of DO levels in the narrower portion of the Slough. Based on this evidence, Mormon Slough, between Commerce St. (the approximate transition point from urban creek to slough) and the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel is being recommended for addition to the 303(d) list due to low DO.

Potential Sources
The impaired reach is within the Stockton urban area. The most likely source of oxygen demanding substances is from runoff from the urban area.

B.1.32 Mormon Slough, Pathogens

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (Regional Board) recommends the addition of Mormon Slough to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by pathogens. Information available to the Regional Board on pathogens levels in Mormon Slough indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. A description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Mormon Slough	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Bacteria
Hydrologic Unit	544.00	**Sources**	Urban runoff, Recreation
Total Waterbody Size	6 Miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	4 Miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	From the confluence with the Deep Water Channel to the confluence with the Stockton Diverting Canal.	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	37° 57' 25"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 20' 53"
Downstream Extent Latitude	37° 58' 02"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 18' 25"

Watershed Characteristics
Mormon Slough is a tributary to the Stockton Deep Water Channel in the Delta. The Delta is characterized by tidal waters with limited flushing flows during the dry seasons. The area around Mormon Slough is highly urbanized and supports recreational uses, including boating, fishing, water skiing and swimming.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for pathogens in the predominantly urban stretches of various Delta waterways (including Mormon Slough). The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states the " the Regional Water Board will also consider...numerical criteria and guidelines developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services...the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective." The Basin Plan also contains a specific objective for fecal coliform bacteria (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf).

Guidelines and criteria have been developed for the protection of human health. Guidelines and criteria have been developed for the protection of human health. The California Department of Health Services (CDHS) has adopted a total coliform bacteria guideline, applicable to recreational waters and beaches, of 10,000 Most Probable Number (MPN) per 100 milliliters for single samples and of 1,000 MPN per 100 ml for 30-day log mean of sample levels (Title 17 California Code of Regulation section 7958). CDHS has also published draft guidelines that include limits for single samples of *E. coli* of 235 MPN per 100 milliliters (CDHS, July 2000 http://www.dhs.ca.gov/ps/ddwem/beaches/freshwater.htm). U.S. EPA guidelines for bacteria are contained in *Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Bacteria* (USEPA, 1986a). The U.S. EPA standards are stated as "Based on a statistically sufficient number of samples (generally not less than 5 samples equally spaced over a 30-day period), the geometric mean of the indicated bacterial densities should not exceed one or the other of the following: *E. coli* 126 MPN per 100 ml; or Enterococci 33 MPN per 100 ml." A methodology for determining exceedances based on single samples is also included in the standards.

Evidence of Impairment
DeltaKeeper submitted bacteria data for Mormon Slough from one sampling location, approximately one mile upstream from the confluence with the Stockton Deep Water Channel (DeltaKeeper, 2001). A total of 31 samples collected during 10 months in 2000-2001 were analyzed. The calculated geometric mean for the *E. coli* levels is 1,272 MPN per 100 ml, which exceeds the U.S. EPA criterion of 126 MPN per 100 ml.

Extent of Impairment
Regional Board staff recommends listing the portion of Mormon Slough between the Stockton Deep water Channel and the Stockton Diverting Canal as impaired for pathogens due to bacterial contamination. The entire area around Mormon Slough is urban and has similar land use patterns and it is anticipated that sampling along other portions of Mormon Slough would show similar bacteria levels.

Potential Sources
In urban settings, the U.S. EPA has identified sources of pathogen pollution including urban litter, contaminated refuse, domestic pet and wildlife excrement and failing sewer lines (USEPA, 2001a). In their pathogen TMDL Guide, the U.S. EPA states "In a study of bacterial loading in urban streams, Young and Thackston (1999) found that fecal bacteria densities were directly related to the density of housing, population, development, percent impervious area, and domestic animal density. Additionally, recreational areas may have high bacteria counts. This can be due to improper disposal of waste from boats, lack of sanitary facilities in the area of recreation and children in diapers using the water."

B.1.33 Mosher Slough, Low Dissolved Oxygen

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board-Central Valley Region, Regional Board, recommends the addition of Mosher Slough to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by low dissolved oxygen. Information available to the Regional Board on dissolved oxygen levels in Mosher Slough indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. A description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Mosher Slough	Pollutants/Stressors	Low Dissolved Oxygen
Hydrologic Unit	544.00	Sources	Urban Runoff/Storm Sewers
Total Waterbody Size	5 miles	TMDL Priority	
Size Affected	2 miles	TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)	
Extent of Impairment	From I-5 bridge to confluence with Bear Creek.	TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)	
Upstream Extent Latitude	38° 1' 57.3"	Upstream Extent Longitude	121° 21' 51.0"
Downstream Extent Latitude	38° 2' 35.2"	Downstream Extent Longitude	121° 23' 11.8"

Watershed Characteristics
Mosher Slough is located within the San Joaquin Delta Hydrologic Unit, in the primarily residential north side of Stockton, California, and joins Bear Creek in the northwest corner of the city limits.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins contains a numeric objective applicable to Mosher Slough which requires dissolved oxygen (DO) not be reduced below 5 milligrams per liter (mg/l) (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf).

Evidence of Impairment
A report of DeltaKeeper data collected between 8 November 1999 and 7 February 2000 found DO concentrations in Mosher Slough below the Basin Plan objective in 18 of 32 samples. Data collected between 15 October 1996 and 8 November 1996 found DO concentrations below the Basin Plan objective in 1 of 11 samples (Lee and Jones-Lee, 2000a).

Table B-2. Dissolved Oxygen Concentrations in Water Samples Collected from Mosher Slough

Data Source	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of DO Concentrations	Number of Samples Below Criterion
Lee and Jones-Lee, 2000a (DeltaKeeper)	October/November 1996; November 1999 to February 2000	43	1.3 – 9.3 mg/L	19

Extent of Impairment
Dissolved oxygen concentrations in Mosher Slough near Stockton have been documented to fall below the Basin Plan objective of 5 mg/l, as demonstrated by the DeltaKeeper data discussed above. Just above the sampling point in Mosher Slough, the characteristics of the Slough change from a narrow urban creek to a much wider Slough. The sampling point may, therefore, not be representative of DO levels in the narrower portion of the Slough. Based on this evidence, Mosher Slough between the I-5 bridge (the approximate transition point from urban creek to slough) and its confluence with Bear Creak is being 303(d) listed due to low DO.

Potential Sources
The impaired reach of Mosher Slough receives runoff from the Stockton urban area. The most likely source of oxygen demanding substances is from runoff from the urban area.

B.1.34 Mosher Slough, Pathogens

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (Regional Board) recommends the addition of Mosher Slough in the Delta to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by pathogens. Information available to the Regional Board on pathogens levels in Mosher Slough indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. A description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Mosher Slough	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Bacteria
Hydrologic Unit	544.00	**Sources**	Urban runoff, Recreation
Total Waterbody Size	5 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	5 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	From Mosher Creek to the confluence with Bear Creek	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	38° 01' 45"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 16 45'
Downstream Extent Latitude	38° 02' 35"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 23' 11"

Watershed Characteristics

Mosher Slough flows through urban portion of Stockton, in the Delta. The Delta is characterized by tidal waters with limited flushing flows during the dry seasons. The lower portion of the slough is near, and is likely also used for, recreational uses including boating, fishing, water skiing and swimming. The predominant land uses in the watershed that encompasses Mosher Slough are agricultural, urban (the city of Stockton), and a deepwater port.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for pathogens in Mosher Slough. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states the " the Regional Water Board will also consider...numerical criteria and guidelines developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services...the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective." The Basin Plan also contains a specific objective for fecal coliform bacteria (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf).

Guidelines and criteria have been developed for the protection of human health. The California Department of Health Services (CDHS) has adopted a total coliform bacteria guideline, applicable to recreational waters and beaches, of 10,000 Most Probable Number (MPN) per 100 milliliters for single samples and of 1,000 MPN per 100 ml for 30-day log mean of sample levels (Title 17 California Code of Regulation section 7958). CDHS has also published draft guidelines that include limits for single samples of *E. coli* of 235 MPN per 100 milliliters (CDHS, July 2000; http://www.dhs.ca.gov/ps/ddwem/beaches/freshwater.htm). The U.S. EPA guidelines for bacteria are contained in *Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Bacteria* (USEPA, 1986a). The U.S. EPA standards are stated as, "Based on a statistically sufficient number of samples (generally not less than 5 samples equally spaced over a 30-day period), the geometric mean of the indicated bacterial densities should not exceed one or the other of the following: *E. coli* 126 per 100 ml; or Enterococci 33 per 100 ml." A methodology for determining exceedances based on single samples is also included in the standards.

Evidence of Impairment
DeltaKeeper submitted bacteria data for Mosher Slough from three sampling locations (DeltaKeeper, 2001). Although geometric means have not been calculated for the data, all 31 samples submitted exceed the CDHS 30 day criterion for total coliform and 29 of the 31 samples exceed the recommended *E. coli* criterion. The measured bacteria densities in the samples were high during the entire sampling period, which includes samples collected during an entire year (May, August, September, October, November, December, January, and February).

Extent of Impairment
Regional Board staff recommends listing Mosher Slough as impaired due to pathogen contamination. The sampling location is within the urban Stockton area. The area around Mosher Slough is heavily urbanized and it is likely that samples collected from other portions of Mosher Slough would show similar high levels of bacteria.

Potential Sources
In urban settings, U.S. EPA has identified sources of pathogen pollution to include urban litter, contaminated refuse, domestic pet and wildlife excrement and failing sewer lines (USEPA, 2001a). In their pathogen TMDL Guide, the U.S. EPA states "In a study of bacterial loading in urban streams, Young and Thackston (1999) found that fecal bacteria densities were directly related to the density of housing, population, development, percent impervious area, and domestic animal density. Additionally, recreational areas may have high bacteria counts. This can be due to improper disposal of waste from boats, lack of sanitary facilities in the area of recreation and children in diapers using the water."

B.1.35 Newman Wasteway, Chlorpyrifos

Summary of Proposed Actions
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of the Newman Wasteway to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by chlorpyrifos. Information available to the Regional Board on chlorpyrifos concentrations indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. The basis for this recommendation is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Newman Wasteway	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Chlorpyrifos
Hydrologic Unit	541.20	**Sources**	Agriculture
Total Waterbody Size	8.5 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	8.5 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	The entire Wasteway	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	37° 17' 27"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 05' 17"
Downstream Extent Latitude	37° 20' 16"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	120° 58' 20"

Watershed Characteristics
The Newman Wasteway originates at the Delta Mendota Canal in Stanislaus County and flows east into Merced County, past Route 33, to the north of Preston Road and continues northeast to the San Joaquin River, just south of Hills Ferry. The Newman Wasteway, owned by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and operated by the San Luis and Delta-Mendota Water Authority, was built to carry emergency releases of water from the Delta-Mendota Canal to the San Joaquin River. Local agricultural drainage is allowed to enter the wasteway.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The narrative objectives for pesticides and toxicity are not being attained for chlorpyrifos in the Newman Wasteway. The narrative objective for pesticides states, "No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses." The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective." (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf) The California Department of Fish and Game has established freshwater numeric acute (1-hour average) and chronic (4-day average) criteria for chlorpyrifos of 0.02 µg/L and 0.014 µg/L, respectively, for the protection of aquatic life (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000).

Evidence of Impairment
Between 1991 and 1993, a total of ten ambient water samples collected from the Newman Wasteway were analyzed for chlorpyrifos (Table 2). Most samples were collected between January and April. Two of the ten (20%) samples contained chlorpyrifos concentrations at or above the CDFG chronic water quality criterion of .014 ug/l, and one of the ten (10%) was above the CDFG acute water quality criterion of .020 ug/l. Overall, chlorpyrifos concentrations in samples collected from Newman Wasteway ranged from less than 1 to 15 times the CDFG chronic water quality criteria (Foe, 1995; Ross, 1992, 1993; Ross et al., 1996, 1999; Fujimura, 1991a,b, 1993a,b,c,d).

Table B-2. Chlorpyrifos Concentrations in Water Samples from the Newman Wasteway

Data Source	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of Chlorpyrifos Concentrations	CDFG Criteria[a]		Number of Samples Equal to or Above Criteria	Percent Samples Equal to or Above Criteria
Foe, 1995; Ross, 1992, 1993; Ross et al., 1996, 1999; Fujimura, 1991a,b, 1993a,b,c,d	1991-1993	10	nd - 0.21 µg/L	chronic	0.014 µg/L	2	20%
				acute	0.02 µg/L	1	10%

a) California Department of Fish and Game Water Quality Criteria for the Protection of Aquatic Life (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000)
nd = not detected

Extent of Impairment
Because the Newman Wasteway is surrounded by agricultural land from which it receives runoff, it is likely that the entire Wasteway is impaired by chlorpyrifos.

Potential Sources
Agriculture is the likely source of chlorpyrifos in the Newman Wasteway.

B.1.36 Newman Wasteway, Diazinon

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of the Newman Wasteway to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by diazinon. Information available to the Regional Board on diazinon concentrations in

the Newman Wasteway indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. The basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Newman Wasteway	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Diazinon
Hydrologic Unit	541.20	**Sources**	Agriculture
Total Waterbody Size	8.5 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	8.5 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	The entire wasteway	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	37° 17' 27"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 05' 17"
Downstream Extent Latitude	37° 20' 16"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	120° 58' 20"

Watershed Characteristics

The Newman Wasteway originates at the Delta Mendota Canal in Stanislaus County and flows east into Merced County, past Route 33, to the north of Preston Road and continues northeast to the San Joaquin River, just south of Hills Ferry. The Newman Wasteway, owned by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and operated by the San Luis and Delta-Mendota Water Authority, was built to carry emergency releases of water from the Delta-Mendota Canal to the San Joaquin River. Local agricultural drainage is allowed to enter the wasteway.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objectives for pesticides and toxicity are not being attained for diazinon in the Newman Wasteway. The narrative objective for pesticides states, "No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses." The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective." (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf) The California Department of Fish and Game has established freshwater numeric acute (1-hour average) and chronic (4-day average) criteria for diazinon of 0.08 µg/L and 0.05 µg/L, respectively, for the protection of aquatic life (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000).

Evidence of Impairment

Between 1991 and 1993, multiple studies analyzed a total of ten water samples collected in Newman Wasteway for diazinon (Table 2). Four out of ten (40%) exceeded the CDFG chronic criterion of 0.05 µg/L, and three out of ten (30%) exceeded the CDFG acute criterion of 0.08 µg/L. Diazinon concentrations ranged from less than 1 time to more than 700 times the CDFG chronic criterion.

Table B-2. Diazinon Concentrations in Water Samples from Newman Wasteway

Data Source	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of Diazinon Concentrations	Criteria[a]		Number of Samples Equal to or Above Criteria	Percent Samples Equal to or Above Criteria
Ross, 1992, 1993; Ross et al., 1996, 1999; Fujimura, 1991a,b, 1993a,b,c,d	1991-1993	10	nd - 36.82 µg/L	chronic	0.05 µg/L	4	40%
				acute	0.08 µg/L	3	30%

a) CDFG water quality criteria for the protection of aquatic organisms (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000)
nd = none detected

Extent of Impairment
Diazinon is used on agricultural crops, especially nut and stone fruit orchards during the dormant season. Because the Newman Wasteway is surrounded by agricultural land, including orchards, and receives agriculture runoff, it is likely that the entire Wasteway is impaired by diazinon.

Potential Sources
Since diazinon is applied to crops in the area surrounding the Newman Wasteway and runoff from agriculture enters surface waters that flow to the Newman Wasteway, the main source of diazinon is likely agriculture.

B.1.37 Oak Run Creek, Fecal Coliform

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board-Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of Oak Run Creek to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by fecal coliform. Information available to the Regional Board on pathogens levels in Oak Run Creek indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. A description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Oak Run Creek	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Fecal Coliform
Hydrologic Unit	507.33	**Sources**	Human and/or livestock sources
Total Waterbody Size	23.5 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	4.5 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	From 16.5 miles before the confluence to 12 miles from the confluence.	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	N 40° 41' 41"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	W 122° 02' 21"
Downstream Extent Latitude	N 40° 39' 19"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	W 122° 04' 23"

Watershed Characteristics
Oak Run Creek is located in Shasta County, and flows from the foothills of Mount Lassen southwest to the Sacramento River, east of Anderson. Oak Run Creek is part of the Cow Creek watershed. Land use within the Cow Creek watershed previously included use by indigenous peoples and historic mining, and currently includes ranches, timberlands, and towns (Montoya and Pan, 1992; Hannaford and North State Institute for Sustainable Communities, 2000).

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The numeric objective for bacteria is not being attained in Oak Run Creek. The bacteria objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "In waters designated for contact recreation (REC-1), the fecal coliform concentration based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period shall not exceed a geometric mean of 200/100 ml, nor shall more than ten percent of the total number of samples taken during any 30-day period exceed 400/100 ml (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf)." The bacteria objectives are presented in terms of Most Probable Number (MPN) per 100 milliliters (ml). The bacteria objectives were evaluated for Oak Run Creek by comparing fecal coliform concentrations measured in Oak Run Creek to Basin Plan objectives.

Evidence of Impairment
Water samples were collected from the middle reach of Oak Run Creek between June and October 1999. The average fecal coliform levels in the water samples collected from Oak Run Creek were approximately 400 MPN/100ml. The fecal coliform levels exceeded the geometric mean Basin Plan criterion (200 MPN/100ml) for at least five months in 1999. The maximum fecal coliform count ranged up to almost 1,800 MPN/100ml. Many of samples were also above the 30-day Basin Plan criterion (400 MPN/100 ml) (Hannaford and North State Institute for Sustainable Communities, 2000).

Extent of Impairment
Oak Run Creek flows for approximately 23.5 miles. The middle reach, approximately 6 miles long, is impacted by fecal coliform.

Potential Sources
Hannaford and North State Institute for Sustainable Communities (2000) concluded that Oak Run Creek contained "at least the wildlife input" and potentially low levels of livestock and human inputs of bacteria. The levels contributed by these sources are considered to be the background levels for the area. Since the impaired Oak Run Creek site is not known to contain more wildlife than the other areas, the excess bacteria "probably originated from livestock or human sources," including septic systems and/or sewage lines leaching into the streams (Hannaford and North State Institute for Sustainable Communities, 2000).

B.1.38 Orestimba Creek, Azinphos-methyl

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board-Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of Orestimba Creek to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by azinphos-methyl. Information available to the Regional Board on azinphos-methyl concentrations in Orestimba Creek indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. The basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Orestimba Creek	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Azinphos-methyl
Hydrologic Unit	541.10	**Sources**	Agriculture
Total Waterbody Size	30 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	10 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	The lower 10 miles, from the foothills to the SJR	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	37° 19' 31"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 06' 58"
Downstream Extent Latitude	37° 25' 17.4"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 0' 12.7"

Watershed Characteristics
Orestimba Creek is an ephemeral stream draining a relatively small basin (6,904 acres) on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley. Orestimba Creek flows result from stormwater runoff in the winter and irrigation return flow in the spring and summer. During the winter the creek can receive flow from Coastal Ranges as well as from the area that drains into the main canal of the Central California Irrigation District, depending on the intensity and duration of storms, thus increasing the drainage area to 125,102 acres.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The narrative objectives for pesticides and toxicity are not being attained for parathion in Orestimba Creek. The narrative objective for pesticides states, "No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses." The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective" (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf). The US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) has established an ambient water quality criterion for azinphos-methyl for the protection of freshwater aquatic life of 0.01 µg/L (USEPA, 1976).

Evidence of Impairment
Between 1992 and 1993, a total of 54 water samples collected from Orestimba Creek at River Road were analyzed for azinphos-methyl (Table 1). Between February 1992 and November 1993, two of the six samples analyzed (33%) contained azinphos-methyl concentrations at or above the USEPA criterion. The highest concentrations generally occurred between June and November; concentrations were also high in February (Ross, 1992, 1993; Ross et al., 1996, 1999; Fujimura, 1991a,b, 1993a,b,c,d). In a second study conducted in 1993, nine of 48 samples collected throughout the year (19%) contained azinphos-methyl concentrations at or above the USEPA criterion (Ross, 1992, 1993; Ross et al., 1996, 1999; Fujimura, 1991a,b, 1993a,b,c,d).

Table B-2. Azinphos-methyl in Water Samples Collected from Orestimba Creek

Data Source	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of Azinphos-methyl Concentrations	Criteria[a]	Number of Samples Equal to or Above Criteria	Percent Samples Equal to or Above Criteria
Ross, 1992, 1993; Ross et al., 1996, 1999; Fujimura, 1991a,b, 1993a,b,c,d	1992-1993	6	nd - 0.1 µg/L	0.01 µg/L	2	33%
Panshin et al, 1998	1993	48	nd - 0.39 µg/L		9	19%
Sum	1992-1993	54	nd - 0.39 µg/L		11	20%

a) USEPA instantaneous maximum ambient water quality criteria (USEPA, 1976)
nd not detected

Extent of Impairment
Orestimba Creek is already on the 303(d) list because of impairment by chlorpyrifos and diazinon, and is proposed for listing for parathion. Because the source (agriculture) is the same for all of these pesticides, it

is likely that agricultural runoff containing azinphos-methyl also impairs the lower 10 miles of Orestimba Creek.

Potential Sources
Azinphos-methyl is used to control insects on many agricultural crops, including almonds and field crops. Therefore the likely source of azinphos-methyl is agriculture.

B.1.39 Orestimba Creek, DDE

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board-Central Valley Region, Regional Board, recommends the addition of Orestimba Creek to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by DDE. Information available to the Regional Board on DDE levels in Orestimba Creek indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. The basis for this recommendation is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Orestimba Creek	**Pollutants/Stressors**	DDE
Hydrologic Unit	541.10	**Sources**	Historical Agriculture
Total Waterbody Size	30 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	10 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	The lower 10 miles, from the foothills to the SJR	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	37° 19' 31"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 06' 58"
Downstream Extent Latitude	37° 25' 17"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 0' 12"

Watershed Characteristics
Orestimba Creek is an ephemeral stream in a relatively small basin (6,904 acres) within the San Joaquin Valley floor on the west side of the valley. Stream flow in Orestimba Creek results from storm runoff in the winter and irrigation return flows in the spring and summer. During the winter, the creek can receive flow from the Coast Range as well as from the area that drains into the main canal of the Central California Irrigation District, depending on the intensity and duration of storms, thus increasing the drainage area to 125,102 acres.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) California Toxic Rule (CTR) criterion for DDE for the protection of human health is not being attained. The USEPA criterion for DDE for the protection of human health through consumption of drinking water and aquatic organisms is 0.00059 µg/L. DDE is a breakdown product of DDT, which was used as an insecticide on agricultural crops and insects that carry diseases. DDT was banned for use as a pesticide in the United States in 1972 because of its potentially harmful effects on humans and wildlife. DDT is relatively insoluble in water, binds strongly to soil, and breaks down into DDD and DDE (US Department of Health and Human Services-Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry [USDHHS-ATSDR], 1995). DDT, DDD, and DDE are known to have detrimental health effects on humans and other animals (USDHHS-ATSDR, 1994).

Evidence of Impairment
During a 1993 monitoring study conducted by the US Geological Survey (USGS), 96 water samples were collected in Orestimba Creek (Table 2). Thirty-two of these samples (33%) exceeded the USEPA Guideline. DDE concentrations ranged from less than 1 to more than 100 times the USEPA Guideline. Samples were collected primarily January thru March, with additional sampling in May and June, and minimal sampling throughout the rest of the year. Concentrations exceeding the USEPA guideline occurred primarily in January and February.

Table B-2. DDE Concentrations in Water Samples from Orestimba Creek

Data Source	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of DDE Concentrations	Guideline[a]	Number of Samples Equal to or Above Guideline	Percent Samples Equal to or Above Guideline
Panshin et al, 1998	1993	96	nd - 0.06 µg/L	0.00059 µg/L	32	33%

a) USEPA Cancer Risk Guideline for Drinking Water (USEPA, 1991)

Extent of Impairment
Orestimba Creek is already listed on the 303(d) list for diazinon and chlorpyrifos (SWRCB, 1999), and is proposed for listing for azinphos-methyl. Because the source (agriculture) is the same for all of these pesticides, it is likely that agricultural runoff containing DDE also impairs the lower ten miles of Orestimba Creek.

Potential Sources
DDT was widely used to control insects on agricultural crops before it was banned nationwide in 1972. The most likely source of DDE, a breakdown product of DDT, is from historical agricultural use of DDT.

B.1.40 Orestimba Creek, Parathion

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board-Central Valley Region, Regional Board, recommends the addition of Orestimba Creek to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by parathion. Information available to the Regional Board on parathion levels in Orestimba Creek indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. The basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Orestimba Creek	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Parathion
Hydrologic Unit	541.10	**Sources**	Agriculture
Total Waterbody Size	30 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	10 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	The lower 10 miles, from the foothills to the SJR	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	37° 19' 31"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 06' 58"
Downstream Extent Latitude	37° 25' 17.4"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 0' 12.7"

Watershed Characteristics
Orestimba Creek is an ephemeral stream in a relatively small basin (6,904 acres) within the San Joaquin Valley floor on the west side of the valley. Stream flow in Orestimba Creek results from storm runoff in

the winter, and irrigation return flows in the spring and summer. During the winter, the creek can receive flow from Coastal Ranges as well as from the area that drains into the main canal of the Central California Irrigation District, depending on the intensity and duration of storms, thus increasing the drainage area to 125,102 acres.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objectives for pesticides and toxicity are not being attained for parathion in Orestimba Creek. The narrative objective for pesticides states, "No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses." The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective" (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf). The US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established water quality criteria for parathion for the protection of freshwater aquatic life of 0.013 µg/L for the continuous concentration (4-day average) and 0.065 µg/L for the maximum concentration (1-hour average) (Marshack, 2000).

Evidence of Impairment

Between 1991 and 1993, a total of 78 water samples collected from Orestimba Creek were analyzed for parathion (Table 2). Samples were collected throughout the year. Five of the 78 samples (6%) contained concentrations of parathion that exceed the EPA continuous concentration and three samples (4%) exceeded the EPA maximum concentration. Parathion concentrations ranged from less than one to more than 23 times the USEPA continuous criterion. The highest concentrations were generally measured between February and March (Ross, 1992, 1993; Ross et al., 1996, 1999; Fujimura, 1991a,b, 1993a,b,c,d).

Table B-2. Parathion Concentrations in Orestimba Creek

Data Source	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of Parathion Concentration	Criteria		Number of Samples Equal to or Above Criteria	Percent Samples Equal to or Above Criteria
Ross, 1992, 1993; Ross et al., 1996, 1999; Fujimura, 1991a,b, 1993a,b,c,d	1991-1993	7	nd - 0.05 µg/L	Chronic	0.013 µg/L	1	14%
				Acute	0.065 µg/L	0	0%
Foe, 1995	1991-1993	69	nd - 0.31 µg/L	Chronic	0.013 µg/L	4	6%
				Acute	0.065 µg/L	3	4%
Sum	1991-1993	78	nd - 0.31 µg/L	Chronic	0.013 µg/L	5	6%
				Acute	0.065 µg/L	3	4%

Extent of Impairment

Other pesticides such as diazinon, chlorpyrifos, and azinphos-methyl impair the lower ten miles of Orestimba Creek, from the foothills to the San Joaquin River. Because the source (agriculture) is the same for all of these pesticides, it is likely that agricultural runoff containing parathion also impairs the lower ten miles of Orestimba Creek.

Potential Sources

Because diazinon, chlopyrifos, and azinphos-methyl are also introduced into surface water from agriculture runoff the main source of parathion is likely agriculture.

B.1.41 Lower Putah Creek, Mercury

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (Regional Board) recommends the addition of Putah Creek to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by mercury. Information available to the Regional Board on mercury levels in fish tissue samples indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained in Putah Creek. The description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Lower Putah Creek	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Mercury
Hydrologic Unit	511.20	**Sources**	Mining, source unknown
Total Waterbody Size	30 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	24 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	Lake Solano to Putah Sinks	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	N 38° 30' 48"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	W 122° 06' 15"
Downstream Extent Latitude	N 38° 30' 57"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	W 121° 36' 46"

Watershed Characteristics

Lower Putah Creek is located in Yolo and Solano counties. The creek extends approximately 30 miles from Lake Berryessa to its mouth (the Putah Creek Sinks) at the Yolo Bypass. During low flow periods, Putah Creek is not contiguous with the Yolo Bypass. The land and water uses for the area are diverse (e.g., municipal, agricultural, recreational uses and freshwater habitat) and impact the water quality of Putah Creek in a variety of ways. The lower Putah Creek watershed is farmed and surrounded by towns.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for mercury in lower Putah Creek. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services (OEHHA), the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf)."

Numeric criteria for mercury in fish tissue have been developed for both human health and wildlife protection. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) recently established a human health protection criterion of 0.3 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg; equivalent to parts per million [ppm]) methylmercury in the edible portions of fish (USEPA, 2001b). This criterion is used to determine attainment with of the narrative toxicity objective.

Evidence of Impairment

The Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry (USDHHS-ATSDR) and the Department of Environmental Science and Policy, University of California, Davis (UCD) collected fish tissue samples from Putah Creek at multiple locations between Lake Berryessa and the Putah Creek Sinks (USDHHS-ATSDR, 1997 & 1998; Slotton et al, 1999). In 1997 and 1998, the USDHHS-ATSDR and UCD sampled 204 trophic level 3 fish from multiple locations downstream of Lake Berryessa and 67 trophic level 4 fish from multiple locations downstream of Lake Solano, which is approximately 6 miles downstream from

Lake Berryessa. Trophic level (TL) 3 fish feed on zooplankton, phytoplankton, and benthic invertebrates. Trophic level (TL) 4 fish consume TL 3 fish as part of their diet. Methylmercury and total mercury bioaccumulate in aquatic organisms and tend to increase with increasing trophic levels (USEPA, 1997a). The TL4 fish had an average mercury concentration of 0.28 ppm, which is slightly less than the USEPA criterion of 0.3 ppm. However, several of the TL 4 fish species (black crappie, largemouth bass, Sacramento pike minnow, and smallmouth bass) from Putah Creek had average mercury concentrations that exceeded the USEPA criterion. Table 2 summarizes the available mercury concentration data for TL 4 fish. In addition, several of the TL 3 fish sampled also had mercury concentrations greater than 0.3 ppm. For example, five Sacramento sucker and one hitch were sampled from Lake Solano; five of these six TL 3 fish had mercury concentrations greater than 0.3 ppm.

Table B-2. Summary of Mercury Data for Putah Creek Trophic Level 4 Fish

Fish Species[a]	Mean Mercury Concentration (ppm)[a]	# of Fish Sampled
Black Crappie	**0.33**	1
Channel Catfish	0.14	14
Largemouth Bass	**0.35**	30
Sacramento Pike Minnow	**0.44**	6
Smallmouth Bass	**0.30**	2
White Catfish	0.18	10
White Crappie	0.28	4
Trophic Level 4 Fish Summary:	0.28	67

Bold text indicates fish species with average mercury concentrations equal to or greater than the USEPA criterion of 0.3 ppm.

Extent of Impairment
Available fish tissue data suggest that Putah Creek is impaired by mercury from Lake Solano to the Putah Creek Sinks. Trophic level 4 fish collected from Putah Creek downstream of Lake Solano had mercury concentrations that frequently exceeded the USEPA criterion of 0.3 ppm.

Potential Sources
Mercury sources likely include mining-related wastes and possible unknown sources. Extensive historic mercury mining occurred within the Lake Berryessa/Putah Creek watershed.

B.1.42 Lower Putah Creek, Unknown Toxicity

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board-Central Valley Region, Regional Board, recommends the addition of lower Putah Creek to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by an unknown toxicity. Information available to the Regional Board on an unknown toxin in lower Putah Creek indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. A description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Putah Creek, lower	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Unknown Toxicity
Hydrologic Unit	511.20	**Sources**	Source Unknown
Total Waterbody Size	30 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	30 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	The entire waterbody	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	N 38° 30' 48"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	W 122° 06' 15"
Downstream Extent Latitude		**Downstream Extent Longitude**	

Watershed Characteristics
Lower Putah Creek is located in Yolo and Solano counties. It flows for approximately 30 miles, from Lake Berryessa to the Yolo Bypass. However, during low flow periods, lower Putah Creek is not contiguous with Yolo Bypass. The land and water use for the area is diverse, and impacts the water quality in a variety of ways. The lower Putah Creek watershed is farmed and surrounded by towns. An unknown toxicity, from an unknown source, impairs lower Putah Creek.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for lower Putah Creek. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that, "Compliance with this objective will be determined by analyses of...biotoxicity tests of appropriate duration... (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf)."

The toxicity objective was evaluated for Putah Creek by comparing toxicity test results of ambient water grab samples collected from Putah Creek with laboratory control results. These toxicity test procedures estimate the acute and chronic responses of aquatic test species from three phyla (representing three trophic levels) as an assessment of the toxicity of the ambient water samples. The tests include fathead minnow (a fish, *Pimephales promelas*) larval survival (mortality) and growth tests, zooplankton (a cladoceran, *Ceriodaphnia dubia*) survival and reproduction (offspring counts) tests, and algal (*Selenastrum capricornutum*) growth (chlorophyll a production) tests. The test results produced by the ambient creek water samples were compared to test results of the laboratory control water samples, to identify ambient creek water samples that caused statistically significant test species impairment.

Evidence of Impairment
Between 1998 and 1999, routine (monthly) and rain event (based on a rain storm) toxicity tests, toxicity identification evaluation tests (TIEs), and water quality analysis were conducted on water samples from lower Putah Creek.

Toxicity tended to occur following rain events and occurred throughout the entire watershed (Larsen et al, 2000). Sixteen of the toxicity tests run on ambient samples resulted in impaired growth, impaired reproduction, or mortality to one or more test organisms. The sources of the toxicity may include suspended solids (including particle bound chemicals or toxicants) and diuron. However, other follow-up tests failed to pinpoint potential cause(s) (although some of the tests eliminated ammonia and pathogenicity as sources). In other cases, no follow-up tests were run and the cause of the toxicity is unknown.

Extent of Impairment
Rain event based toxicity was observed in the entire lower Putah Creek, from downstream of Lake Solano to Mace Blvd, on the three rain events in the sampling period. Therefore, an unknown toxin or toxins impairs the entire length of lower Putah Creek.

Potential Sources
Follow-up tests were conducted on some of the samples that caused toxicity. The results of the follow-up tests indicate that a variety of factors, including suspended solids (including particle bound chemicals or toxicants) and diuron, may have been partially responsible for the toxicity in a few of the cases. However, other follow-up tests failed to pinpoint potential cause(s) (although some of the tests eliminated ammonia and pathogenicity as sources) and in other cases, no follow-up tests were run. Therefore, the cause of the toxicity is unknown, in many cases.

B.1.43 Upper Putah Creek, Unknown Toxicity

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board-Central Valley Region, Regional Board, recommends the addition of upper Putah Creek to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by an unknown toxicity. Information available to the Regional Board on an unknown toxin in upper Putah Creek indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. A description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Upper Putah Creek	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Unknown Toxicity
Hydrologic Unit	512.30	**Sources**	Source Unknown
Total Waterbody Size	36 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	27 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	The lower 27 miles	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude		**Upstream Extent Longitude**	
Downstream Extent Latitude		**Downstream Extent Longitude**	

Watershed Characteristics
Upper Putah Creek is located in Lake and Napa counties. It flows for approximately 36 miles, from its headwaters in the Cobb Mountain to Lake Berryessa. Inactive mercury-mining districts and several communities surround the upper Putah Creek watershed.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for unknown toxicity in the upper Putah Creek. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that, "Compliance with this objective will be determined by analyses of...biotoxicity tests of appropriate duration... (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf)."

The toxicity objective was evaluated for Putah Creek by comparing toxicity test results of ambient water grab samples collected from Putah Creek with laboratory control results. These toxicity test procedures estimate the acute and chronic responses of aquatic test species from three phyla (representing three trophic levels) as an assessment of the toxicity of the ambient water samples. The tests include fathead minnow (a fish, *Pimephales promelas*) larval survival (mortality) and growth tests, zooplankton (a cladoceran, *Ceriodaphnia dubia*) survival and reproduction (offspring counts) tests, and algal (*Selenastrum capricornutum*) growth (chlorophyll a production) tests. The test results produced by the ambient creek water samples were compared to test results of the laboratory control water samples, to identify ambient creek water samples that caused statistically significant test species impairment.

Evidence of Impairment
Between November 1998 and October 1999, water samples were collected once a month just upstream from Lake Berryessa. On four of the dates (January, and August through October 1999) the water samples caused reproductive impairments to *Ceriodaphnia*. The source(s) of the toxicity from the water samples collected in August and September were analyzed using TIE (toxicity identification evaluation). Neither the ambient samples (when re-tested) nor the lab water caused toxicity to *Ceriodaphnia*. However, when the eluates (the non-polar molecules from the sample[1]) of the sample were re-added to water without any pollutants, at three times the ambient sample concentration, *Ceriodaphnia* experienced significant reproductive impairments. This suggests that a non-polar, organic chemical may have caused both of the impairments. No follow-up tests, including TIEs, were conducted on the other two dates, so the cause(s) of the toxicity is unknown (Larsen *et al*, 2000).

In July 1999, the water sample cause impaired growth to *Selenastrum*. The ambient water sample was analyzed for metals, but metals could not account for the toxicity. Therefore, the cause of the toxicity is yet unknown (Larsen *et al*, 2000).

Extent of Impairment
The site selected for study was the furthest downstream site, and represents the sum of the watershed. There are several small waterbodies that flow into Putah Creek, but most (except Janche Creek) enter at least 27 miles upstream of the confluence with Lake Berryessa. It seems likely that at least the lower 27 miles is impaired.

Potential Sources
Follow-up tests were conducted on three of the samples that caused toxicity. The results of two of the follow-up tests indicate that a non-polar organic chemical may be partially responsible for the toxicity in those two samples. However, the other follow-up test failed to determine any potential cause(s), and eliminated metals as a potential source. The cause of the toxicity in that sample is unknown. In the other cases, no follow-up tests were run, so the source of the toxicity is unknown. Therefore, the cause of the toxicity is unknown, but may, in some cases, include non-polar organic chemicals.

B.1.44 Rollins Reservoir, Mercury

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of Rollins Reservoir to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by mercury. Information available to the Regional Board on mercury levels in fish tissue samples indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained in Rollins Reservoir. The description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Rollins Reservoir	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Mercury
Hydrologic Unit	516.34	**Sources**	Resource Extraction ()
Total Length	840 acres	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	840 acres	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	All of Rollins Reservoir	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	

[1] The water sample was extracted in such a way that the non-polar organic molecules stayed in the solution, but the water and every other toxin were eliminated.

Watershed Characteristics
The Bear River basin has over 232,800 watershed acres. Water usage ranges from recreational to agricultural and municipal to hydroelectric generation, among others. The basin is bound by the Yuba River on the north, the Little Truckee River basin on the east, and the American River basin on the south. The headwaters are located in the Sierra Nevada snowfields at elevations ranging up to 9,100 feet above sea level. Greenhorn Creek, Steephollow Creek and Bear River flow into Rollins Reservoir. Rollins Reservoir has twenty-six miles of shoreline and its deepest section is 270 feet deep at the dam. At full capacity the reservoir stores 66,000 acre-feet of water and covers 840 surface acres.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for mercury in Rollins Reservoir. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf)."

Numeric criteria for mercury in fish tissue have been developed for both human health and wildlife protection. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) recently established a human health protection criterion of 0.3 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg; equivalent to parts per million [ppm]) methylmercury in the edible portions of fish (USEPA, 2001b). This criterion is used to determine attainment with the narrative toxicity objective.

Evidence of Impairment
The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and Toxic Substances Monitoring Program (TSMP) collected fish tissue samples from the midsection, Bear River Arm, and Greenhorn Creek Arm of Rollins Reservoir (May et al., 2000; SWRCB-DWQ, 1995). The USGS collected trophic level 3 and 4 fish; the TSMP collected only trophic level 4 fish. Trophic level 3 fish feed on zooplankton, phytoplankton, and benthic invertebrates. Trophic level 4 fish consume trophic level 3 fish as part of their diet. Methylmercury and total mercury bioaccumulate in aquatic organisms and tend to increase with increasing trophic levels (USEPA, 1997a). The TSMP and USGS sampled 50 trophic level 4 fish (largemouth bass, smallmouth bass, black crappie, and channel catfish) between 1984 and 1999. The TL4 fish had an average mercury concentration of 0.32 ppm, which exceeds the USEPA criterion of 0.3 ppm. The trophic level 4 fish data from the USGS study are summarized in Table 2, below. Placer, Yuba, and Nevada counties have issued an interim public health notification for all lakes and watercourses within these counties based on the USGS data. OEHHA is in the process of developing a state advisory (Nevada County, 2000).

Table B-2. Mercury Data for Rollins Reservoir River Trophic Level 4 Fish

Sampling Location	Fish Type	# of Fish Sampled	Mean Mercury Concentration (ppm)
Bear River Arm	Largemouth Bass	2	0.25
	Channel Catfish	10	0.365
Greenhorn Creek Arm	Largemouth Bass	5	0.374
	Channel Catfish	3	0.35
	Black Crappie	3	0.31
Midsection of Reservoir	Largemouth Bass	5	0.56
	Channel Catfish	12	0.31
	Smallmouth Bass	10	0.14
SUMMARY	Trophic Level 4 Fish	50	0.32

Extent of Impairment
Rollins Reservoir covers 840 surface acres. Fish collected throughout the reservoir had mercury levels above the USEPA criterion. The entire waterbody is impaired by mercury.

Potential Sources
The Bear River watershed was historically mined extensively for its hardrock and placer gold deposits and has been affected by hydraulic mining (Alpers and Hunerlach, 2000). Several inactive gold exist upstream of Rollins Reservoir in the Bear River watershed (Montoya and Pan, 1992).

B.1.45 Lower San Joaquin River, Mercury

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (Regional Board) recommends the addition of the lower San Joaquin River to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by mercury. Information available to the Regional Board on mercury levels in fish tissue samples indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained in the lower San Joaquin River. The description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Lower San Joaquin River	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Mercury
Hydrologic Unit	544.00	**Sources**	Resource extraction (abandoned mines)
Total Waterbody Size	330 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	60 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	From the confluence with Bear Creek to Vernalis	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	37° 16' 44"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	120° 49' 39"
Downstream Extent Latitude	37° 40' 32.6"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 15' 54"

Watershed Characteristics
The San Joaquin River flows for approximately 330 miles from the headwaters to the Delta boundary near Vernalis in central California. The hydrology in the lower San Joaquin River is highly managed, with numerous tributary impoundments and extensive diversion of river flows. The lower San Joaquin River is

intermittently dry between Gravelly Ford and the Bear Creek confluence, except when Friant Dam releases water for flood control.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for mercury in the lower San Joaquin River. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective" (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf).

Numeric criteria for mercury in fish tissue have been developed for both human health and wildlife protection. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) recently established a human health protection criterion of 0.3 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg; equivalent to parts per million, [ppm]) methylmercury in the edible portions of fish (USEPA, 2001b). This criterion is used to determine attainment of the narrative toxicity objective.

Evidence of Impairment

The Toxic Substances Monitoring Program (TSMP) and San Francisco Estuary Institute (SFEI) collected numerous trophic level 3 and 4 fish samples from the San Joaquin River between 1979 and 1999 (SWRCB-DWQ, 1995; Davis and May, 2000). Trophic level 3 fish (e.g., carp and green sunfish) feed on zooplankton, phytoplankton, and benthic invertebrates. Trophic level 4 fish (e.g., channel catfish and largemouth bass) consume trophic level 3 fish as part of their diet. Methylmercury and total mercury bioaccumulates in aquatic organisms and tends to increase with increasing trophic levels (USEPA, 1997a). The trophic level 4 fish had an average mercury concentration of 0.45 ppm, which exceeds the USEPA criterion of 0.3 ppm. Table 2 summarizes the available mercury concentration data for trophic level 4 fish.

Table B-2. Summary of Mercury Data for Rollins Reservoir River Fish

Sampling Location	Fish Species	Mean Mercury Concentration (ppm)	# of Fish Sampled
Landers Ave / RT 165	Channel Catfish	0.514	3
	Largemouth Bass	0.681	22
	Sacramento Pike Minnow	0.102	24
	Striped Bass	0.491	1
	White Catfish	0.421	22
Between Crow's Landing and Las Palmas Roads	Largemouth Bass	0.665	25
	Striped Bass	0.464	1
	White Catfish	0.451	20
Near Vernalis	Channel Catfish	0.321	64
	Largemouth Bass	0.649	27
	Striped Bass	0.728	7
	White Catfish	0.415	48
SUMMARY:	Trophic Level 4 Fish	0.45	264

Extent of Impairment
Evidence suggests the lower San Joaquin River is impaired by mercury from the confluence with Bear Creek to Vernalis. Bear Creek was chosen as the upstream extent because it is both a major source of water to the San Joaquin River and is located just upstream of the Landers Avenue/Route 165 sampling site sampled by the SFEI study (Davis and May, 2000).

Potential Sources
The principal sources of mercury to aquatic ecosystems in northern California are historic mercury and gold mining sites (RWQCB- SFB et al, 1995).

B.1.46 Scotts Flat Reservoir, Mercury

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (Regional Board) recommends the addition of Scotts Flat Reservoir to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by mercury. Information available to the Regional Board on mercury levels in fish tissue samples indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained in Scotts Flat Reservoir. The description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Scotts Flat Reservoir	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Mercury
Hydrologic Unit	517.20	**Sources**	Resource extraction (abandoned mines)
Total Length	725 acres	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	725 acres	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	All of Scotts Flat Reservoir	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	

Watershed Characteristics
Scotts Flat Reservoir is located on Deer Creek in the Sierra foothills five miles east of Nevada City within the Yuba River basin. Deer Creek flows approximately 20 miles from Scotts Flat Reservoir to its confluence with the Yuba River downstream from Lake Englebright. The Yuba River basin has over 12,700 watershed acres and over 1,900 total river miles. Water usage ranges from recreational to agricultural and municipal to hydroelectric generation, among others. The Yuba River basin is bound by the Feather River basin on the north, by the Little Truckee River basin on the east, and by the Bear River and American River basins on the south. Its headwaters are located in the Sierra Nevada snowfields at elevations ranging up to 9,100 feet above sea level.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for mercury in Scotts Flat Reservoir. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services (OEHHA), the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective" (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf).

Numeric criteria for mercury in fish tissue have been developed for both human health and wildlife protection. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) recently established a human health protection criterion of 0.3 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg; equivalent to parts per million [ppm]) methylmercury in the edible portions of fish (USEPA, 2001b). This criterion is used to determine attainment with of the narrative toxicity objective.

Evidence of Impairment
The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) sampled trophic level 3 and 4 fish from Scotts Flat Reservoir (May et al., 2000). Trophic level 3 fish feed on zooplankton, phytoplankton, and benthic invertebrates. Trophic level 4 fish consume trophic level 3 fish as part of their diet. Methylmercury and total mercury bioaccumulate in aquatic organisms and tend to increase with increasing trophic levels (USEPA, 1997a). The USGS sampled seven trophic level 4 fish (largemouth bass) on September 7 and 8, 1999. These trophic level 4 fish had an average mercury concentration of 0.38 ppm, which exceeds the USEPA criterion of 0.3 ppm. Placer, Yuba, and Nevada counties have issued an interim public health notification for all lakes and watercourses within these counties based on the USGS data. OEHHA is in the process of developing a state advisory (Nevada County, 2000).

Extent of Impairment
Scotts Flat Reservoir covers 725 surface acres with 48,500 acre-feet of storage. The entire waterbody is impaired by mercury.

Potential Sources
Several inactive and partially active gold mines exist upstream of Scotts Flat Reservoir within the Yuba River watershed. The Yuba watershed was historically mined extensively for its hardrock and placer gold deposits and has been affected by hydraulic mining (Alpers and Hunerlach, 2000).

B.1.47 Smith Canal, Low Dissolved Oxygen

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board-Central Valley Region, Regional Board, recommends the addition of Smith Canal to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by low dissolved oxygen. Information available to the Regional Board on dissolved oxygen levels in Smith Canal indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. A description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Smith Canal	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Low Dissolved Oxygen
Hydrologic Unit	544.00	**Sources**	Urban Runoff/Storm Sewers
Total Waterbody Size	2 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	2 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	From confluence with San Joaquin River to Yosemite Lake.	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	37° 57' 25"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 20' 53"
Downstream Extent Latitude	37° 58' 02"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 18' 25"

Watershed Characteristics
The Smith Canal is a dead end slough connecting the San Joaquin River near Rough and Ready Island with Yosemite Lake at Legion Park in downtown Stockton, CA. Smith Canal is located within the San Joaquin Delta Hydrologic Unit and receives storm water discharges from 3,300 acres of urban downtown Stockton, CA area. The land uses are 50% residential, 18% commercial, and 26% street. Institutional and industrial uses occupy the remaining 6% (Chen and Tsai, 1999).

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins contains a numeric objective applicable to Smith Canal which requires dissolved oxygen (DO) not be

reduced below 5 milligrams per liter (mg/l) (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf).

Evidence of Impairment
DO measurements collected from a variety of locations in Smith Canal between 1995 and 2000, have found concentrations below the Basin Plan objective of 5.0 mg/L on many occasions.

Fish kills were observed along Smith Canal by a resident in 1994, by DeltaKeeper in 1995 and 1996, and by CVRWQCB staff in 1994 and 1995. During one of the events in 1994, threadfin shad were observed floating at the surface of Smith Canal. Floating at the surface can be due to the loss of equilibrium associated with inadequate dissolved oxygen levels. These observations prompted a study by the CVRWQCB in the fall of 1995 designed to determine if low DO concentrations were responsible for the fish kills. Continuous monitoring data collected for the report in Smith Canal found DO concentrations during dry weather to be at or above Basin Plan objectives. However, during rain events between 10 and 13 December 1995 and again between 15 and 18 December 1995 DO concentrations dropped below Basin Plan objective after an initial peak during the rain events (Larsen et al, 1998).

An assessment of water quality data from Smith Canal performed by Camp Dresser & McKee Inc. for the City of Stockton between October 1997 and September 1998 found DO concentrations often below Basin Plan objectives. DO concentrations at the Pershing Ave. bridge over Smith Canal were below Basin Plan objectives many times during each month of the twelve month study and were below objectives many times per month at the Smith Canal Pedestrian Bridge in all but three months of the study. DO concentrations at the downstream Smith Canal Pedestrian Bridge were generally higher than the upstream Pershing Ave. bridge and DO concentrations overall were lower in conjunction with wet weather events (CDM, 1999).

A report of DeltaKeeper data collected between 8 November 1999 and 7 February 2000 found DO concentrations in Smith Canal below the Basin Plan objective in 25 of 31 samples. Data in the same report collected between 15 October 1996 and 8 November 1996 found DO concentrations below the Basin Plan objective in 6 of 10 samples (Lee and Jones-Lee, 2000a).

Table B-2. Dissolved Oxygen Concentrations in Water Samples Collected from Smith Canal

Data Source	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of DO Concentration	Number of Samples Below Criteria
Lee and Jones-Lee, 2000a (DeltaKeeper)	October/November 1996; November 1999 to February 2000	41	0.4 - 11 mg/L	31
Larsen, 1998	October to December 1995	Continuous/intermittent	1.7 - >11mg/L	n/a
CDM, 1999	October 1997 to September 1998	Continuous	0 – >11 mg/L	n/a

Extent of Impairment
Dissolved oxygen concentrations in the Smith Canal in Stockton, CA have been documented to fall below the Basin Plan objective of 5 mg/l on many occasions between 1995 and 2000. This data also indicates that some DO concentration episodes below the Basin Plan objectives have coincided with wet weather events. Due to the relatively short length of Smith Canal and uniform characteristics (straight channel surrounded by urban land), the samples collected indicate impairment of all of Smith Canal by low DO.

Potential Sources
The impaired reach of Smith Canal is wholly within the Stockton urban area. The most likely source of oxygen demanding substances is from runoff from the urban area.

B.1.48 Smith Canal, Organophosphorus Pesticides

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board-Central Valley Region, Regional Board, recommends the addition of Smith Canal to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by Organophosphorus (OP) pesticides. Information available to the Regional Board on OP pesticide levels in Smith Canal indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. A description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Smith Canal	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Organophosphate pesticides
Hydrologic Unit	544.00	**Sources**	Urban runoff
Total Waterbody Size	2 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	2 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	All of Smith Canal	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	37° 58' 03"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 18' 24"
Downstream Extent Latitude	38° 32' 49"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 29' 04"

Watershed Characteristics

The Smith Canal is located within and receives all of its water from the City of Stockton, in San Joaquin County. It flows for approximately 2 miles, from Yosemite Lake, in Yosemite Lake Park, to the San Joaquin River-Stockton Deep Water Ship Canal, just east of Louis Park. Land use around the area is primarily urban.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objectives for pesticides and toxicity are not being attained for OP pesticides in the Smith Canal. The narrative objective for pesticides states, "No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses." The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." It further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective...As a minimum, compliance with this objective...shall be evaluated with a 96-hour bioassay (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf)."

The toxicity objective was evaluated for Smith Canal by comparing toxicity test results of ambient water grab samples collected from Smith Canal with laboratory control results. These toxicity test procedures estimate the acute and chronic responses of aquatic test species from three phyla (representing three trophic levels) as an assessment of the toxicity of the ambient water samples. The tests include fathead minnow (a fish, *Pimephales promelas*) larval survival (mortality) and growth tests, zooplankton (a cladoceran, *Ceriodaphnia dubia*) survival and reproduction (offspring counts) tests, and algal (*Selenastrum capricornutum*) growth (chlorophyll a production) tests. The test results produced by the ambient creek water samples were compared to test results of the laboratory control water samples, to identify ambient creek water samples that caused statistically significant test species impairment.

Additionally, the pesticide and toxicity objectives were evaluated for Smith Canal by comparing OP concentrations measured in Smith Canal to chlorpyrifos and diazinon criteria developed by the California Department of Fish and Game.

Evidence of Impairment
Between 1994 and 1998 toxicity tests, toxicity identification evaluation (TIE) tests, chemical analysis, and the toxic units (TUs) of OP pesticides (the weighted toxicity caused by the OP pesticides) calculated by GF Lee (Lee GF, and A. Jones-Lee, 2001) were conducted on water samples from Smith Canal. Four of eight ambient water samples collected from Smith Canal showed survival impairments to *Ceriodaphnia.* On all four occasions, the impairments caused complete (100%) mortality within 7 days (Lee GF, and A. Jones-Lee, 2001). The toxicity events occurred in October, November, and March (Lee GF, and A. Jones-Lee, 2001). On each occasion, TIEs were conducted, and on three of the occasions water quality tests were conducted and TUs were calculated.

On three of the four dates that TIE tests were conducted, the addition Piperonyl Butoxide (PBO), a substance that inhibits OP pesticides (Larsen *et al*, 2000), completely eliminated the previously observed toxicity. This indicates that OP pesticides caused the toxicity. On two of the three days, water quality was measured. The ambient water sample was analyzed for pesticides and found to contain detectable levels of diazinon, ranging in concentration from 0.129 to 0.166 ug/L. These levels exceed the chronic and acute CDFG levels for diazinon, indicating that the concentrations of diazinon are acutely and chronically toxic to freshwater aquatic life. Toxicity units (TUs) for the additive effects of diazinon and chlorpyrifos were also calculated. The TUs for both days was approximately .25 (25%), indicating that diazinon (and chlorpyrifos) could not account for the complete mortality of the samples. Since diazinon could not account for all of the toxicity observed, but the toxicity could be completely eliminated by adding PBO, other OP pesticides, in addition to diazinon, may cause the toxicity in Smith Canal.

On the fourth date, the addition of PBO to the water sample reduced the mortality and caused a delay in the onset of mortality, but did not completely eliminate the mortality. This indicates that OP pesticides played a role in the toxicity. The ambient water sample was analyzed for pesticides and found to contain detectable levels of diazinon (or 0.186 ug/L) and chlorpyrifos (or 0.122 ug/L). These concentrations are above the chronic and acute CDFG criteria. Since the additive concentration of diazinon and chlorpyrifos can cause high levels of mortality and the addition of PBO could reduce the mortality and delay its onset, it is likely that OP pesticides, specifically diazinon and chlorpyrifos, cause at least some of the toxicity in Smith Canal.

Extent of Impairment
Samples appear to be collected from only one location within Smith Canal. However, because the sole source of the water is the City of Stockton, it is likely that the entire waterbody is impaired.

Potential Sources
Chlorpyrifos is an OP pesticide that has been commonly used by homeowners, pest control operators for structural and garden pest control, and on agriculture, including orchards. Diazinon is one of the most commonly used home and garden pesticides. Because the sole source of the water is from Stockton, it is likely that the source of the OP pesticides is urban run-off from the Stockton area.

B.1.49 Smith Canal, Pathogens

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (Regional Board) recommends the addition of Smith Canal in the Delta to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by pathogens. Information available to the Regional Board on pathogen levels in the lower reach of the Smith Canal indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. A description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Smith Canal	Pollutants/Stressors	Pathogens
Hydrologic Unit	544.00	Sources	Urban runoff, Recreation
Total Waterbody Size	2 miles	TMDL Priority	
Size Affected	2 miles	TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)	
Extent of Impairment	From the confluence with the Deep Water Channel to the terminus in Yosemite Lake Park	TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)	
Upstream Extent Latitude	37° 57' 25"	Upstream Extent Longitude	121° 20' 53"
Downstream Extent Latitude	37° 58' 02"	Downstream Extent Longitude	121° 18' 25"

Watershed Characteristics
The Delta is characterized by tidal waters with limited flushing flows during the dry seasons. Smith Canal is located in the Delta and is a tributary to the Stockton Deep Water Channel. The area is highly urbanized and supports recreational uses, including boating, fishing, water skiing and swimming. Additionally, the recreational uses of the waters include a park with a "lake" (Yosemite Lake) at the upper terminus of the canal.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for pathogens in the predominantly urban stretches of various Delta waterways. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states the " the Regional Water Board will also consider...numerical criteria and guidelines developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services...the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective." The Basin Plan also contains a specific objective for fecal coliform bacteria (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf).

Guidelines and criteria have been developed for the protection of human health. The California Department of Health Services (CDHS) has adopted a total coliform bacteria guideline, applicable to recreational waters and beaches, of 10,000 Most Probable Number (MPN) per 100 milliliters for single samples and of 1,000 MPN per 100 ml for 30-day log mean of sample levels (Title 17 California Code of Regulation section 7958). CDHS has also published draft guidelines that include limits for single samples of *E. coli* of 235 MPN per 100 milliliters (CDHS, July 2000 http://www.dhs.ca.gov/ps/ddwem/beaches/freshwater.htm). USEPA guidelines for bacteria are contained in *Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Bacteria* (USEPA, 1986a). The USEPA standards are stated as "Based on a statistically sufficient number of samples (generally not less than 5 samples equally spaced over a 30-day period), the geometric mean of the indicated bacterial densities should not exceed one or the other of the following: *E. coli* 126 MPN per 100 ml; or Enterococci 33 MPN per 100 ml." A methodology for determining exceedances based on single samples is also included in the standards.

Evidence of Impairment
DeltaKeeper submitted bacteria data for Smith Canal from three sampling locations (Jennings, 2001). The sampling locations are located at the upper terminus of the canal at Yosemite Lake, approximately one-quarter mile downstream in the canal, and near the mouth of the canal (near Interstate 5 [I-5]). Geometric means have been calculated using the data submitted by DeltaKeeper. The calculated geometric mean for the *E. coli* levels measured in samples collected from the Yosemite Lake location is 919 MPN per 100 ml, which exceeds the USEPA criterion of 126 MPN per 100 ml. The calculated geometric mean for the *E.*

coli levels measured in samples collected from the sampling location approximately one-quarter mile downstream from the Yosemite Lake is 6,223 MPN per 100 ml, which also exceeds the USEPA criterion of 126 MPN per 100 ml. The calculated geometric mean for the *E. coli* levels measured in samples collected from the sampling location near I-5 is 88 MPN per 100 ml. However, individual *E. coli* measurements for samples collected from location near I-5 have exceeded the USEPA single sample criterion of 235 MPN per 100 ml and the geometric mean of the measured total coliform levels remains high, at 2,090 MPN per 100 ml.

Extent of Impairment
Regional Board staff recommends listing the entire reach of Smith Canal, including Yosemite Lake at the upper terminus, as impaired for pathogens due to bacterial contamination. Sampling locations are within the urban Stockton area. The entire canal is heavily urbanized and has similar land use patterns. Sampling shows high levels of bacteria in the entire length of Smith Canal.

Potential Sources
In urban settings, the USEPA has identified sources of pathogen pollution to include urban litter, contaminated refuse, domestic pet and wildlife excrement, and failing sewer lines (USEPA, 2001a). In their pathogen TMDL Guide, the USEPA states "In a study of bacterial loading in urban streams, Young and Thackston (1999) found that fecal bacteria densities were directly related to the density of housing, population, development, percent impervious area, and domestic animal density. Additionally, recreational areas may have high bacteria counts. This can be due to improper disposal of waste from boats, lack of sanitary facilities in the area of recreation and children in diapers using the water."

B.1.50 South Cow Creek, Fecal Coliform

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board-Central Valley Region, Regional Board, recommends the addition of South Cow Creek to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by pathogens. Information available to the Regional Board on pathogens levels in South Cow Creek indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. A description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	South Cow Creek	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Fecal Coliform
Hydrologic Unit	507.33	**Sources**	Human and/or livestock sources
Total Waterbody Size	28.5 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	7 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	From approximately 14 miles from the confluence to 7 miles before the confluence	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	N 40° 35' 21"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	W 121° 55' 13"
Downstream Extent Latitude	N 40° 34' 55"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	W 122° 00' 51"

Watershed Characteristics
South Cow Creek is located in Shasta County and flows from the foothills of Mount Lassen southwest to the Sacramento River, east of Anderson. South Cow Creek is part of the Cow Creek watershed. Land use within the Cow Creek watershed previously included use by indigenous peoples and historic mining, and currently includes ranches, timberlands, and towns (Montoya and Pan, 1992; Hannaford and North State Institute for Sustainable Communities, 2000).

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The numeric objective for bacteria is not being attained in South Cow Creek. The bacteria objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "In waters designated for contact recreation (REC-1), the fecal coliform concentration based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period shall not exceed a geometric mean of 200/100 ml, nor shall more than ten percent of the total number of samples taken during any 30-day period exceed 400/100 ml (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf)." The bacteria objectives are presented in terms of Most Probable Number (MPN) per 100 milliliters (ml). The bacteria objectives were evaluated for South Cow Creek by comparing fecal coliform concentrations measured in South Cow Creek to Basin Plan objectives.

Evidence of Impairment
Water samples were collected from the middle reach of South Cow Creek between June and October 1999. The average fecal coliform level in the water samples was approximately 800 MPN/100ml. The fecal coliform levels exceeded the geometric mean Basin Plan criterion (200 MPN/100ml) for at least five months in 1999. Many of samples were also above the 30-day Basin Plan criterion (400 MPN/100 ml) (Hannaford and North State Institute for Sustainable Communities, 2000).

Extent of Impairment
South Cow Creek flows for approximately 28.5. The middle reach, approximately 8 miles long, is impacted by fecal coliform.

Potential Sources
Hannaford and North State Institute for Sustainable Communities (2000) concluded that the South Cow Creek site contained "at least the wildlife input" and potentially low levels of livestock and human inputs of bacteria. The levels are considered to be the background level for the area. Since the impaired South Cow Creek site is not known to contain more wildlife than the other areas, the excess bacteria "probably originated from livestock or human sources," including septic systems and/or sewage lines leaching into the streams (Hannaford and North State Institute for Sustainable Communities, 2000).

B.1.51 Lower Stanislaus River, Mercury

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of the lower Stanislaus River to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by mercury. Information available to the Regional Board on mercury levels in fish tissue samples indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained in the lower Stanislaus River. The description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Lower Stanislaus River	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Mercury
Hydrologic Unit	535.30	**Sources**	Resource extraction (abandoned mines)
Total Waterbody Size	48 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	48 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	Entire Lower Stanislaus River	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	37° 52' 24.6"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	120° 36' 16.6"
Downstream Extent Latitude	37° 39' 52.7"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 14' 28.5"

Watershed Characteristics
The lower Stanislaus River flows 48 miles from the Goodwin Diversion Dam through the towns of Oakdale, Riverbank and Ripon to its confluence with the San Joaquin River. The upstream segment forms the Calaveras-Tuolumne County line, the middle segment flows through Stanislaus County, and the downstream segment forms the Stanislaus-San Joaquin County line. The Goodwin Diversion Dam serves as an after bay for hydropower and spillway releases from Tulloch Dam, which is immediately upstream. The Tulloch Dam serves as an after bay for hydropower releases from the upstream New Melones Dam. The New Melones Dam regulates the flows of the Stanislaus River. Neither the Tulloch nor Goodwin reservoirs have flood control space; large releases are passed through both reservoirs. The Oakdale and South San Joaquin Irrigation Districts operate Goodwin Diversion Dam and Tulloch Reservoir; the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation operates the New Melones Dam (USBR, 2001).

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for mercury in the lower Stanislaus River. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf)."

Numeric criteria for mercury in fish tissue have been developed for both human health and wildlife protection. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) recently established a human health protection criterion of 0.3 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg; equivalent to parts per million [ppm]) methylmercury in the edible portions of fish (USEPA, 2001b). This criterion is used to determine attainment with of the narrative toxicity objective.

Evidence of Impairment
The Toxic Substances Monitoring Program (TSMP) and San Francisco Estuary Institute (SFEI) collected composite samples of trophic level 3 and 4 fish from the Stanislaus River between 1978 and 1998 (SWRCB, 1995; Davis and May, 2000). Trophic level 3 fish feed on zooplankton, phytoplankton, and benthic invertebrates. Trophic level 4 fish consume trophic level 3 fish as part of their diet. Methylmercury and total mercury bioaccumulate in aquatic organisms and tend to increase with increasing trophic levels (USEPA, 1997b). The TSMP and SFEI sampled 45 trophic level 4 fish (largemouth bass, channel catfish, and white catfish). These trophic level 4 fish had an average mercury concentration of 0.53 ppm, which exceeds the USEPA criterion of 0.3 ppm.

Extent of Impairment
The lower Stanislaus River flows 58 miles from Goodwin Diversion Dam to its confluence with the San Joaquin River. Data are available only for the downstream segment of the river. However, the entire 58-mile reach is probably impaired because there is no substantial input downstream of Goodwin Dam.

Potential Sources
The principal source of mercury to Stanislaus River is historic gold mining sites in the upper portion of the watershed (OMR, 2000).

B.1.52 Stockton Deep Water Channel, Pathogens

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (Regional Board) recommends the addition of Stockton Deep Water Channel in the Delta to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by pathogens. Information available to the Regional Board on

pathogens levels in Stockton Deep Water Channel indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. A description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Stockton Deep Water Channel	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Bacteria
Hydrologic Unit	544.00	**Sources**	Urban runoff, Recreation
Total Waterbody Size	2 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	2 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	All of the channel	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	37° 57' 28"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 21' 14"
Downstream Extent Latitude	37° 57' 23"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 17' 34"

Watershed Characteristics

The California Department of Health Services (CDHS) has adopted a total coliform bacteria guideline, applicable to recreational waters and beaches, of 10,000 Most Probable Number (MPN) per 100 milliliters for single samples (Title 17 California Code of Regulation section 7958). The Stockton Deep Water Channel is located in the Delta and extends through the Port of Stockton into urban Stockton, where it is bordered by residential housing and recreation areas including Weber Point. The California Department of Health Services (CDHS) has adopted a total coliform bacteria guideline, applicable to recreational waters and beaches, of 10,000 Most Probable Number (MPN) per 100 milliliters for single samples (Title 17 California Code of Regulation section 7958). The Stockton Deep Water Channel supports recreational uses, including boating, fishing, and swimming. The predominant land uses in the area around the Stockton Deep Water Channel are industrial and urban.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for pathogens in the predominantly urban stretches of various Delta waterways. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states the " the Regional Water Board will also consider...numerical criteria and guidelines developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services...the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf)."

Guidelines and criteria have been developed for the protection of human health. The California Department of Health Services (CDHS) has adopted a total coliform bacteria guideline, applicable to recreational waters and beaches, of 10,000 Most Probable Number (MPN) per 100 milliliters for single samples and of 1,000 MPN per 100 ml for 30-day log mean of sample levels (Title 17 California Code of Regulation section 7958). CDHS has also published draft guidelines that include limits for single samples of *E. coli* of 235 MPN per 100 milliliters (CDHS, July 2000 http://www.dhs.ca.gov/ps/ddwem/beaches/freshwater.htm). USEPA guidelines for bacteria are contained in *Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Bacteria* (USEPA, 1986a). The USEPA standards are stated as "Based on a statistically sufficient number of samples (generally not less than 5 samples equally spaced over a 30-day period), the geometric mean of the indicated bacterial densities should not exceed one or the other of the following: *E. coli* 126 MPN per 100 ml; or Enterococci 33 MPN per 100 ml." A methodology for determining exceedances based on single samples is also included in the standards.

Evidence of Impairment
DeltaKeeper submitted bacteria data for the Stockton Deep Water Channel from two sampling locations (Jennings, 2001). One sampling location is at the lower terminus of the channel in McLeod Lake and the other is approximately one mile upstream at Morelli Park. During six months in 2000, 14 samples were collected from each location and analyzed for *E. coli*. Geometric means have been calculated using the data submitted by DeltaKeeper. The calculated geometric mean for *E. coli* in water samples collected from the Morelli Park location is 399 MPN per 100 ml, which exceeds the USEPA criterion of 126 MPN per 100 ml. The calculated geometric mean for *E. coli* in water samples collected from the McLeod Lake location is 287 MPN per 100 ml, which also exceeds the USEPA criterion.

Extent of Impairment
Regional Board staff recommends listing the Stockton Deep Water Channel as impaired due to pathogen contamination. Both sampling locations are within the urban Stockton area, which includes a deep water shipping port. The area around the entire reach of the Stockton Deep Water Channel has similar land use patterns and it is expected that sampling would show similar high levels of bacteria throughout the channel.

Potential Sources
In urban settings, the USEPA has identified sources of pathogen pollution to include urban litter, contaminated refuse, domestic pet and wildlife excrement and failing sewer lines (USEPA, 2001). In their pathogen TMDL Guide USEPA states "In a study of bacterial loading in urban streams, Young and Thackston (1999) found that fecal bacteria densities were directly related to the density of housing, population, development, percent impervious area, and domestic animal density. Additionally, recreational areas may have high bacteria counts. This can be due to improper disposal of waste from boats, lack of sanitary facilities in the area of recreation and children in diapers using the water."

B.1.53 Sutter Bypass, Diazinon

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of the Sutter Bypass to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by diazinon. Information available to the Regional Board on diazinon concentrations in the Sutter Bypass indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. The basis for this recommendation is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Water Body Name	Sutter Bypass	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Diazinon
Hydrologic Unit	520.10	**Sources**	Agriculture
Total Water Body Size	25 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	25 miles	**TMDL Start Date**	
Extent of Impairment	Entire length	**TMDL End Date**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	39° 08' 53"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 50' 18"
Downstream Extent Latitude	38° 46' 50"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 38' 31"

Watershed Characteristics
The Sutter Bypass is located in Butte and Sutter Counties. It flows south for approximately 25 miles, from the Sacramento River to the Feather River. The water flowing through the bypass is primarily from the Sacramento River. However, water quality in the bypass is impacted by agricultural runoff, including storm water and irrigation runoff from extensive orchard areas. A number of other waterbodies also flow into the Sutter Bypass, and many of these tributaries also drain orchards.

Water Quality Objectives Exceeded

The narrative objectives for pesticides and toxicity are not being attained for diazinon in the Sutter Bypass. The narrative objective for pesticides states, "No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses." The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective" (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf). The California Department of Fish and Game has established freshwater numeric acute (1-hour average) and chronic (4-day average) criteria for diazinon of 0.08 µg/L and 0.05 µg/L, respectively, for the protection of aquatic life (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000).

Evidence of Impairment

Several studies have measured diazinon concentrations in water samples collected from the Sutter Bypass (Table 2). These studies were conducted between December and March, the winter orchard dormant season. A total of 78 samples were analyzed for diazinon; of these 78 samples 27 (35%) exceeded the CDFG chronic water quality criterion for diazinon, and ten (13%) exceeded the acute criterion (Nordmark, 1998, 1999, 2000).

Table B-2. Diazinon Concentrations in Water Samples Collected from the Sutter Bypass

Data Source	Sample Years	Number of Samples	Range of Diazinon Concentration	Criteria[a]		Number of Samples Equal to or Above Criteria	Percent Samples Equal to or Above Criteria
Nordmark, 1998	1996 - 1997	16	nd - 0.09 µg/L	chronic	0.05 µg/L	5	31%
				acute	0.08 µg/L	1	6%
Nordmark, 1998	1997 - 1998	20	nd - 0.1 µg/L	chronic	0.05 µg/L	5	25%
				acute	0.08 µg/L	4	20%
Nordmark, 1999	1998 - 1999	20	nd - 0.11 µg/L	chronic	0.05 µg/L	7	35%
				acute	0.08 µg/L	2	10%
Nordmark, 2000	1999 - 2000	22	nd - 0.09 µg/L	chronic	0.05 µg/L	2	9%
				acute	0.08 µg/L	1	4.5%
Sum	1996 - 2000	78	nd - 0.11 µg/L	chronic	0.05 µg/L	27	35%
				acute	0.08 µg/L	10	13%

a) California Department of Fish and Game Water Quality Criteria for Diazinon (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000)
nd not detected

Extent of Impairment

Because of the extensive acreage of orchards drained by the Sutter Bypass and its tributaries, the entire Sutter Bypass is likely to be impaired by diazinon.

Potential Sources

Diazinon is used as a dormant spray on almonds and stonefruits, and these applications are the most likely sources of diazinon runoff to the Sutter Bypass.

B.1.54 Walker Slough, Diazinon

Summary of Proposed Actions

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends the addition of Walker Slough to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by diazinon. Information available to the Regional Board on diazinon concentrations in Walker Slough indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. The basis for this recommendation is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Walker Slough	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Diazinon
Hydrologic Unit	544.00	**Sources**	Urban
Total Waterbody Size	2 miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	2 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	Entire waterbody	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	37° 54' 57"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 16' 31"
Downstream Extent Latitude	37° 54' 57"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 18' 03"

Watershed Characteristics

Walker Slough is located almost entirely within the urban area of the City of Stockton, and drains into French Camp Slough west of Interstate 5. Walker Slough is approximately 2 miles long.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objectives for pesticides and toxicity are not being attained for diazinon in Walker Slough. The narrative objective for pesticides states, "No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses." The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective" (California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf). The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) has established freshwater numeric acute (1-hour average) and chronic (4-day average) criteria for diazinon of 0.08 µg/L and 0.05 µg/L, respectively, for the protection of aquatic life (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000).

Evidence of Impairment

Between 1994 and 1998, nine samples collected from Walker Slough were analyzed for diazinon. Most of these samples were collected during wet weather events in the winter. Five of these samples (55%) exceeded the CDFG acute and chronic criteria for diazinon (Table 2).

Table B-2. Diazinon in Water Samples Collected from Walker Slough

Data Source	Location	Sample Years	# of Samples	Range of Diazinon Concentration	Criteria[a]		Number of Samples Equal to or Above Criteria	Percent Samples Equal to or Above Criteria
Lee and Jones-Lee, 2001	Manthey Road	1998	1	0.17 µg/L	chronic	0.05 µg/L	1	100%
					acute	0.08 µg/L	1	100%
Lee and Jones-Lee, 2001	Western Park Industrial Center	1996 - 1998	5	nd - 0.47 µg/L	chronic	0.05 µg/L	2	40%
					acute	0.08 µg/L	2	40%
Reyes et al, 1994	na	1994	2	nd - 0.27 µg/L	chronic	0.05 µg/L	1	50%
					acute	0.08 µg/L	1	50%
Lee and Jones-Lee, 2001	na	1998	2	0.09 - 0.17 µg/L	chronic	0.05 µg/L	2	100%
					acute	0.08 µg/L	2	100%
Sum	Sum	1994 - 1998	10	nd - 1.0 µg/L	chronic	0.05 µg/L	6	60%
					acute	0.08 µg/L	6	60%

a) CDFG water quality criteria for the protection of aquatic life (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000)
nd = not detected

Extent of Impairment
Because of its location within an urban area the entire length of Walker Slough is likely to be impaired by diazinon.

Potential Sources
Diazinon is used for structural and landscape pest control year-round, and these are the likely sources of diazinon in Walker Slough.

B.1.55 Walker Slough, Pathogens

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (Regional Board) recommends the addition of Walker Slough in the Delta to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by pathogens. Information available to the Regional Board on pathogens levels in the Walker Slough indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. A description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Walker Slough	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Pathogens
Hydrologic Unit	544.00	**Sources**	Urban runoff, Recreation
Total Waterbody Size	7 Miles	**TMDL Priority**	
Size Affected	7 Miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	Walker Slough	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	37° 54' 57"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 16' 31"
Downstream Extent Latitude	37° 54' 57"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 18' 03"

Watershed Characteristics
Walker Slough is located in the Delta and extends between French Camp Slough and Duck Creek. The area is highly urbanized and supports recreational uses, including boating, fishing, water skiing and swimming. The Delta is characterized by tidal waters with limited flushing flows during the dry seasons.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained
The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for pathogens in Walker Slough. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states the " the Regional Water Board will also consider...numerical criteria and guidelines developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services...the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective." The Basin Plan also contains a specific objective for fecal coliform bacteria (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf).

Guidelines and criteria have been developed for the protection of human health. The California Department of Health Services (CDHS) has adopted a total coliform bacteria guideline, applicable to recreational waters and beaches, of 10,000 Most Probable Number (MPN) per 100 milliliters for single samples and of 1,000 MPN per 100 ml for 30-day log mean of sample levels (Title 17 California Code of Regulation section 7958). CDHS has also published draft guidelines that include limits for single samples of *E. coli* of 235 MPN per 100 milliliters (CDHS, July 2000 http://www.dhs.ca.gov/ps/ddwem/beaches/freshwater.htm). USEPA guidelines for bacteria are contained in *Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Bacteria* (USEPA, 1986a). The USEPA standards are stated as "Based on a statistically sufficient number of samples (generally not less than 5 samples equally spaced over a 30-day period), the geometric mean of the indicated bacterial densities should not exceed one or the other of the following: *E. coli* 126 MPN per 100 ml; or Enterococci 33 MPN per 100 ml." A methodology for determining exceedances based on single samples is also included in the standards.

Evidence of Impairment
DeltaKeeper submitted bacteria data for Walker Slough from two sampling locations (DeltaKeeper, 2001). Fourteen samples were collected from each location during six months in 2000-2001 and analyzed for *E. coli*. Geometric means of the bacteria counts have been calculated using the data submitted by DeltaKeeper. The calculated geometric mean for *E. coli* in samples collected from the downstream location is 506 MPN per 100 ml, which exceeds the USEPA criterion of 126 MPN per 100 ml. The calculated geometric mean for *E. coli* in samples collected from the upstream location is 1,182 MPN per 100 ml, which also exceeds the USEPA criterion.

Extent of Impairment
Regional Board staff recommends listing the portion of Walker Slough that occurs between French Camp Slough and Duck Creek as impaired for pathogens due to bacterial contamination. The sampling locations are within the urban Stockton area. The area around the entire slough is urbanized and has similar land use patterns. It is expected that samples collected from other portions of Walker Slough would show similar high levels of *E. coli.*

Potential Sources
In urban settings, the USEPA has identified sources of pathogen pollution to include urban litter, contaminated refuse, domestic pet and wildlife excrement and failing sewer lines (USEPA, 2001). In their pathogen TMDL Guide, the USEPA states "In a study of bacterial loading in urban streams, Young and Thackston (1999) found that fecal bacteria densities were directly related to the density of housing, population, development, percent impervious area, and domestic animal density. Additionally, recreational areas may have high bacteria counts. This can be due to improper disposal of waste from boats, lack of sanitary facilities in the area of recreation and children in diapers using the water."

B.1.56 Wolf Creek, Fecal Coliform

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (Regional Board) recommends the addition of Wolf Creek to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by fecal coliform. Information available to the Regional Board on pathogens levels in Wolf Creek indicates that water quality objectives are not being attained. A description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Wolf Creek	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Bacteria
Hydrologic Unit	516.30	**Sources**	Urban runoff, Recreation, Agriculture
Total Waterbody Size	14.5 miles	**TMDL Priority**	Low
Size Affected	14.5 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	All of Wolf Creek	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	39° 12' 56"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 04' 00"
Downstream Extent Latitude	39° 02' 03"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 07' 51"

Watershed Characteristics
The Wolf Creek watershed is located in the Sierra Nevada foothills. Wolf Creek runs through the urban area of Grass Valley. The Grass Valley Wastewater Treatment Plant (GVWTP) discharges into Wolf Creek below Grass Valley. Downstream from Grass Valley, the Wolf Creek watershed consists of low-density housing that typically has some associated livestock.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The numeric objective for bacteria is not being attained in Wolf Creek. The bacteria objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "In waters designated for contact recreation (REC-1), the fecal coliform concentration based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period shall not exceed a geometric mean of 200/100 ml, nor shall more than ten percent of the total number of samples taken during any 30-day period exceed 400 /100 ml (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf)." The bacteria objectives are presented in terms of Most Probable Number (MPN) per 100 milliliters (ml). The bacteria objectives were evaluated for Wolf Creek by comparing fecal coliform concentrations measured in Wolf Creek to Basin Plan objectives.

Guidelines and criteria have been developed for the protection of human health. The California Department of Health Services (CDHS) has adopted total coliform bacteria guidelines, applicable to recreational waters and beaches, of 10,000 MPN/100 ml for single samples and of 1,000 MPN/ml for 30-day log means of sample levels (Title 17 California Code of Regulation section 7958). CDHS has also published draft guidelines that include a limit for *E. coli* in single samples of 235 MPN/100 ml (CDHS, July 2000 http://www.dhs.ca.gov/ps/ddwem/beaches/freshwater.htm). The USEPA (USEPA) guidelines for bacteria, contained in *Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Bacteria* (USEPA, 1986a), are stated as "Based on a statistically sufficient number of samples (generally not less than 5 samples equally spaced over a 30-day period), the geometric mean of the indicated bacterial densities should not exceed one or the other of the following: *E. coli* 126 MPN per 100 ml; or Enterococci 33 MPN per 100 ml." A methodology for determining exceedances based on single samples is also included in the standards.

Evidence of Impairment

Waste discharge reports and Regional Board inspection sampling results show elevated coliform levels upstream and downstream of the GVWTP (City of Grass Valley, 2000 and 2001). Geometric means were calculated from 18 sample dates during February 2000 to June 2001. Calculated geometric means for total coliform of 1,491 MPN/100 ml (upstream of the GVWTP) and 1,014 MPN/100 ml (downstream of the GVWTP), exceeding the CDHS recommended criteria of 1,000 MPN/100 ml total coliform. The calculated geometric mean for fecal coliform for samples collected upstream of the GVWTP of 238 MPN/100 ml exceeds the Basin Plan Fecal Coliform objective of 200 MPN/100 ml. The calculated geometric mean for fecal coliform for samples collected downstream of the GVWTP is 102 MPN/100 ml. The fecal coliform counts in seven of 18 monthly samples exceeded the 200 MPN/100 ml fecal coliform criterion and reached 2,300 MPN/100 ml in February 2000 (City of Grass Valley, 2000 and 2001).

Extent of Impairment

Regional Boards staff recommends that the entire Wolf Creek be listed for fecal coliform. Although only the upper reach of Wolf Creek has been monitored for coliform, land use in the lower reach is essentially the same. There are no stream segments that would be likely to have substantially lower pathogen loads.

Potential Sources

In urban settings, the USEPA has identified sources of pathogen pollution to include urban litter, contaminated refuse, domestic pet and wildlife excrement and failing sewer lines (USEPA, 2001). In their pathogen TMDL Guide, the USEPA states "In a study of bacterial loading in urban streams, Young and Thackston (1999) found that fecal bacteria densities were directly related to the density of housing, population, development, percent impervious area, and domestic animal density. Additionally, recreational areas may have high bacteria counts. This can be due to improper disposal of waste from boats, lack of sanitary facilities in the area of recreation and children in diapers using the water."

B.2 Fact Sheets Supporting Removal From the 303(d) List

B.2.1 American River, Lower, Group A Pesticides

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (Regional Board) recommends the removal of the lower American River from California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list due to impairment by Group A Pesticides. Information available to the Regional Board on Group A Pesticides levels indicates that water quality objectives are being attained. The description for the basis for this determination is given below.

Watershed Characteristics

The lower American River flows from Folsom Dam, approximately 30 miles east of Sacramento, through the greater Sacramento area to its confluence with the Sacramento River, near downtown Sacramento.

Water Quality Objectives Attained

The narrative objective for pesticides and toxicity are being attained for Group A pesticides in the American River. The narrative objective for pesticides states, "No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses." It further states "discharges shall not result in pesticide concentrations in bottom sediments or aquatic life that adversely affect beneficial uses." The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf)."

The toxicity and pesticide narrative objectives were evaluated for the American River by comparing Group A pesticides concentrations measured in the American River to freshwater fish and marine organism guidelines and criteria that have been developed for both human health and wildlife protection. Group A pesticides consist of a total concentration from the following organochlorine pesticides: aldrin, dieldrin, endrin, heptachlor, heptachlor epoxide, chlordane (total), lindane, hexachlorocyclohexane (total), endosulfan (total), and toxaphene. Group A pesticides bind tightly to soil and break down slowly. They are either insoluble or have low solubility in water, but are lipid soluble thereby accumulating in the fatty tissue of consumers. The Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) classifies Group A pesticides as toxins, carcinogens, or both (USEPA, 2000b). The National Academy of Sciences-National Academy of Engineering (NAS) numeric Group A pesticides guideline of 100 ng/g (nanograms per gram, or parts per billion (ppb)), applies to whole fish for the protection of fish-eating wildlife (NAS, 1973). The United States Food and Drug Administration (USFDA) set 300 ppb as its numeric action level for the edible portion (filet) of commercial freshwater and marine fish (USFDA, 1984).

Evidence of Attainment

The American River was originally placed on the 303(d) list based on Group A pesticide fish tissue concentrations reported by the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program (TSMP) (SWRCB, 1995). The TSMP analysis of Group A pesticides included aldrin, chlordane (total), dieldrin, endsulfan (total), endrin, hexachlorocyclohexane (total), heptachlor, heptachlor epoxide, and toxaphene. Three out of fifteen fish filet samples had total Group A pesticide concentrations greater than 100 ppb. The average Group A pesticide concentration of all samples, when weighted by the number of fish in each composite sample, was 56.2 ppb. When only considering the total dieldrin and chlordane concentration, the weighted average concentration was 55.7 ppb. Dieldrin and chlordane, therefore, account for almost all of the Group A pesticides historically found in fish in the American River.

Dieldrin and chlordane concentrations in fish tissue were recently analyzed in the American River as part of the Sacramento River Watershed Program (Larry Walker and associates, 2001b). Seven different composites of fish filets (which included a total of 33 individual fish) were analyzed for total chlordane and dieldrin. Fish tissue data was collected for the SRWP between 1997 and 1999. None of the samples analyzed exceed fish tissue criteria established by NAS and USFDA (Larry Walker and associates, 2001b). Data from the earlier TSMP studies and the more recent SRWP studies are presented in Table B-1.

Since the earlier TSMP study, upon which the original 303(d) listing was based, showed that dieldrin and chlordane were the dominant Group A pesticides found in fish tissue in the American River, a direct comparison between the TSMP studies and the more recent SRWP studies can be made. The more recent SRWP information indicates that dieldrin/total chlordane concentrations have been reduced by approximately a factor of 7 and that available criteria are not being exceeded.

Table B-1. Summary of Group A Pesticide Concentrations in Fish Tissue Samples

Data Source	Sample Years	# of Composites/ Individuals Analyzed (Total # of Fish)	Mean Dieldrin & Chlordane Pesticide Concentration	Range Dieldrin/ Chlordane Pesticide Concentration	Criteria[1]		Percent Samples Above Criteria
TSMP[2]	1979 - 1990	15 (74)	55.7 ppb	ND – 191.3 ppb	USFDA NAS	300 ppb 100 ppb	0% 20%
SRWP[3]	1997 - 1999	7 (33)	7.5 ppb	ND – 25.47 ppb	USFDA NAS	300 ppb 100 ppb	0% 0%

[1]USFDA-AL = United States Food and Drug Administration action level. NAS = National Academy of Sciences guideline

[2] Sampling locations include American River downstream of the Highway 160 Bridge and American River downstream of Watt Avenue Bridge

[3] Sampling locations include American River at Discovery Park and American River at J Street Bridge

Extent of Attainment

The entire length of the lower American River, Nimbus Dam to the Sacramento River confluence, attains water quality objectives for Group A pesticides and no longer need be identified on the 303(d) list. In the TSMP studies, fish were collected from the American River at Highway 160 (about river mile 2) and downstream of the Watt Avenue Bridge (about river mile 9.5). In the SRWP studies, fish were collected from the American River at Discovery Park (about river mile 0.2) and J Street (about river mile 6.5). The spatial coverage of the sampling sites for the two studies overlaps sufficiently so that the spatially representative of fish tissue concentrations is comparable.

B.3 Fact Sheets Supporting Changes to the 303(d) List

B.3.1 Cache Creek, Mercury and Unknown Toxicity, Change in Total Size and Size Affected

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, recommends changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for the impairment of Cache Creek due to impairment by mercury and unknown toxicity. The Regional Board recommends that the identified total length change from 60 to 81 miles and that the extent of impairment change from 35 miles to 81 miles. The basis for the recommended change is described below.

Watershed Characteristics

The Cache Creek watershed is located primarily within Lake and Yolo counties with a small portion in Colusa County. Cache Creek flows for approximately 80 miles from the Clear Lake dam to the Cache Creek Settling Basin adjacent to the Yolo Bypass (USGS, 1958-1992). The upper Cache Creek watershed (above Rumsey) flows through undeveloped chaparral and shrub oak habitat and is primarily used as rangeland (Foe and Croyle, 1998). The gradient of the creek in the 33-mile reach between Clear Lake (~1,320 feet above sea level [asl]) and Rumsey (420 feet asl) is steep, dropping approximately 27 feet per mile. Large areas are highly erosive. There are three inactive mercury-mining districts in the upper watershed area, Clear Lake, Sulfur Creek, and Knoxville mining districts (Montoya and Pan, 1992; Buer *et al*, 1979). The Sulfur Bank Mercury Mine at Clear Lake is a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Superfund site. The Sulfur Bank Mercury Mine and other historic mercury mines located along tributaries to Cache Creek are discussed in the fact sheets for Clear Lake, Davis Creek Reservoir, Harley Gulch, and Sulfur Creek (a tributary to Cache Creek *via* Bear Creek). The lower Cache Creek watershed (downstream of Rumsey) is intensely farmed, primarily row, orchard, and rice cultivation (Foe and Croyle, 1998).

Total Waterbody Size and Extent of Impairment

Foe & Croyle (1998) indicated that the total length of Cache Creek is 81 miles. There are three inactive mercury-mining districts in the upper watershed area, Clear Lake, Sulfur Creek, and Knoxville mining districts (Montoya and Pan, 1992; Buer *et al*, 1979). Water quality and fish tissue data from the upper watershed (North and South forks, and Cache Creek Canyon) and the lower watershed (at Rumsey, Capay Dam, and Road 102) indicate mercury impairs the entire waterbody. Toxicity tests conducted using samples collected in Cache Creek at Road 102, at Rumsey, and from the North Fork were toxic to Ceriodaphnia, indicating that a toxin impairs the entire length of Cache Creek.

B.3.2 Camanche Reservoir, Copper

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, recommends changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for the impairment of the Camanche Reservoir by elevated dissolved copper concentrations. Camanche Reservoir was included on the 1998 303(d) list as part of the listing for the lower Mokelumne River. Regional Board staff has determined that listing reservoirs separately from their associated downstream drainages is more appropriate because watershed management strategies (and associated data needs) for reservoirs can be distinctly different from management strategies for the downstream drainages.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Camanche Reservoir*	Pollutants/Stressors	Copper
Hydrologic Unit	535.00	Sources	Resource extraction (abandoned mines)
Total Waterbody Size	7,622 acres	TMDL Priority	Low
Size Affected	7,622 acres	TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)	
Extent of Impairment	Entire lake.	TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)	
Original 303(d) Listing Year	1992		

* Previously listed as part of the lower Mokelumne River; TMDL priority, start date, and end date are the same as those listed for the lower Mokelumne River.

Watershed Characteristics

The Camanche Reservoir is approximately 10 miles downstream from Pardee Dam on the Mokelumne River at the intersection of Amador, Calaveras, and San Joaquin Counties. The Camanche Reservoir has a surface area of 7,622 acres and a 63-mile shoreline (EBMUD, 2000). When the reservoir is at full capacity, it extends upstream to Pardee Dam (USGS, 1958-1992). Camanche Reservoir, working in tandem with Pardee Reservoir, stores water for irrigation and stream-flow regulation, providing flood control, water to the meet the needs of downstream water rights holders, and water for fisheries and riparian habitat (EBMUD, 2000). The East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) completed the Camanche Reservoir Project (downstream of Pardee) in 1964. EBMUD built a fish hatchery (the Mokelumne River Fish Installation) immediately downstream of Camanche Dam, which the California Department of Fish and Game operates. In addition, a power plant at the base of the dam was placed in service in 1983.

Several historic copper and gold mines are within the lower Mokelumne River watershed upstream of Camanche Reservoir. Penn Mine, which historically operated for copper extraction from 1861 to 1956, impacted the water quality of Camanche Reservoir. The Penn Mine site occupies a 22-acre area near the southeastern shore of Camanche Reservoir approximately 1.5 miles from the town of Campo Seco in Calaveras County. Penn Mine historically discharged to the reservoir via Mine Run Creek. Metal loading from Penn Mine led to fishery declines and fish kills in Camanche Reservoir, in the Mokelumne River Fish Installation downstream of Camanche Dam, and in the lower Mokelumne River; problems with toxic discharges from the Penn Mine continued through the 1960s and 1970s (Buer et al., 1979; SRWCB, 1990; CDFG, 1991; EDAW, Inc., 1992; EBMUD, 2000). Beginning in 1978, several abatement and restoration projects were conducted to decrease the impact of Penn Mine on Camanche Reservoir and the lower Mokelumne River; the most recent abatement project was completed in late 1999 (Buer et al., 1979; SCH EIR, 1996; CH2MHill, 2000a and 2000b). The recent sampling results indicate that aluminum sources upstream of Penn Mine (e.g., abandoned mine sites and natural sources) contribute enough aluminum to cause water entering Camanche Reservoir to exceed toxicity criteria.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for copper in Camanche Reservoir. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf)."

The toxicity objective was evaluated for Camanche Reservoir by comparing copper concentrations measured in Camanche Reservoir to water quality guidelines and criteria developed for human health and wildlife protection. The numeric United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) California Toxics Rule (CTR) hardness-dependent continuous (4-day average) and maximum (1-hour average) dissolved copper criteria for freshwater aquatic life protection are 2.3 micrograms per liter (µg/L) and 2.9 µg/L, respectively, based on an assumed hardness of 20 milligrams per liter (mg/L) of calcium carbonate ($CaCO_3$) (Marshack, 2000). Hardness is assumed to be 20 mg/l of $CaCO_3$ because numerous studies (e.g., CH2MHill, 2000b & Buer et al., 1979) have indicated that Camanche Reservoir/Mokelumne River water has hardness values typical ranging from 10 to 25 mg/L. The USEPA primary maximum contaminant level (MCL) for drinking water protection is 1,300 µg/L of total recoverable copper (Marshack, 2000).

Evidence of Impairment

Elevated copper concentrations in water samples collected since 1958 indicate that copper impairs Camanche Reservoir. The data also indicate a strong seasonality to the copper loading; Penn Mine historically discharged more copper during wet seasons than during dry seasons. As illustrated by the data summaries below, a series of remediation projects at Penn Mine conducted in 1978, 1993, and 1999-2000 have significantly decreased the amount of copper leaving the mine site.

Water samples collected in Camanche Reservoir upstream of the Penn Mine discharge before the first remediation project had total copper concentrations of 10 µg/L (February 1958, wet season) and less than 10 µg/L (October 1977, dry season) (Buer et al., 1979). Downstream from the mine discharge, total copper concentrations were 3,800 µg/L and 40 µg/L, in 1958 and 1977, respectively (Buer et al., 1979). The downstream concentrations exceeded the toxicity criteria promulgated at that time, and were four to 380 times the upstream copper concentrations. Between February 1993 and February 1996 (after the start up period of the treatment plant at Mine Run Creek), EBMUD analyzed samples collected throughout Camanche Reservoir for total and dissolved copper concentrations (SCH EIR, 1996). Table 2 summarizes the EBMUD data for Camanche Reservoir.

As a result of the most recent remediation activities at Penn Mine that took place in 1999, the copper load from Penn Mine decreased from approximately 19,372 to 23,122 pounds per year (before the 1999 project) to approximately 190.4 pounds per year, a decrease of approximately 99% (CH2MHill, 2000b). Recent data indicate that both the frequency and magnitude of CTR exceedances in Camanche Reservoir have decreased since 1992, and that dissolved copper concentrations in Camanche Reservoir now appear to be at or below the CTR criteria. However, future samples should be analyzed using a lower method detection limit (MDL) to determine long-term compliance with the CTR criteria. Between September 1999 and August 2000, EBMUD collected 12 samples from Camanche Reservoir, approximately 1,000 feet downstream from the inflow of Mine Run Creek (CH2MHill, 2000b). One sample, collected in February 2000, had a dissolved copper concentration of 3.54 µg/L (hardness, 18 mg/l), which slightly exceeds the hardness-adjusted CTR continuous and maximum criteria. The five samples collected in September 1999 through January 2000 contained dissolved copper concentrations below their method detection limit (MDL) of 2.08 µg/L (hardness, 10-25 mg/L), indicating that dissolved copper concentrations probably did not exceed the CTR criteria. However, the MDL for samples collected in February through August 2000 was 3.12 µg/L, which is slightly higher than the hardness-dependent CTR criteria for dissolved copper; therefore, dissolved copper concentrations in these samples may or may not have slightly exceeded the CTR criteria. Table 2 includes a summary of these results.

Table B-2. Summary of Available Copper Concentration Data for Camanche Reservoir (Data sources: SCH EIR, 1996; CH2MHill, 2000b)

Location[a] (upstream to downstream)	Total Copper Concentrations			Dissolved Copper Concentrations			
						# [%] of Samples Exceeding CTR Criteria[b]	
	# of Samples (Dates Collected)	Range of Concentrations (µg/l)	# [%] of Samples Exceeding MCL (1,300 µg/l)[b]	# of Samples (Dates Collected)	Range of Concentrations (µg/l)[c]	Maximum Criterion (2.9 µg/l)	Continuous Criterion (2.3 µg/l)
Site A	47 (2/93 – 2/96)	< 2 – 9	0 [0%]	18 (2/93 – 2/96)	< 1.5 – 5	5 [%]	5 [%]
Site Q	48 (2/93 – 2/96)	< 1 – 17	0 [0%]	16 (2/93 – 2/96)	< 2 – 17	7 [%]	8 [%]
Site D	43 (2/93 – 2/96)	< 1.5 – 14	0 [%]	17 (2/93 – 2/96)	< 2 – 7	4 [%]	4 [%]
Other	131 (2/93 – 2/96)	< 1 – 16, 140[d]	0 [%]	41 (2/93 – 2/96)	< 2 – 5	8 [%]	8 [%]
CAMA				12 (9/99 – 8/00)	< 2 – < 3.12	0 [%]	0 [%]
PENN20				12 (9/99 – 8/00)	< 2 – 3.54	1 [%]	1 [%]

(a) Site A: Camanche Reservoir, 0.5 miles upstream of Penn Mine.
Site Q: Point of discharge of Mine Run Creek to Camanche Reservoir.
Site D: Camanche Reservoir, 0.8 miles downstream of Penn Mine.
Other: Camanche Reservoir, 2 miles, 3 miles, and 10 miles downstream of Penn Mine.
CAMA: Camanche Reservoir, 0.57 miles upstream of Penn Mine (slightly upstream of Site A).
PENN20: Camanche Reservoir, 0.2 miles downstream of Penn Mine (downstream of Site D, slightly upstream of Site Q).
(b) MCL: USEPA primary maximum contaminant level for drinking water protection.
CTR: United States Environmental Protection Agency's California Toxics Rule (CTR) hardness-dependent continuous (4-day average) and maximum (1-hour average) dissolved copper criteria for freshwater aquatic life protection, based on an assumed hardness of 20 mg/L of $CaCO_3$ if hardness data were not available.
Many samples were analyzed using methods with detection limits below the level needed to evaluate compliance with the CTR criteria; therefore, the actual number of exceedances may be greater than indicated by this table.
On February 22, 1993, a total copper concentration of 140 µg/l was measured at the site 3 miles downstream of Penn Mine in the EBMUD data set. No high values were measured for other metals at this site or for total copper concentrations at other sites, on this date.

B.3.3 Camanche Reservoir, Zinc

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, recommends changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for the impairment of the Camanche Reservoir by elevated dissolved zinc concentrations. Camanche Reservoir was included on the 1998 303(d) list as part of the listing for the lower Mokelumne River. Regional Board staff has determined that listing reservoirs separately from their associated downstream drainages is more appropriate because watershed management strategies (and associated data needs) for reservoirs can be distinctly different from management strategies for the downstream drainages.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Camanche Reservoir*	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Zinc
Hydrologic Unit	535.00	**Sources**	Resource extraction (abandoned mines)
Total Waterbody Size	7,622 acres	**TMDL Priority**	Low
Size Affected	7,622 acres	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	Entire lake.	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Original 303(d) Listing Year	1992		

* Previously listed as part of the lower Mokelumne River; TMDL priority, start date, and end date are the same as those listed for the lower Mokelumne River.

Watershed Characteristics

The Camanche Reservoir is approximately 10 miles downstream from Pardee Dam on the Mokelumne River at the intersection of Amador, Calaveras, and San Joaquin Counties. The Camanche Reservoir has a surface area of 7,622 acres and a 63-mile shoreline (EBMUD, 2000). When the reservoir is at full capacity, it extends upstream to Pardee Dam (USGS, 1958-2000). Camanche Reservoir, working in tandem with Pardee Reservoir, stores water for irrigation and stream-flow regulation, providing flood control, water to the meet the needs of downstream water rights holders, and water for fisheries and riparian habitat (EBMUD, 2000). The East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) completed the Camanche Reservoir Project (downstream of Pardee) in 1964. EBMUD built a fish hatchery (the Mokelumne River Fish Installation) immediately downstream of Camanche Dam, which the California Department of Fish and Game operates. In addition, a power plant at the base of the dam was placed in service in 1983.

Several historic copper and gold mines are within the lower Mokelumne River watershed upstream of Camanche Reservoir. Penn Mine, which historically operated for copper extraction from 1861 to 1956, impacted the water quality of Camanche Reservoir. The Penn Mine site occupies a 22-acre area near the southeastern shore of Camanche Reservoir approximately 1.5 miles from the town of Campo Seco in Calaveras County. Penn Mine historically discharged to the reservoir via Mine Run Creek. Metal loading from Penn Mine led to fishery declines and fish kills in Camanche Reservoir, in the Mokelumne River Fish Installation downstream of Camanche Dam, and in the lower Mokelumne River; problems with toxic discharges from the Penn Mine continued through the 1960s and 1970s (Buer et al., 1979; SRWCB, 1990; CDFG, 1991; EDAW, Inc., 1992; EBMUD, 2000). Beginning in 1978, several abatement and restoration projects were conducted to decrease the impact of Penn Mine on Camanche Reservoir and the lower Mokelumne River; the most recent abatement project was completed in late 1999 (Buer et al., 1979; SCH EIR, 1996; CH2MHill, 2000a and 2000b). The recent sampling results indicate that aluminum sources upstream of Penn Mine (e.g., abandoned mine sites and natural sources) contribute enough aluminum to cause water entering Camanche Reservoir to exceed toxicity criteria.

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for zinc in Camanche Reservoir. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf)."

The toxicity objective was evaluated for Camanche Reservoir by comparing zinc concentrations measured in reservoir to water quality guidelines and criteria developed for human health and wildlife protection. The numeric United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) California Toxics Rule (CTR)

hardness-dependent continuous (4-day average) and maximum (1-hour average) dissolved zinc criteria for freshwater aquatic life protection are both 30 micrograms per liter (µg/L), based on an assumed hardness of 20 milligrams per liter (mg/L) of calcium carbonate ($CaCO_3$) (Marshack, 2000). The CTR continuous and maximum criteria adjusted for total recoverable zinc are both 31 µg/L, based on an assumed hardness of 20 mg/L of $CaCO_3$ (Marshack, 2000). (Hardness is assumed to be 20 mg/l of $CaCO_3$ because numerous studies (e.g., CH2MHill, 2000b & Buer et al., 1979) have indicated that Camanche Reservoir/Mokelumne River water has hardness values typical ranging from 10 to 25 mg/L.) The USEPA maximum contaminant level (MCL) for drinking water protection is 5,000 µg/L of total recoverable zinc (Marshack, 2000).

Evidence of Impairment

Elevated zinc concentrations in water samples collected since 1958 indicate that zinc impairs Camanche Reservoir. The data indicate a strong seasonality to the zinc loading; Penn Mine historically discharged more zinc during wet seasons than during dry seasons. As illustrated by the data summaries below, a series of remediation projects at Penn Mine conducted in 1978, 1993, and 1999-2000 have significantly decreased the amount of zinc leaving the mine site.

Water samples collected in Camanche Reservoir upstream of the Penn Mine discharge before the first remediation project had total zinc concentrations of 10 µg/L (February 1958, wet season) and 250 µg/L (October 1977, dry season) (Buer et al., 1979). Downstream from the mine discharge, total zinc concentrations were 37,600 µg/L and 1,120 µg/L, in 1958 and 1977, respectively (Buer et al., 1979). The downstream concentrations exceeded the toxicity criteria promulgated at that time, and were 4.5 to 3,760 times the upstream zinc concentrations. Between February 1993 and February 1996 (after the start up period of the treatment plant at Mine Run Creek), EBMUD analyzed samples collected throughout Camanche Reservoir for total and dissolved zinc concentrations (SCH EIR, 1996). Table 2 summarizes the EBMUD data for Camanche Reservoir.

As a result of the most recent remediation activities at Penn Mine that took place in 1999, the zinc load from Penn Mine decreased from approximately 35,875 to 43,035 pounds per year (before the 1999 project) to approximately 1,907 pounds per year, a decrease of approximately 95% (CH2MHill, 2000b). Between September 1999 and August 2000, EBMUD collected samples from two locations at Camanche Reservoir, 1,000 feet downstream from the inflow of Mine Run Creek into Camanche Reservoir, and 3,000 feet upstream of the inflow. One downstream sample, collected in November 1999, had a dissolved zinc concentration of 31.9 µg/L (hardness, 16 mg/l), which slightly exceeds the hardness-adjusted CTR continuous and maximum criteria. Table 2 includes a summary of these results.

Table B-2 Summary of Available Zinc Concentration Data for Camanche Reservoir (Data sources: SCH EIR, 1996; CH2MHill, 2000b)

Location [a] (upstream to downstream)	Total Zinc Concentrations			Dissolved Zinc Concentrations		
	# of Samples (Dates Collected)	Range of Concentrations (µg/l)	# [%] of Samples Exceeding MCL (1,300 µg/l) [b]	# of Samples (Dates Collected)	Range of Concentrations (µg/l)	# [%] of Samples Exceeding CTR Criteria [c] (30 µg/L)
Site A	47 (2/93 – 2/96)	< 6 – 110	0 [0%]	18 (2/93 – 2/96)	< 3 – 63	1 [6%]
Site Q	48 (2/93 – 2/96)	3 – 180	0 [0%]	16 (2/93 – 1/96)	3 – 95	8 [50%]
Site D	43 (2/93 – 2/96)	< 3.3 – 100	0 [%]	17 (2/93 – 2/96)	< 5 – 97	4 [24%]
Other	133 (2/93 – 2/96)	4 - 59	0 [%]	41 (2/93 – 2/96)	< 3 - 24	0 [0%]
CAMA				12 (9/99 – 8/00)	< 0.8 – 9.29	0 [0%]
PENN20				12 (9/99 – 8/00)	2.12 – 31.9	1 [8%]

(a) Site A: Camanche Reservoir, 0.5 miles upstream of Penn Mine.
Site Q: Point of discharge of Mine Run Creek to Camanche Reservoir.
Site D: Camanche Reservoir, 0.8 miles downstream of Penn Mine.
Other: Camanche Reservoir, 2 miles, 3 miles, and 10 miles downstream of Penn Mine.
CAMA: Camanche Reservoir, 0.57 miles (3,000 feet) upstream of Penn Mine (slightly upstream of Site A).
PENN20: Camanche Reservoir, 0.2 miles (1,000 feet) downstream of Penn Mine (downstream of Site D, slightly upstream of Site Q).
(b) MCL: USEPA primary maximum contaminant level for drinking water protection.
(c) CTR: United States Environmental Protection Agency's California Toxics Rule (CTR) hardness-dependent continuous (4-day average) and maximum (1-hour average) dissolved copper criteria for freshwater aquatic life protection, based on an assumed hardness of 20 mg/L of $CaCO_3$ if hardness data were not available.

B.3.4 Delta Waterways, Dissolved Oxygen— Change in Total Size and Size Affected

Summary of Proposed Actions

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, recommends a change to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for the impairment of the Delta due to impairment organic enrichment/low dissolved oxygen. The Regional Board recommends that the identified total size change from 480,000 acres to 48,000 acres and that the size affected be changed from 75 acres to 1,461 acres. The basis for the recommended change is described below.

Watershed Characteristics

The Delta waterways (Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta) encompass 1,153 square miles, with approximately 1,000 linear miles of waterway and a total waterbody size of approximately 48,000 acres. The Delta waterways form the lowest part of the Central Valley, lying between the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and extending from the confluence of the two rivers inland as far as Sacramento and Stockton. Incoming flows vary widely from season to season and year to year, greatly affecting hydrology and habitat.

Total Waterbody Size and Extent of Impairment
The total waterbody size of the Delta is approximately 48,000 acres. This was misprinted in the final listing of the 1998 303(d) list as 480,000 acres. Therefore, the total size of the Delta should be changed to 48,000 acres for all pollutants. The area of the Delta impacted by low dissolved oxygen is the San Joaquin River from the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel to Disappointment Slough (Lee and Jones-Lee, 2000b). This area is 1,461 acres.

B.3.5 Delta Waterways, Chlorpyrifos, DDT, Diazinon, Group A pesticides, Mercury, and Unknown Toxicity — Change in Total Size and Size Affected

Summary of Proposed Actions
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, recommends changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for the Delta due to impairment by Chlorpyrifos, DDT, Diazinon, Group A pesticides, Mercury, and Unknown Toxicity. The Regional Board recommends that the identified total size change from 480,000 acres to 48,000 acres and that the extent of impairment change 480,000 acres to 48,000 acres. The identified total size of the Delta associated with all other pollutants should be changed to 48,000 acres. The basis for the recommended change is described below.

Watershed Characteristics
The Delta waterways (Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta) encompass 1,153 square miles, with approximately 1,000 linear miles of waterway and a total waterbody size of approximately 48,000 acres. The Delta waterways form the lowest part of the Central Valley, lying between the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and extending from the confluence of the two rivers inland as far as Sacramento and Stockton. Incoming flows vary widely from season to season and year to year, greatly affecting hydrology and habitat.

Total Waterbody Size and Extent of Impairment
The total waterbody size of the Delta is approximately 48,000 acres. This was misprinted in the final listing of the 1998 303(d) list as 480,000 acres. Therefore, the total size of the Delta should be changed to 48,000 acres for all pollutants. Chlorpyrifos, DDT, diazinon, Group A pesticides, mercury, and an unknown toxicity impair the entire area of the Delta, and their extent of impairment should be changed from 480,000 acres to 48,000 acres.

B.3.6 Dunn Creek, Mercury and Metals - Change in Total Size and Size Affected

Summary of Proposed Action
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, recommends changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for the impairment of Dunn Creek due to impairment by mercury and metals. The Regional Board recommends that the identified total length change from 9 to 3 miles and that the extent of impairment change from 9 miles to 1 mile. The basis for the recommended change is described below.

Watershed Characteristics
Dunn Creek is located along the east slope of Mount Diablo in Contra Costa County. It flows for approximately 3 miles before entering Marsh Creek, which flows into the San Joaquin Delta. The Mount Diablo Mine (Mt Diablo Mine), which was historically operated for mercury extraction, is located between Dunn Creek and Horse Creek (a tributary to Dunn Creek). The tailings from the Mt. Diablo Mine are highly acidic and contain numerous metals and mercury.

Total Waterbody Length and Extent of Impairment
Slotten *et al* (1996) and Iovenitti *et al* (1989) indicated that the total length of Dunn Creek is approximately 3 miles. Mt. Diablo Mine, which was historically operated for mercury extraction, is located between Dunn Creek and Horse Creek (a tributary to Dunn Creek), approximately 1 mile upstream from the

confluence of Dunn and Marsh Creeks (Iovenitti, *et al* 1989; Slotten et al, 1996; Buer *et al*, 1979). Water quality data indicates that mercury and metals impair Dunn Creek downstream Mt Diablo Mine.

B.3.7 Fall River, Sediment/Siltation – Change in Size Affected

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, recommends changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for the impairment of Fall River due to impairment by sediment and silt. The Regional Board recommends that the identified impaired length change from 25 to 9.5 miles. The basis for the recommended change is described below.

Watershed Characteristics

Fall River flows for approximately 25 miles, from Thousand Springs (in the southeast portion of Siskiyou County) to its confluence with Fall River (in Shasta County). The Upper Fall River (8.3 miles) meanders through a broad, flat floodplain, and receives inflow, plus sediment and silt, from numerous creeks and springs (including Bear, Spring, and Dry Creeks in wet years). Overall, the water quality and volume (for all areas) is influenced by agricultural uses (including irrigation returns to the river, water collected for irrigation uses, and grazing), tributary inflows, silviculture, and highway, road, and bridge construction. These sources have resulted in sediment and silt entering the river, covering the natural riverbed (composed primarily of clay, hardpan, and exposed volcanic cobbles) with sand, and impairing the water quality of Fall River.

Extent of Impairment

Fall Creek is impaired from its headwaters to just downstream of Spring Creek Bridge, a total distance of approximately 9.5 miles. This is demonstrated by 3 types of studies—identification of erosion sites, sediment studies, and studies of organisms within Fall Creek (including aquatic vegetation, aquatic macroinvertibrates, and fish). Because the studies generally compared upper and lower Fall Creek, most of the evidence suggests that upper Fall Creek is impaired relative to lower Fall Creek (CRWQCB-CVR, 1982; DWR, 1998; North State Resources and T Holmes, 1997; Tetra Tech, Inc, 1998; USDA, 1983).

B.3.8 French Ravine, Bacteria - Change in Total Size and Size Affected

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, recommends changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for the impairment of French Ravine due to impairment by bacteria. The Regional Board recommends that the identified total length change from 1 mile to 4 miles. The basis for the recommended change is described below.

Watershed Characteristics

French Ravine is located in western Nevada County, approximately 4 miles southwest of Grass Valley. It flows for approximately 4 miles before entering Wolf Creek, a tributary to Bear River. McCourtney Road Landfill is located along two drainages approximately ½ mile upslope from French Ravine. The drainages enter French Ravine approximately 2.5 miles upstream from the confluence of French Ravine and Wolf Creek. McCourtney Road Landfill operated as a burn dump from 1950 to 1973, as a landfill for residential and commercial solid refuse and for septic tank pumping from 1973 to 1992, and as a transfer station between 1992 and 1998. The landfill was closed and effectively sealed in 1998, so bacteria no longer impair French Ravine.

Total Waterbody Size Extent of Impairment

French Ravine has a length of approximately 4 miles from its headwaters to its confluence with Wolf Creek (Horizons Technology, Inc., 1997). The historic McCourtney Road Landfill is located along French Ravine approximately half way between its headwaters and its confluence. Water samples tested for bacteria indicate that high levels of bacteria would be present for approximately one mile below the inflow of water from McCourtney Road Landfill.

B.3.9 Horse Creek, All Metals - Change in Size Affected

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, recommends changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for the impairment of Horse Creek due to impairment by metals (cadmium, copper, lead, and zinc). The Regional Board recommends that the identified extent of impairment change from 2 miles to 1 mile, and that the Hydrologic Unit be changed from 526.20 to 506.20. The basis for the recommended change is described below.

Watershed Characteristics

Horse Creek is located in Shasta County, south of the city of Lakehead. It flows for approximately 2 miles before entering the East Squaw Creek Arm of Shasta Lake. Rising Star Mine, which was historically operated for multiple metal extraction, is located along Horse Creek. Rising Star Mine is surrounded by reactive, highly acidic waste rock on steeply graded slopes, and discharges cadmium, copper, lead, and zinc into the Horse Creek.

Total Waterbody Length, and Extent of Impairment

Montoya and Pan (1992) indicate that Horse Creek is located in Shasta County, south of the city of Lakehead. It flows for approximately 2 miles before entering the East Squaw Creek Arm of Shasta Lake.

Rising Star Mine, which was historically operated for multiple metal extraction, is located approximately 1 mile downstream from the headwater of Horse Creek. Water quality data indicates that metals impair Horse Creek downstream from Rising Star Mine.

B.3.10 Humbug Creek, Sedimentation/Siltation, Mercury, Copper and Zinc - Change in Size Affected

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board-Central Valley Region (Regional Board) recommends changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for the impairment of Humbug Creek due to impairment by sediment and silt, mercury, copper, and zinc. The Regional Board recommends that the identified extent of impairment change from 9 miles to 3 miles. The basis for the recommended change is described below.

Watershed Characteristics

Humbug Creek is located in the Sierra foothills, approximately 8 miles northeast of Nevada City in Nevada County. It flows for approximately 9 miles before entering South Yuba River. Malakoff Diggins, an historic hydraulic mine (currently a State Historic Park), is located along Humbug Creek. Hydraulic mining has left barren slopes and unstable soil (primarily clay) exposed to erosional forces for the past hundred years. Erosion of soil materials from the Malakoff Diggins area results in the discharge of sediment into Humbug Creek. Discharges of sediment and silt and metals from Malakoff Diggins impair the water quality of Humbug Creek.

Extent of Impairment

Montoya and Pan (1992) indicated that the total length of Humbug Creek is approximately 9 miles. Malakoff Diggins, a historically operated mine, is located approximately 3 miles upstream Humbug Creek's confluence with the Yuba River. Water quality data indicates that metals impair Humbug Creek downstream Malakoff Diggins (Montoya and Pan, 1992), and several studies indicate that sediment and silt impair Humbug Creek downstream Malakoff.

B.3.11 James Creek, Nickel and Mercury - Change in Total Size and Size Affected

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, recommends changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for the impairment of James Creek due to impairment by nickel and mercury. The Regional Board recommends that the identified total length change from 6 mile to 9 miles, and the impaired length from 6 to 8.5 miles. The basis for the recommended change is described below.

Watershed Characteristics

James Creek is located in Napa County, approximately 10 miles northwest of Lake Berryessa. James Creek flows for approximately 9 miles before joining with Swartz Creek to form Pope Creek, an eight-mile creek that flows into Lake Berryessa (USGS, 1958-2000). The creek has a steep gradient, falling from approximately 2,400 feet above sea level at its headwaters to approximately 720 feet at its confluence with Pope Creek – a drop of approximately 1,680 feet over 6 miles. A fish survey reported both trout and suckers as present inhabitants of the creek in the impacted area (Montoya and Pan, 1992). Several historic mercury mines are located within the James Creek watershed. Corona, Oat Hill, Oat Hill Extension, Aetna Extension, Grenada, and Toyon mines are all located within the watershed. In addition, Twin Peaks Mine is located on Bateman Creek, a tributary to James Creek. Corona Mine is considered to contribute the highest amount of mercury to James Creek. It is located in the headwaters area of the James Creek watershed (Buer et al, 1979; Montoya and Pan, 1982). During the late 1980s, James Creek was coated with an orange gelatinous floc that extending up to 2 miles downstream from Corona Mine (Montoya and Pan, 1992). Discharges of nickel and mercury from Corona Mine impair the water quality of James Creek (SWRCB, 1999).

Total Waterbody Length and Extent of Impairment

Buer et al (1979), Montoya and Pan (1992), and the USGS (1980, 1987a, 1987b, & 1997) indicate that the total length of James Creek is approximately 9 miles. Several historic mercury mines are located within the James Creek watershed. Corona, Oat Hill, Oat Hill Extension, Aetna Extension, Grenada, and Toyon mines are all located within the watershed. In addition, Twin Peaks Mine is located on Bateman Creek, a tributary to James Creek. The inflow of mine drainage originates approximately 0.5 miles downstream from the headwaters of James Creek (Buer et al, 1979; and Montoya and Pan, 1992).

B.3.12 Lower Mokelumne River, Copper - Change in Extent of Impairment

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, recommends changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for the impairment of the lower Mokelumne River by elevated dissolved copper concentrations. Camanche Reservoir was included on the 1998 303(d) list as part of the listing for the lower Mokelumne River. Regional Board staff has determined that listing reservoirs separately from their associated downstream drainages is more appropriate because watershed management strategies (and associated data needs) for reservoirs can be distinctly different from management strategies for the downstream drainages.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Mokelumne River, Lower	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Copper
Hydrologic Unit	535.00	**Sources**	Resource extraction (abandoned mines)
Total Waterbody Size	28 miles	**TMDL Priority**	Low
Size Affected	28 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Extent of Impairment	~~All of lower Mokelumne River.~~ Camanche Dam to Delta.	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	
Upstream Extent Latitude	38° 13' 35"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 1' 21"
Downstream Extent Latitude	38° 12' 36"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 21' 55"
Original 303(d) Listing Year	1992		

Watershed Characteristics

The lower Mokelumne River flows 28 miles from Camanche Dam to the legal Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta boundary in San Joaquin County. Camanche Reservoir, working in tandem with the upstream Pardee Reservoir, stores water for irrigation and stream-flow regulation, providing flood control, water to the meet the needs of downstream water rights holders, and water for fisheries and riparian habitat (EBMUD, 2000). The East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) completed the Camanche Reservoir Project (downstream of Pardee) in 1964. EBMUD built a fish hatchery (the Mokelumne River Fish Installation) immediately downstream of Camanche Dam on the lower Mokelumne River, which the California Department of Fish and Game operates. In addition, a power plant at the base of the dam was placed in service in 1983.

Several historic copper and gold mines (including Argonaut, Newton, and Penn) are within the lower Mokelumne River watershed. Penn Mine, which historically operated for copper extraction from 1861 to 1956, impacted the water quality of both Camanche Reservoir and the lower Mokelumne River downstream of Camanche Dam. The Penn Mine site occupies a 22-acre area near the southeastern shore of Camanche Reservoir approximately 1.5 miles from the town of Campo Seco in Calaveras County. Penn Mine historically discharged to the reservoir via Mine Run Creek. Metal loading from Penn Mine led to fishery declines and fish kills in Camanche Reservoir, in the Mokelumne River Fish Installation downstream of Camanche Dam, and in the lower Mokelumne River; problems with toxic discharges from the Penn Mine continued through the 1960s and 1970s (Buer et al., 1979; SRWCB, 1990; CDFG, 1991; EDAW, Inc., 1992; EBMUD, 2000). Beginning in 1978, several abatement and restoration projects were conducted to decrease the impact of Penn Mine on Camanche Reservoir and the lower Mokelumne River; the most recent abatement project was completed in late 1999 (Buer et al., 1979; SCH EIR, 1996; CH2MHill, 2000a and 2000b).

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for copper in the lower Mokelumne River. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf)."

The toxicity objective was evaluated for the lower Mokelumne River by comparing copper concentrations measured in the lower Mokelumne River downstream of Camanche Dam to water quality guidelines and criteria developed for human health and wildlife protection. The numeric United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) California Toxics Rule (CTR) hardness-dependent continuous (4-day average) and maximum (1-hour average) dissolved copper criteria for freshwater aquatic life protection are 2.3 micrograms per liter (µg/L) and 2.9 µg/L, respectively, based on an assumed hardness of 20 milligrams per liter (mg/L) of calcium carbonate ($CaCO_3$) (Marshack, 2000). Hardness is assumed to be 20 mg/l of $CaCO_3$ because numerous studies (e.g., CH2MHill, 2000b & Buer et al., 1979) have indicated that Camanche Reservoir/Mokelumne River water has hardness values typical ranging from 10 to 25 mg/L. The USEPA primary maximum contaminant level (MCL) for drinking water protection is 1,300 µg/L of total recoverable copper (Marshack, 2000).

Evidence of Impairment

Elevated copper concentrations in water samples collected since 1958 indicate that copper impairs the lower Mokelumne River. The data also indicate a strong seasonality to the copper loading; Penn Mine historically discharged more copper during wet seasons than during dry seasons. As illustrated by the data summaries below, a series of remediation projects at Penn Mine conducted in 1978, 1993, and 1999-2000 have significantly decreased the amount of copper leaving the mine site.

Between 1988 and 1992, EBMUD measured dissolved copper concentrations at three locations on the Mokelumne River downstream of Camanche Dam (USFWS, 1992). In addition, EBMUD collected monthly samples from the Mokelumne River immediately downstream of the Camanche Dam between August 1997 and June 2001 and analyzed the samples for dissolved copper using a method with a detection limit low enough to evaluate compliance with the hardness-dependent CTR criteria (EBMUD, 2001). Table 2 summarizes the EBMUD dissolved copper data for the lower Mokelumne River. Although exceedances of the CTR criteria still occur each year in the lower Mokelumne River immediately downstream of Camanche Dam, both the frequency and magnitude of exceedances have decreased since 1992.

Table B-2. Summary of Available Copper Concentration Data for the Lower Mokelumne River Downstream of Camanche Dam (Data source: USFWS, 1992; EBMUD, 2001)

Location [a]	Total Copper Concentrations			Dissolved Copper Concentrations			
	# of Samples (Dates Collected)	Range of Concentrations (µg/l)	# [%] of Samples Exceeding MCL (1,300 µg/l) [b]	# of Samples (Dates Collected)	Range of Concentrations (µg/l)	# [%] of Samples Exceeding CTR Criteria [b]	
						Maximum Criterion (2.9 µg/l)	Continuous Criterion (2.3 µg/l)
CamC	138 (9/88 – 11/92)	<2 – 88	0 [0%]	141 (2/89 – 11/92)	<2 – 50	70 [50%]	70 [50%]
CamD	92 (5/88 – 11/92)	<2 – 18	0 [0%]	84 (3/89 – 11/92)	<2 – 7, 320 [c]	15 [18%]	15 [18%]
VAPK	23 (5/88 – 11/92)	<1 – 4	0 [0%]	17 (8/91 – 11/92)	<2 – 3	1 [6%]	1 [6%]
CamC				25 (8/97 – 8/99)	0.62 – 7.8 [d]	6 [24%]	7 [28%]
CamD				25 (8/97 – 8/99)	0.8 – 9.1 [d]	4 [16%]	5 [20%]
CamC				22 (9/99 – 6/01)	<0.3 – 5.8 [d]	3 [14%]	3 [14%]
CamD				22 (9/99 – 6/01)	<0.3 – 4.2, 14 [d, e]	2 [9%]	5 [23%]

(a) CamC: Discharge from Camanche Dam to the Mokelumne River.
CamD: Camanche Reservoir lower outlet to the Mokelumne River.
VAPK: Mokelumne River at Van Assen Park, downstream of Camanche Dam.
(b) MCL: USEPA primary maximum contaminant level for drinking water protection.
CTR: United States Environmental Protection Agency's California Toxics Rule (CTR) hardness-dependent continuous (4-day average) and maximum (1-hour average) dissolved copper criteria for freshwater aquatic life protection, based on an assumed hardness of 20 mg/L of $CaCO_3$ if hardness data were not available.
On October 4, 1989, a dissolved copper concentration of 320 µg/l was listed for CamD in the EBMUD data set. Dissolved iron and zinc concentrations measured on that day were also more than a magnitude higher than any recorded during that period; total and dissolved aluminum concentrations were not unusually high. Total copper, iron, and zinc concentrations were not available for comparison. The dissolved and total copper concentrations measured at CamC on October 4, 1989 were less than 2 µg/l, and dissolved aluminum, iron, and zinc levels were also low; only the total aluminum and iron were unusually high at CamC on that day.
Thirty-seven of the 47 samples collected at CamC between August 1997 and June 2001 had dissolved copper concentrations less than 2 µg/l. Thirty-five of the 47 samples collected at CamD between August 1997 and June 2001 had dissolved copper concentrations less than 2 µg/l.
On March 1, 2000, a dissolved copper concentration of 14 µg/l was listed for CamD in the EBMUD data set; no other data were available for comparison to determine the nature of the outlier.

B.3.13 Lower Mokelumne River, Zinc - Change in Extent of Impairment

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, recommends changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for the impairment of the lower Mokelumne River by elevated dissolved zinc concentrations. Camanche Reservoir was included on the 1998 303(d) list as part of the listing for the lower Mokelumne River. Regional Board staff has determined that listing reservoirs separately from their associated downstream drainages is more appropriate because watershed management strategies (and associated data needs) for reservoirs can be distinctly different from management strategies for the downstream drainages.

Table B-1. 303(d) Listing/TMDL Information

Waterbody Name	Mokelumne River, Lower	**Pollutants/Stressors**	Zinc
Hydrologic Unit	535.00	**Sources**	Resource extraction (abandoned mines)
Total Waterbody Size	28 miles	**TMDL Priority**	Low
Size Affected	28 miles	**TMDL Start Date (Mo/Yr)**	01/04
Extent of Impairment	~~All of lower Mokelumne River.~~ Camanche Dam to Delta.	**TMDL End Date (Mo/Yr)**	12/11
Upstream Extent Latitude	38° 13' 35"	**Upstream Extent Longitude**	121° 1' 21"
Downstream Extent Latitude	38° 12' 36"	**Downstream Extent Longitude**	121° 21' 55"
Original 303(d) Listing Year	1992		

Watershed Characteristics

The lower Mokelumne River flows 28 miles from Camanche Dam to the legal Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta boundary in San Joaquin County. Camanche Reservoir, working in tandem with the upstream Pardee Reservoir, stores water for irrigation and stream-flow regulation, providing flood control, water to the meet the needs of downstream water rights holders, and water for fisheries and riparian habitat (EBMUD, 2000). The East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) completed the Camanche Reservoir Project (downstream of Pardee) in 1964. EBMUD built a fish hatchery (the Mokelumne River Fish Installation) immediately downstream of Camanche Dam on the lower Mokelumne River, which the California Department of Fish and Game operates. In addition, a power plant at the base of the dam was placed in service in 1983.

Several historic copper and gold mines (including Argonaut, Newton, and Penn) are within the lower Mokelumne River watershed. Penn Mine, which historically operated for copper extraction from 1861 to 1956, impacted the water quality of both Camanche Reservoir and the lower Mokelumne River downstream of Camanche Dam. The Penn Mine site occupies a 22-acre area near the southeastern shore of Camanche Reservoir approximately 1.5 miles from the town of Campo Seco in Calaveras County. Penn Mine historically discharged to the reservoir via Mine Run Creek. Metal loading from Penn Mine led to fishery declines and fish kills in Camanche Reservoir, in the Mokelumne River Fish Installation downstream of Camanche Dam, and in the lower Mokelumne River; problems with toxic discharges from the Penn Mine continued through the 1960s and 1970s (Buer et al., 1979; SRWCB, 1990; CDFG, 1991; EDAW, Inc., 1992; EBMUD, 2000). Beginning in 1978, several abatement and restoration projects were conducted to decrease the impact of Penn Mine on Camanche Reservoir and the lower Mokelumne River; the most recent abatement project was completed in late 1999 (Buer et al., 1979; SCH EIR, 1996; CH2MHill, 2000a and 2000b).

Water Quality Objectives Not Attained

The narrative objective for toxicity is not being attained for zinc in the lower Mokelumne River. The narrative toxicity objective in the Basin Plan states, in part, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." The narrative toxicity objective further states that "The Regional Water Board will also consider ... numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective (CRWQCB-CVR, 1998; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5/bsnplnab.pdf)."

The toxicity objective was evaluated for the lower Mokelumne River by comparing zinc concentrations measured in the lower Mokelumne River downstream of Camanche Dam to water quality guidelines and criteria developed for human health and wildlife protection. The numeric United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) California Toxics Rule (CTR) hardness-dependent continuous (4-day average) and maximum (1-hour average) dissolved zinc criteria for freshwater aquatic life protection are both 30 micrograms per liter (µg/L), based on an assumed hardness of 20 milligrams per liter (mg/L) of calcium carbonate ($CaCO_3$) (Marshack, 2000). The CTR continuous and maximum criteria adjusted for total recoverable zinc are both 31 µg/L, based on an assumed hardness of 20 mg/L of $CaCO_3$ (Marshack, 2000). (Hardness is assumed to be 20 mg/l of $CaCO_3$ because numerous studies (e.g., CH2MHill, 2000b & Buer et al., 1979) have indicated that Camanche Reservoir/Mokelumne River water has hardness values typical ranging from 10 to 25 mg/L.) The USEPA maximum contaminant level (MCL) for drinking water protection is 5,000 µg/L of total recoverable zinc (Marshack, 2000).

Evidence of Impairment

Elevated zinc concentrations in water samples collected since 1958 indicate that zinc impairs the lower Mokelumne River. The data indicate a strong seasonality to the zinc loading; Penn Mine historically discharged more zinc during wet seasons than during dry seasons. As illustrated by the data summaries below, a series of remediation projects at Penn Mine conducted in 1978, 1993, and 1999-2000 have significantly decreased the amount of zinc leaving the mine site.

Between 1988 and 1992, EBMUD measured dissolved zinc concentrations at three locations on the Mokelumne River downstream of Camanche Dam (USFWS, 1992). Table 1 summarizes the available EBMUD dissolved zinc data. The 1988-1992 data indicate that exceedances of the CTR criteria still occurred in the lower Mokelumne River immediately downstream of Camanche Dam after the remediation activities conducted in the late 1970s. Dissolved zinc data for the period after the remediation activities conducted in the mid-late 1990s are not available.

Table B-2. Summary of Available Zinc Concentration Data for the Lower Mokelumne River Downstream of Camanche Dam (Data source: USFWS, 1992)

Location [a]	Total Zinc Concentrations			Dissolved Zinc Concentrations		
	# of Samples (Dates Collected)	Range of Concentrations (µg/l)	# [%] of Samples Exceeding MCL (5,000 µg/l) [b]	# of Samples (Dates Collected)	Range of Concentrations (µg/l)	# [%] of Samples Exceeding CTR Criteria [b] (30 µg/L)
CamC	136 (9/88 – 11/92)	<2 – 230	0 [0%]	141 (2/89 – 11/92)	<3 – 450	15 [11%]
CamD	92 (5/88 – 11/92)	<2 – 200	0 [0%]	84 (3/89 – 11/92)	<3 – 140	4 [5%]
VAPK	23 (5/88 – 11/92)	<2 – 100; 2,000 [c]	0 [0%]	17 (8/91 – 11/92)	<4 – 9	0 [0%]

[a] CamC: Discharge from Camanche Dam to the Mokelumne River.
CamD: Camanche Reservoir lower outlet to the Mokelumne River
VAPK: Mokelumne River at Van Assen Park, downstream of Camanche Dam.
[b] MCL: USEPA primary maximum contaminant level for drinking water protection.
CTR: United States Environmental Protection Agency's California Toxics Rule (CTR) hardness-dependent continuous (4-day average) and maximum (1-hour average) dissolved zinc criteria for freshwater aquatic life protection, based on an assumed hardness of 20 mg/L of $CaCO_3$.
[c] On May 31, 1989, the EBMUD data set listed a total zinc concentration of 2,000 µg/l for VAPL. Total aluminum, cadmium, copper, and iron concentrations measured on that day were not unusually high. Dissolved zinc, aluminum, cadmium, copper, and iron concentrations were not available for comparison.

B.2.14 Marsh Creek, Mercury – Change in Total Size and Size Affected

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, recommends changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for the impairment of Marsh Creek due to impairment by mercury. The Regional Board recommends that the identified impaired length change from 24 mile to 16.5 miles and the extent of impairment from all of Marsh Creek to Marsh Creek, from Dunn Creek to Marsh Creek Reservoir. The basis for the recommended change is described below.

Watershed Characteristics

Marsh Creek is located in Contra Costa County. It flows for approximately 24 miles, with its water ultimately entering the San Joaquin Delta. The Mount Diablo Mine (Mt Diablo Mine), which was historically operated for mercury extraction, is located between Dunn Creek and Horse Creek (a tributary to Dunn Creek), approximately 7.5 miles downstream from the headwaters of Marsh Creek. The tailings and outflow from the Mt. Diablo Mine are highly acidic and contain numerous metals, including mercury.

Extent of Impairment

Mt. Diablo Mine, which was historically operated for mercury extraction, is located between Dunn Creek and Horse Creek (a tributary to Dunn Creek) (Iovenitti, *et al* 1989; Slotten et al, 1996; Buer *et al*, 1979). Dunn Creek discharges into Marsh Creek approximately 7.5 miles downstream from the headwaters of Marsh Creek. Water quality, fish tissue, and invertebrate data collected above and below the inflow of Dunn Creek indicate that Marsh Creek is impaired downstream of Dunn Creek. The impaired length of Marsh Creek is approximately 16.5 miles, from Dunn Creek through Marsh Creek Reservoir to the furthest extent of Marsh Creek.

B.3.14 Marsh Creek, Metals - Change in Total Size and Size Affected

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, recommends changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for the impairment of Marsh Creek due to impairment by metals. The Regional Board recommends that the identified impaired length change from 24 mile to 8.5 miles and the extent of impairment from all of Marsh Creek to Marsh Creek, from Dunn Creek to Marsh Creek Reservoir. The basis for the recommended change is described below.

Watershed Characteristics

Marsh Creek is located in Contra Costa County. It flows for approximately 24 miles, with its water ultimately entering the San Joaquin Delta. The Mount Diablo Mine (Mt Diablo Mine), which was historically operated for mercury extraction, is located between Dunn Creek and Horse Creek (a tributary to Dunn Creek), approximately 7.5 miles downstream from the headwaters of Marsh Creek. The tailings and outflow from the Mt. Diablo Mine are highly acidic and contain numerous metals (CRWQCB-CVR, 1978).

Extent of Impairment

Mt. Diablo Mine, which was historically operated for mercury extraction, is located between Dunn Creek and Horse Creek (a tributary to Dunn Creek) (Iovenitti, *et al* 1989; Slotten et al, 1996; Buer *et al*, 1979). Dunn Creek discharges into Marsh Creek approximately 7.5 miles downstream from the headwaters of Marsh Creek. Water quality data was collected upstream and downstream from the Dunn Creek inflow to Marsh Creek contains high levels of metals below the confluence of Dunn Creek. However, downstream of Marsh Creek Reservoir, there is no data to indicate that metals impair Marsh Creek (Iovenitti, *et al* 1989; Slotten et al, 1996; Buer *et al*, 1979). The impaired length of Marsh Creek is approximately 8.5 miles, from Dunn Creek to Marsh Creek Reservoir.

B.3.15 Mosher Slough, Diazinon and Chlorpyrifos - Change in Total Size

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, recommends changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for the impairment of Mosher Slough due to impairment by diazinon and chlorpyrifos. The Regional Board recommends that the identified total length change from 3 to 5 miles. The basis for the recommended change is described below.

Watershed Characteristics

Mosher Slough is a small urban creek located entirely within San Joaquin County in the northern part of Stockton. The confluence of Mosher Slough, Bear Creek, and Pixley Slough flows west and converges with Disappointment Slough, which flows to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Horizons Technology, Inc., 1997). Land use in the Mosher Slough watershed is predominately commercial and residential.

Total Waterbody Length

Mosher Slough is approximately 5 miles in length (Horizons Technology, Inc., 1997; DeLorme, 1998).

B.3.16 San Carlos Creek, Mercury - Change in Total Size and Size Affected

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, recommends changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for the impairment of San Carlos Creek due to impairment by mercury. The Regional Board recommends that the identified total length change from 1 mile to 9 miles and that the extent of impairment change from 1 mile to 4 miles. The basis for the recommended change is described below.

Watershed Characteristics

San Carlos Creek is located in the Tulare Lake Basin in San Benito County (USGS, 1969-1981). It is a tributary to Panoche Creek (*via* Silver Creek). San Carlos Creek has a length of approximately 9 miles from its headwaters at San Benito Mountain to its confluence with Silver Creek. It derives from marine sediments, is highly mineralized, and is intermittent, with sustained flows only after extended wet periods (CRWQCB-CVR, 1995). Several small historic mines (such as the San Carlos, Aurora, and Molina mines) are located in the upper portion of the San Carlos watershed. However, the historic New Idria Mine, located along San Carlos Creek approximately 4 miles upstream of the San Carlos Creek – Silver Creek confluence, is by far the largest mine in the region (USGS, 1958-2000). The New Idria Mine has acid mine drainage containing mercury that likely impairs the water quality of the downstream segment of San Carlos Creek (CRWQCB-CVR, 1995).

Total Waterbody Length and Extent of Impairment

San Carlos Creek has a length of approximately 9 miles from its headwaters at San Benito Mountain to its confluence with Silver Creek (CRWQCB-CVR, 1995; USGS, 1958-2000). The historic New Idria Mine is located along San Carlos Creek approximately 4 miles upstream of the San Carlos Creek – Silver Creek confluence (USGS, 1958-2000). Water quality samples indicate that high levels of mercury are present below the mine, indicating that that the lower four miles are impaired by mercury.

B.3.17 Lower Stanislaus River - Change in Total Size and Size Affected

Summary of Proposed Action

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, recommends changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for the impairment of the Stanislaus River due to impairment by diazinon, Group A pesticides, and unknown toxicity. The Regional Board recommends that the identified total length change from 48 to 58 miles and the size affected from 48 to 58 miles. The basis for the recommended change is described below.

Watershed Characteristics

The Stanislaus River is located on the east side of the San Joaquin River Basin and has a total basin area of 1,144 square miles. The Lower Stanislaus River subbasin, covering the area from Goodwin Dam to the San Joaquin River, encompasses approximately 102,550 acres, of which around 52,151acres is used for agriculture.

Total Waterbody Length and Extent of Impairment

USGS topographic maps indicate that the total length of the lower Stanislaus River is approximately 58 miles, from Goodwin Dam to San Joaquin River (USGS, 1958-2000). The Regional Board had previously indicated on the 303(d) list that the entire length is impaired by diazinon, Group A pesticides, and unknown toxicity. The size affected should also be changed to 58 miles for those pollutants.

B.3.18 Lower Tuolumne River, Diazinon - Change in Total Size and Size Affected

Summary of Proposed Actions

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, recommends changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for the impairment of the lower Tuolumne River due to impairment by diazinon. The Regional Board recommends that the identified total length change from 32 to 54 miles and the size affected from 32 to 42 miles. The basis for the recommended change is described below.

Watershed Characteristics

The lower Tuolumne River flows for approximately 54 miles, from New Don Pedro Dam and drains into the San Joaquin River west of Modesto. This sub-basin encompasses approximately 161,268 acres, of which 52,715 acres is used for agriculture.

Total Waterbody Length and Extent of Impairment

Topographic maps provided by the USGS indicate that the total length of the lower Tuolumne River is approximately 54 miles, from New Don Pedro Dam to San Joaquin River (USGS, 1958-2000). Chemical analysis of water samples and land use along the Tuolumne River (the presence of crops) indicate that the lower 42 miles (from Turlock Lake State Park to the San Joaquin River) is impaired by diazinon.

B.3.19 Lower Tuolumne River, Group A pesticides and Unknown Toxicity - Change in Total Size and Size Affected

Summary of Proposed Actions

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, recommends changes to California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for the impairment of the lower Tuolumne River due to impairment by Group A pesticides and unknown toxicity. The Regional Board recommends that the identified total length change from 32 to 54 miles and the size affected from 32 to 54 miles. The basis for the recommended change is described below.

Watershed Characteristics

The lower Tuolumne River flows for approximately 54 miles, from New Don Pedro Dam and drains into the San Joaquin River west of Modesto. This subbasin encompasses approximately 161,268 acres, of which 52,715 acres is used for agriculture.

Total Waterbody Length and Extent of Impairment

USGS topographic maps indicate that the total length of the lower Tuolumne River is approximately 54 miles, from New Don Pedro Dam to San Joaquin River (USGS, 1958-2000). Chemical analysis of water samples from the lower Tuolumne River indicate that the entire length is impaired by Group A pesticides. Toxicity tests, using water from lower Tuolumne River, indicate that the entire length is impaired by an unknown toxin.