

**From:** Nadim Zeywar  
**To:** Diane Beaulaurier  
**Date:** 4/3/02 11:34AM  
**Subject:** Re: 2002 303(d) Hearing Notice

Diane:

The SWRCB 303 (d) List Staff Report does not include Region 7's recommendation for delisting the New River for nutrients. The region's fact sheet, however, does include delisting the New River for nutrients. Do you have any explanation for this discrepancy?

Thanks

Nadim

" The energy challenge facing California is real. Every Californian needs to take immediate action to reduce energy consumption. For a list of simple ways you can do to reduce demand and cut your energy costs, see our website at <http://www.swrcb.ca.gov>. Thank you for your attention to this important matter."

Nadim Zeywar  
Environmental Scientist  
California Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Colorado River Basin Region  
73-720 Fred Waring Drive, Suite 100  
Palm Desert, CA 92260

Phone: (760) 776-8942  
Fax: (760)341-6820

>>> Diane Beaulaurier 04/02/02 01:33PM >>>

The Hearing Notice for the 2002 proposed revisions to the Federal Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List is attached. Please contact Craig J. Wilson at (916) 341-5560 if you have any questions.

Diane Beaulaurier  
Environmental Specialist  
State Water Resources Control Board  
Division of Water Quality  
1001 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
[beaud@dwq.swrcb.ca.gov](mailto:beaud@dwq.swrcb.ca.gov)  
(916) 341-5549

**From:** Judith Unsicker  
**To:** Craig J. Wilson  
**Date:** 3/29/02 8:48AM  
**Subject:** More Region 6 problems with State Board 303(d) recommendations

Chuck Curtis has identified two more discrepancies between the Lahontan Regional Board's recommendations and the tables in the State Board's draft 303(d) list recommendations:

(1) We recommended listing of the West Fork Carson River, Woodfords to Paynesville segment for violation of the percent sodium objective. This listing is not included with other listings for the West Fork on page 29 of 220 in Volume I of the State Board staff report, although it is included on page 104 of 306 in Volume III, and there is a fact sheet on page 138 of 306.

(2) We recommended listing of the West Fork Carson River from Woodfords to the State Line for pathogens. This listing is not addressed in either Volume I or Volume III. (There may have been a problem with reporting from the GeoWBS database since this segment consists of two GeoWBS-mapped segments, Woodfords to Paynesville and Paynesville to State Line.)

These discrepancies should be addressed before the recommendations are made public.

**CC:** Chuck Curtis; Diane Beaulaurier

**From:** Judith Unsicker  
**To:** Craig J. Wilson  
**Date:** 3/29/02 7:20AM  
**Subject:** URGENT- 303(d) List

I have just been skimming through the draft documents sent out yesterday afternoon and noticed that the recommended "delisting" summary table in "Volume 1" includes chloride, sulfate and TDS combinations for the Mojave River. The Mojave River was never listed for these pollutants. Region 6 staff initially recommended three new listings for these pollutants, but changed the staff recommendations after consideration of the small sample sizes involved. Our Board voted to approve staff's recommendations with the initially proposed Mojave listings specifically excluded, and to place the river on the "watch list". Please have the appropriate changes made before the recommendations "go public".

I will be in my office until 3:30 today (except for a short lunch around 11-11:30 if you want to discuss this. My phone number is (530) 542-5462.

**CC:** Chuck Curtis; Diane Beaulaurier