

CHAPTER 7: WATER QUALITY ATTAINMENT STRATEGIES INCLUDING TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOADS

Water Quality Attainment Strategies (WQAS) including Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) deemed necessary and appropriate to ensure attainment and maintenance of water quality standards in the Region are presented herein this chapter.

7.1 A WATER QUALITY ATTAINMENT STRATEGY TO SUPPORT COPPER AND NICKEL SITE-SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES SOUTH OF THE DUMBARTON BRIDGE

The Water Quality Attainment Strategy (WQAS) for copper and nickel in San Francisco Bay south of the Dumbarton Bridge (Lower South SF Bay) is designed to prevent water quality degradation and ensure the ongoing maintenance of the site-specific objectives both for copper and nickel in Lower South SF Bay. This section describes the details of the WQAS and how the Water Board will use its regulatory authority to implement this strategy.

The four elements of the WQAS for copper and nickel in Lower South SF Bay are:

- Current control measures/actions to minimize copper and nickel releases (from municipal wastewater treatment plants and urban runoff programs) to Lower South SF Bay;
- Statistically-based water quality "triggers" and a receiving water monitoring program that would initiate additional control measures/actions if the "triggers" are met;
- A proactive framework for addressing increases to future copper and nickel concentrations in Lower South SF Bay, if they occur; and
- Metal translators that will be used to compute copper and nickel effluent limits for the municipal wastewater treatment plants discharging to Lower South SF Bay.

Except for the specification of metal translators, all actions and monitoring obligations described in this section have been required by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits for the three municipal wastewater dischargers and the municipal urban runoff (stormwater) dischargers in Lower South SF Bay since October 2000 and March 2001, respectively.

7.1.1 BACKGROUND

Lower South SF Bay has been listed as impaired due to point source discharges of generic metals since 1990 (Clean Water Act §304(l) listing) and most recently for copper and nickel from point and urban runoff sources in the State's 1998 list required by Clean Water Act §303(d). The primary reason for the copper and nickel impairment listings had been that ambient water concentrations of dissolved copper and nickel exceeded Basin Plan water quality objectives or US EPA national water quality criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Despite significant reductions in wastewater loadings over the past two decades, ambient concentrations at stations monitored through the San Francisco Estuary Regional Monitoring Program for Trace Substances

(RMP) or the City of San Jose monitoring program still approach or exceed the previously-applicable federal criteria or water quality objectives in Lower South SF Bay. The Water Board has now adopted site-specific water quality objectives. As discussed below, it is likely that these new objectives are being attained.

7.1.1.1 SOURCES

The external sources of copper and nickel to Lower South SF Bay include a minor contribution from atmospheric deposition and substantial discharges from tributaries/urban runoff and municipal wastewater. The dischargers responsible for the urban runoff discharges are the Santa Clara Valley Water District, County of Santa Clara, City of Campbell, City of Cupertino, City of Los Altos, Town of Los Altos Hills, Town of Los Gatos, City of Milpitas, City of Monte Sereno, City of Mountain View, City of Palo Alto, City of San Jose, City of Santa Clara, City of Saratoga, and City of Sunnyvale. These cities have joined together to form the Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program. The municipal wastewater dischargers are the Cities of San Jose and Santa Clara, Sunnyvale, and Palo Alto. Each of these cities owns and operates a wastewater treatment plant (Publicly-Owned Treatment Works or POTW) that discharges into the Lower South Bay.

On an annual basis, about 1100 kilograms (kg) of copper and 1500 kg of nickel enters Lower South SF Bay from POTWs. From tributaries, roughly 3800 kg copper and 6000 kg nickel enters this Bay segment each year. During the dry season (June-November), POTW loading is dominant, and tributary loading is dominant during the wet season (December-May). Substantial amounts of copper (about 1.9 million kg) and nickel (about 50 million kg) already existing in the sediments of Lower South SF Bay can also contribute to water concentrations when the sediments are resuspended by waves, winds, tides, and currents. The metals deposited in the sediments consist of those deposited historically (higher than current levels) and those currently deposited metals. The historical and current external loadings have elevated the total copper and possibly the total nickel concentrations of Lower South SF Bay sediments above what they would be in the absence of anthropogenic sources.

7.1.1.2 STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

The stakeholder group recognized by the Water Board to assist in developing watershed-based programs to address both short and long-term water quality issues in Lower South SF Bay is the Santa Clara Basin Watershed Management Initiative (SCBWMI). The SCBWMI, formed in 1996, is a collaborative effort of representatives from business and industrial sectors, professional and trade organizations, civic, environmental, resource conservation and agricultural groups, regional and local public agencies, resource agencies, and the general public. These groups have joined forces to address all sources of pollution that threaten the water bodies draining into the Lower South Bay. A major aim of the SCBWMI is to coordinate existing watershed activities on a basin-wide scale, ensuring that environmental protection efforts are addressed efficiently and cost-effectively. The Water Board will continue to recognize and rely on the leadership of the SCBWMI to ensure the ongoing success of the WQAS.

A working subgroup of the SCBWMI, the Bay Monitoring and Modeling Subgroup, took the lead to address the water quality issues and to provide the basic strategy and information necessary to address both the water quality technical and related regulatory questions. In 1998, the Copper

and Nickel TMDL Work Group (Workgroup) was formed by the SCBWMI to provide guidance for the development of the TMDLs for copper and nickel in Lower South SF Bay. A broad group of stakeholders was represented on the Workgroup including several environmental groups, local wastewater dischargers, local public agencies responsible for the urban runoff program, state and federal regulators, industry and local business representatives, and national organizations such as the Copper Development Association.

7.1.2 OVERVIEW OF THE TMDL PROJECT FOR COPPER AND NICKEL IN LOWER SOUTH BAY

In 1996, the State Water Board included the South San Francisco Bay on the §303(d) impaired water body list as a high priority impaired water body. In 1998, the list was updated and specifically identified copper, nickel, mercury and selenium as the metal pollutants of concern. The listing triggered the Clean Water Act §303(d) mandate for the State of California, specifically the Water Board, to establish TMDLs for these pollutants of concern. To address NPDES permit issues for its wastewater treatment plant, the City of San Jose and other local municipalities took the lead in providing funding for the development of the copper and nickel TMDLs for Lower South Bay, and other Lower South Bay communities contributed to related SCBWMI activities.

The TMDL effort focused on:

1. Conducting an Impairment Assessment to determine if ambient concentrations of copper and nickel were negatively impacting the designated beneficial uses of Lower South Bay;
2. Developing a range of scientifically defensible water quality objectives for copper and nickel;
3. Developing a conceptual model of copper and nickel cycling to evaluate attainment of the range of objectives; and
4. Characterizing sources and identifying pollution prevention and control actions.

The Workgroup oversaw the preparation and review of several technical reports. These reports provide the basis of the conclusions and recommendations of the Workgroup regarding the effects of ambient concentrations of copper and nickel on the beneficial uses of Lower South Bay.

7.1.3 IMPAIRMENT ASSESSMENT AND SITE-SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

The Impairment Assessment Report was finalized in June 2000 to present new information and to re-evaluate the determination that the beneficial uses of Lower South Bay were impaired due to ambient concentrations of copper and nickel. Specifically, the goals of the assessment were to:

- Compile and evaluate data on ambient concentrations and toxicity information for copper and nickel in Lower South Bay;
- Identify, evaluate and select indicators of beneficial use impairment. The categories of parameters and criteria considered included toxicity (acute and chronic), biological (biota composition, health, abundance, and physical habitat vs. a reference site), chemical (numeric values), and physical (capacity to support uses);
- Develop endpoints for the selected indicators that can be used to assess the existence of impairment and compare these values to ambient concentrations in Lower South Bay. The intent of this assessment was to provide policy makers, regulators, and other

- stakeholders with the best technical laboratory and ambient information currently available to compare with known threshold impact levels on selected indicators;
- Assess the level of certainty with which it can be shown ambient concentrations of copper and nickel are or are not resulting in beneficial use impairment; and
 - Recommend numeric values for site-specific objectives (SSOs) for dissolved copper and nickel in Lower South Bay in lieu of TMDL development upon finding that the Lower South Bay is not impaired due to these metals.

The final results of the impairment assessment indicated that impairment to beneficial uses of Lower South Bay due to ambient copper and nickel concentrations is unlikely. There are several lines of evidence to support the finding for each metal, and these are discussed at length in the Impairment Assessment Report. One important factor in the impairment decision was the recognition that the chemical features of Lower South Bay reduce the toxicity and bioavailability of copper and nickel. These chemical features include binding of copper and nickel by dissolved organic compounds and the abundance of dissolved metals like manganese and iron that compete with copper and nickel for receptor sites on aquatic organisms.

From the established ranges of acute and chronic values of copper and nickel site-specific objectives developed through the Impairment Assessment Report, the Water Board selected specific values for copper and nickel that it deemed protective of beneficial uses and incorporated them into Chapter 3 of this Basin Plan. The acute and chronic site-specific water quality objectives in Lower South Bay for dissolved copper are 10.8 µg/L and 6.9 µg/L, respectively. The acute and chronic site-specific water quality objectives in Lower South Bay for dissolved nickel are 62.4 µg/L and 11.9 µg/L, respectively.

While the conclusions of the Impairment Assessment Report are scientifically sound, like most statements about complex environmental systems, its conclusions on the lack of impairment have some degree of uncertainty. The existence of these uncertainties underscores the need for continued monitoring and studies that are described below. The four primary areas of uncertainty are the toxicity of copper to phytoplankton, copper and nickel cycling in Lower South Bay, sediment toxicity, and uncertainties in loading estimates.

7.1.4 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

This section discusses the actions that will be taken to maintain the copper and nickel site-specific objectives. The underlying goal of these actions is to ensure that ambient levels do not increase due to increases in loading of copper and nickel to Lower South Bay. Except for the specification of metal translators, all actions and monitoring obligations described in this section are already required in the NPDES permits for the three municipal wastewater dischargers and the municipal urban runoff (stormwater) dischargers in Lower South Bay. Other non-regulatory, collaborative actions discussed here will be implemented via the SCBWMI and its participants on a voluntary basis.

7.1.4.1 MONITORING PROGRAM

Fundamental to the monitoring program is the concept of a water quality indicator. An indicator is a measurable quantity that is so strongly associated with particular environmental conditions that the value of the measurable quantity can be used to indicate the existence and maintenance

of these conditions. The indicators used in the monitoring program to support the site-specific objectives are dissolved copper and nickel concentrations in Lower South Bay. The monitoring program described here has been required by the NPDES permits for the three municipal wastewater dischargers since October 2000. (Order No. 00-108). The monitoring program consists of monthly dissolved copper and nickel measurements at the ten stations shown in Table 7-1. As of the adoption of this WQAS, the municipal wastewater dischargers defined dissolved metal as those metal constituents that pass through a 0.45 micron (μm) filter prior to chemical analysis. Any changes to this operational definition of dissolved metal or details of the monitoring program will be addressed through amendments to the NPDES permits.

The purpose of the monitoring component of the WQAS is to assess ambient conditions compared to the specific trigger levels described below. The ambient data collected through the WQAS monitoring program may be considered along with other ambient monitoring data to determine whether additional controls are necessary.

7.1.4.2 TRIGGER VALUES

The NPDES permits for municipal wastewater and stormwater dischargers contain a series of trigger values and corresponding actions that are required to be taken by the dischargers if the triggers are reached. For copper, an increase in dry season dissolved copper concentration of 0.8 $\mu\text{g/L}$ can be reliably detected despite inherent variability, and this specific increase is used to define the copper trigger levels. The copper Phase I trigger is reached and copper-specific Phase I actions will be conducted if the average dry season dissolved copper concentration at stations SB3, SB4, SB5, SB7, SB8, SB9 increases from 3.2 $\mu\text{g/L}$ (overall dry season mean from indicator stations during the period June 1997 to November 1998) to 4.0 $\mu\text{g/L}$. The copper Phase II trigger is reached and Phase II actions will be conducted if the dry season mean concentration of the indicator stations increases further to 4.4 $\mu\text{g/L}$. This 0.4 $\mu\text{g/L}$ change can still be detected with reasonable statistical certainty to justify the more aggressive Phase II actions.

For nickel, an increase in dry season dissolved concentration of 2.0 $\mu\text{g/L}$ can be reliably detected despite inherent variability, and this increase is used to define the trigger levels for nickel. The nickel Phase I trigger is reached and Phase I actions will be conducted if the average dry season dissolved nickel concentration at stations SB3, SB6, SB7, SB8, SB9, SB10 increases from 4.0 $\mu\text{g/L}$ (overall dry season mean from indicator stations during the period June 1997 to November 1998) to 6.0 $\mu\text{g/L}$. The nickel Phase II trigger is reached and Phase II actions will be conducted if the dry season mean dissolved concentration from the indicator stations increases another 2.0 $\mu\text{g/L}$ to 8.0 $\mu\text{g/L}$. Note that the copper and nickel Phase I and Phase II triggers are well below the site-specific objectives for these metals and reaching the triggers indicates a negative trend in water quality but not impairment of beneficial uses.

The Executive Officer will review the monitoring program results annually and determine whether the trigger values have been reached. The Executive Officer will report findings to the Water Board and will notify interested agencies and interested persons of these findings and will provide them with an opportunity to submit their views and recommendations concerning the findings either in written form or at a public hearing.

If the trigger values for ambient copper and nickel concentrations have not been exceeded, the monitoring program will continue to provide information for the next review period. The Water Board shall evaluate performance of the monitoring program during the annual review to determine if the necessary information is being provided.

7.1.4.3 BASELINE ACTIONS

These actions are already being implemented through the NPDES permits and will continue until the Water Board directs otherwise through the permitting process. These actions include: 1) pollution prevention and control actions by public agencies; 2) actions to conduct or track special studies that address specific technical areas of uncertainty (the toxicity of copper to phytoplankton, copper and nickel cycling in Lower South Bay, sediment toxicity, and uncertainties in loading estimates); and 3) planning-type studies to track, evaluate, and/or develop additional indicators and associated triggers (i.e., indicators for growth, development, or increased use or discharge of copper and nickel in the watershed).

BASELINE ACTIONS CONDUCTED BY MUNICIPAL WASTEWATER DISCHARGERS

Baseline actions applicable to municipal wastewater dischargers are actions associated with implementation of reasonable treatment, source control, and pollution prevention measures to limit discharges of copper and/or nickel.

In the consideration of the site-specific objectives for copper and nickel, the “Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California” (State Implementation Plan, or SIP) requires that dischargers demonstrate that they are implementing reasonable treatment, source control, and pollution prevention measures for these metals. The Water Board found that continuation of baseline actions satisfies this requirement as long as the copper and nickel trigger levels are not reached in Lower South Bay. Pollution prevention and minimization are a significant part of these dischargers’ efforts to limit the discharges of copper and nickel. These dischargers have approved Pretreatment Programs and have established Pollution Prevention Programs under the requirements specified by the Water Board in their NPDES permits.

These findings and specific baseline actions are already being implemented through the NPDES permits for these dischargers (Order No. 00-108, October 2000). The municipal wastewater dischargers are required by their permits to maintain these baseline actions and review and report to the Water Board on their implementation on an annual basis. Modifications to the current baseline actions may be considered through the permit process, provided that these dischargers demonstrate to the Water Board that such modifications are consistent with maintaining reasonable treatment, source control, and pollution prevention measures.

BASELINE ACTIONS CONDUCTED BY URBAN RUNOFF (MUNICIPAL STORMWATER) DISCHARGERS

The Urban Runoff Management requirements (see Section 4.14 Urban Runoff Management) and specific copper and nickel baseline actions have been required by the NPDES permit for the Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program and its dischargers since March 2001

(Order No. 01-024). These requirements include actions associated with implementation of controls to reduce copper and/or nickel in discharges to the maximum extent practicable, actions associated with prohibiting discharges other than stormwater to storm drain systems and waterways, and actions associated with monitoring to evaluate effectiveness of controls, identify sources of pollutants, and to measure or estimate pollutant concentrations and loads. On an annual basis, these dischargers are required to describe the controls that they are implementing and any additional controls that will be implemented. These dischargers are required to provide to the Water Board detailed descriptions of activities in each fiscal year in annual workplans and associated evaluations and results in annual reports. Modifications to the current baseline actions may be considered through the NPDES permit, provided that the Dischargers demonstrate to Water Board that such modifications are consistent with maintaining programs that control copper and nickel discharges to the maximum extent practicable in accordance with the requirements of the Water Board's Comprehensive Control Program for Urban Runoff Management and the Clean Water Act. As long as Lower South Bay ambient concentrations of copper and nickel remain below the established Phase I trigger levels, the Water Board has determined that the baseline actions applicable to urban runoff (municipal stormwater) dischargers satisfy the copper- and nickel-specific requirements of the Comprehensive Control Program for Urban Runoff Management and federal regulations (40 CFR 122.26).

BASELINE ACTIONS CONDUCTED BY SANTA CLARA BASIN WATERSHED MANAGEMENT INITIATIVE

As described above, the SCBWMI is a collaborative, stakeholder-participation forum that seeks integration of regulatory and watershed management actions that affect Lower South SF Bay and its tributaries. In addition to the actions required in the NPDES permits for the three municipal wastewater dischargers and the municipal urban runoff dischargers, there are other non-regulatory, collaborative actions that the SCBWMI and participants have committed to implement. These collaborative actions are described in attachments to the NPDES permit for the SCVURPPP and include: establishing a forum on transportation issues and impervious surfaces and for reviewing the appropriateness of transportation control measures with a view toward reducing traffic congestion; implementing measures to improve classification and assessment of watersheds; establishing an environmental clearinghouse of information related to tracking and disseminating new scientific information related to copper toxicity, loadings, fate and transport, and impairment of aquatic ecosystems; and planning-type studies to track, evaluate, and/or develop additional indicators to use and future potential indicators and triggers (i.e., indicators for growth, development, or increased use or discharge of copper and nickel in the watershed). In addition, the SCBWMI serves as a stakeholder participation forum to track, review, and evaluate the baseline actions required by the NPDES permits.

7.1.4.4 PHASE I ACTIONS

Phase I actions are already specified in the NPDES permits for municipal wastewater and stormwater dischargers. These actions are implemented when the mean value of selected monitoring parameters exceeds specified Phase I water quality triggers. The exceedance of the Phase I trigger indicates a negative trend in water quality and not impairment. Phase I actions consist of both specific remedial actions and planning for implementation of future actions if the Phase II triggers are exceeded.

If the Phase I copper or nickel triggers are exceeded, the Regional Board will consider execution of Phase I and Baseline actions as satisfying both the SIP requirement that municipal wastewater dischargers are implementing reasonable treatment, source control, and pollution prevention measures for copper and nickel and the Basin Plan requirement that municipal stormwater dischargers are implementing controls to reduce copper and/or nickel in discharges to the maximum extent practicable. Within 90 days after the determination of Phase I trigger exceedance, the Regional Board expects both the municipal wastewater and municipal stormwater dischargers to submit, for Executive Officer concurrence, their proposed Phase I plans with implementation schedules to implement additional measures to limit their relative cause or contribution to the exceedance. This submittal should, at a minimum, include evaluation of the Phase I actions and development of a Phase II plan. If the submittal is not received within 90 days of the determination of Phase I trigger exceedance or is not being implemented in accordance with the dischargers' implementation schedule following the Executive Officer's concurrence, the Regional Board may consider enforcement action to enforce the terms of the dischargers' permits.

7.1.4.5 PHASE II ACTIONS

Phase II actions are already specified in the NPDES permits for municipal wastewater and stormwater dischargers. Phase II actions are implemented when the mean value of selected monitoring parameters exceeds specified Phase II water quality triggers. Phase II actions are intended to reduce controllable sources further to maintain compliance with the site-specific water quality objectives.

If the Phase II copper or nickel triggers are exceeded, the Regional Board will consider execution of Phase II, Phase I and Baseline actions as satisfying both the SIP requirement that municipal wastewater dischargers are implementing reasonable treatment, source control, and pollution prevention measures for copper and nickel and the Basin Plan and Clean Water Act requirement that municipal stormwater dischargers are implementing controls to reduce copper and/or nickel in discharges to the maximum extent practicable. Within 90 days after the determination of Phase II trigger exceedance, the Regional Board expects the dischargers to submit, for Executive Officer concurrence, the proposed Phase II plans with implementation schedules to implement additional measures to limit their relative cause or contribution to the exceedance. If the submittal is not received within 90 days of the determination of Phase II trigger exceedance or is not being implemented in accordance with the dischargers' implementation schedule upon the Executive Officer's concurrence, the Regional Board may consider enforcement action to enforce the terms of the dischargers' permits.

7.1.4.6 METAL TRANSLATORS APPLICABLE TO LOWER SOUTH SF BAY MUNICIPAL WASTEWATER DISCHARGERS

An important regulatory element of the WQAS is the specification of metal translators applicable to the three Lower South SF Bay municipal wastewater dischargers. When the NPDES permits are re-issued, concentration-based effluent limits for these three facilities will be calculated from the chronic copper and nickel SSOs. Water quality objectives for copper and nickel are expressed as dissolved metal concentrations. Effluent limits for the POTWs are expressed as total metal concentrations and must be calculated according to the procedure outlined in the SIP. Therefore,

for metals like copper and nickel, the calculation of the effluent limit requires the use of a ratio of total to dissolved metal called the metal translator.

Analyses of data from 12 monitoring stations in Lower South SF Bay (Dumbarton to sloughs) collected from February 1997 to August 2000 and including dissolved and total copper and nickel, total suspended solids (TSS), and tidal data, showed a strong TSS dependence. The statistical analyses explored relationships between translator values and TSS, tide, site, and season. Linear regression with log-transformed dissolved fraction (translator) and TSS data provided the best regression fit. The best-fit regression line and its 95% confidence intervals provided the basis for translator values for copper and nickel.

U.S. EPA guidance (U.S. EPA Office of Water, June 1996. The Metals Translator: Guidance for Calculating a Total Recoverable Permit Limit from a Dissolved Criterion. EPA 823-B-96-007) states that, when there is a relationship between the translator and TSS, regression equations should be used to develop translator values using representative TSS values for the site under consideration. There is a fairly wide variation in TSS, and the guidance on translator development suggests using a representative TSS value. In Lower South SF Bay, a median TSS value may not account for the higher translator values and dissolved metal levels that result during high TSS episodes. For this reason, copper and nickel translators computed from 95% confidence interval TSS values were used to develop the POTW effluent limits. A copper translator of 0.53, and a nickel translator of 0.44 resulted from this procedure. Using the 95% confidence interval translator provides an additional measure of beneficial use protection in that effluent limits, expressed at total metal, will be lower using a higher value for metal translators. These translators shall be used to compute copper and nickel effluent limits for POTWs discharging to the Lower South SF Bay when NPDES permits for Lower South SF municipal wastewater dischargers are reissued.

7.2 TOMALES BAY WATERSHED PATHOGENS TMDL

The overall goal of the Tomales Bay Watershed Pathogens Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) is to ensure protection of water contact recreational uses and Bay shellfish harvesting, thereby minimizing human exposure to disease-causing pathogens. The following sections establish a density-based pathogens TMDL for Tomales Bay and its tributaries, and actions and monitoring necessary to implement the TMDL. The TMDL defines allowable density-based water quality bacteria concentrations and prohibits the discharge of human waste. The associated implementation plan specifies the actions necessary to protect and restore beneficial uses. This TMDL strives to achieve a balance that allows human activities including agriculture, recreation, commercial fishing and aquaculture, and residential use to coexist and also restores and protects water quality. As outlined in the adaptive implementation section, the effectiveness of implementation actions, monitoring to track progress toward targets, and the scientific understanding pertaining to pathogens will be periodically reviewed and the TMDL may be adapted as warranted.

In addition to pathogens, animal and human waste contain nutrients that pose a threat to aquatic ecosystem beneficial uses. Tomales Bay, Walker Creek, and Lagunitas Creek are listed as impaired by excess nutrients. Human and animal wastes may also contain other harmful constituents such as steroids and pharmaceuticals. In addition to protecting pathogen-impaired

beneficial uses such as shellfish harvesting, water contact recreation, and non-contact water recreation, by eliminating the discharge of human waste and controlling the discharge of animal waste, this TMDL will also protect aquatic ecosystem beneficial uses such as marine habitat, estuarine habitat, cold and warm freshwater habitat, and wildlife habitat from other harmful constituents found in human and animal waste.

7.2.1 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Monitoring results for Tomales Bay and its main tributaries (Lagunitas, Walker, and Olema creeks) indicate that these waters exceed bacteria water quality objectives for shellfish harvesting and recreational waters (Table 3-1) and, as such, are impaired by pathogens. The presence of pathogens is inferred from high concentrations of fecal coliform bacteria (a commonly used indicator of human pathogenic organisms). Pathogen pollution is adversely affecting existing beneficial uses, which include shellfish harvesting (i.e., sport and commercial oyster, clam, and mussel harvesting), water contact recreation (i.e., swimming, fishing) and non-contact water recreation (i.e., boating, kayaking).

This TMDL addresses the following pathogen-impaired water bodies in the Tomales Bay Watershed:

- Tomales Bay
- Lagunitas Creek
- Walker Creek
- Olema Creek

7.2.2 SOURCES

If not properly managed, the following Tomales Bay Watershed sources have the potential to discharge pathogens to surface waters: on-site sewage disposal systems (OSDSs), small wastewater treatment facilities and sewage holding ponds, boat discharges, grazing lands, dairies, equestrian facilities, and municipal runoff. Pathogens sources are identified based on elevated coliform bacteria levels downstream of identified land uses or facilities and from documentation of inadequately treated human waste discharges.

- The Walker Creek watershed is dominated by grazing lands. Coliform bacteria levels and coliform loads from the Walker Creek watershed are extremely high during storm periods and a significant coliform source to Tomales Bay.
- High coliform levels detected in storm drains indicate that municipal runoff is a pathogens source.
- High coliform levels and loads downstream of residential homes and equestrian facilities suggest that failing septic systems, municipal runoff, and equestrian facilities are coliform sources.
- The Water Board regulates ten small wastewater treatment facilities and sewage holding ponds and prohibits direct discharges from these facilities into Tomales Bay or its tributaries. Four facilities have holding ponds and are permitted to discharge treated effluent to irrigation fields in the dry season. The other six wastewater treatment facilities utilize leach fields for dispersing treated effluent. Accidental malfunctions, including the breaching of ponds, a break in a sewage line, or land application when soil is saturated or

it is raining, could result in discharge of untreated or partially treated effluent. Therefore, these facilities are considered potential sources.

In addition to the above sources, warm-blooded mammals and birds that reside in the watershed and Bay produce coliform bacteria. During non-storm periods Tomales Bay coliform levels are typically below the water quality objectives for shellfish harvesting waters, indicating that in-Bay wildlife such as seals and birds are not significant sources. Approximately 30% of the lands draining to Tomales Bay are open space forested lands. Water quality monitoring of a watershed on the western shoreline of Tomales Bay with minimal human influences suggests that waters draining open space areas are below tributary bacteria water quality objectives and therefore terrestrial wildlife are not a significant source.

7.2.3 NUMERIC TARGETS

Table 7-2 contains the numeric water quality targets for the Tomales Bay Watershed Pathogens TMDL. The coliform bacteria targets are based on fecal coliform bacteria concentrations aimed at protecting shellfish harvesting and contact and non-contact water recreation beneficial uses. These density-based numeric targets define bacterial densities associated with minimal risk to humans and are the same as the water quality objectives contained in Table 3-1. The Tomales Bay targets are intended to protect the most sensitive beneficial use, shellfish harvesting. The tributary targets are intended to protect recreational uses. An additional numeric target for Tomales Bay is expressed as the number of days commercial shellfish growing areas are subjected to harvest closures due to elevated water column bacteria densities. Consistent with the definition of "threatened conditions" in the California Shellfish Protection Act, Tomales Bay shellfish growing areas shall not be closed for harvest for more than 30 days per calendar year. The California Department of Health Services requires shellfish growing areas to close for harvesting when 24-hour and 10-day rainfall totals exceed established thresholds. Rainfall thresholds are established based on the relationship between rainfall and observed fecal coliform levels in Bay waters and shellfish.

In addition, no human waste (raw sewage or inadequately treated waste) shall be discharged to Tomales Bay or its tributaries. The no human waste discharge target is consistent with Discharge Prohibitions 5 and 15, contained in Table 4-1. This target is necessary because human waste is a significant source of pathogenic organisms, including viruses; and attainment of fecal coliform targets alone may not sufficiently protect human health. The coliform bacteria targets, in combination with the human waste discharge prohibitions and the shellfish harvesting closure targets, are the basis for the TMDL and load allocations, and fully protect beneficial uses.

7.2.4 TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD

Table 7-3 lists the Tomales Bay Watershed Pathogens TMDL. The TMDL consists of the density-based coliform bacteria TMDL targets. The TMDL ensures protection of water contact recreational uses and Bay shellfish harvesting, thereby minimizing human exposure to disease causing pathogens.

7.2.5 LOAD ALLOCATIONS

TMDL targets are an interpretation of water quality standards, whereas TMDL allocations specify the amount (or concentration) of a pollutant that can be discharged to a waterbody such that standards are attained in both the receiving waterbody and all downstream waters. Table 7-4A presents density-based load allocations for Tomales Bay watersheds pathogens source categories that implement tributary targets, and Table 7-4B presents allocations to major tributaries, where they discharge to Tomales Bay, and implement the Bay targets. Load allocations to the tributaries reflect the highest fecal coliform concentrations that can be discharged while still attaining and maintaining the Bay shellfish harvesting water quality objectives. All entities in a watershed are responsible for meeting their source category allocation (Table 7-4A) and the applicable geographic-based allocations (Table 7-4B).

Discharging entities will not be held responsible for uncontrollable coliform discharges originating from wildlife. If wildlife contributions are determined to be the cause of exceedances, the TMDL targets and allocation scheme will be revisited as part of the adaptive implementation program. The discharge of human waste is prohibited. All sources of human waste have an allocation of zero. Nonpoint source runoff containing coliform bacteria of animal and wildlife origin, at levels that do not result in exceedances of water objectives, does not constitute wastewater with particular characteristics of concern to beneficial uses. Therefore, animal- and wildlife-associated discharges, in compliance with the conditions of this TMDL, do not constitute a violation of applicable discharge prohibitions.

7.2.6 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The Tomales Bay Watershed Pathogens TMDL Implementation Plan builds upon previous and ongoing successful efforts to reduce pathogen loads in Tomales Bay and its tributaries. The plan requires actions consistent with the California Water Code (CWC 13000 et seq.), the state's Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program Plan (CWC Section 13369), the Policy for Implementation and Enforcement of the Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program¹, and human waste discharge prohibitions (Prohibitions 5 and 15, Table 4-1).

This plan specifies required implementation measures (Table 7-5) for each of the source categories (Table 7-4). These implementation measures include evaluation of operating practices, development of comprehensive site-specific pathogens control measures and an implementation schedule for such management measures, and submittal of progress reports documenting actions undertaken. Progress reports may be submitted directly to the Water Board or, if designated, through third parties. These progress reports will serve as documentation that source reduction measures are being implemented. While third parties may provide valuable assistance to TMDL implementation, the discharger is the entity responsible for complying with the specified regulations and regulatory controls. Responsible parties within each source category are required to implement the measures as specified in Table 7-5. The numeric targets and load allocations are not directly enforceable. For purpose of demonstrating attainment of applicable allocations, responsible parties will only be responsible for compliance with specified implementation measures and applicable waste discharge requirements or waiver conditions.

¹ State Water Resources Control Board. 2004. *Policy for Implementation and Enforcement of the Nonpoint Source Pollution Prevention Control Program*.

The state's Policy for Implementation and Enforcement of the Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program requires that current and proposed nonpoint source discharges are regulated under waste discharge requirements (WDRs), waiver of waste discharge requirements, Basin Plan prohibitions, or some combination of these tools. Table 7-6 describes the method that will be used to regulate dischargers in each source category. The Water Board has established conditions for waiving WDRs for dairies. The Water Board intends to work with stakeholders to develop similar waiver conditions for grazing lands and equestrian facilities by 2009.

7.2.6.1 AGRICULTURAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL PROGRAM COSTS

The implementation measures for grazing lands and dairies constitute an agricultural water quality control program and therefore, consistent with California Water Code requirements (Section 13141), the cost of the program is estimated herein. The total program implementation cost for these agricultural sources is estimated to range between \$900,000 – \$2 million per year over the next 10 years. The estimated cost will be shared by Tomales Bay watershed grazing lands operators (approximately 150). This estimate includes the cost of implementing animal waste control and grazing management measures and is based on costs associated with technical assistance and evaluation, installation of water troughs, and cattle control fencing along all streams. The program cost estimate may be high as it does not account for implementation actions already underway or areas that may not require fencing. Besides fencing, other acceptable methods of managing livestock access to streams are not included in this cost estimate due to variability in costs and site specific applicability. Potential financing sources include federal and state water quality grants and federal agricultural grants.

7.2.6.2 EVALUATION AND MONITORING

Dischargers, stakeholders, and Water Board staff will conduct water quality monitoring to evaluate fecal coliform concentration trends in Tomales Bay and its tributaries. Five years after TMDL adoption, the Water Board will evaluate monitoring results and assess progress made toward attaining TMDL targets (Table 7-2) and load allocations (Table 7-4).

In 2009 and approximately every five years after the adoption of the TMDL, the Water Board will evaluate site specific, sub-watershed specific, and watershed-wide compliance with the trackable implementation measures specified in Table 7-5. In evaluating compliance with the trackable implementation measures, the Water Board will consider the level of participation of each source category as well as individual dischargers (as documented by Water Board staff or third parties).

If a discharger demonstrates that all implementation measures have been undertaken or that it is infeasible to meet their allocation due to wildlife contributions, the Water Board will consider revising allocations as appropriate. If source control actions are fully implemented throughout the Watershed and the TMDL targets are not met, the Water Board may consider re-evaluating or revising the TMDL and allocations. If, on the other hand, the required actions are not fully implemented, or are partially implemented, the Water Board may consider regulatory or enforcement action against parties or individual dischargers not in compliance.

The California Department of Health Services, working in consultation with the Shellfish Technical Advisory Committee, is encouraged to periodically evaluate, beginning in 2009,

shellfish harvest closure guidelines and the relationship between precipitation, runoff, coliform levels, and water quality exceedances.

In order to assess water quality improvements and obtain additional information for further refinement of the TMDL, Water Board staff and stakeholders will collaborate in monitoring efforts. The main objectives of the Monitoring Program are to:

- Assess attainment of TMDL targets;
- Evaluate spatial and temporal water quality trends in the Bay and its tributaries;
- Further identify significant pathogens source areas;
- Evaluate coliform levels and loadings to the Bay at the terminus of major tributaries.
- Collect sufficient data to calibrate and validate the Bay hydrodynamic model to observed coliform levels; and
- Collect sufficient data to prioritize implementation efforts and assess the effectiveness of implementation actions.

Table 7-7 outlines the locations, constituents, sampling frequency, analytical methods, and the sampling entities for a baseline water quality monitoring program. Additional monitoring will be conducted as needed if funds are available. The Water Board, in coordination with the sampling entities and interested third parties, such as National Park Service, California Department of Health Services, commercial shellfish growers, the Inverness Public Utility District, and the Salmon Protection and Watershed Network will implement this long-term water quality monitoring program. All water quality monitoring (including Quality Assurance and Quality Control procedures) will be performed pursuant to the State Water Board's Quality Assurance Management Plan for the Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program.

7.2.6.3 ADAPTIVE IMPLEMENTATION

Approximately every five years, the Water Board will review the Tomales Bay Watershed Pathogens TMDL and evaluate new and relevant information from monitoring, special studies, and scientific literature. The reviews will be coordinated through the Water Board's continuing planning program and will provide opportunities for stakeholder participation. Any necessary modifications to the targets, allocations, or implementation plan will be incorporated into the Basin Plan. In evaluating necessary modifications, the Water Board will favor actions that reduce sediment and nutrient loads, pollutants for which the Tomales Bay Watershed is also impaired. At a minimum, the following questions will be used to conduct the reviews. Additional questions will be developed in collaboration with stakeholders during each review.

1. Are the Bay and the tributaries progressing toward TMDL targets as expected? If progress is unclear, how should monitoring efforts be modified to detect trends? If there has not been adequate progress, how might the implementation actions or allocations be modified?
2. What are the pollutant loads for the various source categories (including naturally occurring background pathogen contributions and the contribution from open space lands), how have these loads changed over time, how do they vary seasonally, and how might source control measures be modified to improve load reduction?

3. Is there new, reliable, and widely accepted scientific information that suggests modifications to targets, allocations, or implementation actions? If so, how should the TMDL be modified?
4. The allocations assume a conservative bacterial die-off rate of 0.02 per hour. This value is based on rates reported for San Francisco Bay in 1970. If bacterial die-off is found to be higher, higher allocations may be considered. What are bacterial die-off rates in the water column and stream sediments? Do they vary by season? What are bacteria transport times from sources to the Bay?
5. How does estuarine mixing and dilution of tributary waters vary by flow and season?
6. What is the relationship between precipitation, runoff, tributary loads, Bay coliform levels, and water quality exceedances and shellfish harvesting closures?
7. Are there bacteria in Tomales Bay sediments that enter the water column during storm events? If yes, how should this process be accounted for?

If it is demonstrated that all reasonable and feasible source control measures have been implemented for a sufficient period of time and TMDL targets are still not being met, the Water Board will reevaluate water quality standards, TMDL targets and allocations as appropriate.

7.3 WATER QUALITY ATTAINMENT STRATEGY AND TMDL FOR DIAZINON AND PESTICIDE-RELATED TOXICITY IN URBAN CREEKS

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

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

7.3.1 PROBLEM STATEMENT

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

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

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

7.3.2 NUMERIC TARGETS

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

7.3.2.1 PESTICIDE-RELATED TOXICITY

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

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

7.3.2.2 DIAZINON

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

7.3.3 SOURCES

Pesticides, including diazinon, enter urban creeks through urban runoff. Most urban runoff flows through storm drains owned and operated by the Region's municipalities, industrial dischargers, large institutions (e.g., campuses), construction dischargers, and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Urban runoff contains pesticides as a result of pesticides being manufactured, formulated into products, and sold through distributors and retailers to businesses and individuals who apply them for structural pest control, landscape maintenance, agricultural, and other pest management purposes. Factors that affect pesticide concentrations in urban creeks include the amount used, the chemical and physical properties of the pesticide and its product formulation, the sites of use (e.g., landscaping, turf, or paved surfaces), and irrigation practices and precipitation. In the San Francisco Bay Region, ants are the most common pest problem for which pesticides are used. Argentine ants are an introduced species. Pesticide use by structural pest control professionals and use of products sold over-the-counter can be among the greatest contributors of pesticides in urban runoff.

7.3.4 TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD

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

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

7.3.5 ALLOCATIONS

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

7.3.6 IMPLEMENTATION

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

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

The term “less toxic pest control,” as used here, refers to the use of pest control strategies selected to minimize the potential for pesticide-related toxicity in water and sediment. Strategy implementation will focus on three areas: (1) regulatory programs, (2) education and outreach, and (3) research and monitoring. Regulatory programs will prevent pollution by using existing regulatory tools to ensure that pesticides are not applied in a manner that results in discharges that threaten urban creek uses. Education and outreach programs will focus on decreasing demand for pesticides that threaten water quality, while increasing awareness of alternatives that pose less risk to water quality. Research will fill existing information gaps, and monitoring will be used to measure implementation progress and success. The actions described below are intended to address these strategic goals.

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

7.3.6.1 WATER BOARD ACTIONS

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

- Track U.S. EPA pesticide evaluation and registration activities as they relate to surface water quality and share monitoring and research data with U.S. EPA;
- When necessary, request that U.S. EPA coordinate implementation of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Clean Water Act;
- Encourage U.S. EPA to fully address urban water quality concerns within its pesticide registration process;

- Work with the California Department of Pesticide Regulation, County Agricultural Commissioners, and the Structural Pest Control Board to ensure that pesticide applications result in discharges that comply with water quality standards;
- Interpret water quality standards for the California Department of Pesticide Regulation and County Agricultural Commissioners, and assemble available information (such as monitoring data) to assist the California Department of Pesticide Regulation and County Agricultural Commissioners in taking actions necessary to protect water quality; and
- Use authorities (e.g., through permits or waste discharge requirements) to require implementation of best management practices and control measures to minimize pesticide discharges to urban creeks.

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

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

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

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

7.3.6.2 U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY ACTIONS

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

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

7.3.6.3 CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION ACTIONS

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

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

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

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

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

- Complete studies to address critical data needs (see Adaptive Implementation, below).

7.3.6.4 COLLABORATION WITHIN THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7.3.6.5 COUNTY AGRICULTURAL COMMISSIONERS ACTIONS

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

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

7.3.6.6 STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD ACTIONS

The Structural Pest Control Board is responsible for licensing structural pest control professionals. The Structural Pest Control Board requires training and examinations to maintain a license to practice structural pest control, and regulates the advertising practices of structural pest control businesses. The Structural Pest Control Board should implement the following actions:

- Through licensing and other authorities, work to ensure that structural pest control practices result in discharges that comply with water quality standards;

- Work to develop a mechanism through which consumers can determine which structural pest control providers offer services most likely to protect water quality; and
- Work to enhance initial and continuing integrated pest management training for structural pest control licensees.

7.3.6.7 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACTIONS

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

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

7.3.6.8 URBAN RUNOFF MANAGEMENT AGENCIES AND SIMILAR ENTITIES ACTIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Track U.S. EPA pesticide evaluation and registration activities as they relate to surface water quality and, when necessary, encourage U.S. EPA to coordinate implementation of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Clean Water Act and to accommodate water quality concerns within its pesticide registration process;
2. Assemble and submit information (such as monitoring data) as needed to assist the California Department of Pesticide Regulation and County Agricultural Commissioners

- in ensuring that pesticide applications within the Region comply with water quality standards; and
3. Report violations of pesticide regulations (e.g., illegal handling) to County Agricultural Commissioners.

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

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

7.3.6.9 PRIVATE ENTITIES ACTIONS

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

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

7.3.7 MONITORING

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

A number of programs monitor pesticide concentrations and toxicity in the Region's waters, including the Water Board's Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program, the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's Surface Water Protection Program, and the Regional Monitoring Program for Trace Substances. Municipal storm water NPDES permits may also

require dischargers to characterize their discharges and receiving waters. This can involve monitoring toxicity and specific pollutants, like diazinon, in storm drain systems and urban creeks.

7.3.7.1 MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

Additional types of monitoring tools may be used to support and optimize conventional water and sediment monitoring. For example, monitoring in storm drain systems or near application sites may be useful in selecting creek sampling strategies because pesticide concentrations are easier to detect nearer to the pesticide application site. Efforts to monitor parameters that can serve as surrogates or indicators of pesticide-related water quality conditions may moderate the need for more comprehensive water quality monitoring. While some toxicity and pollutant monitoring will always be necessary, extensive monitoring will be less important if other information is collected that can be used to evaluate the potential for toxicity or specific pollutants to occur in water. Alternative monitoring information can also help focus water

quality monitoring efforts and mitigation actions. Such monitoring could include reviewing pesticide sales and use data for the Region, pesticide fate and transport data, and public attitudes regarding pesticides and water quality. If undertaken, such monitoring may seek to answer the following questions:

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

7.3.7.2 MONITORING BENCHMARKS

To determine whether measured or predicted pesticide concentrations in water are cause for concern, monitoring benchmarks are needed. Ideally, water quality criteria would be used; however, water quality criteria do not exist for most pesticides. In the absence of water quality criteria, a monitoring benchmark may be calculated as follows. Such a monitoring benchmark is not a water quality objective unless adopted as such by the Water Board. Where valid tests have determined four-day LC₅₀ values for aquatic organisms (the concentration that kills one half of the test organisms), a monitoring benchmark may be calculated by dividing the lowest LC₅₀ value measured by the appropriate benchmark factor from Table 7-8 (typically 14 or less for a registered pesticide).

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

Where multiple LC₅₀ measurements are available, the lowest “genus mean acute value” may be used in place of the lowest LC₅₀. The term “genus mean acute value,” as used here, refers to the geometric mean of the available “species mean acute values” within a genus. The term “species mean acute value,” as used here, refers to the geometric mean of available four-day LC₅₀ values for each species. Other available information regarding the pesticide (such as its potential for sub-lethal effects) may also be considered to determine if lower monitoring benchmarks are appropriate to reflect attainment of the narrative objectives. Table 7-8 is not intended for deriving monitoring benchmarks for sediment tests.

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

7.3.8 ADAPTIVE IMPLEMENTATION

Adaptive implementation entails taking immediate actions commensurate with available information, reviewing new information as it becomes available, and modifying actions as

necessary based on the new information. Taking immediate action allows progress to occur while more and better information is collected and the effectiveness of current actions is evaluated. Table 7-9 lists specific actions the Water Board will use to track its progress and an implementation timeframe. If the Water Board determines that expected actions by responsible parties are not occurring or are not sufficient to attain allocations and targets, the Water Board will consider appropriate response actions to improve implementation or otherwise consider revisions to the strategy.

7.3.8.1 PERIODIC REVIEW

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

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

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

7.3.8.2 ADDITIONAL SOURCES

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

7.3.8.3 CRITICAL DATA NEEDS

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

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

TABLES

Table 7-1: Monitoring Stations for Copper and Nickel in Lower South San Francisco Bay

Table 7-2: Water Quality Targets for Tomales Bay and Its Tributaries

Table 7-3: Total Maximum Daily Load of Pathogens Indicators for Tomales Bay and Its Tributaries

Table 7-4A: Density-Based Pollutant Wasteload and Load Allocations for Dischargers of Pathogens in Tomales Bay Watershed

Table 7-4B: Density-Based Pollutant Load Allocations for Tomales Bay Tributaries

Table 7-5: Trackable Implementation Measures for the Tomales Bay Watershed Pathogens Total Maximum Daily Load

Table 7-6: Regulatory Framework for Dischargers by Source Category

Table 7-7: Baseline Water Quality Monitoring Program

Table 7-8: Benchmark Factors

Table 7-9: Water Board Implementation Measure Tracking

Table 7-1: Monitoring Stations for Copper and Nickel in Lower South San Francisco Bay

SBS Site ID	Reference Location	Longitude	Latitude	RMP Site ID
SB01	Channel Marker #14	37° 30.782'	122° 8.036'	BA30
SB02	Channel Marker #16	37° 29.595'	122° 5.243'	BA20
SB03	Channel Marker #20	37° 27.437'	122° 3.033'	BA10
SB04	Coyote Creek Railroad Bridge	37° 27.600'	121° 58.540'	C-3-0
SB05	Coyote Creek at Guadalupe River confluence	37° 27.875'	122° 1.406'	NA
SB06	Between Channel Markers #17 & #18	37° 28.390'	122° 4.180'	NA
SB07	Mouth of Mowry Slough	37° 29.499'	122° 3.110'	NA
SB08	Mouth of Newark Slough	37° 30.066'	122° 5.231'	NA
SB09	North of Cooley Landing	37° 28.959'	122° 7.068'	NA
SB10	Old Palo Alto Yacht Club Channel Mouth	37° 28.087'	122° 5.846'	NA
SB11	Standish Dam in Coyote Creek	37° 27.150'	121° 55.501'	BW10
SB12	Alviso Yacht Club Dock	37° 25.574'	121° 58.778'	BW15

Table 7-2: Water Quality Targets^a for Tomales Bay and Its Tributaries

Zero discharge of human waste

Shellfish harvest closures < 30 days/year

Coliform Bacteria Levels

(Expressed as Most Probable Number [MPN] of fecal coliforms per 100 mL of water)

Tomales Bay

Median < 14^b and 90th percentile < 43^c

Tomales Bay Tributaries

Log mean <200^b and 90th percentile < 400^c

NOTES:

- a. These targets are applicable year-round.
- b. Based on a minimum of five consecutive samples equally spaced over a 30-day period.
- c. No more than 10% of total samples during any 30-day period may exceed this number.

Table 7-3: Total Maximum Daily Load of Pathogens Indicators for Tomales Bay and Its Tributaries

Waterbody	Indicator Parameter	TMDL (Most Probable Number (MPN) of fecal coliforms per 100 mL of water)
Tomales Bay	Fecal coliform	median < 14 ^a 90 th percentile < 43 ^b
Major Tributaries: Walker Creek Lagunitas Creek Olema Creek	Fecal coliform	log mean < 200 ^a 90 th percentile < 400 ^b

NOTES:

- a. Based on a minimum of five consecutive samples equally spaced over a 30-day period.
- b. No more than 10% of total samples during any 30-day period may exceed this number.

Table 7-4A: Density-Based Pollutant Wasteload and Load Allocations^a for Dischargers of Pathogens in Tomales Bay Watershed

Categorical Pollutant Source	Wasteload and Load Allocations Fecal Coliform (MPN/100 mL)		
	For Direct Discharges to the Bay		For Discharges to Major Tomales Bay Tributaries
	Median ^b	90 th Percentile ^c	Log Mean ^b
Onsite Sewage Disposal Systems	0	0	0
Small Wastewater Treatment Facilities	0	0	0
Boat Discharges	0	0	N/A
Grazing Lands	<14	<43	< 200
Dairies	<14	<43	< 200
Equestrian Facilities	<14	<43	< 200
Municipal Runoff	<14	<43	< 200
Open space lands (terrestrial wildlife) ^d	<14	<43	< 200
In-Bay Background (marine wildlife) ^d	<14	<43	N/A

NOTES:

- a. These allocations are applicable year-round. Wasteload allocations apply to any sources (existing or future) subject to regulation by a NPDES permit.
- b. Based on a minimum of five consecutive samples equally spaced over a 30-day period.
- c. No more than 10% of total samples during any 30-day period may exceed this number.
- d. Open space lands and the Bay contain wildlife and are therefore recognized as potential source areas. These areas are not believed to be a significant source of pathogens and their contribution is considered natural background; therefore, no management measures are required.

Table 7-4B: Density-Based Pollutant Wasteload and Load Allocations for Tomales Bay Tributaries

Tributary	Allocation Fecal Coliform (MPN/100 mL) Log Mean
Walker Creek at Highway 1 Bridge	95 ^a
Lagunitas Creek at Green Bridge	95 ^a

NOTE:

- a. Based on a minimum of five consecutive samples equally spaced over a 30-day period.

Table 7-5: Trackable Implementation Measures for the Tomales Bay Watershed Pathogens Total Maximum Daily Load

Source Category	Action	Implementing Party	Completion Dates
On-Site Sewage Disposal Systems (OSDS)	Submit to the Executive Officer for approval a plan and implementation schedule to evaluate OSDS performance for the Tomales Bay watershed and to bring identified OSDS up to County's repair standards.	Marin County, Community Development Agency	January 2007
	Report progress on implementation of OSDS evaluation and repair program.	Marin County, Community Development Agency	Starting January 2011 and biennially thereafter
Small Wastewater Treatment Facilities	Comply with applicable Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs).	Small wastewater treatment facilities	As specified in the applicable WDRs
	Inspect and evaluate all permitted WDR facilities and update WDRs as warranted.	Water Board staff	January 2009
	Report progress on inspection and evaluation of WDR facilities.	Water Board staff	No less than once every five years starting in January 2009

Source Category	Action	Implementing Party	Completion Dates
Boat Discharges	In coordination with interested stakeholders in Tomales Bay, determine the adequacy of on-shore restroom facilities and boater disposal/pump out facilities, and prepare a schedule for a determination of Pumpout Facility Need and Public Hearing Notification, as appropriate.	Regional Water Board	January 2009
	Water Board will coordinate with participating agencies and rely on their interests and authorities to develop and implement a Tomales Bay boating management plan that includes: evaluation of existing moorings and water quality impacts; permitting and enforcement procedures to ensure compliance with applicable mooring requirements and to ensure no sewage discharge from boats.	Point Reyes National Seashore, California Coastal Commission, California State Lands Commission, California State Parks, County of Marin, Regional Water Board, Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary.	January 2009
	Report progress on implementation of boating management plan.	As specified in the Boating Management Plan: Point Reyes National Seashore, California Coastal Commission, California State Lands Commission, California State Parks, County of Marin, Regional Water Board, Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary	As specified in the Boating Management Plan
	Comply with boating management plan for Tomales Bay.	Boaters	As specified in the Boating Management Plan

Source Category	Action	Implementing Party	Completion Dates
Grazing Lands ¹	Submit a Report of Waste Discharge ² to the Water Board that provides the following: a description of the facility; identification of necessary site-specific grazing management measures to reduce animal waste runoff; and a schedule to implement identified management measures.	Dairies and ranchers (landowners and leasees). These Reports may be submitted individually or jointly or through a third party.	January 2009
	Comply with applicable Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) or waiver of WDRs.	Dairies and ranchers (landowners and leasees)	As specified in applicable WDRs or waiver of WDRs
	Report progress on implementation of grazing-management measures that reduce animal waste runoff.	Dairies and ranchers (landowners and leasees). These reports may be submitted individually or jointly or through a third party.	As specified in applicable WDRs or waiver of WDRs
Dairies ³	Comply with applicable Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) for confined animal facilities or requirements specified in applicable individual WDRs.	Dairies (landowners and leasees)	As specified in applicable WDRs or waiver of WDRs

¹ Grazing lands include all land areas grazed by livestock such as ranchlands, riparian areas, and pasturelands. Confined animal facilities which are already regulated under existing WDRs or waiver of WDRs and are excluded from this requirement.

² WDRs waiver conditions may allow for other submittals in lieu of a Report of Waste Discharge.

³ These implementation actions for Dairies are for the confined animal portions of the facilities and do not include the grazing areas. Implementation actions for grazing lands associated with dairies are included under Grazing lands.

Source Category	Action	Implementing Party	Completion Dates
Equestrian Facilities	Submit a Report of Waste Discharge ² to the Water Board that provides the following: a description of the facility; identification of necessary site-specific management measures to reduce animal waste runoff; and a schedule for implementation of identified management measures.	Equestrian facilities. These Reports may be submitted individually or jointly or through a third party.	January 2009
	Comply with applicable Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) or waiver of WDRs.	Equestrian facilities	As specified in applicable WDRs or waiver of WDRs.
	Report progress on implementation of management measures that reduce animal waste runoff.	Equestrian facilities. These reports may be submitted individually or jointly or through a third party.	As specified in applicable WDRs or waiver of WDRs
Municipal Runoff	Submit to Water Board for approval a stormwater management plan (that includes management measures to reduce pathogens runoff and a schedule for implementation of identified management measures.	Marin County, Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program	January 2009
	Report progress on implementation of pathogens-reduction measures.	Marin County, Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program	As specified in approved stormwater management plan

Table 7-6: Regulatory Framework for Discharges by Source Category

Source Category	Regulatory Tool
On-site Sewage Disposal Systems (OSDS)	Waiver ^a of Waste Discharge Requirements Prohibition of Human Waste Discharge
Small Wastewater Treatment Facilities	Individual Waste Discharge Requirements Prohibition of Human Waste Discharge
Boat Discharges	Prohibition of Human Waste Discharge
Grazing Lands	Waiver ^a of Waste Discharge Requirements
Dairies	Waiver ^a of Waste Discharge Requirements or Individual WDRs, as appropriate
Equestrian Facilities	Waiver ^a of Waste Discharge Requirements
Municipal Runoff	NPDES Permit

NOTE:

- a. Water Board retains the option of requiring individual waste discharge requirements or compliance with a discharge prohibition, as appropriate.

Table 7-7: Baseline Water Quality Monitoring Program

Constituent	Location	Frequency	Sampling Entities
<i>Tomales Bay</i>			
Fecal coliform ^a	California Department of Health Services designated primary water quality monitoring stations	Weekly for five weeks beginning in January; Monthly March – December Weekly for five weeks during summer months	Shellfish growers
<i>Tributaries</i>			
Fecal coliform Stream Flow	Olema Creek (tributary to Lagunitas)	Weekly for five weeks beginning in January; Monthly March - December Weekly for five weeks during summer months	National Park Service
Fecal coliform	West Shore tributaries	Same as above	Inverness Public Utilities District
Fecal coliform	East Shore tributaries	Same as above	Water Board
Fecal coliform Stream Flow	Lagunitas Creek	Same as above	Water Board, Salmon Protection and Watershed Network
Fecal coliform Stream Flow	Walker Creek	Same as above	Water Board

NOTE:

- a. *E. coli* monitoring may be used in the future to assess general water quality trends and exceedances. If *E. coli* is used, a Tomales Bay specific correlation factor linking fecal coliform and *E. coli* levels will need to be established.

Table 7-8: Benchmark Factors

Number of Data Requirements Satisfied ^a	Benchmark Factor ^b
2	16
3	14
4	14
5	12
6	10
7	8

NOTES:

- a. U.S. EPA water quality criteria guidelines require data for at least eight taxonomic families to derive water quality criteria.
- b. These values apply only when both daphnid and salmonid toxicity data are available. U.S. EPA typically requires such data to register a pesticide.

Table 7-9: Water Board Implementation Measure Tracking

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