

**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
ON THE
2024 JOINT TRIENNIAL REVIEW OF THE WATER QUALITY CONTROL
PLANS FOR THE SACRAMENTO AND SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASINS AND
TULARE LAKE BASIN**

This document summarizes comments pertaining to the 2024 Triennial Review of the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins and Tulare Lake Basin (Basin Plans) received by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Central Valley Water Board or Board) and provides staff responses to those comments.

In this document comments are listed in chronological order and are referred to by number as indicated in the following table. The comment letters below were submitted in response to the Central Valley Water Board’s 05 January 2024 Solicitation Notice.

Comment No.	Comment Date	Organization	Representative
1	14 Feb 2024	Valley Water Management Company (Valley Water)	Melissa Thorne
2	16 Feb 2024	California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)	Morgan Kilgour, Julie A. Vance
3	21 Feb 2024	Muck Valley Hydroelectric, LP (Muck Valley)	David Bates
4	21 Feb 2024	California Coastkeeper Alliance (CCKA)	Cody Phillips
5	21 Feb 2024	U.S. EPA Region 9 (USEPA)	Matthew Mitchell
6	21 Feb 2024	California Valley Clean Water Association (CVCWA)	Debbie Mackey
7	21 Feb 2024	Save California Salmon, Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman's Associations, Institute for Fisheries Resources	Regina Chichizola, Glen H. Spain
8	21 Feb 2024	Pit River Tribe, Mount Shasta Bioregional Ecological Center, Trout Unlimited	Yatch Bamford, Michelle Berditshevsky, Sam Davidson, Jennifer Clary

1. Valley Water Management Company (Valley Water)

1A Comment:

Valley Water Management Company (Valley Water), as an active member of CV-SALTS and the Central Valley Salinity Coalition, expressed its support of the CV-SALTS program as a high-priority to not only provide a plan for addressing salt and nitrates in groundwater, but also to provide more certainty on the regulatory side.

1A Response:

Board staff note and appreciate the commenter's continued support of the CV-SALTS program.

1B Comment:

Valley Water commented on the Central Valley Water Board's blanket beneficial use designations for both municipal drinking water (MUN) use and agricultural (AGR) use. Valley Water recommended that Project 4 be elevated to Rank 1.

1B Response:

Board staff appreciate the comment but have determined Project 4 (MUN and AGR in Oil Production Zones) is ranked appropriately based on prioritization criteria. Board staff are actively undertaking two separate Basin Plan Amendments and will begin a third once a revised workplan is provided from California Independent Petroleum Association to address beneficial use designations in the oil production zones. Project 4 describes multiple projects that Board staff work on related to evaluation of beneficial use designations for MUN and AGR. While the Board is under a legally-enforceable order to evaluate de-designation efforts for one project, this is not an umbrella order for all Basin Plan amendments that fall under this project. Therefore, Project 4 remains as originally ranked, but Board staff acknowledge the legal order to complete the evaluation of MUN and AGR for groundwater located north of the town of McKittrick and are working expeditiously to bring that Basin Plan Amendment to the Board for consideration.

1C Comment:

Valley Water recommended that the Central Valley Water Board address and elevate Project 15 to Rank 2 as a special status project. Valley Water proposed the following additional prioritization criteria for Project 15:

- Project Addresses Tribal Interests or Specifically Addresses the Human Right to Water
- Projects to Address Impediments to Water Recycling/ Efficient Use/ Integrated Water Management
- Complements Prior Work
- Addresses 303(d) Water Quality Impairment or Threat to Impairment

1C Response:

Board staff appreciate the comment but do not concur with Valley Water’s recommended additional prioritization criteria. Board staff have determined that Project 15 (Re-evaluation of the Prospective- Incorporation-by-Reference of the Maximum Contaminant Levels) is ranked appropriately based on prioritization criteria. Board staff disagree that the project is needed to correct legal issues as prospective incorporation by reference has specifically been allowed by the courts (see *California Association of Sanitation Agencies v. State Water Resources Control Board* (2012) 208 Cal.App.4th 1438, 1468.) Furthermore, Rank 2 is reserved for projects the Board specifically directs as a high-priority.

2. California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)

2A Comment:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) recommended elevating Project 11 to Rank 2. CDFW is concerned with continued failure to obtain suitable temperatures for aquatic resources in the Central Valley, which has contributed to the decline of Central Valley salmonids through temperature-related mortality and recommended that the Central Valley Water Board prioritize Project 11 for implementation. CDFW proposes that Project 11 also meets a fifth prioritization criteria, “Efficient Use of Board or Public Resources.”

2A Response:

The Draft Workplan has been revised to reflect the additional prioritization criterion recommended by the commenter for Project 11 (Temperature Criteria and Objectives). While Project 11 qualifies for five criteria, Board staff have determined this project is ranked appropriately as additional prioritization criteria do not elevate ranking beyond Rank 3. Furthermore, Rank 2 is reserved for projects the Board specifically directs as a high priority.

See 2024 Triennial Review Draft Workplan, Table 4.

2B Comment:

CDFW recommended implementing Project 28 to evaluate if current selenium criteria protect fish and wildlife beneficial uses. CDFW also advised that Project 28 consider additional constituents of concern, including but not limited to salinity, nitrates, metals, pesticides, and endocrine disruptors.

2B Response:

Board staff appreciate the recommendations. The Central Valley Water Board has put an abundance of staff resources into developing site-specific selenium objectives for waterbodies and has seen no evidence that these objectives are not protective. Board staff will continue to diligently collect data and evaluate the protectiveness of the selenium objectives. If Board staff find that current selenium objectives are insufficient to protect beneficial uses, Board staff will seek additional resources and measures to address the issue. Please see Project 25

(formerly Project 28; Evaluation of Selenium Criteria's Protectiveness of Beneficial Uses) for updates on the Central Valley Water Board's existing efforts to address selenium impacts within the Region.

Through the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, dischargers are currently collecting data on additional constituents outside of selenium that may pose a threat to beneficial uses in the Region and staff will continue to monitor other constituents of concern as the data is collected. Given the current efforts and activities the Board continues to implement, there is not a need to expand Project 25 at this time.

2C Comment:

CDFW recommended that the Central Valley Water Board work with CDFW to identify and designate waterbodies and associated habitat falling within the beneficial use category of Rare, Threatened, or Endangered Species (RARE). Given the importance for groundwater and surface water beneficial uses for the Tulare Lake Basin, CDFW recommended adding the Tulare Lake Basin to the scope of Project 32 to identify waterbodies and habitat within the Tulare Lake Basin meeting the criteria for the RARE beneficial use category. CDFW recommended that the Central Valley Water Board consider adding the RARE beneficial surface water use to the following streams:

- Kings River from Pine Flat Dam to the Stinson Weir on North Fork and to Empire Weir No. 2 on the South Fork
- Kaweah River from Lake Kaweah and below Lake Kaweah
- Tule River from Lake Success to below Lake Success
- Kern River from Lake Isabella and downstream
- Mill Creek source to Kings River
- Other Eastside Streams (from Table 2-1 of the Tulare Lake Basin Plan).

CDFW also recommended that, since there may be multiple streams with the same name (such as Deer and Mill Creeks), the Workplan include a map for the locations for these waterbodies. CDFW believes that Project 32 protects public trust resources by designating RARE beneficial uses to surface waters and would therefore meet a second criteria of "Efficient Use of Board or Public Resources", as application of beneficial use designations builds upon existing CDFW information on the status and location of rare, threatened, or endangered species.

2C Response:

Board staff appreciate this comment. Rather than add the Tulare Lake Basin to Project 29 (formerly Project 32; Designate RARE, GWR, and FRSH Beneficial Uses for Waterbodies in the Sacramento River Basin and San Joaquin River Basin), Board staff have developed a new project to capture this recommendation as well as a subsequent comment from CDFW regarding the designation of BIOL in the Tulare Lake Basin. Additionally, Board staff added the additional prioritization criterion recommended by CDFW to Project 29 and the new Project 33. Board staff appreciate the recommendation to add a map to these project factsheets but have determined not to include one because that is

outside the scope of the Triennial Review workplan. Waterbody assessment and visualization pursuant to this project will be performed once resources are allocated.

See 2024 Triennial Review Draft Workplan, Table 4.

See 2024 Triennial Review Draft Workplan, Appendix 1, Project 33 - Designate Beneficial Uses of RARE and BIOL for Waterbodies in the Tulare Lake Basin.

2D Comment:

CDFW recommended the Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems (GDEs) that were mapped as part of Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) compliance be used to designate where the Ground Water Recharge (GWR) beneficial use should apply within the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins. As not all Groundwater Sustainability Plans have sufficiently identified the GDEs within their groundwater basins, CDFW recommended including the use of alternative information sources to identify all GDEs for the purpose of designating where the GWR beneficial use may apply. CDFW recommended that the Central Valley Water Board also partner with CDFW to identify waterbodies and habitats within the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins meeting the criteria for the beneficial use categories of GWR and Freshwater Replenishment (FRSH), components of Workplan Project 32, and designate those beneficial uses to waterbodies as applicable in the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins.

2D Response:

Board staff appreciate this comment and have revised Project 29 (formerly Project 32; Designate RARE, GWR, and FRSH Beneficial Uses for Waterbodies in the Sacramento River Basin and San Joaquin River Basin) to include GWR and FRSH beneficial uses.

See 2024 Triennial Review Draft Workplan, Appendix 1, Project 29 - Designate RARE, GWR, and FRSH Beneficial Uses for Waterbodies in the Sacramento River Basin and San Joaquin River Basin.

2E Comment:

CDFW recommended identifying waterbodies in the Tulare Lake Basin that meet the criteria for Preservation of Biological Habitats of Special Significance (BIOL) and assigning this beneficial use to those waterbodies.

2E Response:

Board staff appreciate this comment and have developed a new project accordingly.

See 2024 Triennial Review Draft Workplan, Appendix 1, Project 33 - Designate Beneficial Uses of RARE and BIOL for Waterbodies in the Tulare Lake Basin.

2F Comment:

CDFW commented that while the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) sets flow requirements, CDFW recommends that the Central Valley Water Board work with the State Water Board to implement the California Environmental Flows Framework (CEFF) approach to evaluate beneficial uses, determine ecological flow needs, and inform regulatory actions. CDFW encouraged the Central Valley Water Board to implement the CEFF approach across the Region using the tools and resources developed by the technical subcommittee composed of scientists from academia, state agencies (including CDFW and the State Water Board), research organizations, and non-governmental organizations.

2F Response:

Board staff appreciate the comment. There are numerous projects being conducted in the Region that are, or will be, affecting flow. These projects include, but are not limited to San Joaquin River restoration, SGMA, water storage projects, and potential voluntary flow agreements. As these projects are implemented, Board staff will continue to ensure water quality is protected. Furthermore, the Central Valley Water Board will continue to collaborate with State Board Water Rights staff on flow regulation as water quantity is assessed and considered.

2G Comment:

CDFW recommended that the Central Valley Water Board develop numeric biostimulatory objectives using the robust scientific evidence and tools that are currently available to address water quality impairments.

2G Response:

Board staff appreciate this comment and are supporting ongoing efforts on part of the State Water Board to develop statewide biostimulatory objectives. Board staff have participated in the Regulatory Group associated with the State Water Board's Biostimulation, Cyanotoxins, and Biological Condition Provisions (Provisions) and continue to collaborate with State Water Board staff to provide input relevant to the Central Valley on the development of the Provisions.

3. Muck Valley Hydroelectric, LP (Muck Valley)**3A Comment:**

Muck Valley Hydroelectric (Muck Valley) recommended that the Central Valley Water Board revise the water quality objectives as related to turbidity for the upper Pit River based upon further studies into water quality. Muck Valley believes the current Basin Plan objectives for turbidity hold its facility to an unfair and unachievable standard due to high natural levels of turbidity and the agricultural influence of nutrients and organic material of the received water.

3A Response:

Based on meetings between Regional and State Water Boards' staff and Muck Valley representatives, it is Board staff's understanding that the 401 certification is the regulatory mechanism for addressing Muck Valley's compliance with turbidity objectives.

Board staff reviewed the supporting documentation provided by Muck Valley and acknowledge that the turbidity of the Pit River is variable due to myriad factors. However, this variability is accounted for by the current Basin Plan objective for turbidity, which provides quantitative allowances for increases in turbidity across various ranges of "natural turbidity". Therefore, Board staff believe Muck Valley's request would be better addressed through coordination with the Water Boards' 401 Certification staff. Board staff will direct Muck Valley to the appropriate contacts for its request.

4. California Coastkeeper Alliance (CCKA)**4A Comment:**

The California Coastkeeper Alliance (CCKA) recommended that the Central Valley Water Board develop regional narrative flow objectives. CCKA commented that Tribal cultures and threatened aquatic life are widespread within the Central Valley Water Board's jurisdiction, and that it is imperative that the Board adopt a narrative, regional water quality objective, like the example objective provided by the EPA, with a recognition of tribal cultural uses.

4A Response:

Please see the response to comment 2F.

4B Comment:

CCKA recommended that the Central Valley Water Board adopt specific numeric flow objectives for waterways where instream flow studies have been completed. When specific instream numbers designed to protect aquatic life are readily available, the Central Valley Water Board should adopt those numbers as numeric water quality objectives to protect aquatic life uses.

4B Response:

Please see the response to 2F.

5. U.S. EPA Region 9 (USEPA)**5A Comment:**

U.S. EPA Region 9 (USEPA) commented that to comply with 40 C.F.R. Part 131.20, a state's Triennial Review must include an explanation if the State does not adopt new or revised criteria for parameters for which USEPA has published new or updated Clean Water Act (CWA) section 304(a) criteria recommendations. USEPA notes that while the project description in the Central Valley Water Board's 2021 Joint Triennial Review

outlined a process for evaluation of the applicability of USEPA 304(a) criteria to assist with compliance with narrative objectives, the Board did not provide an explanation as to why it does not plan to adopt new or revised criteria for parameters on the 304(a) criteria list.

5A Response:

Board staff appreciate this comment and have included language in Section I: Introduction of the Draft Workplan to satisfy the 40 C.F.R. Part 131.20 requirement. Additionally, staff have recommended Project 14 (Review of Proposed USEPA Water Quality Criteria and 304(a) Criteria) for removal based on discussion with USEPA.

5B Comment:

USEPA recommended that the Central Valley Water Board evaluate its selenium Basin Plan objectives for protectiveness of beneficial uses. USEPA also recommended that the Central Valley Water Board's selenium water quality objectives provide protection equivalent to USEPA's 2016 304(a) selenium criteria, particularly in waters that currently have site-specific selenium objectives including the Lower San Joaquin River, Mud Slough, and Salt Slough.

5B Response:

Board staff appreciate the comment. The Central Valley Water Board has put an abundance of staff resources into developing objectives for specific waterbodies and has seen no evidence that its objectives are not protective. Please see Project 25 (formerly Project 28; Evaluation of Selenium Criteria's Protectiveness of Beneficial Uses) for updates on the Central Valley Water Board's existing efforts to address selenium impacts within the Region.

Board staff will continue to diligently collect data and evaluate the protectiveness of the selenium objectives. If Board staff find that current mitigation efforts are insufficient to protect beneficial uses, Board staff will seek additional resources and measures to address the issue.

5C Comment:

USEPA recommended that the Central Valley Water Board should review all waterbody designations and add COMM to any freshwaters that should be covered for recreational/sport fishing for consumption.

5C Response:

Board staff appreciate this comment and have developed a new project accordingly.

See 2024 Triennial Review Draft Workplan, Appendix 1, Project 34 - Evaluation and Designation for COMM.

6. California Valley Clean Water Association (CVCWA)

6A Comment:

The Central Valley Clean Water Association (CVCWA) recommended increasing the priority on re-evaluating the prospective incorporation-by-reference of MCLs as water quality objectives in the Basin Plans.

6A Response:

Board staff appreciate the comment, but Project 15 (Re-evaluation of the Prospective- Incorporation-by-Reference of the Maximum Contaminant Levels) does not qualify for additional prioritization criteria. At this time, staff have determined that Project 15 is ranked appropriately based on prioritization criteria.

6B Comment:

CVCWA recommended an increased prioritization and allocation of staff resources for the Delta Methylmercury Control Program.

6B Response:

Board staff appreciate the comment and the support for the Board's efforts. Project 20 (formerly Project 23; Delta Mercury Control Program) is already ranked as high as possible as Rank 1. Staff resources are currently assigned to this project and have been in previous Fiscal Years 20/21, 21/22, 22/23, 23/24. Board staff will continue to work diligently on the Delta Mercury Control Program.

6C Comment:

CVCWA indicated their support of the Central Valley Water Board efforts to find areas of coordination with Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR). CVCWA commented that there needs to be more interagency discussions, and CVCWA encouraged the Central Valley Water Board to allocate staff resources to find areas for improvement with pesticide registration, detection, and application practices to address water quality concerns.

6C Response:

Board staff appreciate the support and recommendation. The Water Boards and DPR have responsibilities and distinct authorities to protect water quality from the potential adverse effects of pesticides. Both agencies concur that the State benefits from a unified and cooperative program to protect water quality related to the use of pesticides. Therefore, the agencies, including the Central Valley Water Board, maintain a formal coordination as defined in the Management Agency Agreement between the State Water Board and DPR. The Central Valley Water Board will continue to collaborate with DPR in the Board's ongoing efforts to improve water quality related to pesticides in the Region.

6D Comment:

CVCWA commented that the Central Valley Water Board's Basin Plan Amendment for the Region-Wide MUN Evaluation Process in Agriculturally Dominated Surface Water Bodies and Removing MUN from 231 Constructed or Modified Ag Drains (R5-2017-0088) is not fully approved or in effect and has not been considered at the State Water Board. CVCWA requested an update on the status of the State Water Board's engagement and review of this amendment.

6D Response:

The Region-Wide MUN Evaluation Process in Agriculturally Dominated Surface Water Bodies and Removing MUN from 231 Constructed or Modified Ag Drains (R5-2017-0088) has been allocated resources in FY 24/25. Board staff will review the previous Basin Plan Amendment and other relevant documents, as well as coordinate internal meetings to develop a plan to revise the Basin Plan Amendment. The revisions will address questions and concerns raised by the State Water Board. As with all Basin Plan Amendments, all revisions will be subject to regulations requiring public and tribal engagement, review, and opportunity to comment.

See 2024 Triennial Review Draft Workplan, Appendix 1, Project 35 - Region-Wide MUN Evaluation Process in Agriculturally Dominated Surface Water Bodies and Removing MUN from 231 Constructed or Modified Ag Drains in the San Luis Canal Company District (R5-2017-0088).

7. Save California Salmon, Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman's Associations, Institute for Fisheries Resources**7A Comment:**

Save California Salmon, et al. recommended that the Central Valley Water Board include temperature objectives that reflect the best available science for salmonid-bearing rivers that are protective of the fisheries in each watershed of the Central Valley in the Basin Plan. The Commenters recommended that a temperature standard that is protective of Chinook Salmon eggs should be applied to all salmon-bearing rivers in the Central Valley at the downstream end of reaches where Chinook Salmon spawn and where human management can potentially affect water temperatures.

7A Response:

Board staff appreciate the comment and recommendation. Project 11 (Temperature Criteria and Objectives) outlines the challenges surrounding the development and implementation of temperature objectives. Staff will continue to collaborate with the State Water Board's Division of Water Rights to evaluate unresolved temperature criteria questions and uncertainties, including continued special studies to investigate temperature standards that are protective to all salmon-bearing rivers in the Central Valley Region. Project 11 is currently ranked as Rank 3 and will be diligently worked on as staffing and resources allow.

7B Comment:

Save California Salmon, et al. recommended the Central Valley Water Board review the Sites Reservoir and its impacts to water quality.

7B Response:

Board staff appreciate the comment. Board staff will continue to collaborate with State Water Board permitting programs to ensure that appropriate data is being collected to address potential water quality concerns.

7C Comment:

Save California Salmon, et al. recommended that the Central Valley Water Board evaluate and analyze the impacts that the Delta Conveyance Project will have on water quality throughout the Central Valley.

7C Response:

Board staff appreciate the comment. Please see the response to 7B.

7D Comment:

Save California Salmon, et al. indicated their support for the Tribal Beneficial Uses (TBU) Project, including the designation of Tribal Tradition and Culture (CUL), Tribal Subsistence Fishing (T-SUB), and Subsistence Fishing (SUB) beneficial uses. Save California Salmon, et al. recommended that the Central Valley Water Board effectively include beneficial uses that acknowledge the Indigenous peoples of California and the Tribal subsistence fishing that was established long before the colonization of the state.

To properly protect Tribal traditions and cultures, the Save California Salmon, et al. recommended that there should be some allowance for the protection of fish populations and aquatic habitat under CUL, T-SUB, and SUB beneficial uses. Save California Salmon, et al. encouraged the Central Valley Water Board to be fully engaged in the designation process and support the cooperation between the Water Boards to protect TBUs.

7D Response:

Board staff appreciate the comment and acknowledge that Indigenous peoples of California and Tribal subsistence fishing was established long before the colonization of the state. As a first step toward TBU waterbody designations, Board staff developed a Basin Plan Amendment (BPA) to add the TBU definitions of CUL, T-SUB, and SUB to the Basin Plans and implemented the regulatory requirements for public and tribal engagement on the BPA. The BPA was adopted by the Central Valley Water Board on 18 February 2022 with support expressed from several tribes including Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians, Big Valley Band of Pomo Indians, California Indian Environmental Alliance, Enterprise Rancheria, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Merced River Conservation Committee, the Mono Lake Kutzadika Tribe, and the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation. The BPA was approved by the State Water Board on 7 September 2022 with support expressed by the Merced River Conservation

Committee, Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians, Southern Sierra Miwuk Nation, the California Indian Environmental Alliance, Clean Water Action, Big Valley Band of Pomo Indians and the Save California Salmon.

The BPA was approved by the California Office of Administrative Law (OAL) on 14 December 2023. OAL provided a corrected Notice of Approval dated 11 January 2024. The BPA was submitted to the United States Environmental Protection Agency for review on 29 February 2024 and the Central Valley Water Board awaits approval at which time the BPA becomes fully effective.

Board staff continue to review TBU designation requests received and meet with Tribal requestors to determine next steps for designation of waterbodies with appropriate tribal uses of water. As part of the designation process, the Central Valley Water Board organizes a semi-annual government to government meeting and invites all tribes with interests in the Central Valley Region based on contact information provided through the Native American Heritage Commission, the State Water Board's Office of Public Participation, and through our individual interactions with Native American Tribes.

7E Comment:

Save California Salmon, et al. also requested that since waterways cross Tribal borders and boundaries frequently, that the Central Valley Water Board acknowledge that there may be tribes upstream, downstream, or in the watershed that will be affected by any change in one section of a waterway or body of water. As such, consultation should be with the "appropriate" tribes and from all tribes whose water will be affected by the designation of the TBUs for any body of water. Save California Salmon, et al. also recommended that while there is a need for privacy when it comes to working with Tribes to establish and designate TBUs, the Central Valley Water Board should have a public list of the Tribes with whom it is coordinating for transparency to hold the Board accountable and ensure that Tribal consultation is happening.

7E Response:

The Central Valley Water Board recognizes actions in a waterway affect all Tribal communities in the watershed. Therefore, the Board is committed to consulting with all interested and affected Tribes. The Central Valley Water Board fully supports interagency cooperation and strives to be as communicative and transparent as possible within its legal constraints. Board staff will contact Save California Salmon, et al. to discuss their concerns and suggestions. Board staff have been communicating with all tribes throughout the watersheds for which we have contact information through the Native American Heritage Commission, the State Water Board's Office of Public Participation, and through our individual interactions with Native American Tribes.

Additionally, the semi-annual government to government TBU Tribal Update meetings allow all affected tribes to meet directly with Board staff, management, and executives to discuss TBU designations.

8. Pit River Tribe, Mount Shasta Bioregional Ecological Center, Trout Unlimited (Pit River Tribe, et al.)

8A Comment:

Pit River Tribe, et al. recommended that the Central Valley Regional Board designate the following hydrologic resources in Siskiyou and Shasta Counties as Outstanding National Resource Waters (ONRWs):

- Medicine Lake Volcanic Basin and watershed including recharge areas (e.g., Giant Crater Lava Field), wetlands, and springs with a hydrologic connection (e.g., Payne Springs)
- Fall River Springs complex and the watershed that drains into it, groundwater recharge areas, and springs (e.g., Ahjumawi Lava Springs and springs along the White Horse Mountains)

The Pit River Tribe, et al. recommended that the Board include this action as a highly ranked project in the 2024 Triennial Review Workplan.

8A Response:

Board staff appreciate this comment and have populated the placeholder project factsheet from the 2021 Triennial Review Workplan. The revised Project 30 (formerly Project 33; Consideration of Outstanding National Resource Waters Designation for Medicine Lake Volcanic Basin and Fall River Springs of the Draft Workplan) has been assigned as Rank 3.

See 2024 Triennial Review Draft Workplan, Appendix 1, Project 30 - Consideration of Outstanding National Resource Waters Designation for Medicine Lake Volcanic Basin and Fall River Springs of the Draft Workplan.