+30-24 **Department of Pesticide Regulation** Paul Helliker MEMORANDUM Arnold Schwarzenegger Director Governor Craig J. Wilson, Chief TO: TMDL Listing Unit

TMDL Listing Unit Division of Water Quality State Water Resources Control Board

FROM: Paul Helliker Paul Helliker Director (916) 445-4000

DATE: February 17, 2004

SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED POLICY FOR DEVELOPING CALIFORNIA'S CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 303(d) LIST

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the State Water Resources Control Board's proposed *Water Quality Control Policy for Developing California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List* (policy).

The Department of Pesticide Regulation's (DPR's) comments are presented below.

With the adoption last year of DPR's *Process for Responding to the Presence of Pesticides in Surface Water*, we rely on regional water quality control boards (regional boards) to determine when water quality objectives are exceeded for reasons related to pesticide use. Then, DPR and the regional boards work collaboratively to identify the best responses that will result in attainment and maintenance of water quality objectives. At the core of this process is high quality monitoring data and rigorous evaluations on which the regional boards will base their determinations. The data will help DPR and the regional boards describe temporal and spatial characteristics of the pesticide pollutant, identify sources, and recognize important data gaps, all critical for development of effective remediation.

As proposed, the policy appears to preserve flexibility for the regional boards to work with stakeholders to obtain and evaluate high quality data and to discuss findings in an open, public process. We encourage you to ensure that such flexibility is preserved in your policy so that determinations on exceedences of water quality objectives are based on a broad array of information and on sound science. In that regard, your policy should promote a wide variety of investigative strategies and avoid the appearance that it endorses or prescribes specific procedures, such as the proposed application of the binomial distribution. Regional boards should have the

RECEIVED

FEB 2 4 2004

DIVISION OF

Craig J. Wilson February 17, 2004 Page 2

discretion to consider all data and interpretations that they and stakeholders deem appropriate as part of a comprehensive, weight-of-evidence approach for determining water quality impairments.

Thank you for your consideration. If you have any comments, please contact John S. Sanders, Ph.D., of my staff, at 324-4100 or <jsanders@cdpr.ca.gov>.

cc: John S. Sanders

Celeste Cantú, State Water Resources Control Board Executive Director

ASSIGNMENT ROUTE SLIP

2

DPR ASSIGNMENT # 03-0151

4

CORRESPONDE	NCE AUTHOR: Irvin, D	Debble (SWRCB)	
SUBJECT: Pu	blic Hearing on Clear	n Water ActRequest for Co	omments
CORRESPONDE	NCE DATE: 12/2/2003		DATE RECEIVED 12/8/2003
ASSIGNED TO ASSIGNED TO	: DOkumura : JSanders Kom Doh/Marsha	BY (INITIAL): PHelliker BY (INITIAL): DOKumun U	DATE ASSIGNED: $12/10/200$ DATE ASSIGNED: $\frac{2}{12/03}$ /2/12/03
INSTRUCTION			
D Phone/Fax		r signature of: Paul Hellik	cer
🗹 cc to: ap		-	
🗹 bcc to: a	pprop. staff	· · · · ·	
🗌 Coordinat	e with:		
Please note DIRECTION: Depth of Res Position of	that if we have any sponse: [] Brief [] Mo	Marshall, et al ce you don't think the criteria is appr	later than February 11, 2004. In you let me know Why e binomial distribution opriate? - I'll e-mail n on this
Draft Review for Content Requested:	W Branch Chief Assistant Director	Due Date	Initials/ Proofreader/ Date Date
Final Due Date to:	Branch Chief Assistant Director Other: Chief Deputy Direct Director	$\frac{\frac{1/27/2004}{1/29/2004}}{\text{or}}$	2/4/04/R 13/04 D 13/04 D pH 2/17/04 Jr 1/13
Due to Agend Completion I) Gov	ernor:(#)

1313