

COMMENTS FROM MARSHALL LEE, DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION

From: Margie Lopez-Read
To: mlee@cdpr.ca.gov
Date: 6/28/2007 6:45:19 AM
Subject: Re: Monitoring Data Review

Marshall -

thank you for your thoughtful comments. We intend to make any necessary changes this week and early next week, and will post the revised document on the web. I have always appreciated your input in our Program.

margie

Margie Read, REAII, Chief
Monitoring and Assessment Unit
Irrigated Lands Conditional Waiver Program
Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
11020 Sun Center Drive Suite 200
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670-6114

phone: 916-464-4624

fax: 916-464-4780

>>> "Marshall Lee" <mlee@cdpr.ca.gov> 06/27/07 9:05 PM >>>

Margie:

Thanks for the opportunity to review the draft 2007 Review of Monitoring Data. I have a few comments.

I'll start with Appendix 1, since it contains the trigger limits that are compared to the data for the various zones. Of course, how you respond to these comments may affect your analyses in Section II.

1) The triggers for chlorpyrifos and diazinon are water quality objectives for chronic exposures, as determined by the 4-day average concentration. The monitoring schedules described in the MRP are not designed to determine compliance with those objectives. If the chronic objectives are used, rationale, perhaps in Section 1 or as a footnote in Appendix 1, should be provided.

2) Similarly, the triggers for cypermethrin and methomyl are based the Department of Fish and Game's (DFG's) recommended 4-day average concentrations, even though DFG derived 1-hour average concentrations as well. (The recommended 1-hour average concentrations and 4-day average concentrations for carbaryl are the same [2.53 ug/L]). If using chronic criteria over acute criteria is favored, additional rationale would be helpful given the MRP's monitoring schedule.

3) The Basin Plan does not have numeric water quality objectives for malathion, so the "standard type" designation of "numeric" seems incorrect. Performance goals should not be characterized as a numeric standard since they are not included in the water quality objectives section of the Basin Plan*they are described in the Basin Plan's implementation section as performance criteria of acceptable management practices. Additionally, "0 ug/L" should not be characterized as a numeric standard either: It's the assumed numeric result of the prohibition of discharge, which is part of the

overall implementation strategy to bring concentrations down to levels that approach compliance with water quality objectives. It has little value as a "water quality trigger" because, unlike the other triggers, there is no toxicological basis for it to be used for the protection of beneficial uses or compliance with the toxicity objective. As an alternative, consider a water quality trigger of 0.1 ug/L (U.S. EPA's National Ambient Water Quality Criterion) as an interpretation of the narrative toxicity objective.

This comment is also relevant to the methyl parathion and carbofuran triggers, which also have performance goals listed in the Basin Plan's implementation section. For methyl parathion, consider a trigger of 0.08 ug/L (DFG's interim water quality criterion); and for carbofuran, consider a trigger of 0.5 ug/L (DFG's interim water quality criterion).

4) Section I, Page 7, Comparison to Standards: It will probably not be apparent to many readers why MCLs and other public health-related values will be used as water quality triggers in waterways that are not intuitively considered drinking water sources (MUN). A fuller explanation of your generalizations and assumptions would be helpful. Also, to allay concern that drinking water may be unhealthful due to pesticides found in MUN-designated waters, it would be valuable to state that MCLs (as defined in CCR Title 22) for pesticides are fully protected.

5) Similarly, it would be valuable to state, perhaps in Section I, that exceedances of water quality triggers do not necessarily equate to toxic conditions or impairments of beneficial uses. Water quality criteria, for example, are protective by design and cannot be equated with thresholds of toxicity.

6) Section II: When comparing pesticide use between years, as you did when describing the Shasta/Tehama Subwatershed in Zone 1, use caution when using the terms "decreasing" and "increasing." They suggest trends that cannot be determined with two years data.

Thanks for considering my comments. I look forward to our continued collaboration.
Marshall

Marshall Lee
Environmental Monitoring Branch
Department of Pesticide Regulation
1001 I Street, P.O. Box 4015
Sacramento, California 95812-4015
ph: (916) 324-4269
fax: (916) 324-4088
mlee@cdpr.ca.gov

FLEX YOUR POWER! For simple ways to reduce energy demand and costs, see <www.cdpr.ca.gov>.

>>> "Margie Lopez-Read" <MLopez-Read@waterboards.ca.gov> 6/13/2007 5:24 PM >>>
TIC Members, ILP Stakeholders and Interested Parties -
If you are receiving this email, it is because you have participated in the TIC and Stakeholder meetings for the Irrigated Lands Conditional Waiver

Program, and in discussions regarding the developing monitoring and reporting program.

Attached are copies of the Draft 2007 Review of Monitoring Data for the Irrigated Lands Conditional Waiver Program. For the purpose of this Review, the Central Valley has been divided into four Zones, as described in the introduction. There are several maps that have been developed for each Zone, but these are not included with this email due to their size. If you would like to see copies of the maps, please let me know. When the Review is finalized, it will be posted on the Irrigated Lands website in complete form.

Additionally, a Monitoring Workshop to discuss the Review is scheduled for the Regional Board meeting which will be held on August 3rd or 4th.

At this point, the review is still in draft form, and your thoughts and comments will need to be received by 27 June 2007 in order to be considered for the final Review. Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Best Regards -

Margie

Margie Read, REAII, Chief
Monitoring and Assessment Unit
Irrigated Lands Conditional Waiver Program
Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
11020 Sun Center Drive Suite 200
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670-6114

phone: 916-464-4624
fax: 916-464-4780

CC: kgoh@cdpr.ca.gov, jsanders@cdpr.ca.gov