

Response to Comments – September 30, 2011

Basin Plan Amendment - Pesticide Prohibition & Exemption Criteria

(Comment deadline 5 p.m., May 13, 2011)

Nancy A. and Don C. Erman

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/comments051311/erman.pdf

Comments

Response

1

Comments submitted by e-mail. Please confirm receipt.

Date: May 10, 2011

To:

Mary Wagner mfwagner@waterboards.ca.gov and
Daniel Sussman dsussman@waterboards.ca.gov
Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board
South Lake Tahoe
CA 96158

From:

Don C. Erman
Professor Emeritus
Aquatic ecology / fisheries biology
Department of Wildlife, Fish, and Conservation Biology
University of California, Davis
43200 East Oaks Place
Davis, CA 95618
530 / 758-1206
e-mail: dcerman@ucdavis.edu

and

Nancy A. Erman
Specialist Emeritus
Aquatic ecology / freshwater invertebrates
Department of Wildlife, Fish, and Conservation Biology
University of California, Davis
e-mail: naerman@ucdavis.edu

Re: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE WATER QUALITY CONTROL PLAN FOR THE
LAHONTAN REGION: PESTICIDE PROHIBITION WITH EXEMPTION CRITERIA

We are filing these comments on the proposed amendments to the Lahontan Basin Plan as private citizens, in the public interest. We have been reviewing government documents on the use of rotenone formulations to remove unwanted fish species from the waters of California, and many other parts of the country, for the past 16 years. We have reviewed much of the published and unpublished literature on the impacts of rotenone to non-target species. We have reviewed over the last 10 years many documents in the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (LRWQCB) files and have filed comments on the proposed project to poison most of the remaining parts of the Silver King Creek basin. We have also filed comments with the

Comments	Response
<p style="text-align: right;">2</p> <p>Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on the impacts of fish poisons on the non-target aquatic animal community (Erman and Erman, 2005, 2006, 2007).</p> <p>Our detailed comments refer largely to the use of rotenone formulations to remove fish from aquatic systems. The more general comments apply also to other forms of government poison applications in and over water for such things as eliminating plants in water and for mosquito abatement, etc. The documentation supporting the statements we are making are found in LRWQCB and EPA files and are available from us upon request.</p> <p>The proposed Lahontan Basin Plan change is an attempt by the staff of the LRWQCB to relinquish their responsibility for oversight of government poisoning projects using pesticides in and over water, to lower the standards of the Clean Water Act Antidegradation Policy, and to reduce or remove the role of the public members of the LRWQC Board in assessing government poisoning projects in the Lahontan region.</p> <p>The changes define water poisoning by government agencies as in the public interest by definition. The draft revisions remove much of the regulatory authority and responsibility of the LRWQCB where government agencies are the parties seeking to poison water. They can remove the need for individual NPDES permits and give full authority to the Executive Officer to permit poisoning projects without going to the public Board and without holding public hearings to grant individual NPDES permits. As long as government agencies are doing the poisoning, for whatever reason, the LRWQCB staff will not make judgments about need for poisons or impacts of poisons. They will merely require that "monitoring" be conducted by the agencies before and after the completion of poisoning.</p> <p>The U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service has been added to the list of government agencies who can now poison water in the Lahontan Basin. Private entities will also be allowed to apply poisons into and over water for a variety of reasons.</p> <p>Perhaps the chief reason for the staff's proposed changes is to protect the LRWQCB and State Water Board from legal responsibility for the many failures and</p>	<p>D&NE R1: The proposed Amendment is designed to increase oversight of pesticide projects in the Lahontan Region. Currently, pesticides are applied by Mosquito Abatement Districts, Water Purveyors, and other entities with statutory responsibility to protect public health and safety. While many to all of these applicators submit NOIs to be covered under statewide general NPDES permits, Lahontan staff and the Water Board does not have interaction with the project proponents, and has had little opportunity to influence projects, management practices, and APAPs. The Amendment will bring these projects under Water Board oversight. Similarly, the role of the members of the Water Board will be increased, as all projects, save vector control and emergency projects, will be considered for exemption by the members of the Board during a public meeting on a case by case basis. The standards of the CWA Antidegradation Policy remain sound, as described in Section 10 of the Staff Report. During both the scoping and public comment period, the public has the opportunity to comment on the project and monitoring requirements to further refine project implementation.</p> <p>D&NE R2: As mentioned in D&NE R1, with the exception of vector control and emergency projects, all exemption requests will individually be considered by the members of the Water Board, unless the Water Board delegates such decisions to the Executive Officer. Each project proponent, regardless of whether it is a government or private entity, must make their case for exemption and demonstrate that a change in water quality is offset by the social or economic benefits provided by implementing the proposed project. Protection or enhancement of the environment (e.g. projects to restore ecological integrity) is justification that may qualify as a social benefit (1987 State Board memo, Chief Counsel Attwater). The proposed language provides for, but does not require, that projects may be permitted using statewide general NPDES permits. No general permit exists for rotenone projects, and future projects will thus need individual permits.</p>

Comments	Response
<p style="text-align: right;">3</p> <p>misrepresentations that have occurred in poisoning projects conducted by the California Department of Fish and Game in the Lahontan region over the past 25 years. We suspect the staff foresees a significant increase in aquatic poison applications in the region in the future including poisoning in more visible and popular areas like Lake Tahoe, Fallen Leaf Lake, and other high mountain lakes and streams for a variety of reasons deemed essential by various agencies.</p> <p>At present the LRWQCB is not enforcing the current requirements of the Basin Plan, and therefore of the Clean Water Act, where rotenone formulations are concerned, and so the easiest route for the staff is to just get rid of those requirements through redefinition. The intent of the proposed changes is to weaken the Basin Plan rather than to protect the aquatic resources and beneficial uses in the Lahontan Basin. We think they also violate the required standards of the Antidegradation Policy of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>It is unclear from the proposed revisions whether or not individual NPDES permits will be required in the future or whether a blanket permit will be given for all projects. It is not clear whether or not public hearings will be held or that the citizen Board will even be involved in future projects. One possibility listed in the policy changes suggests that the Executive Officer alone could grant permission for individual projects.</p> <p>Rotenone projects in the Lahontan basin serve as a useful example of what to expect from future poisoning projects in the Lahontan basin when requirements are less strict than they are now, should these proposed changes be adopted.</p> <p>The rotenone picture has changed significantly in the last few years. Many studies over the past 10 years have shown a connection between rotenone and Parkinson's disease. Two of the principle pesticides that will be used under this proposed revision of the Basin Plan are rotenone and the herbicide paraquat—both approved for use in California. Both pesticides are documented in laboratory studies as mitochondrial Complex I inhibitors that lead to Parkinson's Disease-like symptoms. Both pesticides have been shown in a recent study to be definitively associated with</p>	<p>D&NE R3: Staff does not foresee a great increase in the use of aquatic pesticides following adoption of the proposed Basin Plan amendment over and above project frequency currently occurring in the Lahontan Region. Currently, Water Board staff actively supports and permits non-chemical projects - both implementations and experiments - to control aquatic invasive species (fish, plants, mollusks). Under the proposed language, when a project is brought forth to request exemption all criteria must be satisfied. One criteria is that alternatives to chemical use have failed, or an explanation of why they would be infeasible to meet project goals. Any foreseeable increase in proposed aquatic pesticide projects will likely be in response to aquatic invasive species infestations unresponsive to non-chemical control means. This does not include the permitting of pre-existing ongoing activities that involve the use of aquatic pesticides in the Region, such as mosquito abatement programs and treatments implemented to provide source water protection.</p>

Comments	Response
<p style="text-align: right;">3</p> <p>misrepresentations that have occurred in poisoning projects conducted by the California Department of Fish and Game in the Lahontan region over the past 25 years. We suspect the staff foresees a significant increase in aquatic poison applications in the region in the future including poisoning in more visible and popular areas like Lake Tahoe, Fallen Leaf Lake, and other high mountain lakes and streams for a variety of reasons deemed essential by various agencies.</p> <p>At present the LRWQCB is not enforcing the current requirements of the Basin Plan, and therefore of the Clean Water Act, where rotenone formulations are concerned, and so the easiest route for the staff is to just get rid of those requirements through redefinition. The intent of the proposed changes is to weaken the Basin Plan rather than to protect the aquatic resources and beneficial uses in the Lahontan Basin. We think they also violate the required standards of the Antidegradation Policy of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>It is unclear from the proposed revisions whether or not individual NPDES permits will be required in the future or whether a blanket permit will be given for all projects. It is not clear whether or not public hearings will be held or that the citizen Board will even be involved in future projects. One possibility listed in the policy changes suggests that the Executive Officer alone could grant permission for individual projects.</p> <p>Rotenone projects in the Lahontan basin serve as a useful example of what to expect from future poisoning projects in the Lahontan basin when requirements are less strict than they are now, should these proposed changes be adopted.</p> <p>The rotenone picture has changed significantly in the last few years. Many studies over the past 10 years have shown a connection between rotenone and Parkinson's disease. Two of the principle pesticides that will be used under this proposed revision of the Basin Plan are rotenone and the herbicide paraquat—both approved for use in California. Both pesticides are documented in laboratory studies as mitochondrial Complex I inhibitors that lead to Parkinson's Disease-like symptoms. Both pesticides have been shown in a recent study to be definitively associated with</p>	<p>D&NE R4: Refer to D&NE R2. If the Water Board chooses to adopt the proposed amendment, prohibition exemptions may be granted for aquatic pesticide uses conducted for purposes of vector control, public health and safety, preservation of ecological integrity, fisheries management, and projects implemented for these purposes in response to emergency situations. For vector control projects statutorily required for public health and projects that satisfy the CEQA definition for emergency project (CEQA Guidelines 15269(a)(b)(c)), the adoption of the Amendment grants exemption without subsequent hearing at a public Water Board hearing. All other projects need to satisfy exemption criteria prior to staff bringing the exemption request to the Water Board for approval or denial of request at a public hearing. All projects are subject to permitting. It is probable that for projects that can be permitted under a statewide general NPDES permit that will be the preferred permitting avenue.</p> <p>If a statewide or regionwide general NPDES permit does not exist for the circumstance, then Water Board staff will propose the appropriate permit for adoption at a Water Board public hearing. In the future, Congress may exempt aquatic pesticide applications from Clean Water Act permitting requirements (e.g. HR 872). If that is the case, State and Regional Boards will pursue other permitting options under the California Water Code, which could include Waste Discharge Requirements, Waivers, or other permitting options. Also refer to Response CDFA R8.</p> <p>D&NE R5: The proposed Amendment does not decrease compliance requirements of pesticide projects, nor does it decrease regulatory oversight. The Amendment increases monitoring requirements.</p>

Comments	Response
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <p>misrepresentations that have occurred in poisoning projects conducted by the California Department of Fish and Game in the Lahontan region over the past 25 years. We suspect the staff foresees a significant increase in aquatic poison applications in the region in the future including poisoning in more visible and popular areas like Lake Tahoe, Fallen Leaf Lake, and other high mountain lakes and streams for a variety of reasons deemed essential by various agencies.</p> <p>At present the LRWQCB is not enforcing the current requirements of the Basin Plan, and therefore of the Clean Water Act, where rotenone formulations are concerned, and so the easiest route for the staff is to just get rid of those requirements through redefinition. The intent of the proposed changes is to weaken the Basin Plan rather than to protect the aquatic resources and beneficial uses in the Lahontan Basin. We think they also violate the required standards of the Antidegradation Policy of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>It is unclear from the proposed revisions whether or not individual NPDES permits will be required in the future or whether a blanket permit will be given for all projects. It is not clear whether or not public hearings will be held or that the citizen Board will even be involved in future projects. One possibility listed in the policy changes suggests that the Executive Officer alone could grant permission for individual projects.</p> <p>Rotenone projects in the Lahontan basin serve as a useful example of what to expect from future poisoning projects in the Lahontan basin when requirements are less strict than they are now, should these proposed changes be adopted.</p> <p>The rotenone picture has changed significantly in the last few years. Many studies over the past 10 years have shown a connection between rotenone and Parkinson's disease. Two of the principle pesticides that will be used under this proposed revision of the Basin Plan are rotenone and the herbicide paraquat—both approved for use in California. Both pesticides are documented in laboratory studies as mitochondrial Complex I inhibitors that lead to Parkinson's Disease-like symptoms. Both pesticides have been shown in a recent study to be definitively associated with</p>	<p>D&NE R6: Though diquat and paraquat are both dipyridyl compounds, paraquat is not an aquatic pesticide covered under the State Board's Aquatic Weed Permit. It is possible that a project proponent in the Lahontan Region may propose to use paraquat during a pesticide application. Since the State Board's permit does not cover this compound, the Water Board would have to issue an individual NPDES permit to regulate the discharge of paraquat, provided an exemption to the pesticide prohibition was first granted. The Water Board must consider all environmental impacts associated with the proposed discharge and determine if the project benefits outweigh the risks and short-term impacts. It is within the Water Board's purview to review the proposed use of rotenone and regulate the proposed discharge of rotenone provided the project proponent prepares and implements a best management plan to protect water quality, ensure worker safety and prevent potential health impacts.</p> <p>USEPA and DPR's decisions to (re)register a pesticide are based on whether a compound causes an unreasonable risk to the environment and human health. It is not within the Water Board's authority, nor is it the Water Board's responsibility, to determine whether the scientific data presented to the USEPA and DPR is sufficient to revoke a pesticide's registration. The Water Board does retain the right, within the proposed exemption process, to deny an exemption request based on evidence submitted in the exemption process, including public testimony, written and oral, against granting an exemption.</p>

Comments	Response
<p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <p>Parkinson's Disease in humans. The authors concluded "The current study helps connect the dots between basic research and human populations." (Tanner and 19 others. 2011. Rotenone, paraquat and Parkinson's Disease. <i>Envir. Health Perspectives</i>, available at ehponline.org).</p> <p>The EPA conducted a review of rotenone in 2006. Subsequently, the manufacturers of rotenone withdrew it for all terrestrial use (insect and/or invertebrate control) in the U.S., Canada, and the European Union. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) asked the companies that produce rotenone to submit evidence on the neurotoxic effects of rotenone on humans. The companies chose to withdraw from the market the products containing rotenone rather than supply the data. (EPA website: www.epa.gov/oppssrdd1/reregistration/rotenone Docket ID: EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0494)</p> <p>In 2009, the EPA banned rotenone for use in marine and estuarine habitats.</p> <p>The only use of rotenone now is as a freshwater poison to kill unwanted fish. It is, as the revision has stated, a non-specific poison that also kills aquatic insects, other aquatic invertebrates, and amphibians at the same time it kills fish. As a consequence, rotenone poisoning disrupts aquatic and terrestrial food webs for many years and affects many other species. These effects have been acknowledged by the EPA (see Erman and Erman, Silver King Creek, Draft EIS/EIR Comments, 2009). These proposed amendments to the Basin Plan admit the immediate, the long-term, the many-years and the probably permanent impact of rotenone poisons on aquatic invertebrates (Chapter 4).</p> <p>Once poison has been applied to water, monitoring of either the poison or the animal life, no matter how thorough, cannot change the impacts of the poison, of the mistakes that were made, of information that was not known, revealed, or understood, or of species that were lost. And, yet, the LRWQCB has refused to require inventories of non-target species prior to rotenone projects. The assurances that "monitoring " will be "robust" and "rigorous" mean little based on past staff actions (e.g., see NPDES permit for Silver King Creek rotenone poisoning, 2010).</p>	<p>D&NE R7: Currently the only registered use for rotenone is as a piscicide (fish-kill) for freshwater fish. Rotenone is no longer registered for use in oceans/estuaries; however, EPA did not ban rotenone for use in marine and estuarine habitats in 2009 as reported in the comment letter. Instead, as reported by EPA's Pesticide Re-evaluation Division, in preparation for the 2007 Reregistration Eligibility Decision, all rotenone labels were reviewed. The labels stated that rotenone could be used in streams, lakes, ponds and rivers. The estuarine/marine use was never specified on a label. In preparing the ecological risk assessment only data on the freshwater use of rotenone was available. In clarifying the piscicide use with the registrants, the registrants decided to add a prohibition of the use of rotenone in estuarine/marine environments in lieu of submitting any data. Labels have been submitted and are currently updated to reflect this prohibition. (Electronic Mail Communication with Joel Wolf, Office of Pesticide Programs, USEPA, 08/02/2011 and 08/05/2011).</p>

Comments	Response
<p style="text-align: right;">4</p> <p>Parkinson's Disease in humans. The authors concluded "The current study helps connect the dots between basic research and human populations." (Tanner and 19 others. 2011. Rotenone, paraquat and Parkinson's Disease. Envir. Health Perspectives, available at ehponline.org).</p> <p>The EPA conducted a review of rotenone in 2006. Subsequently, the manufacturers of rotenone withdrew it for all terrestrial use (insect and /or invertebrate control) in the U.S., Canada, and the European Union. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) asked the companies that produce rotenone to submit evidence on the neurotoxic effects of rotenone on humans. The companies chose to withdraw from the market the products containing rotenone rather than supply the data. (EPA website: www.epa.gov/opprrd1/reregistration/rotenone Docket ID: EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0494)</p> <p>In 2009, the EPA banned rotenone for use in marine and estuarine habitats.</p> <p>The only use of rotenone now is as a freshwater poison to kill unwanted fish. It is, as the revision has stated, a non-specific poison that also kills aquatic insects, other aquatic invertebrates, and amphibians at the same time it kills fish. As a consequence, rotenone poisoning disrupts aquatic and terrestrial food webs for many years and affects many other species. These effects have been acknowledged by the EPA (see Erman and Erman, Silver King Creek, Draft EIS/ EIR Comments, 2009). These proposed amendments to the Basin Plan admit the immediate, the long-term, the many-years and the probably permanent impact of rotenone poisons on aquatic invertebrates (Chapter 4).</p> <p>Once poison has been applied to water, monitoring of either the poison or the animal life, no matter how thorough, cannot change the impacts of the poison, of the mistakes that were made, of information that was not known, revealed, or understood, or of species that were lost. And, yet, the LRWQCB has refused to require inventories of non-target species prior to rotenone projects. The assurances that "monitoring " will be "robust" and "rigorous" mean little based on past staff actions (e.g., see NPDES permit for Silver King Creek rotenone poisoning, 2010).</p>	<p>D&NE R8: Staff recognizes and acknowledges in the SED that unintended, short-term changes in the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of a waterbody may occur during the use of an aquatic pesticide. The monitoring requirements, which include a pre-project inventory of the aquatic community, and control measures proposed in the Basin Plan Amendment, are intended to protect water quality and non-target species from the unintended effects of an aquatic pesticide application (see also D&NE R10). The exemption criteria that must be satisfied to obtain an exemption give the Water Board the ability to oversee and track pesticide projects. The monitoring and reporting requirements are an important element of the proposed language; they help evaluate project success and inform staff recommendations on whether to deny or grant exemptions for future proposals. The</p> <p>BPA language provides the overarching monitoring elements that must be included for all projects. The more specific details of the required monitoring and mitigation plans will be developed during project review and incorporated as enforceable permit conditions. Because each project is unique, it is premature, within this Basin Plan Amendment, to present specific monitoring details for aquatic pesticide project's including those that use rotenone in this amendment. Detailed monitoring plan and design must be developed on a project-by-project basis as pesticide applications are proposed to the Water Board. Pre-project monitoring is required for non-target species as detailed in Chapter 4 language under section titled "Exemption Criteria for Aquatic Pesticide Use".</p>

Comments	Response
<p>Monitoring is not mitigation. The monitoring being conducted by the agencies can and has documented the losses of broad taxonomic groups of organisms that represent many species, but it cannot bring back species that are permanently lost through poisoning. Many of the stream basins in the Lahontan region are isolated and likely contain endemic invertebrate species that are present nowhere else. The following two sentences in the proposed revision have no meaning : “Biological monitoring will be designed and conducted as long as needed, to effectively demonstrate that non-target macroinvertebrate populations have been fully restored to pre-project assemblages. These data will help determine realistic timelines for species recovery after treatment with aquatic pesticides.” Species and populations of species that are lost through poisoning may never return to the stream or lake and may be permanently extinguished. No amount of monitoring will change that reality. There is no mitigation for extinguishing a species.</p> <p>Even the above requirement is later revised in the proposed revisions to say that an agency can apply for release from the obligation to monitor after five years.</p> <p>The statement is misleading in another way as well: the monitoring being done by government agencies is not precise enough to identify species. Adult forms of invertebrates are not collected or identified. The “metrics” being used by the agencies are too crude to determine what species or how many are lost through poisoning. The LRWQCB staff passes off its responsibilities by leaving monitoring designs up to proponents and outside peer reviews selected by proponents.</p> <p>The Clean Water Act allows the lowering of water quality under specified times and circumstances, but if and only if, such lowering assures protection of beneficial uses fully.</p> <p>The following example from the EPA Water Quality Handbook is key (2nd Edition, updated through 2009, Appendix G, Questions and Answers: Antidegradation): The question is asked and answered: “THE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS REGULATION STATES THAT ‘EXISTING USES AND THE LEVEL OF WATER QUALITY NECESSARY TO PROTECT THE</p>	<p>D&NE R9: The intent of pesticides is to kill biota. Some pesticide projects, particularly rotenone projects, will kill non-target species. The SED acknowledges the potential that recovery of the aquatic macroinvertebrate assemblage to pre-project levels is uncertain. The Water Board does not offer monitoring as a mitigation measure, and the proposed amendment includes the separate requirement to develop a mitigation plan. Monitoring, not mitigation, will help determine compliance with control measures required by the exemption criteria and help determine compliance with permit conditions. Additionally, monitoring can provide information to support or reject assertions made in subsequent exemption applications for the use of aquatic pesticides. The SED, in acknowledging potential significant environmental impacts (such as loss of endemic species) from some aquatic pesticide exemptions, includes a Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC) for the proposed amendment. For individual aquatic pesticide exemption requests, if the potential for a significant adverse effect is identified, the Water Board will weigh the potential effect against the benefits to the people and environment of California, and decide whether to adopt a project level SOC and grant an exemption, or reject the exemption request.</p> <p>Monitoring is vital, not only to evaluate compliance status, but to gather information to inform the Water Board and Water Board staff on success of project goal attainment and the progress of a project site returning to pre-project conditions. The requirements of a project's monitoring and mitigation program include annual assessment of non-target macroinvertebrate communities for comparison with pre-project macroinvertebrate community assemblages. If two years post-project the communities are not demonstrably restored (as quantitatively established by standardized monitoring indices and accepted metrics) then the project proponent must implement the planned mitigation program that was accepted by the Water Board at project inception. Monitoring must continue annually.</p>

Comments	Response
<p style="text-align: right;">5</p> <p>Monitoring is not mitigation. The monitoring being conducted by the agencies can and has documented the losses of broad taxonomic groups of organisms that represent many species, but it cannot bring back species that are permanently lost through poisoning. Many of the stream basins in the Lahontan region are isolated and likely contain endemic invertebrate species that are present nowhere else. The following two sentences in the proposed revision have no meaning : "Biological monitoring will be designed and conducted as long as needed, to effectively demonstrate that non-target macroinvertebrate populations have been fully restored to pre-project assemblages. These data will help determine realistic timelines for species recovery after treatment with aquatic pesticides." Species and populations of species that are lost through poisoning may never return to the stream or lake and may be permanently extinguished. No amount of monitoring will change that reality. There is no mitigation for extinguishing a species.</p> <p>Even the above requirement is later revised in the proposed revisions to say that an agency can apply for release from the obligation to monitor after five years.</p> <p>The statement is misleading in another way as well: the monitoring being done by government agencies is not precise enough to identify species. Adult forms of invertebrates are not collected or identified. The "metrics" being used by the agencies are too crude to determine what species or how many are lost through poisoning. The LRWQCB staff passes off its responsibilities by leaving monitoring designs up to proponents and outside peer reviews selected by proponents.</p> <p>The Clean Water Act allows the lowering of water quality under specified times and circumstances, but if and only if, such lowering assures protection of beneficial uses fully.</p> <p>The following example from the EPA Water Quality Handbook is key (2nd Edition, updated through 2009, Appendix G, Questions and Answers: Antidegradation): The question is asked and answered: "THE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS REGULATION STATES THAT 'EXISTING USES AND THE LEVEL OF WATER QUALITY NECESSARY TO PROTECT THE</p>	<p>D&NE R9 (cont'd): The proponent may petition the Water Board for release of the obligation to continue monitoring only after five years of post-project monitoring, and only if monitoring results provide evidence that the recovery of the benthic community has become asymptotic or the recovery curve has plateaued. The project proponent may use such evidence to demonstrate to the Water Board that the benthic community of the affected waterbody is unlikely to return to pre-project health and that it has likely recovered as much as can be expected. In such instances it may not be reasonable to require continued resource expenditure on monitoring. The Water Board has the opportunity to then release the project proponent of their monitoring responsibility, reject the proponent's petition to cease monitoring, or lessen the monitoring obligation, for example, by altering monitoring design (e.g., frequency, number of locations). It is precisely this type of long term quantitative monitoring data that will inform the Water Board and Water Board staff as to the impacts of similar projects and the success of their mitigation methods, so that future similar project proposals can be evaluated with greater understanding.</p> <p>D&NE R10: The commenters highlight the need, recognized in the proposed language, for site specific monitoring plans. Consistency with the water quality objectives and beneficial uses for the waters of the Lahontan Region, specifically the COLD designation, is not determined by the presence or absence of a particular invertebrate species. The indices used by the agencies (if accepted by the Water Board) are sufficient to compare pre and post-project invertebrate community health within a project water body. The metrics in these indices are sufficient to determine the occupation of the niches within the benthic invertebrate community. So long as the post-project community is healthy (e.g., similar to pre-project measures of richness, abundance, biomass, functional feeding groups, etc.) it is immaterial to the agency's regulations which particular species fits which particular niche.</p>

Comments	Response
<p style="text-align: right;">5</p> <p>Monitoring is not mitigation. The monitoring being conducted by the agencies can and has documented the losses of broad taxonomic groups of organisms that represent many species, but it cannot bring back species that are permanently lost through poisoning. Many of the stream basins in the Lahontan region are isolated and likely contain endemic invertebrate species that are present nowhere else. The following two sentences in the proposed revision have no meaning : "Biological monitoring will be designed and conducted as long as needed, to effectively demonstrate that non-target macroinvertebrate populations have been fully restored to pre-project assemblages. These data will help determine realistic timelines for species recovery after treatment with aquatic pesticides." Species and populations of species that are lost through poisoning may never return to the stream or lake and may be permanently extinguished. No amount of monitoring will change that reality. There is no mitigation for extinguishing a species.</p> <p>Even the above requirement is later revised in the proposed revisions to say that an agency can apply for release from the obligation to monitor after five years.</p> <p>The statement is misleading in another way as well: the monitoring being done by government agencies is not precise enough to identify species. Adult forms of invertebrates are not collected or identified. The "metrics" being used by the agencies are too crude to determine what species or how many are lost through poisoning. The LRWQCB staff passes off its responsibilities by leaving monitoring designs up to proponents and outside peer reviews selected by proponents.</p> <p>The Clean Water Act allows the lowering of water quality under specified times and circumstances, but if and only if, such lowering assures protection of beneficial uses fully.</p> <p>The following example from the EPA Water Quality Handbook is key (2nd Edition, updated through 2009, Appendix G, Questions and Answers: Antidegradation): The question is asked and answered: "THE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS REGULATION STATES THAT 'EXISTING USES AND THE LEVEL OF WATER QUALITY NECESSARY TO PROTECT THE</p>	<p>D&NE R10: It is the responsibility of the Water Board to ensure that the monitoring plans are rigorous, scientifically sound, and can be used to compare pre- and post-project health of a water body's benthic macroinvertebrate community and pre- and post-project water quality. Such responsibility is strengthened and overtly maintained within the proposed amendment language.</p> <p>D&NE R11: Protecting "existing uses fully" should not be confused with protecting any specific benthic invertebrates, but instead should be focused on protecting the ecological integrity of the aquatic community. As the EPA Water Quality Handbook notes in its discussion of how the antidegradation policy applies to 'Aquatic Life', "the term 'aquatic life' would more accurately reflect the protection of the aquatic community that was intended in section 101(a)(2) of the CWA." The objective of the Clean Water Act is to "restore and maintain the chemical, physical and biological integrity of our Nations waters." (33 U.S.C. 1251(a); Clean Water Act 101(a)(1); Water Quality Handbook 4.4.2.) The commenters assert that beneficial uses are not fully protected if pesticide treatments impact non-target organisms including rare endemic species not prevalent in number or abundance within an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic pesticide treatments that may be allowed under the amendment are intended to maintain, protect, and improve the beneficial use as a whole and over the long-term. We acknowledge that aquatic pesticide applications implemented to protect aquatic communities and restore ecological integrity may temporarily eliminate non-target, possibly rare and endemic, species that may not be prevalent in number or abundance. It is unreasonable to assume a beneficial use is not fully protected because there are short-term impairments to non-target species present within the pesticide treatment area. There must be some flexibility to allow temporary impacts. Otherwise, the health and stability of an entire aquatic community would be jeopardized if judicious uses of aquatic pesticides are prohibited due to transient effects to specific species.</p>

Comments	Response
<p style="text-align: center;">6</p> <p>EXISTING USES SHALL BE MAINTAINED AND PROTECTED.' HOW FULLY AND AT WHAT LEVEL OF PROTECTION IS AN EXISTING USE TO BE PROTECTED IN ORDER TO SATISFY THE ABOVE REOUIREMENT?</p> <p>NO activity is allowable under the antidegradation policy which would partially or completely eliminate any existing use whether or not that use is designated in a State's water quality standards. The aquatic protection use is a broad category requiring further explanation. Species that are in the water body and which are consistent with the designated-use (i.e., not aberrational) must be protected, even if not prevalent in number or importance. Nor can activity be allowed which would render the species unfit for maintaining the use. Water quality should be such that it results in no mortality and no significant growth or reproductive impairment of resident species. (See Question 16 for situation where an aberrant sensitive species may exist.) Any lowering of water quality below this full level of protection is not allowed. A State may develop subcategories of aquatic protection uses but cannot choose different levels of protection for like uses. The fact that sport or commercial fish are not present does not mean that the water may not be supporting an aquatic life protection function. An existing aquatic community composed entirely of invertebrates and plants, such as may be found in a pristine alpine tributary stream, should still be protected whether or not such a stream supports a fishery. Even though the shorthand expression "fishable/swimmable" is often used, the actual objective of the act is to "restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of our Nation's waters (Section 101(a)(1). The term "aquatic life" would more accurately reflect the protection of the aquatic community that was intended in Section 101(a)(2) of the Act." (Emphasis added in bold).</p> <p>The Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) has recently begun using a new rotenone formulation of rotenone called CFT Legumine. It was used for the first time in California in the 2007 poisoning of the Lake Davis and the surrounding streams and springs. It did not perform as expected. The CDFG was unable to apply the rotenone in CFT Legumine at target levels. Levels were far above the target levels (> 1000% above target levels at some stations in the first poisoning), and high concentrations were even more common in the second poisoning than in the first. These results indicate the inability of CDFG to deliver, under field conditions, the poison rotenone in CFT Legumine at designed concentrations (see Erman and Erman, 2010, Comments on Draft</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">D&NE R11, continued</p> <p>D&NE R12: This comment addresses two projects not a part of the proposed amendment. It speaks to the Lake Davis project as a proxy for the forthcoming Silver King project. Though both projects use the active ingredient rotenone, neither project is being addressed by the proposed amendment since the existing Basin Plan provides for approval of the use of rotenone. However, acknowledging the commenters' concern, Water Board staff will briefly address the comment. The Lake Davis project, regulated by the Central Valley Water Board, did demonstrate some shortcomings in DFG administering and implementing that project. The experience of the Lake Davis project was used to inform changes in project implementation by DFG. The current permit requires additional planning, monitoring and reporting to ensure application as required by the applicable plans and policies (FIFRA, Basin Plan, Aquatic Pesticide Application Plan).</p>

Comments	Response
<p data-bbox="930 284 947 297">7</p> <p data-bbox="195 337 905 451">NPDES permit, Silver King Creek; Erman and Erman, 2010, Comments on Final EIR/EIS Silver King Creek). Based on the Lake Davis watershed results, we think it highly likely that the Agencies will exceed the EPA/FIFRA label requirement for normal use of 50µg/L in Silver King Creek if this project is allowed.</p> <p data-bbox="195 495 888 609">The proposed new language in the basin plan eliminates monitoring of pesticide application during the treatment phase of a project. In so doing, the Regional Board staff eliminates any means of verifying pesticide label restrictions for maximum allowed rates of application.</p> <p data-bbox="195 652 942 799">Independent monitoring of rotenone projects is essential. The Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) has a poor record of compliance. In the Lahontan Region alone, 6 of 11 rotenone projects between 1988 and 1994 violated water quality standards. Rotenone, rotenolone, or naphthalene were detected downstream or persisted longer than limits established in the basin plan (LRWQCB files).</p> <p data-bbox="195 842 940 1081">CFT Legumine contains 5% rotenone and 5% other cube resins (primarily deguelin and tephrosin) as active ingredients. Cube resins have not been analyzed and it is unknown if they are neutralized by potassium permanganate (verbal testimony by Bruce Warden, LRWQCB staff, April 14, 2010, NPDES hearing). Breakdown of deguelin and tephrosin, unlike rotenone, does not produce rotenolone (Caboni et al. 2004). Therefore, monitoring of either rotenone or rotenolone will not account for other cube resins in the active ingredients. Deguelin also has been shown in laboratory tests to elicit the same Parkinson's Disease-like changes in cells as rotenone (Caboni et al. 2004).</p> <p data-bbox="195 1125 942 1331">In other words, half of the active ingredients in CFT Legumine have not been analyzed or considered in any government document. We notice the same omission has appeared again in this proposed document (p. 4 pp 4.9-2125). It is assumed that the only active ingredient in rotenone formulations is rotenone. That is false. The statement is correct, however, in stating that many other chemicals are in the formulations. But the revision has omitted the information that some of these so-called "inert" chemicals are known carcinogens, or have other deleterious properties.</p>	<p data-bbox="1066 375 1346 404">D&NE R12, continued</p> <p data-bbox="1066 496 1881 1195">D&NE R13: Satisfaction of the proposed criteria and a granting of an exemption does not end Water Board oversight of pesticide projects. Projects also need a permit to proceed. Permits or the Executive Officer may impose additional monitoring to ensure compliance. Additionally, some of the aquatic pesticide projects proposed under this amendment will be regulated under the existing Statewide Aquatic Pesticide NPDES permits which include the Vector and Aquatic Weed Control Permits. Both of these permits require background, event, and post-project monitoring. The Notice of Applicability (NOA) issued for these Statewide NPDES permits will specify any additional Regional Water Board specific conditions and requirements not already stated in the Statewide NPDES permits. To qualify for a prohibition exemption, project applicants must develop and implement monitoring programs to verify compliance with criterion that require the planned treatment protocol result in the minimum discharge of chemical substances that can reasonably be expected for an effective treatment. Additionally, all aquatic pesticide applications potentially allowed under this amendment must be applied according to label instruction. A pesticide's label prescribes the proper, safe, and legal use of that pesticide. Pesticide applicators that disregard the label instructions risk (1) suspension or revocation of their license/certificate, (2) fines, and/or (3) civil or criminal prosecution.</p>

Comments	Response
<p style="text-align: center;">7</p> <p>NPDES permit, Silver King Creek; Erman and Erman, 2010, Comments on Final EIR/EIS Silver King Creek). Based on the Lake Davis watershed results, we think it highly likely that the Agencies will exceed the EPA/FIFRA label requirement for normal use of 50µg/L in Silver King Creek if this project is allowed.</p> <p>The proposed new language in the basin plan eliminates monitoring of pesticide application during the treatment phase of a project. In so doing, the Regional Board staff eliminates any means of verifying pesticide label restrictions for maximum allowed rates of application.</p> <p>Independent monitoring of rotenone projects is essential. The Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) has a poor record of compliance. In the Lahontan Region alone, 6 of 11 rotenone projects between 1988 and 1994 violated water quality standards. Rotenone, rotenolone, or naphthalene were detected downstream or persisted longer than limits established in the basin plan (LRWQCB files).</p> <p>CFT Legumine contains 5% rotenone and 5% other cube resins (primarily deguelin and tephrosin) as active ingredients. Cube resins have not been analyzed and it is unknown if they are neutralized by potassium permanganate (verbal testimony by Bruce Warden, LRWQCB staff, April 14, 2010, NPDES hearing). Breakdown of deguelin and tephrosin, unlike rotenone, does not produce rotenolone (Caboni et al. 2004). Therefore, monitoring of either rotenone or rotenolone will not account for other cube resins in the active ingredients. Deguelin also has been shown in laboratory tests to elicit the same Parkinson's Disease-like changes in cells as rotenone (Caboni et al. 2004).</p> <p>In other words, half of the active ingredients in CFT Legumine have not been analyzed or considered in any government document. We notice the same omission has appeared again in this proposed document (p. 4 pp 4.9-2125). It is assumed that the only active ingredient in rotenone formulations is rotenone. That is false. The statement is correct, however, in stating that many other chemicals are in the formulations. But the revision has omitted the information that some of these so-called "inert" chemicals are known carcinogens, or have other deleterious properties.</p>	<p>D&NE R14: Independent monitoring is an important tool in regulating pesticide projects. The proposed amendment language does not prevent the Water Board from conducting independent monitoring to verify discharger monitoring and reporting. Water quality violations that occurred as a result of the rotenone project implemented during the 1990s have been used to refine monitoring requirements for future rotenone projects and will inform any future permit conditions.</p> <p>D&NE R15: The pesticide product labels for both CFT Legumine (EPA Registration No.: 75338-1) and CFT Legimine - Fish Toxicant (EPA Registration Nos.: 655-899 or 75338-2) list active ingredients as rotenone (5%) and other associated resins (5%), which include the cube resins (deguelin and tephrosin) referred to by the commenters. During product registration, a registrant provides toxicity data regarding potential adverse effects to humans and the environment. The acute toxicity data that is submitted by the registrants for project registration considers acute toxic effects caused by the formulated product, which includes active and inert ingredients. The chronic toxicity data is submitted only for the active ingredients. So for CFT Legimine products, the 5% other cube resins, which are categorized as active ingredients in these registered products, have been analyzed, studied, and considered with respect to satisfying requirements during the product registration process. The Water Board is not the agency responsible for analyzing and considering the active cube resins. (continues below)</p>

Comments	Response
<p style="text-align: center;">7</p> <p>NPDES permit, Silver King Creek; Erman and Erman, 2010, Comments on Final EIR/EIS Silver King Creek). Based on the Lake Davis watershed results, we think it highly likely that the Agencies will exceed the EPA/FIFRA label requirement for normal use of 50µg/L in Silver King Creek if this project is allowed.</p> <p>The proposed new language in the basin plan eliminates monitoring of pesticide application during the treatment phase of a project. In so doing, the Regional Board staff eliminates any means of verifying pesticide label restrictions for maximum allowed rates of application.</p> <p>Independent monitoring of rotenone projects is essential. The Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) has a poor record of compliance. In the Lahontan Region alone, 6 of 11 rotenone projects between 1988 and 1994 violated water quality standards. Rotenone, rotenolone, or naphthalene were detected downstream or persisted longer than limits established in the basin plan (LRWQCB files).</p> <p>CFT Legumine contains 5% rotenone and 5% other cube resins (primarily deguelin and tephrosin) as active ingredients. Cube resins have not been analyzed and it is unknown if they are neutralized by potassium permanganate (verbal testimony by Bruce Warden, LRWQCB staff, April 14, 2010, NPDES hearing). Breakdown of deguelin and tephrosin, unlike rotenone, does not produce rotenolone (Caboni et al. 2004). Therefore, monitoring of either rotenone or rotenolone will not account for other cube resins in the active ingredients. Deguelin also has been shown in laboratory tests to elicit the same Parkinson's Disease-like changes in cells as rotenone (Caboni et al. 2004).</p> <p>In other words, half of the active ingredients in CFT Legumine have not been analyzed or considered in any government document. We notice the same omission has appeared again in this proposed document (p. 4 pp 4.9-2125). It is assumed that the only active ingredient in rotenone formulations is rotenone. That is false. The statement is correct, however, in stating that many other chemicals are in the formulations. But the revision has omitted the information that some of these so-called "inert" chemicals are known carcinogens, or have other deleterious properties.</p>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px;"> <p>D&NE R15 cont'd: The onus is on the project proponent to disclose potential impacts associated with a specific pesticide application and verify, through implementation of control measures and monitoring, that impacts are minimized or avoided. Further, Water Board staff have retained, not omitted, the following condition, "The chemical composition of the rotenone formulation has not changed significantly (based on analytical chemical scans to be performed by the DFG or USFWS on each formulation lot to be used) in such a way that potential hazards may be present which have not been addressed." This general statement provides a safeguard against the use of rotenone formulations that have not been vetted through the environmental and human health risk assessments required by USEPA and DPR during product (re)registration and re-evaluation. It is important to monitor other active and inert ingredients in rotenone formulations such as the "other cube resins." Such responsibilities and direction are more appropriately regulated in project level permits than in the proposed Basin Plan amendment. Also refer to Response D&NE R6 for a discussion about the Water Board's ability to consider all environmental impacts (including health impacts) in its determination to grant or deny an exemption for an aquatic pesticide discharge.</p> </div>

Comments	Response
<p style="text-align: center;">8</p> <p>For example, N-methyl pyrrolidone (NMP) is 10% of the composition of CFT Legumine (i.e., twice the amount of rotenone). NMP is considered a Substance of Very High Concern by the European Union authorities and is on the candidate list for banning as of February 2011. The concern is over its toxicity to reproduction—teratogenic in children. (wiki.answers.com/Q/Will_N-methyl_pyrrolidone_be_banned_in_Europe). The California Department of Health Services issued a Health Hazard Advisory in October 2006 to workers exposed to NMP. "You should treat NMP as a potential human reproductive hazard". (www.cdph.ca.gov/programs/hesis/Documents/nmp.pdf)</p> <p>There often is a delay in officially recognizing harm in chemicals used in our environment. In the case of rotenone, NMP and others, the evidence is accumulating about their harm. One of the reasons we enacted a Clean Water Act was so that we do not pollute our water systems and then find out later it was a mistake.</p> <p>Rotenone persisted in the bottom sediments of Lake Davis for at least six months following the 2007 poisoning. Rotenone was measured in stream water 14 days after it had been applied. It had apparently persisted in bottom sediments and was being released back into the stream. These results indicate that CFT Legumine behaves in some unexplained and unknown ways. It is unknown if rotenone persisted in streams longer than this measured period. Monitoring was apparently not conducted beyond two weeks in streams (Erman and Erman, Comments on Draft NPDES permit, Silver King Creek, 2010).</p> <p>The persistence of rotenone in stream sediments and ground water is a significant environmental concern that has not been analyzed by the LRWQCB. Hyporheic invertebrate life will be affected by the residual rotenone in the substrate. Ground water should also be monitored. The Agencies are assuming that hyporheic invertebrates will re-populate streams that are poisoned (Silver King Creek, Final EIS/EIR p. 5.1-45; 5.1-19; Response to Comments, pp. F-50, F-80). They seem to assume that the rotenone in bottom sediments will not affect these invertebrates. (Incidentally, even assuming they would not also be poisoned, these would only be the hyporheic invertebrates in the upper part of stream bottom sediments. Invertebrates lower in the</p>	<p>D&NE R16: Sediment monitoring and reporting data from rotenone applications conducted in the Lahontan Region in Silver King Creek (Alpine Co.) in 1991, 1992, and 1993, Silver Creek (Mono Co.) in 1994, 1995 and 1996, and in Wolf Creek (and below the confluence of West Walker River) (Mono Co.) in 1991 and 1992 do not indicate the persistence of rotenone and rotenolone in the bottom sediments. Considering monitoring results indicated non-detect levels one-week post treatment, it would be speculative to assume the invertebrates present in the hyporeheic zone may be affected by residual rotenone in the bottom substrate. A literature search did not reveal evidence of any effects of a rotenone piscicide treatment on the hyporeheic zone. Commenters do not cite evidence indicating that hyporheic invertebrates would be impacted by residual rotenone in the substrate. Consequently it would be premature to speculate as to the impacts a rotenone project would have on hyporeheic invertebrates. To broaden the limited body of knowledge on the potential effects, language will be added that recommends future research to this end. (See Chapter 4, section titled Recommended Future Actions for Rotenone Use.)</p>

Comments	Response
<p style="text-align: center;">9</p> <p>hyporheos are restricted to that habitat.) But the LRWQCB did not consider the effects of rotenone in the stream sediments and hyporheos in the NPDES permit issued in 2010 for poisoning Silver King Creek.</p> <p>If the lower Silver King Creek rotenone project is carried out, rotenone concentrations in the stream water will be 2 to 4.6 times the mean concentration that was measured in the 1991–93 poisoning of the upper part of Silver King Creek. It is likely that even greater losses of invertebrate life will occur than did as a result of the 1991–93 poisoning. (Incidentally, this proposed revision gives the false impression that fish poisoning was conducted for only one year the last time on Silver King Creek. In fact, the poisoning was done twice a year for three consecutive years. The 2010 NPDES permit allows poisoning for the same duration.)</p> <p>We note that all of the wording on the problems the CDFG has of applying potassium permanganate (another poison that kills aquatic animal life) to neutralize rotenone has been eliminated in the revisions, thus omitting the information that fish kills from potassium permanganate have occurred far below project boundaries in past poisoning episodes in the Lahontan Region.</p> <p>The proposed revision to the Basin Plan ignores or incompletely or incorrectly states the provisions of the Clean Water Act Antidegradation Policy.</p> <p>For example, new LRWQCB staff language in Exemption Criteria for Aquatic Pesticide Use, <u>Purpose and Need for Exemption</u>, paragraph 4, summarizes and re-words the federal Antidegradation Policy as "...that water quality shall be preserved unless it is determined that the lowering of water quality is necessary to accommodate important economic or social development. Additionally, it requires that water quality be maintained at levels capable of supporting existing beneficial uses." This last sentence changes the wording and meaning of the Antidegradation Policy which is, "In allowing such degradation or lower water quality, the State shall assure water quality adequate to protect existing uses fully (40 CFR 131.12(a)(2))." (Our emphasis added).</p>	<p>D&NE R16, continued</p> <p>D&NE R17: Comments on the Silver King Creek rotenone project appear to be added out of context. The proposed amendment will not address the Silver King Creek project in question, the Silver King Creek projects of the past, or the 2010 NPDES permit. The proposed amendment, referred to in the comment as "proposed revision," does not address Silver King Creek, and so can give no impression, false or otherwise, on the duration of fish poisoning in said creek. We acknowledge the toxicity of potassium permanganate when excess remains from its use as a neutralizer of rotenone and have re-added the language in question to the amendment in Chapter 4, in the section <i>Rotenone Use in Fisheries Management</i>. Regulation of the use of this chemical is best addressed through project specific</p>

Comments	Response
<p style="text-align: right;">9</p> <p>hyporheos are restricted to that habitat.) But the LRWQCB did not consider the effects of rotenone in the stream sediments and hyporheos in the NPDES permit issued in 2010 for poisoning Silver King Creek.</p> <p>If the lower Silver King Creek rotenone project is carried out, rotenone concentrations in the stream water will be 2 to 4.6 times the mean concentration that was measured in the 1991–93 poisoning of the upper part of Silver King Creek. It is likely that even greater losses of invertebrate life will occur than did as a result of the 1991–93 poisoning. (Incidentally, this proposed revision gives the false impression that fish poisoning was conducted for only one year the last time on Silver King Creek. In fact, the poisoning was done twice a year for three consecutive years. The 2010 NPDES permit allows poisoning for the same duration.)</p> <p>We note that all of the wording on the problems the CDFG has of applying potassium permanganate (another poison that kills aquatic animal life) to neutralize rotenone has been eliminated in the revisions, thus omitting the information that fish kills from potassium permanganate have occurred far below project boundaries in past poisoning episodes in the Lahontan Region.</p> <p>The proposed revision to the Basin Plan ignores or incompletely or incorrectly states the provisions of the Clean Water Act Antidegradation Policy.</p> <p>For example, new LRWQCB staff language in Exemption Criteria for Aquatic Pesticide Use, <u>Purpose and Need for Exemption</u>, paragraph 4, summarizes and re-words the federal Antidegradation Policy as "...that water quality shall be preserved unless it is determined that the lowering of water quality is necessary to accommodate important economic or social development. Additionally, it requires that water quality be maintained at levels capable of supporting existing beneficial uses." This last sentence changes the wording and meaning of the Antidegradation Policy which is, "In allowing such degradation or lower water quality, the State shall assure water quality adequate to protect existing uses fully (40 CFR 131.12(a)(2)." (Our emphasis added).</p>	<p>D&NE R18: It is not staff's intent to ignore or incompletely or incorrectly state the provisions of the Clean Water Act Antidegradation Policy. Rather, staff understands that the antidegradation policies were not intended to place an absolute bar on reductions in water quality. Nor should the State's application of the Federal Antidegradation Policy prevent States from undertaking activities that are necessary to uphold the goals of the Clean Water Act to "restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of our Nation's waters" (33 U.S. C. 1251(a)). We understand that the antidegradation policies are not meant to prohibit States from allowing changes in water quality that will improve a waterbody's overall conditions. The language prescribed in 40 CFR 131.12(a)(2) has replaced the paraphrased language originally presented in Exemption Criteria for Aquatic Pesticide Use, Purpose and Need for Exemption, paragraph 4, so this section now reads, "Similarly, the federal Antidegradation Policy (40 CFR 131.12) dictates that water quality shall be preserved unless it is determined that the lowering of water quality is necessary to accommodate important economic or social development. In allowing such degradation or lower water quality, the State shall assure water quality adequate to protect existing uses fully (40 CFR 131.12(a)(2)." Further, if the Water Board adopts the proposed Pesticide Basin Plan Amendment, the amendment will have to be approved by the State Board, the Office of Administrative Law, and the U.S. EPA. The State Board could reject the amendment if they find the Water Board has incorrectly or incompletely applied the requirements of the State and Federal Antidegradation Policies. Additionally, in the final approval step, the amendment could be disapproved if the EPA finds that the Water Board has not appropriately fulfilled the federal regulatory requirements of the antidegradation policy with respect to the proposed action.</p>

Comments	Response
<p data-bbox="905 280 932 302">10</p> <p data-bbox="191 334 926 480">The LRWQCB staff is using their creative interpretation of the Policy to claim that after water has been poisoned, even if species have been lost and the biological community has been altered, the water is still capable of supporting species once the poison is gone and, therefore, the staff maintains the revised plan is in compliance with the Antidegradation Policy.</p> <p data-bbox="191 521 932 760">The Antidegradation Policy says that the beneficial uses themselves must be fully protected in any project that proposes lowering of water quality “necessary to accommodate important economic or social development.” This distinction between the two components: 1) lowering of water quality under certain circumstances and 2) fully protecting beneficial uses if water quality is lowered, is fundamental to the Antidegradation Policy. The latest version of the EPA Water Quality Handbook (Section 4, 2nd Edition, last updated on 11/06/2009) provides ample discussion of these two distinct components.</p> <p data-bbox="191 800 926 1008">Elsewhere, in Chapter 4, the proposed revision states that “Similarly, the federal Antidegradation Policy (40 CFR Section 131.12) dictates that water quality shall be preserved unless degradation is necessary to accommodate important economic or social development.” The section quoted conveniently leaves out the next sentence (40 CFR Section 131.12(2)) of the policy, which is “In allowing such degradation or lower water quality, the State shall assure water quality adequate to protect existing uses fully.”</p> <p data-bbox="191 1049 919 1166">The state and LRWQCB are not at liberty to rewrite the Clean Water Act or change the plain meaning of the words used to define the regulations except “States may adopt antidegradation statements more protective than the Federal requirement.” (EPA Water Quality Handbook, 2nd Edition, Section 4.3)</p> <p data-bbox="191 1206 926 1320">It is also not at the discretion of a regional board to decide to vacate portions of the Clean Water Act Antidegradation Policy in favor of other acts of the state or federal government unless such acts so dictate. The Endangered Species Act, for example, does not specify what methods are necessary to carry out its provisions or claim superiority</p>	<p data-bbox="1066 302 1885 967">D&NE R19: During a scheduled aquatic pesticide treatment event, a lethal concentration of chemicals is intentionally applied to water to control pests. This application of aquatic pesticides will result in a spatially localized and short-term lowering of water quality that may temporarily, but not unreasonably, affect beneficial uses within the treatment area. During the treatment event, the lowering of water quality and the subsequent effect to beneficial uses are confined to the treatment area. Precluding the use of aquatic pesticide due to short-term and transient impacts within the treatment area would be non-sensible considering the holistic benefit to the waterbody and the important public interests that are served by such aquatic pesticide use. It is expected that there may be short-term impacts from the pesticide applications allowed under this amendment, but regulatory oversight and the implementation of best management practices will help minimize or avoid reductions of water quality. Overall, the treatment of aquatic pests will promote the long-term maintenance and restoration of beneficial uses and the waterbody as a whole. To this end, temporary reductions in water quality are acceptable, since the intent of the pesticide applications considered under this amendment is to restore and maintain the biological integrity of the waterbody, which is consistent with the spirit and goals of the CWA. Also refer to responses D&NE R11 and D&NE R18.</p>

Comments	Response
<p style="text-align: right;">10</p> <p>The LRWQCB staff is using their creative interpretation of the Policy to claim that after water has been poisoned, even if species have been lost and the biological community has been altered, the water is still capable of supporting species once the poison is gone and, therefore, the staff maintains the revised plan is in compliance with the Antidegradation Policy.</p> <p>The Antidegradation Policy says that the beneficial uses themselves must be fully protected in any project that proposes lowering of water quality “necessary to accommodate important economic or social development.” This distinction between the two components: 1) lowering of water quality under certain circumstances and 2) fully protecting beneficial uses if water quality is lowered, is fundamental to the Antidegradation Policy. The latest version of the EPA Water Quality Handbook (Section 4, 2nd Edition, last updated on 11/06/2009) provides ample discussion of these two distinct components.</p> <p>Elsewhere, in Chapter 4, the proposed revision states that “Similarly, the federal Antidegradation Policy (40 CFR Section 131.12) dictates that water quality shall be preserved unless degradation is necessary to accommodate important economic or social development.” The section quoted conveniently leaves out the next sentence (40 CFR Section 131.12(2)) of the policy, which is “In allowing such degradation or lower water quality, the State shall assure water quality adequate to protect existing uses fully.”</p> <p>The state and LRWQCB are not at liberty to rewrite the Clean Water Act or change the plain meaning of the words used to define the regulations except “States may adopt antidegradation statements more protective than the Federal requirement.” (EPA Water Quality Handbook, 2nd Edition, Section 4.3)</p> <p>It is also not at the discretion of a regional board to decide to vacate portions of the Clean Water Act Antidegradation Policy in favor of other acts of the state or federal government unless such acts so dictate. The Endangered Species Act, for example, does not specify what methods are necessary to carry out its provisions or claim superiority</p>	<p>D&NE R20: Projects that may be proposed under this amendment may foreseeably lower water quality, but not to the extent that it no longer is sufficient to fully protect the existing uses in that water body (See SED, Considerations of Antidegradation When Removing a Water Quality Objective). It is unreasonable to assume a beneficial use is not fully protected because there are short-term impacts to non-target species present within the pesticide treatment area. To assume otherwise prevents the Water Board's ability to consider aquatic pesticide applications proposed where necessary for the restoration of ecological integrity and the protection of public health. Also refer to Response D&NE R18 (2nd para) indicating staff has replaced the paraphrased language originally presented in Exemption Criteria for Aquatic Pesticide Use, Purpose and Need for Exemption, paragraph 4, so this section now directly cites the Federal Antidegradation Policy 40 CFR 131.12(a)(2).</p>

Comments	Response
<p style="text-align: center;">11</p> <p>over the Clean Water Act. The purpose of the Regional Boards (among other things) is to implement the provisions of the Clean Water Act and Porter-Cologne Act.</p> <p>In section 4.4.2 of the Water Quality Handbook, the meaning of protection of beneficial uses is expanded.</p> <p>“No activity is allowable under the antidegradation policy which would partially or completely eliminate any existing use whether or not that use is designated in a State’s water quality standards. The aquatic protection use is a broad category requiring further explanation. Non-aberrational resident species must be protected, even if not prevalent in number or importance. Water quality should be such that it results in no mortality and no significant growth or reproductive impairment of resident species.”</p> <p>The intent of allowing lowering of water quality while fully protecting existing uses was reviewed and further explained in the Preamble by the EPA during the last revisions of rules for the Clean Water Act: “In Sec. 131.12(a)(2) a phrase was added that ‘In allowing such degradation or lower water quality, the State shall assure water quality adequate to protect existing uses fully’. This means that the full use must continue to exist even if some change in water quality may be permitted” (Federal Register Vol 48, No. 217, Tuesday, November 8, 1983/Rules and Regulations. (51402).</p> <p>“In its entirety, the antidegradation policy represents a three-tiered approach to maintaining and protecting various levels of water quality and uses. At its base (Section 131.12(a)(1): all existing uses and the level of water quality necessary to protect those uses must be maintained and protected. This provision establishes the absolute floor of water quality in all waters of the United States” (Federal Register Vol 48, No. 217, Tuesday, November 8, 1983/Rules and Regulations. (51402).</p> <p>Further, in response to comments not discussed in the Preamble to the proposed rule, EPA discussed three options for changes in the existing antidegradation policy. “Option 3 would have allowed changes in an existing use if maintaining that use would effectively prevent any future growth in the community or if the benefits of maintaining</p>	

Comments	Response
<p style="text-align: right;">12</p> <p>the use do not bear a reasonable relationship to the costs." EPA response was "...commenters believed that allowances should be made for carefully defined exceptions to the absolute requirement that uses attained must be maintained. EPA rejects this contention as being totally inconsistent with the spirit and intent of both the Clean Water Act and the underlying philosophy of the antidegradation policy." (Federal Register Vol 48, No. 217, Tuesday, November 8, 1983/Rules and Regulations (51409))</p> <p>The proposed new language on fisheries management recognizes the violation of Antidegradation Policy (Draft Waste Discharge Prohibition and Exemption Criteria Language: Pesticide Basin Plan Amendment, p. 4): <i>"It is not appropriate or possible for the Regional Board to find that discharges within the zone of impact comply with federal and state antidegradation policies."</i> Not only is the use of rotenone formulations at odds with the policies during the period of treatment, the Regional Board acknowledges (Chapter 4, p. 4.9-21-25 revised Plan) such use has long-term and permanent adverse effects on aquatic invertebrates and frogs – beneficial uses protected by the state. The staff's justification for approving such a project anyway, is that the purpose of the project is of value to the people of the State.</p> <p>What the Regional Board staff is doing by these proposed revisions is to eliminate the elements of the Antidegradation Policy that fully protect beneficial uses when government agencies, and some private entities, claim they need to lower water quality through use of aquatic pesticides. They have chosen to focus on the aspect of the Federal policy that allows, under limited circumstances, the lowering of water quality, while ignoring or redefining the simultaneous <u>requirement</u> of fully protecting resident aquatic life.</p> <p>In conclusion, these proposed revisions by the staff of the Lahontan Basin Plan seem to reduce the responsibility and liability of the LRWQCB for all poison applications in the basin by public agencies and to permit an increase in poisoning by private agencies. The public will have to decide whether it serves the purposes of protecting health, safety and the environment, as claimed</p>	<p>D&NE R21: The state and federal antidegradation policies are complex policies intended to prevent the loss of water quality and allow the maintenance and enhancement of the physical, chemical and biological aspects of water quality (CWA section 101(a)). The proposed amendment is necessary to fulfill all of these aspects of the Clean Water Act. While it may not be possible to prevent each and every instance of water quality being lowered, including temporary drops, such application of the policy would be unreasonable considering it would prevent attainment of the goals of the Clean Water Act. Staff asks the commenters to direct their attention to the revised SED language (refer to pages 16-19) on considerations of the state and federal antidegradation policies for a reasoned analysis of how the proposed amendment achieves consistency with the antidegradation policies.</p> <p>D&NE R22: The Water Board is not ignoring the second aspect of the federal antidegradation policy. We recognize that the policy allows relief when "the economic and social need for the activity clearly outweighs the benefit of maintaining water quality above that required for 'fishable/swimmable' water, and both cannot be achieved (EPA Water Quality Handbook, Section 4.5)." There is a demonstrated need for this amendment as discussed in Sections 4 and 5 of the SED. The specific circumstances and related water quality controls included in the proposed language ensure that subsequent actions by the Water Board that provide exemption to the proposed waste discharge prohibition also meet the standards of the federal antidegradation policy. Additionally, the protection of aquatic life "more accurately reflect[s] the protection of the aquatic community that was intended in section 101(a)(2) of the [Clean Water] Act (EPA WQ Handbook, Section 4.4.2)." In this, the proposed amendment is consistent with the restoration and maintenance of the biological integrity of the waters of the United States that is stated as a goal of the Clean Water Act in section 101(a). Also, refer to response D&NE R11.</p>

Comments	Response
<p data-bbox="1024 321 1052 342">13</p> <p data-bbox="212 383 947 513">repeatedly in this staff document, to spray or pour an increasing amount of poison over or into water for an ever-expanding variety of reasons, under the banner of “in the public interest.” We urge the Regional Board to deny these suggested revisions to the Lahontan Basin Plan.</p>	