

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
COLORADO RIVER BASIN REGION**

RESOLUTION NO. R7-2002-0097

A Resolution Amending the Water Quality Control Plan
for the Colorado River Basin
to Establish a Total Maximum Daily Load for Sedimentation/Siltation
for the New River

WHEREAS, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Colorado River Basin Region (hereinafter Regional Board), finds that:

1. An updated Water Quality Control Plan for the Colorado River Basin (Basin Plan) was adopted by the Regional Board on November 17, 1993, approved by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) on February 17, 1994, and approved by the Office of Administrative Law on August 3, 1994.
2. Warm freshwater habitat (WARM), wildlife habitat (WILD), preservation of rare, threatened, and endangered species (RARE), water contact recreation (REC I), non-contact recreation (REC II), and freshwater replenishment (FRSH) are among the beneficial use designations specified in the Basin Plan for the New River.
3. The Basin Plan includes narrative water quality objectives for total suspended solids, sediment, and turbidity for the New River to protect the beneficial uses listed in Finding No. 2, above.
4. Water quality objectives are not being met in the New River because direct and indirect discharges of silt-laden agricultural tailwater into the River and drain maintenance operations are adversely impacting the beneficial uses. The silt carries insoluble pesticides such as DDT and its byproducts, which bioaccumulate in fish tissue.
5. Pursuant to Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act, the Regional Board, with the concurrence of the State Board, listed the New River as water quality limited because of the sediment impairments. Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act requires the establishment of the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) of sediment/silt that can be discharged while still ensuring compliance with water quality standards. Section 303(d) also requires the allocation of this TMDL among sources of sediment/silt, together with an implementation plan and schedule that will ensure that the TMDL is met and that compliance with water quality standards is achieved.
6. The New River Sedimentation/Siltation TMDL Report (hereafter "TMDL Report") and the proposed Basin Plan amendment (hereafter "Attachment 2") to establish the TMDL are hereby made part of this Resolution by reference.
7. The TMDL Report and related Basin Plan amendment attached to this resolution meet the requirements of Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act. The amendment requires, in part, that nonpoint sources implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control sediment/silt inputs to provide a reasonable assurance that water quality standards will be met.

8. The Regional Board prepared and distributed written reports regarding adoption of the Basin Plan amendment in compliance with applicable state and federal environmental regulations (Title 23, California Code of Regulations, Section 3775 et seq.; and Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 25 and 131).
9. The process of basin planning has been certified by the Secretary for Resources as exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.) to prepare an Environmental Impact Report or Negative Declaration. (Pub. Resources Code, 21080.5; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, 15251, subd. (g).) The TMDL Report-Basin Plan amendment package includes an Environmental Checklist, an assessment of the environmental impacts of the Basin Plan amendment, and a discussion of alternatives, among other analyses. The amended Basin Plan, Environmental Checklist, TMDL Report, and supporting documentation are functionally equivalent to an Environmental Impact Report or Negative Declaration.
10. The proposed adoption of the Basin Plan amendment based on the TMDL Report is a regulatory action subject to the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21159. Consistent with the requirements of that section, the CEQA Checklist and the CEQA Checklist Discussion include, among other things, an analysis of reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts associated with proposed methods of compliance set forth in the Basin Plan amendment, an analysis of reasonably foreseeable feasible mitigation measures to reduce or avoid those impacts, and an analysis of reasonably foreseeable alternative means of compliance with the requirements embodied by the Basin Plan amendment that would avoid or eliminate the related environmental impacts. (Pub. Resources Code, 21159, subd. (a)(1)-(3); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, 15187, subds. (b), (c)(1)-(3).) In so doing, the analysis in the CEQA Checklist and CEQA Checklist Discussion takes into account a reasonable range of environmental, economic, and technical factors. CEQA analysis determined that the proposed Basin Plan amendment could have a significant adverse effect on the environment. However, there are feasible alternatives and/or feasible mitigation measures that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impact.
11. The Regional Board has considered federal and state antidegradation policies and other relevant water quality control policies and finds the Basin Plan amendment consistent with those policies.
12. Since January 1998, Regional Board staff has engaged interested parties in stakeholder involvement through regular meetings of the Silt Total Maximum Daily Load Technical Advisory Committee.
13. Consistent with Title 23, California Code of Regulations, Sections 3778 through 3780, the Regional Board consulted about the proposed action with stakeholders in the Region and with other potentially affected parties, considered and addressed comments on the matter, and considered and incorporated feasible mitigation measures to avoid significant impacts on the environment.
14. On June 26, 2002, the Regional Board held a Public Hearing to consider the TMDL Report and the Basin Plan amendment. Notice of the Public Hearing was given to all interested persons and published in accordance with Water Code Section 13244 and Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 25.

15. The Basin Plan amendment must be submitted for review and approval by the SWRCB, the Office of Administrative Law (OAL), and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Once approved by the SWRCB, the amendment is submitted to OAL. A Notice of Decision will be filed after the SWRCB and OAL have acted on this matter. The SWRCB will forward the approved amendment to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for review and approval.
16. The TMDL establishes a numeric target of 200 mg/L for Total Suspended Solids (annual average). Numeric targets in a TMDL are not water quality objectives. Numeric targets are implementation tools that translate existing objectives, by quantifying the limits those objectives require, considering seasonal variations and a margin of safety. Targets do not create new bases for enforcement apart from the objectives they translate.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. The Regional Board adopts the amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Colorado River Basin as set forth in Attachment 2.
2. The Executive Officer is directed to forward copies of the Basin Plan amendment to the SWRCB in accordance with the requirement of Section 13245 of the California Water Code.
3. The Regional Board requests that the State Water Resources Control Board approve the Basin Plan amendment in accordance with Sections 13245 and 13246 of the California Water Code and forward it to the Office of Administrative Law and United States Environmental Protection Agency for approval.
4. The Executive Officer is directed to file a Notice of Decision with the California Secretary for Resources after final approval of the Basin Plan amendment, in accordance with Section 21080.5(d) (2)(E) of the Public Resources Code and Title 23, California Code of Regulations, Section 3781.
5. If during its approval process the SWRCB or OAL determines that minor, non-substantive corrections to the language of the amendment are needed for clarity or consistency, the Executive Officer may make such changes, and shall inform the Board of any such changes.

I, Phil Gruenberg, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Colorado River Basin Region, on June 26, 2002.



Phil Gruenberg
Executive Officer

ATTACHMENT 2

An Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Colorado River Basin Region to Establish the New River Sedimentation/Siltation Total Maximum Daily Load

AMENDMENT

(Proposed changes are in reference to the May 23, 2002 version of the Basin Plan. Proposed additions are denoted by underlined text, proposed deletions are denoted by ~~strikethrough text~~)

Page 4-19, change "~~VI. TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOADS~~" TO "V. TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOADS" and add the following new subsequent Section and renumber accordingly:

C. New River Sedimentation/Siltation TMDL

1. TMDL ELEMENTS

Table 4-3: New River Sedimentation/Siltation TMDL Elements

<u>ELEMENT</u>	
<u>Problem Statement</u> <u>(impaired water quality standard)</u>	Excess delivery of sediment to the New River has resulted in degraded conditions that impairs designated beneficial uses: warm freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; preservation of threatened, rare, and endangered species habitat; contact- and non-contact recreation; freshwater replenishment. As the New River discharges into the Salton Sea, sediment also threatens the same beneficial uses of the Salton Sea. Sediment serves as a carrier for DDT, DDT metabolites, and other insoluble pesticides including toxaphene, which pose a threat to aquatic and avian communities and people feeding on fish from the New River; and suspended solids concentrations, sediment loads, and turbidity levels are in violation of water quality objectives. These current concentrations, loads, and levels are also forming objectionable bottom deposits, which are also adversely affecting the beneficial uses of New River.

(This table is continued on the following page.)

ATTACHMENT 2

Table C-1: New River Sedimentation/Siltation TMDL Elements (continued)

ELEMENT	CURRENT CONDITIONS												
<u>Numeric Target</u>	<u>200 mg/L Total Suspended Solids (annual average)¹</u>												
<u>Source Analysis</u>	<table border="0"> <tr> <td><u>Source</u></td> <td align="right"><u>tons/year</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agricultural Drain Discharges:</td> <td align="right">137,715</td> </tr> <tr> <td>In-Stream Erosion & Wind Deposition:</td> <td align="right">6,409</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NPDES Permitted Facilities:</td> <td align="right">356</td> </tr> <tr> <td>International Boundary</td> <td align="right">11,265</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total:</td> <td align="right">155,745</td> </tr> </table>	<u>Source</u>	<u>tons/year</u>	Agricultural Drain Discharges:	137,715	In-Stream Erosion & Wind Deposition:	6,409	NPDES Permitted Facilities:	356	International Boundary	11,265	Total:	155,745
	<u>Source</u>	<u>tons/year</u>											
	Agricultural Drain Discharges:	137,715											
	In-Stream Erosion & Wind Deposition:	6,409											
	NPDES Permitted Facilities:	356											
International Boundary	11,265												
Total:	155,745												
<u>Margin of Safety</u>	<u>6,409 tons/year</u> <u>(corresponds to 10 mg/L)</u>												
<u>Seasonal Variations and Critical Conditions</u>	<u>Both the flow and sedimentation regimes within the New River watershed are relatively stable, and the sediment and water sources within the watershed are relatively uniform and widespread; therefore, this TMDL does not include provisions other than the established load allocations and implementation plan for seasonal variations or critical conditions. Staff's analysis of potential water transfers out of the watershed indicate that the transfers are not likely to affect compliance with this TMDL, but could cause other water quality problems that will need to be addressed by the parties responsible for the transfers.</u>												
<u>Loading Capacity</u>	<u>127,881 tons/year</u>												

(This table is continued on the following page.)

¹ The numeric target is a goal that translates current silt/sediment-related Basin Plan narrative objectives and shall not be used for enforcement purposes.

ATTACHMENT 2

Table C-1: New River Sedimentation/Siltation TMDL Elements (continued)

ELEMENT			
<u>Load Allocations and Wasteload Allocations</u>	<p><u>Load Allocations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Natural sources of sediment to the New River, including erosion and wind deposition, are allocated 6,409 tons/year.</u> <u>Waste discharges from nonpoint sources into the New River shall not exceed the load allocations specified below:</u> 		
	<u>River Reach</u>	<u># of IID Drains Identified within Reach</u>	<u>Sediment Load Allocation (tons/year)^{1,2}</u>
	<u>New River immediately downstream of the International Boundary, at the USGS gauging station, a point identified hereafter at "NR-0"</u>	None	11,265
	<u>Reach 1: Downstream from the International Boundary to the intersection of the Evan Hewes Road Bridge and the New River Channel, a point identified hereafter as "NR-1"</u>	14	20,730
	<u>Reach 2: This reach encompasses the river from NR-1 to Drop Structure 2, a point upstream of the Rutheford Road Bridge hereafter referred to as "NR-2".</u>	17	32,350

(This table is continued on the following page.)

ATTACHMENT 2

Table C-1: New River Sedimentation/Siltation TMDL Elements (continued)

ELEMENT			
Load Allocations and Wasteload Allocations	<u>Reach 3: This reach covers the river from NR-2 to the point where it intersects the Lack Road Bridge, a point hereafter referred to as "NR-Outlet."</u>	23	35,835
	<u>Direct Outfalls to River</u>	<u># of IID Drains Identified</u>	<u>Sediment Load Allocation (tons/year)^{1,2}</u>
	<u>Tailwater outfalls discharging directly to the New River.</u>	a	14,884
	<u>Natural Sources</u>		
	<u>Natural Sources</u>		6,409
	Waste Load Allocations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>The discharge from point sources (NPDES permits) shall not exceed the total suspended solids limits specified under 40 CFR 122 et seq., and the corresponding mass loading rates.</u> 			

Footnotes for Table No. C-1:

¹ The sediment load allocation for any particular applicable reach shall be distributed proportionately amongst the agricultural drains within that particular reach based on the relative flow contribution of each drain to the total flow contribution to the reach from the drains within the reach. The Regional Board's Executive Officer shall determine the proportional load amongst the agricultural drains within that particular reach. The sediment load allocation will be reviewed by the Regional Board's Executive Officer every three years following TMDL implementation.

² The sediment load allocations have been calculated based on the estimated individual average drain flows within the reach for the 1995-2000 period. At lower or higher drain flows, the average annual load allocation for a particular reach shall not exceed the load given by:

$$LA_R = (180) * (Q_R) * (0.0013597), \text{ where:}$$

LA_R = Load Allocation for any of the New River reaches identified above (tons/yr).

Q_R = Reach Flow (ac-ft) = Total flow contribution to the reach from the drains within the reach (ac-ft).
The sediment load allocation will be reviewed by the Executive Officer every three years following TMDL implementation.

^a The number of outfalls has not been determined.

TMDL attainment shall be in accordance with the schedule contained in Table C-2, below:

Table C-2: Interim Numeric Targets for Attainment of the TMDL

<u>Phase</u>	<u>Time Period¹</u>	<u>Estimated Percent Load Reduction²</u>	<u>Interim Target (mg/L)³</u>
<u>Phase 1</u>	<u>Years 1 – 3</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>229</u>
<u>Phase 2</u>	<u>Years 4 – 6</u>	<u>7%</u>	<u>213</u>
<u>Phase 3</u>	<u>Years 7 – 9</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>204</u>
<u>Phase 4</u>	<u>Years 10 – 12</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u>200</u>

ATTACHMENT 2

Footnotes for Table No. C-2:

- ^{1.} Year 1 refers to the effective date to start TMDL implementation, which shall be one year after USEPA approves the TMDL. For example, if USEPA approves the TMDL on November 15, 2002, Year 1 is November 15, 2003, which makes Year 3 November 15, 2005, which makes Year 4 November 15, 2006, and so on.
- ^{2.} Percent reductions indicate the reduction required in total suspended sediment load from the average concentration of the New River at the beginning of each phase, beginning with the 1980-2001 average concentration of 306 mg/L.
- ^{3.} These interim targets are goals which translate current silt/sediment related Basin Plan narrative objectives and are not intended to specifically be used for enforcement purposes.

ATTACHMENT 2

Page 4-25, Edit subsequent Section 1. IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS AND REGULATIONS FOR ATTAINMENT OF ALAMO RIVER SEDIMENTATION/SILTATION TMDL change to "1. IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS AND REGULATIONS FOR ATTAINMENT OF SEDIMENTATION/SILTATION TMDLs"

Page 4-25, Edit Subsequent Section "1.1 DESIGNATED MANAGEMENT ACTIONS" and change to:

- Farmers/growers discharging waste into the New River and Alamo River in a manner that causes or could cause violation of load allocations and/or exceedance of the Sediment/Silt numeric target;

Page 4-25, Edit Subsequent Section "1.1.1 Farmers/growers Water Quality Management Plans" and change to:

The farmers/growers shall submit self-determined sediment control programs to the Regional Board by: (insert the date that corresponds to 15 months following the date of USEPA TMDL approval).

Table 4-4 Date that Corresponds to 15 months following the date of USEPA TMDL Approval *

<u>TMDL</u>	<u>Date (15 months after USEPA Approval)</u>
Alamo River	
New River	

Edit Subsequent Section "1.1.2 The Imperial Irrigation District" and change to:

By: (insert the date that corresponds to 15 months following the date of USEPA TMDL approval)

Table 4-5 Date that Corresponds to 15 months following the date of USEPA TMDL Approval *

<u>TMDL</u>	<u>Date (15 months after USEPA Approval)</u>
Alamo River	
New River	

the Imperial Irrigation District shall submit to the Regional Board a revised Drain Water Quality Improvement Plan (DWQIP) with a proposed program to control and monitor water quality impacts caused by drain maintenance operations within the Alamo and New River Watershed and dredging operations in the Alamo and New Rivers.

* Note: Upon USEPA TMDL approval, this parenthetical "formula" will be replaced by the date certain, based on the date of approval.

* Note: Upon USEPA TMDL approval, this parenthetical "formula" will be replaced by the date certain, based on the date of approval. The Executive Officer shall be responsible for determining proportional sediment load allocations amongst the agricultural drains.

ATTACHMENT 2

a. Drain and New River Deltas Maintenance

- Reduction in drain cleaning and dredging activities to the practical extent allowed by the implementation of on- and off-field sediment control BMPs by the farmers/growers and the BMP effectiveness in reducing silt built up in the drains and the New and Alamo River Deltas to avoid impacts on sensitive resources.

b. Drain Water Quality Monitoring Plan

The revised DWQIP shall consist of a proposed program to monitor:

- Water quality impacts caused by dredging operations in the drains and to monitor the effects that dredging operations in the New and Alamo River Deltas have on the river's water quality standards;
- Representative samples from the water column of all major drains and a representative number of the small drains tributary to the New and Alamo Rivers for analyses of flow, TSS, Turbidity, and nutrients.

c. Information on Agricultural Dischargers

No later than insert date that corresponds to 16 months following the date of USEPA TMDL approval.

Table 4-6 Date that Corresponds to 16 months following the date of USEPA TMDL Approval

<u>TMDL</u>	<u>Date (16 months after USEPA Approval)</u>
Alamo River	
New River	

Page 4-27, Edit Subsequent Section "1.1.3. United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and U.S. Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission (IBWC)" and change to:

By: insert the date that corresponds to 15 months following the date of USEPA TMDL approval*

Table 4-7 Date that Corresponds to 15 months following the date of USEPA TMDL Approval *

<u>TMDL</u>	<u>Date (15 months after USEPA Approval)</u>
Alamo River	
New River	

the USEPA and/or the U.S. Section of the IBWC shall submit to the Regional Board a technical report pursuant to Section 13225 of the California Water Code describing the proposed control

* Note: Upon USEPA approval, this parenthetical "formula" will be replaced by the date certain, based on the date of approval.

ATTACHMENT 2

measures, monitoring plan and reporting procedures, and quality assurance procedures the U.S. Government proposes to take to ensure that discharges of wastes from Mexico do not violate or contribute to a violation of ~~this~~ these TMDL TMDLs, particularly a violation of the Load Allocation immediately downstream of the International Boundary, at the ~~point~~ points identified as "AR-0-" and "NR-0."

Edit Subsequent Section "1.2 RECOMMENDED MANAGEMENT ACTIONS FOR FARMERS/GROWERS AND DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT" and change to:

Implementation of BMPs should normally include: (1) consideration of specific site conditions; (2) monitoring to assure that practices are properly applied and are effective; (3) improvement of a BMP or implementation of additional BMPs or other management practices when needed to resolve a deficiency and; (4) mitigation of a problem where the practices are not effective. The practices listed herein are a compilation of BMPs recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee for the Silt TMDL for the Alamo and New Rivers (Silt TAC), the Natural Resources Conservation Services Field Office Technical Guide (NRCS FOTG), the IID, and the University of California Cooperative Extension (Holtville Field Station). Inclusion of practices herein is not meant to imply or establish a prescriptive list of 'one size fits all' preferred practices for the drainage basins tributary to the Alamo and New River Rivers.

Edit Subsequent Section Title "1.2.3 ESTIMATED COST OF IMPLEMENTATION AND SOURCES OF FINANCING" and change to "1.2.3 ESTIMATED COST OF IMPLEMENTATION AND SOURCES OF FINANCING FOR THE NEW AND ALAMO RIVERS"

Edit Subsequent Section 1.3.1 IMPERIAL COUNTY FARM BUREAU VOLUNTARY WATERSHED PROGRAM and change to:

a. ICFB WATERSHED PROGRAM PLAN

The Imperial County Farm Bureau should:

- ~~By: insert the date that corresponds to 13 months following the date of USEPA TMDL approval~~

Table 4-8 Date that Corresponds to 13 months following the date of USEPA TMDL Approval *

<u>TMDL</u>	<u>Date (13 months after USEPA Approval</u>
<u>Alamo River</u>	
<u>New River</u>	

~~Issue~~ issue letters to all potential program participants within the Alamo and New Rivers watersheds s that describes the ICFB Voluntary Watershed Program.

- ~~By: insert the date that corresponds to 15 months following the date of USEPA TMDL approval~~

Table 4-9 Date that Corresponds to 15 months following the date of USEPA TMDL Approval *

* Note: Upon USEPA TMDL approval, this parenthetical "formula" will be replaced by the date certain, based on the date of approval.

ATTACHMENT 2

<u>TMDL</u>	<u>Date (15 months after USEPA Approval)</u>
Alamo River	
New River	

provide the Regional Board with a list of program participants, organized by subwatershed ("drainshed").

- ~~By: {insert the date that corresponds to 15 months following the date of USEPA TMDL approval}*.~~

Table 4-10 Date that Corresponds to 15 months following the date of USEPA TMDL Approval *

<u>TMDL</u>	<u>Date (15 months after USEPA Approval)</u>
Alamo River	
New River	

submit the ICFB Watershed Program Plan to the Regional Board. The Plan should (1) identify measurable environmental and programmatic goals; (2) describe aggressive, reasonable milestones and timelines for the development and implementation of TMDL outreach plans; (3) describe aggressive, reasonable milestones and timelines for the development of sub-watershed ("drainshed") plans; (4) describe a commitment to develop and implement a tracking and reporting program.

b. ICFB TRACKING AND REPORTING PROCEDURES

The Imperial County Farm Bureau should also:

- ~~By: {insert the date that corresponds to 16 months following the date of USEPA TMDL approval}*.~~

Table 4-11 Date that Corresponds to 16 months following the date of USEPA TMDL Approval *

<u>TMDL</u>	<u>Date (16 months after USEPA Approval)</u>
Alamo River	
New River	

submit a plan describing the process and procedures for tracking and reporting implementation of BMPs (and other proven management practices) and BMP performance to the Regional Board's Executive Officer.

- Implement the tracking and reporting procedures.
- Submit semi-monthly written reports assessing trends in the data and level of adoption of the process and procedures throughout each of the sub-watersheds ("drainsheds") to the Executive Officer.
- Submit a yearly summary report to the Executive Officer by 15th of February of each year.

Page 4-32, Edit “ VI. ACTIONS OF OTHER AUTHORITIES” change to “VII. ACTIONS OF OTHER AUTHORITIES”

Page 6-3, Edit “II. REGIONAL BOARD MONITORING”, SUBSECTION “B. COMPLIANCE MONITORING”, SUBSEQUENT SECTION “~~1. Recommended Biomonitoring (Toxicity Monitoring) Programs~~” change to “2. Recommended Biomonitoring (Toxicity Monitoring) Programs”

Page 6-4, Edit under subsequent Sections the following:

~~2-3.~~ New River Pathogen TMDL

~~3-4.~~ Alamo River Sedimentation/Siltation TMDL

5. New River Sedimentation/Siltation TMDL

~~3-1-5.1~~ Compliance Assurance and Enforcement

~~3-2-5.2~~ Monitoring and Tracking

Page 6-5, Edit Section

- **Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment** and add the Subsection “Alamo River” directly beneath the Section title. Add the subsequent Subsection “New River” with the following text:

Monitoring activities are contingent upon adequate programmatic funding. The Regional Board will conduct monitoring activities for the New River Sedimentation/Siltation TMDL pursuant to a Regional Board Quality Assurance Project Plan for the New River (QAPP-NR). The QAPP-NR shall be developed by Regional Board staff and be ready for implementation within 180 days following USEPA approval of this TMDL. The Regional Board's Executive Officer shall approve the QAPP-NR and monitoring plan after determining that the QAPP-NR and monitoring plan satisfy the objectives and requirements of this Section 5.2. The objectives of the monitoring program shall include collection of water quality data for:

- Assessment of water quality standards attainment,
- Verification of pollution source allocations,
- Calibration or modification of selected models (if any),
- Evaluation of point and nonpoint source control implementation and effectiveness,
- Evaluation of in-stream water quality,
- Evaluation of temporal and spatial trends in water quality, and
- Modification of the TMDL as necessary.

The monitoring program shall include a sufficient number of sampling locations and sampling points per location along the New River and major drain tributaries to the river. Monthly grab samples from the above-mentioned surface waters shall be collected and analyzed for the following parameters:

ATTACHMENT 2

- Flow (to be obtained from IID or USGS)
- Dissolved Oxygen
- pH
- Temperature
- Field turbidity
- Laboratory turbidity
- Total suspended solids
- Quarterly monitoring of DDT and DDT metabolites
- Fecal coliform organisms
- E. Coli
- Fecal streptococci
- Enterococci

The Regional Board will track activities implemented by dischargers and responsible parties and surveillance conducted for the New River Sedimentation/Siltation TMDL pursuant to an implementation tracking plan (ITP). Regional Board staff will develop the ITP within 180 days following USEPA approval of this TMDL. The Regional Board's Executive Officer shall approve the ITP after determining that the ITP satisfies the objectives and requirements of this Section 5.2. The objectives of Regional Board Surveillance and implementation tracking are:

- Assess/track/account for practices already in place;
- Measure the attainment of Milestones;
- Determine compliance with NPDES permits, WLAs, and LAs; and
- Report progress toward implementation of NPS water quality control, in accordance with the SWRCB NPS Program Plan (PROSIP).