



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
REGION 8

1595 Wynkoop Street  
DENVER, CO 80202-1129  
Phone 800-227-8917  
<http://www.epa.gov/region08>

FEB 10 2012

Ref: EPR-EP

Mr. Walter L. Baker, P.E.  
Director, Division of Water Quality  
Department of Environmental Quality  
195 North 1950 West  
P.O. Box 144870  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-4870

Re: Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List of Impaired  
Waters in need of Total Maximum Daily Loads  
(TMDL)

Dear Mr. Baker:

Thank you for your submittal of the State of Utah's 2008 and 2010 Integrated Reports (IR). The Environmental Protection Agency Region 8 (EPA) has completed its review of the Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 303(d) lists included in both reports. Given that both Section 303(d) lists were available for review at the same time (see Enclosure 1 for submittal and receipt dates), the EPA is acting on both lists via this letter.

Based on our review of both Section 303(d) lists, the EPA is taking a "partial approval/further review pending" action on Utah's 2008 and 2010 lists. Specifically, the EPA approves the State's decisions to list all the water bodies identified on Utah's list submissions (Enclosures 2 and 4), as well as the State's decisions not to list certain waters (Enclosures 3 and 5). The EPA is deferring action on the following three waters: Kanab Creek-2, Lower Robinson Creek, and the Great Salt Lake, to allow continued review of all existing and readily available water quality related data and to coordinate with Utah. Further details of our "partial approval/further review pending" action are provided in Enclosure 1.

In accordance with 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(5), States are required to "assemble and evaluate all existing and readily available water quality-related data and information to develop the list" required by Section 303(d) of the CWA and 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(1). The EPA has concluded that Utah has met the requirements of 40 CFR § 130.7(b)(5) with regards to all the waters listed in Enclosures 2 through 5. The EPA has not made any decision regarding the State's decision to not list Kanab Creek-2, Lower Robinson Creek, and Great Salt Lake, and will continue to review all existing and readily available water quality related data on these waters. The EPA anticipates taking a final action on Kanab Creek-2 and Lower Robinson Creek within 60 days and the Great Salt Lake within 180 days.

The EPA's partial approval of Utah's 2008 and 2010 Section 303(d) lists extends to all waterbodies on the lists with the exception of those waters that are within Indian country, as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 1151.

Thank you for your efforts in developing Utah's 2008 and 2010 Integrated Reports. The EPA Region 8 anticipates working with you and your staff over the coming months as we complete our evaluation of these three waters. If you have any questions, the most knowledgeable person on my staff is Kris Jensen and she may be reached at 303-312-6237.

Sincerely,



Martin Hestmark  
Assistant Regional Administrator  
Office of Ecosystems Protection  
and Remediation

Enclosures (5)

1. Final Record of Decision
2. Final Utah 2008 303(d) List
3. Final Utah 2008 Request for Removal (from Section 303(d)) List
4. Final Utah 2010 303(d) List
5. Final Utah 2010 Request for Removal (from Section 303(d)) List

cc: Ms. Leah Ann Lamb, Assistant Director, Water Quality Division, UDEQ  
Mr. Jeff Ostermiller, Chief, Water Quality Management Branch, UDEQ



## Enclosure 1

# Review of Utah's 2008 and 2010 Section 303(d) Waterbody Lists

---

*Attachment to letter from Martin Hestmark, Assistant Regional Administrator,  
Office of Ecosystems Protection and Remediation, US EPA, Region 8 to Walter L. Baker, Director, Division of Water Quality,  
Utah Department of Environmental Quality*

### **Dates of Integrated Report Transmittal from State:**

*2008 Integrated Report:* March 31, April 21,  
May 24, and September 14, 2011  
*2010 Integrated Report:* April 21, April 27,  
and May 24, 2011

### **Dates of Receipt by EPA:**

*2008 Integrated Report:* April 6, April 21,  
May 24, and September 14, 2011  
*2010 Integrated Report:* May 3, April 21 and  
May 24, 2011

## **I. Introduction**

Utah Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) submitted the State of Utah's final 2008 Integrated Report (IR) to EPA in a series of four submittals on March 31, April 21, May 24, and September 14, 2011. DEQ submitted the State's final 2010 Integrated Report (IR) to EPA in a series of three submittals on April 21, April 27, and May 24, 2011. Because both documents are currently available for review, EPA is acting simultaneously on both the 2008 and the 2010 Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 303(d) lists contained in the two reports. Based on our review of the two Section 303(d) lists, EPA is partially approving Utah's 2008 and 2010 lists, with further review pending on three waters, as described below.

The purpose of this review document is to describe the rationale for EPA's partial approval/further review pending action. EPA is deferring action on Utah's decisions not to include the following three waters on its 2008 and 2010 list: Kanab Creek-2, its tributary Lower Robinson Creek, and the Great Salt Lake (also known as "deferral waters"). Section II of this document explains the statutory and regulatory background of the 303(d) process, Section III reviews Utah's 2008 and 2010 303(d) list submissions, and Section IV records EPA's final determination on the two lists.

On October 12, 2006, EPA issued guidance entitled *Information Concerning 2008 Clean Water Act Sections 303(d), 305(b), and 314 Integrated Reporting and Listing Decisions*. (Memorandum from Diane Regas, Director, Office of Oceans, Wetlands, and Watersheds.) This guidance, and previous EPA guidance, recommends that states develop an Integrated Report of the quality of their waters by placing all waters into one of five assessment categories. By following this guidance, Category 5 of the Integrated Report is the State's Section 303(d) list. EPA's action is only on Category 5 that comprises the Section 303(d) list within the 2008 and 2010 Integrated

## Enclosure 1

Reports.

EPA reviewed the methodology used by the State in developing the Section 303(d) 2008 and 2010 lists and the State's description of the data and information it considered. EPA's review of Utah's 2008 and 2010 Section 303(d) lists is based on EPA's analysis of whether the State reasonably considered existing and readily available water quality-related data and information and reasonably identified waters required to be listed.

Utah's 2008 list is considered an update of the State's 2006 303(d) list, which was comprised of 114 assessment units. The 2008 Section 303(d) list is comprised of 136 assessment units (191 waterbody-pollutant combinations). These 136 assessment units do not include the three deferral waters.

Utah's 2010 list is an update of the State's 2008 303(d) list, which is comprised of 155 assessment units (219 waterbody-pollutant combinations). These 155 assessment units do not include the three deferral waters.

States may add and take waters off their Section 303(d) lists for several reasons, including the approval of a TMDL or the adoption of a site-specific water quality standard that is currently being attained. For the 2008 cycle, Utah removed 79 waterbody-pollutant combinations from the 2006 303(d) list. The majority (50 waterbody-pollutant combinations) were removed based on an EPA-approved total maximum daily load (TMDL). For the 2010 cycle, Utah removed an additional 21 waterbody-pollutant combinations that appeared on 2008 303(d) list. The majority (16 waterbody-pollutant combinations) were removed based on an EPA-approved TMDL.

## II. Statutory and Regulatory Background

### A. Identification of Water Quality Limited Segments for Inclusion on a State Section 303(d) List

Section 303(d)(1) of the CWA directs states to identify those waters within its jurisdiction for which effluent limitations required by Section 301(b)(1)(A) and (B) are not stringent enough to implement any applicable water quality standard, and to establish a priority ranking for such waters, taking into account the severity of the pollution and the uses to be made of such waters. The Section 303(d) listing requirement applies to waters impaired by point and/or nonpoint sources, pursuant to EPA's long-standing interpretation of Section 303(d).

EPA regulations implementing Section 303(d) require states to identify water quality limited segments (WQLSs) that need TMDLs. 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b). WQLSs<sup>1</sup> are defined

---

<sup>1</sup> WQLSs may also be referred to as "impaired waterbodies" or "impairments" throughout this document.

## Enclosure 1

in regulation as segments “where it is known that water quality does not meet applicable water quality standards, and/or is not expected to meet applicable water quality standards, even after the application of the technology-based effluent limitations required by sections 301(b) and 306 of the Act.” 40 C.F.R. § 130.2(j). Thus, states do not need to list waters where the following controls are adequate to implement applicable standards: (1) technology-based effluent limitations required by the CWA; (2) more stringent effluent limitations required by state or local authority; and (3) other pollution control requirements required by state, local, or federal authority. 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(1).

### **B. Consideration of Existing and Readily Available Water Quality-Related Data and Information**

In developing Section 303(d) lists, states are required to assemble and evaluate all existing and readily available water quality-related data and information, including, at a minimum, consideration of existing and readily available data and information about the following categories of waters: (1) waters identified as not meeting designated uses, or as threatened, in the State’s most recent CWA Section 305(b) report; (2) waters for which dilution calculations or predictive modeling indicate nonattainment of applicable standards; (3) waters for which water quality problems have been reported by governmental agencies, members of the public, or academic institutions; and (4) waters identified as impaired or threatened in any Section 319 nonpoint assessment submitted to EPA. 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(5). In addition to these minimum categories, states are required to consider any other data and information that is existing and readily available. EPA’s 1991 Guidance for Water Quality-Based Decisions describes categories of water quality-related data and information that may be existing and readily available. (*See Guidance for Water Quality-Based Decisions: The TMDL Process*, EPA Office of Water, April 1991.) While states are required to evaluate all existing and readily available water quality-related data and information, states may decide to rely or not rely on particular data or information in determining whether to list particular waters.

In addition to requiring states to assemble and evaluate all existing and readily available water quality-related data and information, EPA regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(6) require States to include, as part of their submissions to EPA, documentation to support decisions using or excluding particular data and information and decisions to list or not list waters. Such documentation needs to include, at a minimum, the following information: (1) a description of the methodology used to develop the list; (2) a description of the data and information used to identify waters; (3) a rationale for any decision not to use any existing and readily available data and information 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(5), and (4) any other reasonable information requested by the Region.

## **Enclosure 1**

### **C. Priority Ranking**

EPA regulations also codify and interpret the requirement in Section 303(d)(1)(A) of the CWA that states establish a priority ranking for listed waters. The regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(4) require states to prioritize waters on their Section 303(d) lists for TMDL development, and also to identify those WQLSs targeted for TMDL development in the next two years. In prioritizing and targeting waters, states must, at a minimum, take into account the severity of the pollution and the uses to be made of such waters. CWA Section 303(d)(1)(A). As long as these factors are taken into account, the CWA provides that states establish priorities. States may consider other factors relevant to prioritizing waters for TMDL development, including immediate programmatic needs such as wasteload allocations for permits, vulnerability of particular waters as aquatic habitats, recreational, economic, and aesthetic importance of particular waters, degree of public interest and support, and state or national policies and priorities. (See 57 Fed. Reg. 33040, 33045 (July 24, 1992), and EPA’s 1991 Guidance.)

### **D. Applicable Water Quality Standards.**

For purposes of identifying waters for the Section 303(d) list, the terms “water quality standard applicable to such waters” and “applicable water quality standards” refer to those water quality standards established under Section 303 of the Act. On April 27, 2000, EPA promulgated a rule under which the “applicable standard” for Clean Water Act purposes depends on when the relevant State or authorized Tribe promulgated that standard. Standards that States or authorized Tribes have promulgated before May 30, 2000, are effective upon promulgation by the States or authorized Tribes. Standards that States or authorized Tribes promulgated on or after May 30, 2000, become effective only upon EPA approval. 40 C.F.R. § 131.21(c).

EPA interprets CWA Section 303(d) to require EPA establishment or approval of section 303(d) lists only for impairments of waters with Federally-approved water quality standards.

## **III. Analysis of Utah’s Submission**

### **A. Background**

In reviewing Utah’s submittal, EPA first reviewed the methodology used by the State to develop their 2008 and 2010 Section 303(d) lists in light of Utah’s approved water quality standards, and then reviewed the actual lists of waters. The State’s assessment methodologies are included in the following sections of the two integrated reports:

## Enclosure 1

- Part 1: *Water Quality Assessment Guidance*, pages 1-i to 1-73, Utah Final 2008 Integrated Report.
- Part 1: *Methods for Assessing and Reporting the Condition of Lakes and Streams*, pages I to 56, Utah Final 2010 Integrated Report.

EPA has reviewed the State's submissions, and has concluded that the State developed its Section 303(d) list in compliance with Section 303(d) of the CWA and 40 C.F.R. § 130.7. EPA's review is based on its analysis of whether the State reasonably considered existing and readily available water quality-related data and information and reasonably identified waters required to be listed. With the possible exception of the deferral waters previously identified, Utah considered all data and information pertaining to the categories under 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(5), and properly listed WQLSs under 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(1).

In previous guidance, EPA recommended that states develop an Integrated Report of the quality of their waters by placing all waters into one of five assessment categories. (See Information Concerning 2008 Clean Water Act Sections 303(d), 305(b), and 314 Integrated Reporting and Listing Decisions) By following this guidance, Category 5 of the Integrated Report is the State's Section 303(d) list. EPA's action in review and approval of this document is only on Category 5 that comprises the Section 303(d) list within the Integrated Report.

The State's 2008 and 2010 lists, contained in the state's *Utah Final 2008 Integrated Report* and *Utah Final 2010 Integrated Report*, respectively, were submitted to EPA Region 8 in a series of submittals beginning with an initial submittal on April 6, 2011, and ending with a final submittal on September 14, 2011. These submittals were transmitted by Jeffrey Ostermiller, Chief of the Water Quality Management Section of Utah DEQ, or Walter L. Baker, Director of the Division of Water Quality of Utah DEQ.

The 2008 and 2010 Integrated Reports submitted to the EPA, from Utah DEQ consisted of the following portions that are necessary for the Section 303(d) waterbody list:

- **Waterbodies and corresponding pollutants that make up the State's Section 303(d) list** (See Enclosures 2, 3, 4 and 5.)
- **Prioritization of waterbodies for TMDL development** (See enclosures 2 and 4.)
- **Identification of waters targeted for TMDL development over the next biennium** (See Part 3 Utah 2008 303(d) Report List of Impaired Waters; and Part 2, Chapter 15 Utah's 2010 303(d) List of Impaired Waters.)

EPA's action on Utah's 2008 and 2010 Section 303(d) lists extends only to the items listed immediately above.

## Enclosure 1

Enclosures 2 and 3 contain tables detailing the waters Utah is listing, and waters that Utah is removing from the list, for 2008. These tables contain the following information for each waterbody: Watershed management unit, assessment unit identifier (ID), assessment unit name, assessment unit description, beneficial use class, beneficial use support, assessment category, pollutant, stream miles or lake acres, and TMDL priority. Enclosures 4 and 5 contain tables detailing the waters Utah is listing, and waters that Utah is removing from the list, for 2010. Because Utah changed its tables slightly, these tables contain the following information for each waterbody: assessment unit identifier (ID), assessment unit (waterbody) name, waterbody type, size, and location description, beneficial use class, cause(s) (pollutant(s)) and source(s), integrated reporting cycle first listed and TMDL priority status.

### **B. Identification of Waters and Consideration of Existing and Readily Available Water Quality-Related Data and Information**

EPA has reviewed Utah's description of the data and information it considered for identifying waters on the Section 303(d) lists. With the possible exception of the previously identified deferral waters, EPA concludes that the State properly assembled and evaluated all existing and readily available data and information, including data and information relating to the categories of waters specified in 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(5), and properly identified and listed WQLSs as required by 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(1). In particular, the State relied on information from the 2008 and 2010 Section 305(b) water quality assessments, assessments performed under the CWA Section 319 non-point source program, as well as data and information obtained through an extensive process to solicit information from state, federal and citizen sources. The State's evaluation of data and information in each of these categories is described below.

- *Waters identified by the state in its most recent section 305(b) report as "partially meeting" or "not meeting" designated uses or as "threatened," per 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(5)(i):* Utah produced its 2008 and 2010 Integrated Reports consistent with EPA's guidance regarding combined CWA 305(b) reports and 303(d) lists. EPA concludes that with the possible exception of the deferral waters previously identified, Utah made listing decisions using all existing and readily available data and information in development of its 2008 and 2010 Section 303(d) lists.
- *Waters for which dilution calculations or predictive models indicate non-attainment of applicable water quality standards, per 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(5)(ii):* Utah assembled and evaluated information from past and anticipated dilution calculations and predictive modeling. EPA concludes that Utah properly considered waters for which dilution calculations or predictive models indicate nonattainment of applicable water quality standards in development of its 2008 and 2010 Section 303(d) lists.

## **Enclosure 1**

- *Waters for which water quality problems have been reported by local, state, or federal agencies; members of the public; or academic institutions, per 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(5)(iii):* The State solicited data and information from the public in preparing its 2008 and 2010 Integrated Reports. The State's data solicitation for the 2008 IR ended on January 1, 2007, and the State's data solicitation for the 2010 IR ended on January 1, 2009. Data and information obtained as a result of this effort were evaluated and considered.
  
- *Waters identified by the State as impaired or threatened in a nonpoint assessment submitted to EPA under Section 319 of the CWA or in any updates of the assessment, per 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(5)(iv):* The State's 2008 and 2010 Section 303(d) lists include all waters that have data to support nonpoint source pollution impairment. Utah's listing approach and methodologies direct 319 activities and resources to the highest priorities. Watershed assessments are often conducted for waterbodies that are already listed in order to collect current data to support TMDL development.

Based upon its review, EPA concludes that with regards to the waters identified in Enclosures 2 through 5, the State's process for developing its 2008 and 2010 Section 303(d) lists substantially meets the requirements of 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(5)(i-iv) regarding the consideration of all existing and readily available water quality-related data and information, as well as the requirements of 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(1). However, with regards to the deferral waters, EPA is taking additional time to make this assessment. EPA will continue to review all existing and readily available water-quality related data and information to further evaluate whether all applicable water quality standards are being met, and expects to take final action on Kanab Creek-2 and Lower Robinson Creek within 60 days, and Great Salt Lake within 180 days.

### **C. Waters Removed from the Section 303(d) List**

In addition to adding WQLs that require TMDLs to its 303(d) list, a state may also remove waters from its list when such removal is justified. EPA has identified four reasons that justify the removal of a water from a state's 303(d) list. These are:

1. The state has prepared and EPA has approved a TMDL for the listed water.
2. The original basis for listing the water was incorrect.
3. New data or information indicates that the applicable water quality standard for the water is being met and its designated uses are fully supported.
4. The state has adopted and EPA has approved a site-specific water quality standard for the water, and the new water quality standard is being met.

Enclosure 3 consists of a table detailing the waters Utah identified in the 2008 cycle for removal from the State's 2006 303(d) list. Enclosure 5 consists of a table detailing the

## Enclosure 1

waters Utah identified in the 2010 cycle for removal from the State's 2008 303(d) list. Each table includes a column describing the reason for removing each of the waters. The states removal decisions and stated justifications are summarized below:

<b>Number of Waterbody-Pollutant Combinations Removed from List</b>		
<b>Reason</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2010</b>
TMDL completed and approved by EPA	50	16
Original basis for listing was incorrect	4	1
New data or information indicate applicable WQS is being met	3	4
A site-specific WQS was approved by EPA and the new standard is being met	22	0
Total	79	21

In reviewing the State's 2008 and 2010 Section 303(d) lists, EPA carefully considered Utah's decision to remove certain waterbody-pollutant combinations from the state's 303(d) lists, its justification for those removals, and the methodology it used in making those decisions. EPA concludes that the removal decisions identified in Enclosures 3 and 5 are based on all existing and readily available water quality-related data and information, and that the removal decisions are properly justified.

### **D. Priority Ranking and Schedule for Development of TMDLS for Listed Waters and Pollutants**

Pursuant to the listing methodology set out in the State's submittal, Utah prioritized water quality limited segments for TMDL development according to the severity of the impairment and the designated uses of the segment, taking into account the most serious water quality problems, most valuable and threatened resources, and risk to human health and aquatic life. Utah's TMDL prioritization strategy is fully described in Part 3: *Utah 2008 303(d) Report List of Impaired Waters*, page 3-6 to 3-8 of Utah's 2008 Section 303(d) list submission package and Part 2, Chapter 15: *Utah's 2010 303(d) List of Impaired Waters*, page 349 to 400 of Utah's 2010 Section 303(d) list submission package .

EPA reviewed the State's priority ranking of listed waters for TMDL development, and concluded that the State took into account the severity of pollution and the uses to be made of such waters, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(4), as well as other relevant factors such as imminent human health problems or local support for water quality improvement. In addition, EPA also concluded that the State's listed WQLSs targeted for TMDL development in the next two years, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(d).

## **Enclosure 1**

### **IV. Final Determination on Utah's 2008 and 2010 Section 303(d) List Submittals**

After careful review of Utah's final Section 303(d) 2008 and 2010 list submittal packages, including Enclosures 2 through 5, EPA has determined that, with the exception of the deferral waters Kanab Creek-2, Lower Robinson Creek, and Great Salt Lake, Utah's 2008 and 2010 Section 303(d) lists meet the requirements of Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and EPA's implementing regulations and partially approves these lists. EPA is deferring action on Utah's decision not to include Kanab Creek-2, Lower Robinson Creek, and the Great Salt Lake on its 2008 and 2010 list. EPA expects to take action on Kanab Creek-2 and Lower Robinson Creek within 60 days, and on Great Salt Lake within 180 days.

## Enclosure 1

### V. References

The following list includes documents that were used directly or indirectly as a basis for EPA's review and approval of the State's Section 303(d) waterbody list. This list is not meant to be an exhaustive list of all records, but to provide the primary documents the Region relied upon in making its decisions to approve the State's list.

40 C.F.R. Part 130 Water Quality Planning and Management

40 C.F.R. Part 131 Water Quality Standards

July 29, 2005 memorandum from Diane Regas, Director, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds, US EPA to Water Division Directors transmitting EPA's *Guidance for 2006 Assessment, Listing and Reporting Requirements Pursuant to Sections 303(d), 305(b) and 314 of the Clean Water Act*.

October 12, 2006 Memorandum from Diane Regas, Director, Office of Oceans, Wetlands, and Watersheds entitled *Information Concerning 2008 Clean Water Act Sections 303(d), 305(b), and 314 Integrated Reporting and Listing Decisions*.

May 5, 2009 memorandum from Suzanne Schwartz, Acting Director, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds, US EPA, to Water Division Directors entitled *Information Concerning 2010 Clean Water Action Sections 303(d), 305(b), and 314 Integrated Reporting and Listing Decisions*.

May 15, 2007 letter from Humberto Garcia, Director, Ecosystems Protection Program, EPA Region 8 to Art Compton, Division Director, Montana Department of Environmental Quality regarding 2010 Cycle Integrated Reports.

April 1991, *Guidance for Water Quality-Based Decisions: The TMDL Process*, EPA 440/4-91-001.

July 24, 1992 Federal Register Notice, *40 CFR Parts 122, 123, 130, Revision of Regulation*, 57 FR 33040.

August 8, 1997 Memorandum from Robert Perciasepe, Assistant Administrator for Water, Office of Water, US EPA, regarding *New Policies for Establishing and Implementing TMDLs*.

September 1997 Guidance from Office of Water, US EPA regarding *Guidelines for Preparation of the Comprehensive State Water Quality Assessments (305(b) Reports) and Electronic Updates Supplement*, EPA-841-B-97-002B.

## Enclosure 1

November 5, 1997 Memorandum from Tudor Davies, Director, Office of Science and Technology to Water Management Division Directors entitled *Establishing Site Specific Aquatic Life Criteria Equal to Natural Background*.

August 23, 1999 Federal Register Notice, *Proposed Revisions to the Water Quality Management and Planning Regulations*, 64 FR 46012

April 27, 2000 Federal Register Notice, *EPA Review and Approval of State and Tribal Water Quality Standards*, 65 FR 24641

USEPA. 2004. *Guidance for 2004 Assessment, Listing and Reporting Requirements Pursuant to Sections 303(d), 305(b) and 314 of the Clean Water Act*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watershed, Assessment and Watershed Protection Division. Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2005. *Guidance for 2006 Assessment, Listing and Reporting Requirements Pursuant to Sections 303(d), 305(b) and 314 of the Clean Water Act*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watershed, Assessment and Watershed Protection Division. Washington, DC.