



## REGION 9

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

By Email Only

Trevor Baggione  
Director, Water Quality Division  
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality

Re: Arizona's 2024 List of Impaired Waters under Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 303(d)

Dear Director Baggione,

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is pleased to partially approve the Subject List, including all water quality-limited segments and associated pollutants identified by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) as requiring a total maximum daily load (TMDL) under CWA section 303(d). EPA is also disapproving the state's omission of Patagonia Lake for methylmercury-in-fish-tissue impairment and is identifying the impairment for inclusion on the 2024 List of Impaired Waters (2024 List). EPA's review and rationale for this action is enclosed.

EPA finds that ADEQ developed its 2024 List largely consistent with the requirements of CWA section 303(d) but found ADEQ's decision not to list Patagonia Lake for methylmercury-in-fish-tissue impairments inconsistent with its existing methylmercury numeric criterion for fish consumption. EPA will issue a public notice providing a 30-day public comment period on the inclusion of the impairment to ADEQ's 2024 List. After considering any comments received, EPA may make revisions, as appropriate, and will transmit final listings to ADEQ for incorporation into the state's water quality management plan. EPA is deferring action on Brewery Gulch and three segments of Mule Gulch, pending additional supporting documentation from ADEQ for each waterbody.

I look forward to our continued partnership to protect Arizona's water quality and in advancing human health and wildlife protection. Please call me at 415-972-3337 if you would like to discuss further, or your staff may contact Diana Hsieh at (415) 972-3526 or [hsieh.diana@epa.gov](mailto:hsieh.diana@epa.gov).

Sincerely,

Tomás Torres  
Director, Water Division

Enclosure

1. EPA Review of Arizona's 2024 CWA Section 303(d) List of Impaired Waters

cc: Erin Jordan, ADEQ

## Enclosure

### EPA Review of Arizona’s 2024 CWA Section 303(d) List of Impaired Waters

#### I. Purpose

Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) requires each state and territory to “identify those waters within its boundaries for which [current pollution control technologies] ... are not stringent enough to implement any water quality standard applicable to such waters.” This list is referred to as the state's 303(d) list of water quality-limited segments (WQLSs) still requiring TMDLs (i.e., Category 5 of the state's Integrated Report, see Table 1 below).<sup>1</sup> In addition to section 303(d) lists of impaired waters (List), states are required to submit CWA section 305(b) water quality reports that provide information on the water quality status of all waters in the state. EPA recommends that states combine the section 305(b) report and section 303(d) List into a single “Integrated Report” (IR). EPA reviews CWA 305(b) reports and is required to approve or disapprove CWA 303(d) Lists. EPA reviews Integrated Report submittals for consistency with the CWA and its implementing regulations, as well as EPA guidance addressing assessment, listing, and reporting requirements under CWA sections 303(d), 305(b) and 314 (see References).

**Table 1. Integrated Report Categories**

Category 1	All designated uses are supported, no use is threatened.
Category 2	Available data and/or some information indicated that some, but not all of the designated uses are supported.
Category 3	There is insufficient available data and/or information to make a use support determination.
Category 4	Available data and/or information indicate that at least one designated use is not being supported or is threatened, but establishment of a TMDL is not required for a particular cause or a TMDL has already been established.
Category 5	Available data and/or information indicate that at least one designated use is not being supported or is threatened, and a TMDL is needed.

EPA received the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality’s (ADEQ) submittal: *Arizona’s 2024 Clean Water Act Assessment* in EPA’s ATTAINS database and via email on March 13, 2024. The 2024 IR submittal includes Arizona’s 2024 CWA section 303(d) list of WQLSs requiring a TMDL pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 130.7 and its required CWA section 305(b) report.

This document describes EPA’s decision to partially approve Arizona’s 2024 List identified in *Arizona’s 2024 Clean Water Act Assessment* Appendix C and the 303(d) listings in EPA’s ATTAINS

---

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2005. “Guidance for 2006 Assessment, Listing and Reporting requirements Pursuant to Sections 303(d), 305(b) and 314 of the Clean Water Act,” Diane Regas, EPA Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds, Washington, DC.

database. This review also describes the basis for EPA’s decision to disapprove ADEQ’s omission of Patagonia Lake from its list of WQLSs requiring a TMDL for methylmercury-in-fish-tissue consistent with ADEQ’s water quality standards. EPA is deferring action on Brewery Gulch and three segments of Mule Gulch for now to provide time for ADEQ to submit its final determination for each water and the supporting documentation for each determination.

## **II. Statutory and Regulatory Background**

### **A. Identification of WQLSs for Inclusion in the List**

CWA section 303(d)(1) directs states to identify those waters within their jurisdiction for which effluent limitations required by CWA section 301(b)(1)(A) and (B) are not stringent enough to achieve applicable water quality standards, and to establish a priority ranking for addressing such waters, considering the severity of the pollution and the designated uses of such waters. CWA section 303(d) listing requirements apply to waters impaired by either point or nonpoint sources of pollution or both.

As provided at 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(1), a state does not need to include WQLSs in Category 5 when specific circumstances exist. Such WQLSs are included in Category 4 as follows:

- Category 4a: A TMDL to address a specific segment/pollutant combination has been approved or established by EPA.
- Category 4b: A use impairment caused by a pollutant is being addressed by the state through other pollution control requirements.
- Category 4c: A use is impaired, but a non-pollutant causes or contributes to the impairment. Note: Impaired waters must be in Category 5 unless it can be shown that a pollutant is not causing or contributing to the impairment.

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

EPA regulations require each state to “assemble and evaluate all existing and readily available water quality-related data and information to develop the list” and provide a rationale, subject to EPA approval, for any decision not to use existing and readily available data and information. 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b).

The regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(5) specify that this requirement includes, but is not limited to, all the existing and readily available data and information about the following categories of waters:

- Waters identified as partially meeting or not meeting designated uses or as threatened in the state’s most recent CWA section 305(b) report.
- Waters for which dilution calculations or predictive modeling indicate nonattainment of applicable standards.
- Waters for which water quality problems have been reported by governmental agencies, members of the public, or academic institutions.
- Waters identified as impaired or threatened in any CWA section 319 nonpoint source assessment submitted to the EPA.

Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(6), each state must include, as part of its submittal to EPA, documentation to support decisions to rely or not rely on data, 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; and (3) any other reasonable information requested by EPA.

### **C. Priority Ranking**

EPA regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(4) also require each state’s 303(d) List to prioritize WQLSs for TMDL development, and to specifically identify those targeted for TMDL development in the next two years. In prioritizing and targeting waters, each state must, at a minimum, consider the severity of the pollution and the uses of such waters. CWA section 303(d)(1)(A). A state may consider other factors including immediate programmatic needs including vulnerable aquatic habitats, recreational, economic, and aesthetic importance, degree of public interest and support, and state or national policies and priorities.<sup>2,3</sup>

## **III. Analysis of Submittal**

### **A. Identification of WQLSs for Inclusion in the List**

EPA has reviewed ADEQ’s submittal and concludes Arizona’s 2024 List is in partial compliance with CWA section 303(d) and 40 C.F.R. § 130.7.

ADEQ based its 2024 List on its analysis of readily available data and information to determine whether additions to its 2020-2022 List were necessary. Arizona added 26 new WQLSs to its 2024 List. EPA approves all WQLSs ADEQ identified on the 2024 List as requiring a TMDL.

---

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1992. July 24, 1992 Federal Register and 40 C.F.R. Parts 122, 123, 130, revision of regulation, 57 Fed. Reg. 43 pp. 33040

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1991. “Guidance for Water Quality-Based Decisions: The TMDL Process,” Office of Water. EPA 440/4-91-001

## **B. Assembly and Evaluation of Data**

EPA assessed whether ADEQ assembled and evaluated all existing and readily available water quality-related data and information and reasonably identified waters required to be listed.

EPA finds that ADEQ's data compilation process was clear and provided an adequate basis for listing the waters identified as impaired. The state considered data provided by government and non-government agencies and water quality data collected by the ADEQ staff between July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2022.

ADEQ compiled data and information from multiple sources, including those identified in 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(5)(iii). The state opened a public call for comments on its draft 2024 IR between June 28, 2023 and September 11, 2023 via ADEQ's website and through its email list to interested parties. Most of the data assessed in the 2024 IR originated from ADEQ's monitoring program and from the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). Additional water quality data considered were provided by volunteer and other entities; however, the primary sources of data are federal and state agencies. Below, is a list of data sources ADEQ used for the 2024 IR.<sup>4</sup>

1. Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
2. United States Geological Survey
3. Adventure Scientists
4. Aravaipa Group
5. AZ Water Dogs
6. Butte Creek Restoration Council
7. Colorado River Water Quality Improvement Program
8. Friends of Luna Lake
9. Friends of the Forest
10. Friends of the Tonto
11. Friends of the Verde
12. Gila Watershed Partnership
13. Greenbrush Grunts
14. Hassayampa Nature Preserve
15. Oak Creek Watershed Improvement Council
16. Patagonia Area Watershed
17. Project Wet
18. Rainbow Lake
19. Sierra Club
20. Show Low High School
21. Trout Unlimited
22. Verde River Institute
23. Water Guardians
24. Yuma Rivers Team
25. Arizona Game and Fish

---

<sup>4</sup> Figure 2-2 from Arizona's 2024 Clean Water Act Assessment

26. Arizona State Parks Park
27. Bureau of Land Management
28. Bureau of Reclamation
29. City of Tucson
30. City of Scottsdale
31. National Park Service
32. Pima County
33. Slide Rock State Park
34. California Water Quality Control Board
35. US Forest Service
36. US Environmental Protection Agency
37. Allied Signal Engines
38. International Boundary and Water Commission
39. Salt River Project
40. University of Arizona
41. Walker Ecological Services

### **C. Listing Methodology**

ADEQ's listing methodology describes how impaired waters are identified and specifies explicit factors for making listing and de-listing decisions for different pollutant types based on different kinds of data and information. In general, the state lists a waterbody based on adequate documentation that water quality standards (WQS), as defined in the Arizona Administrative Code (AAC), Title 18, Chapter 11, Article 1: Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters, and approved by EPA, were not met during the assessment period.

Decisions to list or de-list are based on the quality and quantity of data, water body type, and the applicable WQS. The state's surface waters are monitored to determine if water quality conditions support aquatic life, human health, recreational uses, and ecosystem health. Chapter 3-26 of the 2020-2022 and the 2024 IRs notes *"In the past, EPA has identified assessment units and pollutants of concern that needed to be added to Arizona's impaired water list to make the list consistent with federal regulations (over-filings). In subsequent assessments, EPA must decide when these additional impairments are removed from Arizona's 303(d) List. In this respect, these impairments are tracked separately. However, once listed by EPA, ADEQ recognizes these waters as impaired, initiates TMDL according to priorities, and protects them from further pollutant loadings according to Arizona's antidegradation rules and permit requirements."* EPA clarifies that de-listing of all impairments, including those added by EPA, are the responsibility of the state and should be based on ADEQ's review of existing and readily available data.

The state's assessment methodologies and quantitative assessment factors include statistical methods for evaluating potential WQS exceedances and data quality requirements. These decision factors are applied to various types of data, including water chemistry, bacteria, nutrients, and other parameters. The state used the assessment decision factors as the basis for its decisions. However, EPA, relying on federal listing regulations under 40 C.F.R. § 130.7,

determined that Patagonia Lake is impaired for methylmercury-in-fish-tissue and was omitted from the state's list of WQLSs requiring a TMDL. In this action, EPA disapproves the omission, as it is inconsistent with Arizona's approved methylmercury criterion for fish consumption use.

#### **Basis for EPA Decision to List Patagonia Lake in Arizona's 2024 List**

When determining whether to add waters to Arizona's 2024 List, EPA considered the state WQS, 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b), and considerations described in EPA's guidance documents.

The applicable Arizona water quality standard for Patagonia Lake is the fish consumption (FC) criterion of 0.3 mg methylmercury per kg of wet weight fish tissue (0.3 mg/kg). This criterion was adopted in 2009 in accordance with the requirements of CWA Section 303(c) and approved by EPA. However, according to ADEQ, under Arizona law, implementation procedures must be adopted in its Impaired Waters Identification Rule (IWIR) for the state to list impairments. The IWIR does not include fish tissue assessment procedures and therefore, ADEQ states that it cannot use the available data and information that includes fish consumption advisories, associated fish tissue data, and individual exceedances as the basis to add waters to the List. ADEQ did evaluate fish tissue methylmercury data and information and shared its findings with EPA. ADEQ did not identify these waters as impaired on its 2024 List.

EPA reviewed the methylmercury data and information and found that the arithmetic mean of the methylmercury concentrations exceeded Arizona's FC criterion of 0.3 mg methylmercury/kg in fish tissue in Patagonia Lake. EPA concludes the fish consumption use is impaired, and Patagonia Lake is required to be identified as WQLSs under 40 C.F.R. § 130.7. Therefore, EPA disapproves ADEQ's omission of Patagonia Lake from the 2024 List.

When EPA disapproves a state's omission of a WQLS from its List, EPA must identify waters for listing in accordance with 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(d)(2). Therefore, EPA is adding Patagonia Lake to the 2024 List because the data show that the WQS for the fish consumption use are not being met.

#### **D. New Impairment Listings**

The state added 26 new WQLSs in the 2024 List compared to its 2020-2022 List. New listings are found in Appendix C of the 2024 Integrated Report Excel Sheet. The pollutants associated with new listings are selenium, ammonia-nitrogen, *E. coli*, iron, lead, dissolved oxygen, and methylmercury-in-fish-tissue.

As discussed above in Section C, EPA is adding Patagonia Lake as a new WQLS impaired from methylmercury-in-fish-tissue, for a total of 27 WQLSs added to the 2024 List.

#### **E. Waters Removed from Arizona's 303(d) List**

ADEQ's 2024 IR provides a basis for removal of 16 WQLSs identified on the 2020-2022 List. For example, five WQLSs were removed because TMDLs were completed and eight WQLSs were



removed because data showed that standards were being attained. The WQLSs removed from the 2024 List are identified in Table 2.

**Table 2. Water Quality Limited Segments Removed from the 2024 List**

<b>Waterbody ID</b>	<b>Waterbody Name</b>	<b>Pollutant/Criteria</b>
15060106B-0050	Alvord Park Lake	Ammonia-Nitrogen
15040004-025B	Blue River, from Strayhorse Creek to San Francisco River	Escherichia Coli
15030202-006B	Boulder Creek, from Tributary to Wilder Creek	Beryllium
15060106B-0300	Chaparral Park Lake	Dissolved Oxygen
15060106B-0410	Cortez Park Lake	Dissolved Oxygen
15060106B-0410	Cortez Park Lake	pH
15050301-011	Nogales Wash, from Mexican border to Potrero Creek	Escherichia Coli
15050301-500B	Potrero Creek, from Interstate 19 to Santa Cruz River	Escherichia Coli
15050301-500B	Potrero Creek, from Interstate 19 to Santa Cruz River	Dissolved Oxygen
15050301-009	Santa Cruz River, from Nogales WWTP to Josephine Canyon	Escherichia Coli
15050301-009	Santa Cruz River, from Nogales WWTP to Josephine Canyon	Nickel
15050301-008A	Santa Cruz River, from Josephine Canyon to Tubac Bridge	Escherichia Coli
15050301-008B	Santa Cruz River, from Tubac Bridge to Sopori Wash	Escherichia Coli
15050301-013C	Sonoita Cr, from 1600 feet Below Patagonia WTP to Patagonia Lake	Zinc
15010010-003	Virgin River, from Beaver Dam Wash to Sand Hollow Wash	Escherichia Coli
15060202-1660	Willow Creek Reservoir	Ammonia-Nitrogen

EPA reviewed the information provided and concludes that ADEQ’s decisions to delist the 16 WQLSs identified above are consistent with federal listing requirements.

Additionally, four WQLSs (Brewery Gulch and three segments of Mule Gulch) were not included in ADEQ’s submission to EPA because listings for those WQLSs have been appealed in the state administrative process. If ADEQ determines these waters are not WQLSs and removes them from its 303(d) list, EPA will request that ADEQ demonstrate good cause for not including the water or waters. See 40 CFR 130.7(b)(6)(iv). EPA is deferring action on these waters for now to allow time for ADEQ to submit its final determinations and supporting documentation for each determination.

## **F. Impairments Recategorized from Arizona’s 303(d) List**

ADEQ also corrected the impairment listing causes for eight waters that had been incorrectly identified in previous IRs as impaired for mercury in the water column. The eight waters are impaired for methylmercury-in-fish-tissue and were recategorized with the correct cause of impairment.

## **G. Public Comment on 2024 IR**

ADEQ solicited public comments on its draft 2024 IR over a 76-day period from June 28, 2023 to September 11, 2023, through ADEQ’s website and through its email list to interested parties. ADEQ received 12 comments and prepared a response to comments document that can be found on the Arizona Secretary of State website.<sup>5</sup> Comments included discussion regarding hardness, Patagonia Lake, and four WQLSs.

Specifically, EPA commented that ADEQ was incorrectly using total hardness rather than dissolved hardness to calculate hardness dependent metals criteria. EPA reiterates that dissolved hardness should be used to calculate hardness dependent metals criteria. EPA also commented that EPA would list Patagonia Lake on the 303(d) List for mercury in fish tissue, and ADEQ should amend its Impaired Waters Identification Rule (IWIR) to allow the state to list all water quality impairments. EPA is adding Patagonia Lake to the 2024 List and ADEQ intends to revise the IWIR. Freeport Minerals Corporation commented that three segments of Mule Gulch (15080301-090A, 15080301-090B and 15080301-090C) and Brewery Gulch (15080301-337) should not be included in the 303(d) List because they contend the waters are not “waters of the United States.” According to ADEQ, these waters were not included in ADEQ’s submission to EPA because listings for those WQLSs have been appealed in the state administrative process.<sup>6</sup> ADEQ will submit its decision on the appealed listings once the state administrative process is complete.

EPA finds that Arizona’s 2024 List was developed with opportunities for public participation consistent with 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(a).

## **IV. TMDL Priority Ranking and Schedule**

ADEQ’s submittal includes a priority ranking for those waters requiring a TMDL, using a low/medium/high scale. The TMDL priority rankings are shown in Appendix D of the 2024 IR. EPA finds that ADEQ developed a priority ranking for TMDL development consistent with the requirements in 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b). ADEQ has identified Queen Creek metal TMDLs (WBIDs 15050100-014A, 15050100-014B, 15050100-014C, 15050100-1000, 15050100-1818, and

---

<sup>5</sup> [https://apps.azsos.gov/public\\_services/register/2023/49/contents.pdf](https://apps.azsos.gov/public_services/register/2023/49/contents.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> March 13, 2024 Email transmittal of Arizona 2024 Integrated Report. From Jason Jones, ADEQ to Tomás Torres, EPA re: 2024 – EPA Approval.

15050100-1843) and the Oak Creek bacteria TMDL (WBID 15060202-016) as priorities in the next two years.

#### **V. Tribal Consultation**

EPA's policy is to consult on a government-to-government basis with federally recognized tribal governments when EPA actions and decisions may affect tribes. To promote coordination and consultation, all tribes that may be affected by EPA's proposed action on Arizona's listing determinations were identified and notified for consultation. On September 7, 2023, the following tribes were contacted and offered consultation by letter:

1. Ak-Chin Indian Community
2. Chemehuevi Indian Tribe of the Chemehuevi Reservation (California)
3. Cocopah Tribe of Arizona
4. Colorado River Indian Tribes of the Colorado River Indian Reservation (Arizona and California)
5. Tonto Apache Tribe of Arizona
6. Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, Arizona
7. Fort Mojave Indian Tribe of Arizona, California & Nevada
8. Gila River Indian Community of the Gila River Indian Reservation, Arizona
9. Havasupai Tribe of the Havasupai Reservation, Arizona
10. Hopi Tribe of Arizona
11. Hualapai Indian Tribe of the Hualapai Indian Reservation, Arizona
12. Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians of the Kaibab Indian Reservation, Arizona
13. Navajo Nation, Arizona, New Mexico & Utah
14. Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona
15. Pueblo of Zuni
16. Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Indian Reservation, California & Arizona
17. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community of the Salt River Reservation, Arizona
18. San Carlos Apache Tribe of the San Carlos Reservation, Arizona
19. San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe of Arizona
20. Tohono O'odham Nation of Arizona
21. White Mountain Apache Tribe of the Fort Apache Reservation, Arizona
22. Yavapai-Apache Nation of the Camp Verde Indian Reservation, Arizona
23. Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe

Additionally, EPA contacted the Inter-Tribal Council of Arizona (ITCA, a non-profit corporation representing 21 tribes located in the state of Arizona). ITCA confirmed that the list of tribes EPA contacted were, to the best of their knowledge, complete. The consultation and coordination processes were conducted in accordance with EPA's policy on consultation and coordination with Indian Tribes.<sup>7</sup> One tribe requested consultation, the San Carlos Apache Tribe.

---

<sup>7</sup> [www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2023-12/epa-policy-on-consultation-with-indian-tribes-2023.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2023-12/epa-policy-on-consultation-with-indian-tribes-2023.pdf)

## **San Carlos Apache Tribe**

The San Carlos Apache Tribe (SCAT) requested consultation via email on September 14, 2023. EPA met with SCAT staff on October 2, 2023 to scope and schedule the consultation process. EPA attended a SCAT Tribal Council meeting in-person on December 5, 2023. EPA provided an overview of its review and action on Arizona's 2024 List. SCAT Tribal Council members asked general comments about monitoring of waters within the San Carlos Reservation and specific questions regarding the health of waters in the Bylas district. These comments were not directly related to EPA's action on Arizona's 2024 List, however EPA's Clean Water Act 106 grant project officer will follow-up on the concerns raised. EPA did not receive any comments specific to its review of the Arizona 2024 List. EPA emailed the SCAT chairman and staff (dated January 12, 2024, March 21, 2024, and April 17, 2024) to confirm if the Tribe had additional information to inform EPA's review. No additional comments were received therefore EPA will conclude consultation with transmission of its final decision to SCAT.

## References

ARIZONA'S 2024 CLEAN WATER ACT ASSESSMENT, (JULY 1, 2017 TO JUNE 30, 2022), Integrated 305(b) Assessment and 303(d) Listing Report, Revised May 2023. Submitted via email and EPA's ATTAINS database from Jason Jones, ADEQ to Diana Hsieh, Water Division, U.S. EPA Region 9 (March 13, 2024).

Arizona Administrative Code (AAC), Title 18, Chapter 11, Article 1: *WATER QUALITY STANDARDS FOR SURFACE WATERS* <https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2014-12/documents/az-chapter11.pdf> . Accessed March 21, 2024.

Arizona Administrative Register, February 18, 2022. [https://apps.azsos.gov/public\\_services/register/2023/49/contents.pdf](https://apps.azsos.gov/public_services/register/2023/49/contents.pdf). Accessed March 21, 2024.

Arizona Game and Fish Department. Fish consumption Advisories. <https://www.azgfd.com/fishing-2/fish-consumption-advisories/>. Accessed January 18, 2024.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1991. "Guidance for Water Quality-Based Decisions: The TMDL Process," Office of Water. EPA 440/4-91-001.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1992. July 24, 1992 Federal Register and 40 C.F.R. Parts 122, 123, 130, revision of regulation, 57 Fed. Reg. 43 pp. 33040.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2002. Consolidated Assessment and Listing Methodology. Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds, Washington, DC.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2003. "Guidance for 2004 Assessment, Listing and Reporting Requirements Pursuant to Sections 303(d) and 305(b) of the Clean Water Act," Diane Regas, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds, Washington, DC.

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

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2006. "Information Concerning 2008 Clean Water Act Sections 303(d), 305(b), and 314 Integrated Reporting and Listing Decisions," Diane Regas, EPA Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds, Washington, DC.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2009. "Information Concerning 2010 Clean Water Act Sections 303(d), 305(b), and 314 Integrated Reporting and Listing Decisions," Suzanne Schwartz, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds, Washington, DC.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2011. "Information Concerning 2012 Clean Water Act Sections 303(d), 305(b), and 314 Integrated Reporting and Listing Decisions," Denise Keehner, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds, Washington, DC.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2013. "Information Concerning 2014 Clean Water Act Sections 303(d), 305(b), and 314 Integrated Reporting and Listing Decisions," Denise Keehner, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds, September 3, 2013.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2015. "Information Concerning 2016 Clean Water Act Sections 303(d), 305(b), and 314 Integrated Reporting and Listing Decisions," Benita Best-Wong, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds, August 13, 2015.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2017. "Information Concerning 2018 Clean Water Act Sections 303(d), 305(b), and 314 Integrated Reporting and Listing Decisions," John Goodin, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds, December 22, 2017.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2021. "Information Concerning 2022 Clean Water Act Sections 303(d), 305(b), and 314 Integrated Reporting and Listing Decisions," John Goodin, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds, March 31, 2021.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2023. "Information Concerning 2024 Clean Water Act Sections 303(d), 305(b), and 314 Integrated Reporting and Listing Decisions," Brian Frazer, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds, March 29, 2023.