

Printed: 04-20-97
By: Howe, Carol
Priority: Normal
Topic: RESPONSE TO CHRIS'S REQUEST
Sent: 04-18-97
From: rwoodard@goldeneye.water.ca.go
To: Howe, Carol; Carol Howe

*Overall
LAFFED Program*

Mail*Link»

RESPONSE TO CHRIS'S REQUEST (fwd)

>Date: Thu, 17 Apr 1997 12:32:39 -0700 (PDT)
>From: Chris Foe <chrisf@bptcp1.swrcb.ca.gov>
>Subject: RESPONSE TO CHRIS'S REQUEST (fwd)
>To: cdarling@water.ca.gov, rwoodard@water.ca.gov

>
>Rick, Cindy FYI Chris

>
>----- Forwarded message -----

>Date: Mon, 14 Apr 1997 15:07:01 -0700 (PDT)
>From: Vic DeVlaming <vicdv@bptcp1.swrcb.ca.gov>
>To: pwt - contaminants <aquasci@aol.com>, awconsult@aol.com,
> bfinlays@hq.dfg.ca.gov, bherbold@aol.com, bobf@delta.dfg.ca.gov,
> brucet@sfei.org, chrisf@bptcp1.swrcb.ca.gov, dehinton@ucdavis.edu,
> dmfray@ucdavis.edu, gfredlee@aol.com, hbailey@evs.wa.com, jay@sfei.org,
> jtm@crl.com, karent@bptcp1.swrcb.ca.gov, kkuivila@usgs.gov,
> lhsmith@usgs.gov, lrbrown@usgs.gov, lwintern@water.ca.gov,
> mjsnyder@ucdavis.edu, mjunginc@aol.com, nsinghasemanon@cdpr.ca.gov,
> phyllisfox@aol.com, scottogle@eco-risk.com, slanderson@lbl.gov,
> snluoma@usgs.gov, spies@amarine.com, valc@bptcp1.swrcb.ca.gov,
> wabennett@ucdavis.edu

>Subject: RESPONSE TO CHRIS'S REQUEST

>
>
>Chris-

>
>Your e-mail was confusing to me. First, I am stunned that the
>ecosystem restoration group failed to consider contaminants.
>What is the disjoint here? Why are the "ecologists" uninformed
>and/or ignoring chemical contaminants? Where and how have we
>failed in the education process? We must be poor educators or we
>have a very recalcitrant audience.

>
>I don't understand if you are asking us to help Cindy make a
>connection between the contaminant group and the restoration
>group? It seems Cindy is requesting actions, NOT further
>studies. If that is the case, in response to her first question
>I recommend development of ag practices which reduce or eliminate
>the use of pesticides which have tend to move offsite. Where
>pesticides are essential I recommend development of practices
>which reduce or eliminate the offsite movement of pesticides.
>The justification for the above recommendations--poisons designed
>to kill invertebrates should not occur at concentrations toxic to
>invertebrates in surface waters of the state, otherwise there
>will be damage to aquatic ecosystems. There is an ever
>increasing number of studies which conclusively demonstrate that

*WA Action
PE-10-10-10
(Source
Control)*

>pesticides occur at concentrations toxic to invertebrates in many
>surface waters across the country.

>
>In response to Cindy's second question--if proposals are designed
>to improve water quality, they should include monitoring for
>toxicity, Toxicity Identification Evaluations (TIEs), and
>chemical analyses to assess whether there are exceedances of
>water quality criteria, guidelines, or standards. Moreover, this
>monitoring would be to gauge the success of improving water
>quality.

WA
Projects
(projects)

>
>_Victor

>
>