

## 2018 Data Solicitation Report

Section 303(d) of the federal Clean Water Act requires Pennsylvania to identify all its water quality limited water body segments. According to 40 CFR section 131.3, a “water quality limited segment” is any segment 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 technology-based effluent limitations required by sections 301(b) and 306 of the CWA. These water bodies appear on Category 5 in the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection’s (DEP) Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report (Integrated Report). As part of this ongoing effort, DEP utilizes available outside sources of data and information.

For the 2018 Integrated Report, DEP contacted approximately 460 potential outside data sources including federal, state, and local governments; universities; advisory groups; citizen monitoring groups; watershed associations; public interest groups; and sportsmen’s groups to request information regarding water quality. Each group on the mailing list received information that briefly explained the reasons why DEP was soliciting information from them. Minimum quality assurance standards for the data were made available on DEP’s website. Those groups with data and/or information regarding water quality limited segments were requested to fill out a data submission form and return it, along with any pertinent supporting documentation, to DEP’s Water Quality Division by September 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017. Starting with the 2020 Integrated Report, DEP will no longer mail data solicitation postcards, instead, the information will be posted on the DEP website by April 1<sup>st</sup> of odd-numbered years for the subsequent Integrated Report.

For any given listing cycle, DEP determines the accuracy and validity of existing and readily available data and information provided by outside groups based on a set of minimum quality assurance requirements. These requirements include the specific location of the reported impairment, identification of the particular water quality standards violation(s), data to substantiate the conclusion of impairment, identification of the source(s) and cause(s) of impairment, and the presence of a quality assurance/quality control plan. Acceptable data from these sources are then included in the assessment database to prepare the use support summary and the five-part list of waterbody-specific use support decisions.

Data from seven separate outside data sources were submitted to DEP for consideration in the 2018 Integrated Report.

The Chester Water Authority submitted 2016 and 2017 fecal coliform and nitrite plus nitrate data for the Octoraro Reservoir and nitrite plus nitrate data for the East and West Branches of Octoraro Creek. The nitrite plus nitrate criterion stated in Chapter 93 of the Pa. Code provides a maximum level of 10 mg/l, which cannot be exceeded more than one percent of the time. The fecal coliform criterion for potable water supply provides a maximum of 5,000/100 ml as a monthly average, with no more than this number in >20 samples collected in a month, nor more than 20,000/100 ml in more than 5% of the samples. The Octoraro Reservoir exceeded the potable water supply criteria for fecal coliforms in both 2016 and 2017. Five months in 2016 and three months in 2017 were greater than the 5,000/100 ml monthly average. The East and West Branches of Octoraro Creek were placed in Category 5 of the Integrated Report in 2006, with a cause of nutrients. The data submitted this year confirms the continued impairment of the West Branch Octoraro Creek which violated the 99% rule for the nitrite plus nitrate criterion in 2016. The East Branch Octoraro Creek did not exceed the criterion for nitrite plus nitrate in either the 2016 or 2017 datasets, however, the nutrient impairment will remain on the East Branch Octoraro Creek due to the Chester Water Authority implementing advanced treatment to meet drinking water standards at current elevated levels of nitrite plus nitrate.

The Susquehanna River Basin Commission (SRBC) submitted data and documentation for seven different studies they conducted in the Susquehanna River basin during 2014 and 2015. Quality Assurance Plans and final reports were provided for all seven studies. Data for approximately 240 different stations was provided. This included macroinvertebrate and fish quantitative data and water chemistry data. Water chemistry was collected during all studies and 273 samples were submitted for review. The water chemistry data is valuable information that DEP can use while monitoring and assessing streams in the Susquehanna River watershed. Most of the sites were sampled only one-time for water chemistry and therefore could not solely be used to make an assessment. Macroinvertebrate data was collected during all seven studies. DEP's macroinvertebrate sampling protocol was used during many of the projects. 163 stations and their IBI scores were submitted for review. These stations were mapped in GIS to determine if a new Aquatic Life Use assessment could be made. Watershed size, land use, IBI score, and current assessment status were all reviewed. Single stations do not adequately represent the water quality of large watersheds or smaller watersheds composed of varying land uses and/or multiple anthropogenic influences, in these instances, an assessment for the Integrated Report was not done. The macroinvertebrate data from these stations will help DEP biologists when considering watersheds for reassessment. There was adequate data to make nine new aquatic life use assessments which reassessed about 75.5 stream miles. All nine assessments were for stream segments attaining their aquatic life use. Fish survey data was collected during three of the studies and data for 26 samples was submitted. The data is valuable to our aquatic life monitoring programs. DEP is currently developing a Susquehanna/Potomac basins fish IBI and has published a semi-quantitative fish sample protocol for wadeable streams in the 2013 Assessment Methods. Stations sampled with methods comparable to DEP's protocol will be assessed using the fish IBI when it becomes available. In addition to the studies described above, SRBC also submitted reports proposing the delisting of 10 different streams. Macroinvertebrate data, IBI scores, and water chemistry results were provided when appropriate. DEP approved all 10 proposals which resulted in the delisting of about 31 miles of impaired streams. DEP commends SRBC for their monitoring work in the Susquehanna River basin and for opting to use DEP sampling protocols when applicable.

Mifflin County Conservation District (MCCD) was awarded 319 nonpoint source management program funding to monitor the Upper Kishacoquillas and Hungry Run watersheds. MCCD sampled 13 stations in the Upper Kishacoquillas and 9 stations in the Hungry Run basin from 2014 to 2017. At each station, macroinvertebrate samples and chemistry samples were collected. The macroinvertebrate samples were sorted and identified by Mike Bilger from Susquehanna University. The chemistry samples were analyzed by the DEP Bureau of Labs. All data were submitted to the Department for inclusion in our database and used for assessments.

Berks County Conservation District (BCCD) was awarded 319 nonpoint source management program funding to monitor the Maiden Creek and Sacony Creek Watersheds. BCCD sampled 10 stations annually from 2014 to 2017. Five stations are permanent stations and five stations are variable and will be moved yearly as goals and previous data dictates. At each station, macroinvertebrate samples and chemistry samples were collected. The macroinvertebrate samples were sorted and identified by Mike Bilger from Susquehanna University. The chemistry samples were analyzed by the DEP Bureau of Labs. All data were submitted to the Department for inclusion in our database and used for assessments.

The Forest Service for the Allegheny National Forest (ANF) submitted water chemistry data for 52 stations collected on October 24<sup>th</sup>, 2017. The data was collected during a watershed snapshot event by ANF and Trout Unlimited. DEP can use this data for monitoring the water quality of the streams sampled, however, more samples are required to make assessment decisions.

The Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission (ORSANCO) completes an assessment on the Ohio River every 2 years and compiles a 305(b) report. ORSANCO provided fish and macroinvertebrate survey data, bimonthly water quality data, and continuous monitoring data for temperature and dissolved oxygen. The data was thoroughly reviewed. DEP is part of the Ohio River 305(b) Coordinators Work Group. Through this Work Group, DEP discussed this data and the assessments on PA's 40.2 mile portion of the Ohio River. DEP agrees with ORSANCO's assessment decisions which maintain the current 2016 IR assessment status on the Ohio River.

The Delaware River Basin Commission (DRBC) compiles the Delaware River and Bay Water Quality Assessment Report (305(b) report) every 2 years. Part of this report assesses the PA portion of the Delaware River. DEP has received and thoroughly reviewed the data that is presented in DRBC's 2018 Report. For 303(d) purposes, the data was either insufficient for our assessment purposes or agrees with DEP's current assessment status.

Data is often provided outside of the data submission window. DEP may specifically request this data or it may be provided by the data holder on their own. This data is very valuable and can also be considered for assessment purposes.

**APPENDIX A – DATA SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS FOR  
2018 INTEGRATED REPORT**



## EXISTING AND READILY AVAILABLE DATA

The Bureau of Clean Water's Water Quality Division is seeking data for consideration in the **2018** 303(d) assessment process. Data will be accepted until **September 30<sup>th</sup> 2017**.

Section 303(d) of the federal Clean Water Act requires Pennsylvania to identify all its water quality limited water bodies. These water bodies appear on Category 5 in DEP's Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report. As part of this ongoing effort, the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) utilizes available outside sources of data and information.

If you believe that your organization/agency has data or information that could be utilized by DEP in the 303(d) listing process, we encourage you to submit it. Please carefully read through the information in this document. In order for any data or information to be considered, a completed copy of the Data Submission Form must be submitted.

Data submitted after the deadline listed above will be considered for the next Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report.

Please feel free to distribute this information to all interested groups, agencies, and partners.

This document will be posted to the DEP website by April 1st of odd-numbered years for the subsequent Integrated Report and will be removed after the data submission deadline.

# DATA SUBMISSION FORM

## PART 1. Identification of Waterbody

Waterbody Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Tributary to: \_\_\_\_\_ County \_\_\_\_\_

Purpose of Study:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Please include a map of the waterbody and the coordinates of the sampling site(s).

---

## PART 2. Investigator(s) Information

Name of group/individual which collected the data: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person(s) for Questions regarding the data: \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone #: (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_

---

## PART 3. Data Submission Content

What type(s) of data is/are being submitted? (Check all that apply)

Water Chemistry: \_\_\_\_\_ Bacteriological: \_\_\_\_\_ Macroinvertebrate: \_\_\_\_\_ Fish: \_\_\_\_\_

Was a DEP sampling method used? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, what method(s): \_\_\_\_\_

---

## PART 4. Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Information

Was the data being submitted for consideration collected under a program with either a written study design completed in accordance with DEP's "Designing Your Monitoring Program- A Technical Handbook for Community-Based Monitoring in Pennsylvania", a written quality assurance project plan completed in accordance with EPA's "The Volunteer Monitors Guide to Quality Assurance Project Plans" or a standard QA/QC protocol?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ If yes, please submit a copy of the study design, QAPP or QA/QC protocol.

Was the data collected under a program that adhered to a quality control plan that included external quality control checks such as split samples analyzed by an outside lab?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ If yes, please submit a copy of the outside lab analysis for review.

Is the submitted data incorporated into a finalized report, document, or journal article?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ If yes, please include a copy with this submission form.

If the data submitted is biological data, who is/are the source(s) of the taxonomic expertise? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Did this person(s) perform all the taxonomic work? Yes: \_\_\_\_\_ No: \_\_\_\_\_



## DATA REQUIREMENTS FOR CONSIDERATION IN 305(b)/303(d) ASSESSMENT DECISIONS

This is a summary of the process that DEP uses in its evaluation of outside data and information submitted for consideration in the development of the Water Quality Assessment 305(b) Report and 303(d) list of impaired waters. DEP will consider all data submissions from outside agencies in its decision-making process. Data that meets the minimal data requirements provided in this document may be used in the listing process and will be incorporated into DEP's 305(b) database. Data not meeting the requirements may be helpful for other purposes such as public education or the targeting of waters for further study. The 303(d) list of impaired waters is a subset of the 305(b) Report on the state of the waters.

Section 305(b) of the Clean Water Act requires states, territories, tribes, and interstate commission to assess the health of their waters and the extent to which water quality standards and the basic goals of the Clean Water Act are being met. The goals of the Clean Water Act are to achieve and maintain water quality that provides for healthy communities of fish and shellfish and that allows for recreation in and on the water. States collect data and information that allow them to characterize whether water quality meets these and other uses for their waters, which are expressed in water quality standards that each state sets.

Water quality standards for all Pennsylvania surface waters can be found in Chapter 93 - Water Quality Standards and Chapter 16 - Water Quality Toxics Management Strategy (PA Code - Title 25. Environmental Protection).

For DEP to use data in the 305(b)/303(d) process, it must be of a documented quality. DEP will screen all outside sources of data for the following minimal requirements:

1. Written documentation of the protocols used in sampling and analysis describing quality assurance and quality control measures in the form of a Monitoring Study Design or Quality Assurance Project Plan.
2. Location and extent of the waterbody

DEP recognizes there are groups and organizations that do not have established sampling and analysis protocols and a Monitoring Study Design or Quality Assurance Project Plan. Groups or individuals that would like to begin monitoring with the goal of having their data utilized by DEP in the 305(b)/303(d) process are encouraged to reference this published handbook for volunteer monitors:

**“Designing Your Monitoring Program – A Technical Handbook for Community-Based Monitoring in Pennsylvania.”** A copy of this document can be obtained by contacting:

Bureau of Clean Water  
P.O. Box 8774  
Attn: Diane Wilson  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8774  
Telephone (717) 787-5017

### Documentation of a Water Quality Standard Violation:

For any given waterbody in the Commonwealth, the applicable water quality standard (as found in Chapter 93 - Water Quality Standards and Chapter 16 - Water Quality Toxics Management Strategy <PA Code - Title 25. Environmental Protection>) is comprised of the designated uses and numeric and/or narrative criteria established to protect those uses. Documented evidence of a use impairment or criterion violation constitutes a violation of the applicable water quality standard. Because of the significance attached to 303(d)-listed waters, it is important that any determination of a water quality standard violation be based on scientifically sound methods and data. Assessments

based on the comparison of numeric criteria with long-term water quality data typically meet this principle. Chemical assessments based on single, one-time grab samples generally do not. Single, one-time biological surveys conducted to assess support of designated aquatic life uses are generally acceptable because the biology is a long-term indicator of water quality. Sufficient evidence must be presented for both chemical and biological data to indicate that the assessment reflects the conditions throughout the entire waterbody segment and not simply a single site.

In reviewing data submitted by outside sources, DEP will use the following guidelines to determine if criteria are being violated and/or uses are being impaired.

### **Chemical Data**

Data age	Data must be less than 5 years old, unless it can be demonstrated that data is representative of current conditions.
Chemical Parameters	Only those chemical parameters for which a criterion has been established can be considered. Applicable water quality criteria vary depending on the waterbody being considered. Criteria for all waterbodies in the Commonwealth can be found in Chapters 93 - <u>Water Quality Standards</u> , 96 - <u>Water Quality Standards Implementation</u> , & 16 - <u>Water Quality Toxics Management Strategy</u> of DEP's Rules and Regulations (PA Code - Title 25. Environmental Protection)
Minimum number of sampling sites	A minimum of two sites must be sampled for each stream segment. If landuse changes or point sources enter the stream between the upstream and downstream boundary points, more sites are required. See the discussion "Location of Waterbody" for more details.
Sampling duration and frequency	To avoid the problems associated with serial correlation of time series data, sample collections must be at least one week apart. Sampling should occur during the most critical time period for the parameters being monitored.
Minimum number of samples required for data to be considered representative of actual conditions	A minimum of 3 samples for each site is required. Single one-time grab samples will not be considered for assessments.
Laboratory	Samples need to be analyzed by a laboratory registered with or accredited by the PA Laboratory Accreditation Program (LAP). The National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (NELAP) is also acceptable.
Required analysis to determine if samples exceed water quality criteria	To be performed by DEP staff using procedures outlined in the current Assessment and Listing Methodology.

## **Bacteriological Data**

Data age	Data must be less than 5 years old, unless it can be demonstrated that data is representative of current conditions.
Minimum number of sampling sites	A minimum of two sites must be sampled for each stream segment. If landuse changes or point sources enter the stream between the upstream and downstream boundary points, more sites are required. See the discussion "Location of Waterbody" for more details.
Sampling duration and frequency	No more than one sample per day. A minimum of 5 samples collected on different days spanning a minimum of 14 days and a maximum of 30 days constitutes one monthly sampling group.
Minimum number of samples required for data to be considered representative of actual conditions.	One monthly sampling group collected during the recreation season (May 1-September 30).
Laboratory	Samples need to be analyzed by a laboratory registered with or accredited by the PA Laboratory Accreditation Program (LAP). The National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (NELAP) is also acceptable.
Required analysis to determine if samples exceed water quality criteria	To be performed by DEP staff using procedures outlined in the current Assessment and Listing Methodology.

## **Macroinvertebrate/Fish Data**

Data age	Data must be less than 5 years old, unless it can be demonstrated that data is representative of current conditions.
Minimum number of sampling sites	A minimum of two sites must be sampled for each stream segment. If landuse changes or point sources enter the stream between the upstream and downstream boundary points, more sites are required. See the discussion "Location of Waterbody" for more details.
Sampling duration	Single one-time samples are acceptable. Sampling must be done using one of DEP's approved methodologies.
Acceptable data	Macroinvertebrates must be identified to the lowest practical taxonomic level (generally to genus, except for snails, worms, clams, and midges. Fishes must be identified to species.
Quality assurance for macroinvertebrate identification.	Persons with SFS certification is required and 10% of the identified samples must be provided to DEP to confirm identifications.
Required analysis to determine if the biological community is impaired	To be performed by DEP staff using procedures outlined in the current Assessment and Listing Methodology.

## **Location of Waterbody:**

DEP defines a stream segment as the portion of a stream between an upstream tributary and the next downstream tributary. Assessments may consist of one or multiple segments. For headwater sections, the first segment extends from the source to the first tributary. DEP uses the United States Geological Survey's (USGS) National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) to identify tributaries and the resulting stream segments. This GIS layer is set to a 1:24,000 scale. The rationale for segmenting streams is that tributaries can deliver pollution loads and/or dilution water in quantities sufficient to affect the water quality of the receiving stream. Some tributaries have a flow so small in relation to the mainstem that they are not a factor in the overall quality of the mainstem. There is no need to place sampling sites around these tributaries.

After identifying a stream segment for study, sampling locations should be situated so they reflect the quality of all waters upstream to the next sampling point. A minimum of two sites is required to assess the quality of a stream segment. One location is just above the upstream tributary to measure the water quality entering the stream segment (background water quality) and another location just above the downstream tributary to measure the water quality as it flows out of the segment.

Outside sources of data and information that fail to adequately delineate a stream segment, cannot be used in the 305(b)/303(d) process. It is imperative that submitted information clearly identifies the extent of the waterbody segment(s) to which the data applies.

For water quality limited segments, the DEP requires the submitted information to include maps with impaired segments clearly highlighted. For assessments that document impairments to entire basins, identifying the location of the mouth of the major stream is sufficient. In this latter case, all segments upstream of the mouth will be assigned the same impaired or attained status.

## **Quality Assurance/Quality Control:**

All reports and data submitted to DEP must be accompanied by either a written study design completed in accordance with DEP's "Designing Your Monitoring Program – A Technical Handbook for Community-Based Monitoring in Pennsylvania", a written quality assurance project plan completed in accordance with EPA's "The Volunteer Monitors Guide to Quality Assurance Project Plans", or a standard QA/QC protocol. A quality assurance plan should be adhered to that includes external checks such as split sample analysis by DEP certified labs.

## **Chemical and Bacteriological Data**

Guidance for QA/QC and monitoring of chemical and bacteriological data collection is available in DEP's "Designing Your Monitoring Program – A Technical Handbook For Community-Based Monitoring in Pennsylvania" or EPA's The Volunteer Monitor's Guide to Quality Assurance Project Plans, EPA 841-B-96-003. The DEP guidance can be obtained by contacting:

Bureau of Clean Water  
P.O. Box 8774  
Attn: Diane Wilson  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8774  
Telephone (717) 787-5017

## **Biological Data**

For use in waterbody assessment decisions, DEP requires the use of DEP developed assessment methodologies available on DEP's website. EPA's Rapid Bioassessment Protocol described in "Rapid Bioassessment Protocols for Use in Wadeable Streams and Rivers; Periphyton, Benthic Macroinvertebrates, and Fish" is also acceptable (EPA 841-B-99-002, July 1999). Other analytical methods will be considered if submitted to and agreed upon by the DEP.

## **INFORMATION SHEET**

### **303(d) LIST AND EXISTING AND READILY AVAILABLE WATER QUALITY DATA**

#### **What is the 303(d) List?**

Section 303(d) of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) requires Pennsylvania to identify all waters within the Commonwealth for which effluent limitations required by the CWA are not stringent enough to implement any water quality standard applicable to such waters. The 303(d) List includes those water quality limited segments that still require the development of total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) to assure future compliance with water quality standards. Water quality limited segments are defined as waterbodies that do not meet water quality standards even after the application of technology-based treatment requirements to point and nonpoint sources of pollution. Water quality standards are defined as the combination of designated water uses to be protected and the water quality criteria necessary to protect those uses. Water quality standards for all Pennsylvania surface waters can be found in Chapter 93 - Water Quality Standards and Chapter 16 - Water Quality Toxics Management Strategy (PA Code - Title 25. Environmental Protection). The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) must submit the 303(d) List to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) by April 1<sup>st</sup> of a reporting year. The most current version of the 303(d) list can be accessed electronically on DEP's webpage: <http://www.dep.pa.gov>.

#### **How is the determination made to place a waterbody on the 303(d) List?**

In determining which waters to place on the 303(d) List, DEP is required by federal regulation (40 CFR 130.7(b)(5)) to assemble and evaluate all existing and readily available water quality related data and information. At a minimum, all existing and readily available water quality related data and information includes the following categories of waters:

1. Waters identified by the State in its most recent section 305(b) report as partially supporting or not supporting designated uses, or as threatened;
2. Waters for which dilution calculations or predictive models indicate non-attainment of applicable water quality standards;
3. Waters for which water quality problems have been reported by local, state, or federal agencies; members of the public; or academic institutions.
4. Waters identified by the State as impaired or threatened in a nonpoint assessment submitted to EPA under section 319 of the CWA.

The determination of how much data and information is adequate to include a waterbody on the 303(d) List is a deliberative process involving best professional judgment by DEP staff. The EPA guidance identifies several screening categories that DEP should use to identify water quality limited waters. Those that may apply to existing and readily available water quality data and information submitted by outside sources include:

1. **Evidence of numeric criterion violations.** Example: Ambient monitoring data demonstrates chronic exceedance of the Chapter 93 temperature criteria.

2. **Beneficial use impaired.** Listing a waterbody due to use impairment requires information that shows the use is not being supported and that this failure is due to degraded water quality. Examples: A waterbody designated for water contact sports has been closed to swimming by local or state authorities due to human health concerns. A waterbody designated as a cold water fishery has exhibited a documented decline in biomass due to excessive sediment deposits that have inhibited or precluded spawning.
3. **Evidence of a narrative criterion violation.** Example: Assessment demonstrates that a discharge is releasing substances that produce color, odor, or turbidity in amounts harmful to a designated water use.
4. **Technical analysis.** Example: Predicative modeling results show that criteria will be violated at design flow or Rapid Bioassessment Protocol results indicate beneficial uses will not be maintained.

### **Is DEP required to use all data and information submitted by outside sources in determining if a waterbody should be included on the 303(d) List?**

In order to be used in the 303(d) listing process, data and/or information submitted to DEP should include the following:

1. Name and location of waterbody.
2. Name of investigator(s) and/or phone number of a contact person.
3. Data and documentation which substantiates the conclusion of an impairment or attainment
  - a. data needs to be provided in a usable format (e.g., excel, Access)
4. Identification of all sampling locations. GIS coordinates are preferred.
5. Identification of the source(s) of documented impairment (e.g., industrial point source discharge, construction, habitat modification, nonpoint source, etc.).

DEP is interested in evaluating all available information in the 303(d) listing process; however, some types and sources of information will not be adequate. At a minimum, data submitted to DEP will be reviewed to determine the following:

1. Presence of a quality assurance/quality control plan.
2. Adherence to accepted methods in the operation of field instruments.
3. Use of standardized protocols for chemical/biological monitoring.
4. Some indication that all other testing methods comply with accepted practices.

DEP is required to review all data submitted. However, data deemed inadequate based on insufficient data quantity/quality will not be used in the compiling of the 303(d) List. An explanation will be provided in the 303(d) List documentation submitted to EPA for any data reviewed but not included on the list.

### **When can outside sources submit data and information to DEP for consideration in the 303(d) listing process?**

The 303(d) listing process is an ongoing effort and outside sources are encouraged to submit data and information at any time. However, in order to allow for the federally mandated submission of the 303(d) List to EPA by April 1<sup>st</sup> of even years, DEP must impose a data submission deadline. Information and data submitted to DEP by close of business on the last day of the deadline will be considered for inclusion in the upcoming 303(d) List. Information and data received after the established deadline will be considered during the next 303(d) listing cycle.

**Where should I submit data and information for consideration in the 303(d) listing process?**

Anyone wishing to submit data and information for consideration in the 303(d) listing process may send it to the following address:

Bureau of Clean Water  
Water Quality Division  
Attn: Molly Pulket  
P.O. Box 8774  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8774

**Who can I contact with questions regarding the 303(d) listing process?**

Anyone with questions regarding the 303(d) listing process is encouraged to call the following individual at (717) 787-9637:

Gary Walters, Environmental Group Manager  
Water Quality Division  
[RA-WQAssessments@pa.gov](mailto:RA-WQAssessments@pa.gov)