

Fact Sheets Supporting
Revision of the Section 303(d) List



September 2005

Table of Contents

List Recommendations.....	11
Aliso Canyon Wash.....	13
Bacteria Indicators.....	13
Aliso Canyon Wash.....	16
Copper.....	16
Ballona Creek.....	18
Cyanide.....	18
Ballona Creek.....	20
Trash.....	20
Ballona Creek Estuary.....	21
Copper.....	21
Burbank Western Channel.....	23
Ammonia.....	23
Burbank Western Channel.....	25
Copper.....	25
Burbank Western Channel.....	27
Cyanide.....	27
Burbank Western Channel.....	29
Fecal Coliform.....	29
Burbank Western Channel.....	32
Nitrite.....	32
Burbank Western Channel.....	35
Zinc.....	35
Calleguas Creek Reach 3 (Potrero Road upstream to confluence with Conejo Creek on 1998 303d list).....	37
Chlordane.....	37
Calleguas Creek Reach 3 (Potrero Road upstream to confluence with Conejo Creek on 1998 303d list).....	39
DDT.....	39
Calleguas Creek Reach 3 (Potrero Road upstream to confluence with Conejo Creek on 1998 303d list).....	41
Dieldrin.....	41
Calleguas Creek Reach 3 (Potrero Road upstream to confluence with Conejo Creek on 1998 303d list).....	43
Toxaphene.....	43
Coyote Creek.....	45
Ammonia.....	45
Coyote Creek.....	48
Cyanide.....	48
Coyote Creek.....	50
Diazinon.....	50
Coyote Creek.....	52
Nitrogen, Nitrite.....	52
Coyote Creek.....	54

pH.....	54
Dominguez Channel (lined portion above Vermont Ave).....	57
Aluminum.....	57
Dominguez Channel (lined portion above Vermont Ave).....	60
Enterococcus	60
Dominguez Channel (lined portion above Vermont Ave).....	64
Zinc.....	64
Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave)	68
Benzo(a)pyrene (PAHs)	68
Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave).....	71
Chrysene (C1-C4)	71
Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave)	74
Phenanthrene	74
Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave).....	77
Polychlorinated biphenyls	77
Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave).....	80
Pyrene.....	80
Duck Pond Agricultural Drains/Mugu Drain/Oxnard Drain No 2	83
Chlordane	83
Duck Pond Agricultural Drains/Mugu Drain/Oxnard Drain No 2	85
DDT.....	85
Duck Pond Agricultural Drains/Mugu Drain/Oxnard Drain No 2	87
Toxaphene	87
Echo Park Lake.....	89
Trash.....	89
Lake Lindero.....	90
Selenium.....	90
Leo Carillo Beach (South of County Line)	92
Coliform Bacteria.....	92
Lincoln Park Lake	93
Trash.....	93
Los Angeles Harbor - Cabrillo Marina.....	94
DDT.....	94
Los Angeles Harbor - Cabrillo Marina.....	96
Polychlorinated biphenyls	96
Los Angeles Harbor - Inner Cabrillo Beach Area	98
Bacteria Indicators.....	98
Los Angeles Harbor - Inner Cabrillo Beach Area	100
Copper	100
Los Angeles Harbor - Inner Cabrillo Beach Area	102
DDT.....	102
Los Angeles Harbor - Inner Cabrillo Beach Area	104
Polychlorinated biphenyls	104
Los Angeles River Estuary	106
Trash.....	106
Los Angeles River Reach 1 (Estuary to Carson Street).....	108

Cyanide.....	108
Los Angeles River Reach 1 (Estuary to Carson Street).....	110
Diazinon	110
Los Angeles River Reach 1 (Estuary to Carson Street).....	112
Nutrients (Algae).....	112
Los Angeles River Reach 1 (Estuary to Carson Street).....	113
Trash.....	113
Los Angeles River Reach 2 (Carson to Figueroa Street).....	114
Trash.....	114
Los Angeles River Reach 3 (Figueroa St. to Riverside Dr.)	115
Ammonia.....	115
Los Angeles River Reach 3 (Figueroa St. to Riverside Dr.)	116
Trash.....	116
Los Angeles River Reach 4 (Sepulveda Dr. to Sepulveda Dam)	117
Trash.....	117
Los Angeles River Reach 5 (within Sepulveda Basin).....	118
Trash.....	118
Los Angeles/Long Beach Inner Harbor.....	119
Copper	119
Los Angeles/Long Beach Inner Harbor.....	121
DDT.....	121
Los Angeles/Long Beach Inner Harbor.....	123
Polychlorinated biphenyls	123
Los Angeles/Long Beach Inner Harbor.....	125
Zinc.....	125
Los Angeles/Long Beach Outer Harbor (inside breakwater)	128
DDT.....	128
Los Cerritos Channel.....	131
Aluminum.....	131
Los Cerritos Channel.....	133
Bis(2ethylhexyl)phthalate	133
Malibu Creek	135
Aluminum.....	135
Malibu Creek.....	137
Selenium.....	137
Malibu Creek.....	139
Sulfates.....	139
Marina del Rey Harbor - Back Basins.....	141
Sediment Bioassays for Estuarine and Marine Water	141
Peck Road Park Lake.....	143
Trash.....	143
Piru Creek (from gaging station below Santa Felicia Dam to headwaters).....	144
Chloride.....	144
Port Hueneme Pier.....	146
Polychlorinated biphenyls	146
Rio Hondo Reach 1 (Confl. LA River to Snt Ana Fwy)	148

Ammonia.....	148
San Gabriel River Estuary	150
Ammonia as Nitrogen	150
San Gabriel River Reach 1 (Estuary to Firestone)	152
Ammonia.....	152
San Gabriel River Reach 1 (Estuary to Firestone)	154
pH.....	154
San Gabriel River Reach 2 (Firestone to Whittier Narrows Dam)	156
Aluminum.....	156
San Gabriel River Reach 2 (Firestone to Whittier Narrows Dam)	158
Ammonia.....	158
San Gabriel River, East Fork.....	160
Trash.....	160
San Jose Creek Reach 1 (SG Confluence to Temple St.).....	161
Ammonia.....	161
San Jose Creek Reach 2 (Temple to I-10 at White Ave.).....	163
Ammonia.....	163
Santa Clara River Reach 1 (Estuary to Hwy 101 Bridge)	165
Toxicity	165
Santa Clara River Reach 11 (Piru Creek, from confluence with Santa Clara River Reach 4 to gaging station below Santa Felicia Dam)	167
Boron.....	167
Santa Clara River Reach 11 (Piru Creek, from confluence with Santa Clara River Reach 4 to gaging station below Santa Felicia Dam)	169
Sulfates.....	169
Santa Clara River Reach 5 (Blue Cut gaging station to West Pier Hwy 99 Bridge) (was named Santa Clara River Reach 7 on 2002 303(d) lists)	171
Aluminum.....	171
Santa Clara River Reach 5 (Blue Cut gaging station to West Pier Hwy 99 Bridge) (was named Santa Clara River Reach 7 on 2002 303(d) lists)	173
Ammonia.....	173
Santa Clara River Reach 5 (Blue Cut gaging station to West Pier Hwy 99 Bridge) (was named Santa Clara River Reach 7 on 2002 303(d) lists)	175
Chloride.....	175
Santa Clara River Reach 5 (Blue Cut gaging station to West Pier Hwy 99 Bridge) (was named Santa Clara River Reach 7 on 2002 303(d) lists)	177
Diazinon	177
Santa Clara River Reach 5 (Blue Cut gaging station to West Pier Hwy 99 Bridge) (was named Santa Clara River Reach 7 on 2002 303(d) lists)	179
Polychlorinated biphenyls.....	179
Santa Clara River Reach 6 (W Pier Hwy 99 to Bouquet Cyn Rd) (was named Santa Clara River Reach 8 on 2002 303(d) lists)	181
Ammonia.....	181
Santa Clara River Reach 6 (W Pier Hwy 99 to Bouquet Cyn Rd) (was named Santa Clara River Reach 8 on 2002 303(d) lists)	183
Chloride.....	183

Santa Clara River Reach 6 (W Pier Hwy 99 to Bouquet Cyn Rd) (was named Santa Clara River Reach 8 on 2002 303(d) lists)	184
Chlorpyrifos	184
Santa Clara River Reach 6 (W Pier Hwy 99 to Bouquet Cyn Rd) (was named Santa Clara River Reach 8 on 2002 303(d) lists)	186
Diazinon	186
Santa Clara River Reach 6 (W Pier Hwy 99 to Bouquet Cyn Rd) (was named Santa Clara River Reach 8 on 2002 303(d) lists)	188
Nitrogen, Nitrite	188
Santa Clara River Reach 6 (W Pier Hwy 99 to Bouquet Cyn Rd) (was named Santa Clara River Reach 8 on 2002 303(d) lists)	190
Toxicity	190
Sawpit Creek.....	192
Bis(2ethylhexyl)phthalate	192
Sawpit Creek.....	194
Fecal Coliform.....	194
Ventura Marina Jetties.....	196
DDT.....	196
Ventura Marina Jetties.....	198
Polychlorinated biphenyls	198
Delist Recommendations	201
Abalone Cove Beach	203
Beach Closures.....	203
Arroyo Seco Reach 1 (LA River to West Holly Ave.).....	204
Excess Algal Growth.....	204
Arroyo Seco Reach 2 (Figueroa St. to Riverside Dr.).....	205
Excess Algal Growth.....	205
Ballona Creek	206
Cadmium	206
Ballona Creek	208
ChemA	208
Ballona Creek	210
Chlordane	210
Ballona Creek	212
DDT.....	212
Ballona Creek	214
Dieldrin.....	214
Ballona Creek	216
Lead.....	216
Ballona Creek	220
PCBs (dioxin-like).....	220
Ballona Creek	222
Sediment Bioassays for Estuarine and Marine Water	222
Ballona Creek	224
Selenium.....	224
Ballona Creek	228

Silver	228
Ballona Creek	230
Zinc.....	230
Ballona Creek	234
pH.....	234
Bluff Cove Beach	236
Beach Closures.....	236
Burbank Western Channel.....	237
Cadmium	237
Burbank Western Channel.....	239
Excess Algal Growth.....	239
Burbank Western Channel.....	243
Foam/Flocs/Scum/Oil Slicks.....	243
Burbank Western Channel.....	247
Taste and odor	247
Calleguas Creek Reach 4 (was Revolon Slough Main Branch: Mugu Lagoon to Central Avenue on 1998 303d list).....	251
Excess Algal Growth.....	251
Calleguas Creek Reach 5 (was Beardsley Channel on 1998 303d list).....	252
Excess Algal Growth.....	252
Calleguas Creek Reach 9B (was part of Conejo Creek Reaches 1 and 2 on 1998 303d list).....	253
Excess Algal Growth.....	253
Calleguas Creek Reach 10 (Conejo Creek (Hill Canyon)- was part of Conejo Crk Reaches 2 & 3, and lower Conejo Crk/Arroyo Conejo N Fk on 1998 303d list).....	254
Excess Algal Growth.....	254
Calleguas Creek Reach 11 (Arroyo Santa Rosa, was part of Conejo Creek Reach 3 on 1998 303d list).....	255
Excess Algal Growth.....	255
Calleguas Creek Reach 13 (Conejo Creek South Fork, was Conejo Cr Reach 4 and part of Reach 3 on 1998 303d list).....	256
Excess Algal Growth.....	256
Carbon Beach	257
Beach Closures.....	257
Coyote Creek.....	258
Abnormal Fish Histology (Lesions).....	258
Coyote Creek.....	261
Excess Algal Growth.....	261
Coyote Creek.....	265
Selenium.....	265
Coyote Creek.....	268
Zinc.....	268
Dockweiler Beach.....	271
Beach Closures.....	271
Dominguez Channel (lined portion above Vermont Ave).....	272
Aldrin	272

Dominguez Channel (lined portion above Vermont Ave).....	274
ChemA	274
Dominguez Channel (lined portion above Vermont Ave).....	276
Chlordane	276
Dominguez Channel (lined portion above Vermont Ave).....	278
DDT.....	278
Dominguez Channel (lined portion above Vermont Ave).....	280
Dieldrin.....	280
Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave)	282
Aldrin	282
Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave)	284
ChemA	284
Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave)	286
Chlordane	286
Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave)	288
Chromium (total).....	288
Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave)	290
DDT.....	290
Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave)	292
Dieldrin.....	292
Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave)	294
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs) (Aquatic Ecosystems).....	294
Escondido Beach	296
Beach Closures.....	296
Flat Rock Point Beach Area	297
Beach Closures.....	297
Hermosa Beach.....	298
Beach Closures.....	298
Inspiration Point Beach	299
Beach Closures.....	299
La Costa Beach.....	300
Beach Closures.....	300
Las Tunas Beach.....	301
Beach Closures.....	301
Los Angeles Harbor - Consolidated Slip.....	302
Dieldrin.....	302
Los Angeles Harbor - Consolidated Slip.....	304
Nickel	304
Los Angeles Harbor - Consolidated Slip.....	306
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs) (Aquatic Ecosystems).....	306
Los Angeles River Estuary (Queensway Bay)	309
DDT.....	309
Los Angeles River Reach 1 (Estuary to Carson Street).....	312
Cadmium	312
Los Angeles River Reach 2 (Carson to Figueroa Street).....	314
Foam/Flocs/Scum/Oil Slicks.....	314

Los Angeles River Reach 2 (Carson to Figueroa Street).....	315
Nutrients (Algae).....	315
Los Angeles River Reach 2 (Carson to Figueroa Street).....	316
Taste and odor	316
Los Angeles/Long Beach Outer Harbor (inside breakwater)	317
Polychlorinated biphenyls	317
Lunada Bay Beach.....	319
Beach Closures.....	319
Malaga Cove Beach.....	320
Beach Closures.....	320
Malibu Beach.....	321
Beach Closures.....	321
Manhattan Beach	322
Beach Closures.....	322
Nicholas Canyon Beach.....	323
Beach Closures.....	323
Ormond Beach.....	324
Bacteria Indicators.....	324
Point Dume Beach.....	327
Beach Closures.....	327
Point Fermin Park Beach.....	328
Beach Closures.....	328
Point Vicente Beach	329
Beach Closures.....	329
Portuguese Bend Beach.....	330
Beach Closures.....	330
Puerco Beach.....	331
Beach Closures.....	331
Resort Point Beach	332
Beach Closures.....	332
Rocky Point Beach	333
Beach Closures.....	333
Royal Palms Beach.....	334
Beach Closures.....	334
San Buenaventura Beach.....	335
Bacteria Indicators.....	335
San Gabriel River Estuary	339
Abnormal Fish Histology (Lesions).....	339
San Gabriel River Reach 1 (Estuary to Firestone)	343
Abnormal Fish Histology (Lesions).....	343
San Gabriel River Reach 1 (Estuary to Firestone)	346
Excess Algal Growth.....	346
San Gabriel River Reach 1 (Estuary to Firestone)	348
Toxicity	348
San Gabriel River Reach 2 (Firestone to Whittier Narrows Dam	351
Lead.....	351

San Gabriel River Reach 2 (Firestone to Whittier Narrows Dam)	353
Zinc	353
San Jose Creek Reach 1 (SG Confluence to Temple St.)	355
Excess Algal Growth	355
San Jose Creek Reach 2 (Temple to I-10 at White Ave.)	357
Excess Algal Growth	357
Sea Level Beach	359
Beach Closures	359
Topanga Beach	360
Beach Closures	360
Torrance Beach	361
Beach Closures	361
Trancas Beach (Broad Beach)	362
Beach Closures	362
Tujunga Wash (LA River to Hansen Dam)	363
Foam/Flocs/Scum/Oil Slicks	363
Tujunga Wash (LA River to Hansen Dam)	364
Taste and odor	364
Venice Beach	365
Beach Closures	365
Ventura River Estuary	366
Fecal Coliform	366
Verdugo Wash Reach 1 (LA River to Verdugo Rd.)	368
Excess Algal Growth	368
Verdugo Wash Reach 2 (Above Verdugo Road)	369
Excess Algal Growth	369
Whites Point Beach	370
Beach Closures	370
Will Rogers Beach	371
Beach Closures	371
Zuma Beach (Westward Beach)	372
Beach Closures	372
Area Change Recommendations	373
Dominguez Channel (lined portion above Vermont Ave)	375
Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave)	376
Los Angeles Harbor - Cabrillo Marina	377
Los Angeles Harbor - Consolidated Slip	378
Los Angeles Harbor - Fish Harbor	379
Los Angeles Harbor - Inner Cabrillo Beach Area	380
Los Angeles/Long Beach Inner Harbor	381
Los Angeles/Long Beach Outer Harbor (inside breakwater)	382
San Pedro Bay Near/Off Shore Zones	383

Page left blank intentionally.

Los Angeles Region (4)

LIST

Recommendations to place waters and
pollutants on the section 303(d) List

Page left blank intentionally.

Region 4

Water Segment: Aliso Canyon Wash

Pollutant: Bacteria Indicators

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under sections 3.3 the Listing Policy. Three lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 3.3 the site exceeds the Total and Fecal coliform WQO for the protection of REC1 beneficial Uses. Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Six of six samples exceeded the Basin Plan WQOs for total and fecal coliform bacteria to protect REC1 beneficial uses, and these exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. The REC1 beneficial uses are being impacted in this water body by bacteriological pollutants.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Fecal Coliform data linked and applicable to REC 1 Beneficial use.

Data Used to Assess Water Six Fecal Coliform samples, 6 of which exceeded the WQO (LACDPW, 2003a).

Quality:

Spatial Representation: One sample site.

Temporal Representation: Approximate monthly sampling events. 5 samples taken during the wet season (11/08/2003 - 3/15/2003 and one sample taken during the dry season (04/30/2003).

Environmental Conditions: Data age 1-2 years old.

Data Quality Assessment: QA/QC used by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works - Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde Consultants, 1996).

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Total Coliform linked and applicable to REC-1

*Data Used to Assess Water
Quality:* Six bacterial samples, 6 exceeding the WQO (LACDPW, 2003a).

Spatial Representation: One sample site

Temporal Representation: Monthly sampling events. Five(5) samples taken during the wet season (11/ 8/ 2002 - 03 / 15 / 2003) and one (1) sample taken during the dry season (04 / 30 / 2003).

Environmental Conditions: Data Age 1 to 2 years.

Data Quality Assessment: Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Matrix: Water

Water Quality Objective/ There is no WQO for enterococcus linked or applicable to fresh water

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	REC-1 Beneficial Uses.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Six samples collected (LACDPW, 2003a).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sampling site.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Five samples taken during the wet season (11/08/2002-03/15/2003) and one sample taken during the dry season (04/30/2003).
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Data age 1-2 years.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Region 4

Water Segment: Aliso Canyon Wash

Pollutant: Copper

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Two of six samples exceeded the CTR criterion continuous concentration for dissolved copper for protection of aquatic life and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable CTR criteria continuous concentration is exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	CTR criteria linked and applicable to Warm Fresh Water Habitat BUs.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Five samples, 2 exceeded the CTR criteria (LACDPW, 2003a).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sampling site.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Five monthly samples taken during the wet season (11/08/2002- 3/15/2003) and one sample taken during the dry season (04/30/2003).
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Data Age 1-2 years.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Region 4

Water Segment: Ballona Creek

Pollutant: Cyanide

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. There were sufficient number of exceedances of the CTR Cyanide criteria continuous concentration to list.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

- 1.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
- 2.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
- 3.Three of 18 samples exceeded the CTR Cyanide criteria continuous concentration and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
- 4.Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

Water Quality Objective/ CTR Criteria Continuous Concentration of 0.0052 mg/l is the highest

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	concentration of Cyanide to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (four days) without deleterious effects applicable to protect aquatic life BUs.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 18 samples out of which Three samples exceeded the CTR Criteria Continuous Concentration of 0.0052 mg/l for protection of aquatic life (LACDPW, 2004c).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sample site sampled during the dry and wet season beginning on 10/12/00 through 04/30/2003 at approximately one to two-week sampling interval.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Eighteen samples were taken during the wet and dry season from 10/12/00 to 4/30/03 at approximately one to two-week sampling interval as part of the Los Angeles County Storm water Monitoring report prepared by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Data Age is 1 to 4 years old. The Ballona Creek monitoring station is located at the existing stream gage station (Stream Gage No. F38C-R) between Sawtelle Boulevard and Sepulveda Boulevard in the City of Los Angeles. At this location, which was chosen to avoid tidal influences, the upstream tributary watershed of Ballona Creek is 88.8 square miles. The entire Ballona Creek Watershed is 127.1 square miles. At the gauging station, Ballona Creek is a concrete lined trapezoidal channel.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Region 4

Water Segment: Ballona Creek

Pollutant: Trash

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under sections 2.2 and 3.11 of the Listing Policy. Under these sections of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. This water segment-pollutant combination was moved off the section 303(d) list during the 2002 listing cycle only because a TMDL had been completed. No substantial evidence in the record shows that standards are met.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a TMDL has been approved by USEPA, an implementation plan has been approved, and applicable water quality standards are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: TMDL completed.

Region 4

Water Segment: Ballona Creek Estuary

Pollutant: Copper

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to access listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Ten of 48 samples exceeded the copper water quality criterion and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat

Matrix: Water

Water Quality Objective/ CTR Copper Criterion for continuous concentration in water for the protection

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	of marine aquatic life. The value used was 3.1 ug/L.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Forty-eight samples with 10 exceeding the water quality criterion. Detection limits was 10 ug/L (USEPA and LARWQCB, 2005).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The metals data from the City of Los Angeles were from four locations along Ballona Creek at National Boulevard, Overland Avenue, Centinela Boulevard, and Pacific Avenue. The data from Centinela Boulevard and Pacific Avenue are representative of the estuary and these data were used to assess conditions in the estuary.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Sampled on a monthly basis between January 2002 through May 2003.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Data are representative of dry-weather conditions.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	City of Los Angeles.

Region 4

Water Segment: Burbank Western Channel

Pollutant: Ammonia

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. It was not possible to determine any exceedances in the first line of evidence because of insufficient data. However, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the nutrient standard.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a TMDL has been approved by USEPA and an implementation plan has been approved.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* One hour average Basin Plan Water Quality Objectives for ammonia-N was revised in 2002. For freshwaters not designated COLD and/or MIGR the ammonia WQO is dependent on pH and fish species, but not temperature. The 30-day average WQO for waters not designated for spawning are dependent on pH and temperature. These WQOs have been adopted into the basin plan and are linked and applicable to protection of aquatic live beneficial uses.

<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 27 samples taken from 5/7/02 to 5/25/04 at two to three monthly intervals. No sample exceeded the basin plan ammonia WQO. Data was compared against 2002 adopted ammonia WQO of which the 1-hour average objective is dependent on pH and fish species and the 30-day average is dependent on pH and temperature. It was not possible to determine any exceedances of the 1-hour average WQO or the 30-day average because pH and temperature data was not provided (City of Burbank, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Three sample sites sampled from May 2002 through May 2004 at two to three monthly intervals.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Twenty seven samples were taken at three sampling stations.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Data was collected from May 2002 through May 2004 at 3 sampling stations. Sampling R1 is located at the confluence of Burbank Western Channel and Lockheed Channel about 50 feet above the Burbank Reclamation Plant. Station R2 is located at Burbank Western Wash at Verdugo Avenue. Station R5 is located at Burbank Western Wash just upstream from the confluence with the L.A. River.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Standard Operating Procedures for Receiving Water Monitoring, Burbank Western Channel (United Water Burbank Water Reclamation Plant).

<i>Line of Evidence</i>	Remedial Program in Place
<i>Beneficial Use</i>	R2 - Non-Contact Recreation
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Los Angeles River Nitrogen TMDL was approved by RWQCB on August 19, 2003 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March 18, 2004.

Region 4

Water Segment: Burbank Western Channel

Pollutant: Copper

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Three samples exceeded the CTR dissolved copper criterion for the protection of aquatic life.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Three of six samples exceeded the CTR dissolved copper criterion for continuous concentration in water and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

Water Quality Objective/ CTR Dissolved Copper Criterion for continuous concentration (CCC) in water for the protection of aquatic life is expressed as a function of the total hardness

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	of the water body. The aquatic life criteria will vary depending of total hardness reported at the sampling site. The CCC for dissolved copper is the highest concentration to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (four days) without deleterious effects. This criterion is linked and applicable for the protection of aquatic life Beneficial Uses.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Data generated from six samples out of which three samples exceeded CTR criteria values (LACDPW, 2003a).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sample site.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Six monthly samples, Five (5) taken during the wet season (11/08/2002-03/15/2003) and one (1) sample taken during the dry season (04/30/2003).
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Data age 1-2 years. Data taken during the wet and dry seasons.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program(Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Region 4

Water Segment: Burbank Western Channel

Pollutant: Cyanide

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Two samples exceeded the CTR Criteria Continuous Concentration of 0.0052 mg/l which is the highest concentration of Cyanide to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (four days) without deleterious effects applicable to protect aquatic life BUs.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

- 1.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
- 2.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
- 3.Two of six samples exceeded the CTR Criteria Continuous Concentration of 0.0052 mg/l for Cyanide and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
- 4.Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: MU - Municipal & Domestic

Matrix: Water

<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	CTR Criteria Continuous Concentration of 0.0052 mg/l is the highest concentration of Cyanide to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (four days) without deleterious effects applicable to protect aquatic life BUs.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Data generated from six samples out of which 2 samples exceeded the CTR Criteria Continuous Concentration guideline for the protection of aquatic life (LACDPW, 2003a).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One (1) sample site.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Six monthly samples, Five (5) taken during the wet season (11/08/2002-03/15/2003) and one (1) sample taken during the dry season (04/30/2003).
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Age of data 1-2- years.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Region 4

Water Segment: Burbank Western Channel

Pollutant: Fecal Coliform

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.3 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.3 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status. Three lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant but only exceedance in the fecal coliform samples could be determined because a WQO has been already established in the basin plan. There are no applicable WQO or criteria with which determine exceedances in the other two lines of evidence in fresh water.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

- 1.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
- 2.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
- 3.Six of six samples exceeded the Fecal Coliform water quality objective and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.2 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Matrix: Water

Water Quality Objective/ There is no fresh water WQO or criteria for Total Coliform applicable with

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	protection of REC 1 BUs.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Six samples out of which exceedances could not be determined because there are no applicable WQOs for total coliform density in fresh waters (LACDPW, 2003a).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One (1) sample site.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Six monthly samples, Five taken during the wet season (11/08/2002-03/15/2003) and one sample taken during the dry season (04/30/2003).
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Data age 1-2 years. Taken during the wet and dry season.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	R1 - Water Contact Recreation
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan WQO for single sample fecal coliform density shall not exceed 400/100ml. This WQO is linked and applicable to protection of REC-1 beneficial uses in fresh water.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Six samples out of which six samples exceeded the WQO for protection of REC-1 in fresh water (LACDPW, 2003a).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One (1) sampling site.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Six monthly samples, Five taken during the wet season (11/08/2002-03/15/2003) and one sample taken during the dry season (04/30/2003).
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Data age 1-2 years. Data taken during the wet and dry seasons.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	R1 - Water Contact Recreation
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water

<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	There is no fresh water basin plan WQOs or criteria for enterococcus applicable to the protection of REC 1 BUs in fresh water.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from six samples out of which exceedances could not be determined because there are no applicable WQOs for enterococcus density in fresh waters (LACDWPW, 2003a).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sample site.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Six monthly samples, Five (5) taken during the wet season (11/08/2002-03/15/2003) and one (1) sample taken during the dry season (04/30/2003).
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Data age 1-2 years. Data taken during the wet and dry seasons.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Region 4

Water Segment: Burbank Western Channel

Pollutant: Nitrite

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, One line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

Three lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed the water quality objective. In addition, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard for Nitrite.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments being addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of Listing Policy section 6.1.4.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of Listing Policy section 6.1.5.
3. Four of 33 samples exceeded the water quality standard and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments being addressed category because a TMDL is in place and is expected to result in attainment of the standard.

Lines of Evidence:

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	MU - Municipal & Domestic
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	WQO is linked and applicable to MUN BUs
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from six samples out of which one sample exceeded the WQO for protection MUN (SWRCB, 2003).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sampling site.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Six monthly samples, Five taken during the wet season (11/08/2002-03/15/2003) and one sample taken during the dry season (04/30/2003).
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Data age 1-2 years. Data taken during the wet and dry seasons. Documented exceedance recorded in 2/25/2003 (wet season).
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	MU - Municipal & Domestic
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	The Basin Plan Water Quality Objective for Nitrite-Nitrogen of 1 mg/l is linked and applicable for the protection of drinking water supplies.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 27 samples taken from 3/6/02 to 5/25/04 at two to three monthly intervals. Three samples exceeded the Basin Plan Nitrite-N WQO (City of Burbank, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Three sample sites at receiving water stations consistent with the Burbank Water Reclamation Plant NPDES permit which included receiving water stations both upstream (R1) and downstream (R2, and R5) of the reclamation plant and the BWP power plan discharges.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Twenty-seven samples were taken from 5/7/02 through 5/25/04 at quarterly intervals from three sampling stations (R1, R2, and R5).
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Data was collected from 3/02 through 5/04 at three sampling stations. Sampling station R1 is located at the confluence of Burbank Western Channel and

Lockheed Channel about 50 feet above the Burbank Reclamation Plant.
Sampling station R2 is located at Burbank Western Wash at Verdugo Avenue.
Sampling station R5 is located at Burbank Western Wash just upstream from the
confluence with the Los Angeles River.

Data Quality Assessment:

Standard Operating Procedures for Receiving Water Monitoring, Burbank
Western Channel (United Water Burbank Water Reclamation Plant).

Region 4

Water Segment: Burbank Western Channel

Pollutant: Zinc

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status. Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. One line of evidence pertains to the dissolved portion of zinc and the other pertains to the total fraction in water. Three exceedances of CTR guidelines were recorded in the dissolve zinc data set. The total zinc data set was compared to secondary MCLs and none were in exceedances.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment on the section 303(d) list for dissolved zinc but not for total Zinc in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Three of six dissolved zinc samples exceeded the CTR guidelines and none of the total zinc samples exceeded the secondary MCL for the protection of drinking water supplies. The dissolved zinc fraction exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: MU - Municipal & Domestic, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	CTR Dissolved Zinc Criterion for continuous concentration (CCC) in water for the protection of aquatic life is expressed as a function of the total hardness of the water body. The aquatic life criteria will vary depending of total hardness reported at the sampling site. The CCC for dissolved zinc is the highest concentration to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (four days) without deleterious effects. This criterion is linked and applicable for the protection of aquatic life Beneficial Uses.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from six samples out of which three samples exceeded the CTR criteria for protection of aquatic life (LACDPW, 2003a).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sampling site.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Six monthly samples, Five (5) taken during the wet season (11/08/2002-03/15/2003) and one (1) sample taken during the dry season (04/30/2003).
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Data age 1-2 years. Data was taken during the wet and dry seasons.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	MU - Municipal & Domestic, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Secondary MCL guideline for Zinc of 5 mg/l shall not be exceeded to protect MUN beneficial uses in accordance with Title 22 of the California Code of regulation table 64449-A of section 64449.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from six samples out of which none exceeded the Secondary MCL guideline for protection of marine aquatic life (LACDPW, 2003a).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sample site.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Six monthly samples, Five (5) taken during the wet season (11/08/2002-03/15/2003) and one (1) sample taken during the dry season (04/30/2003).
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Six monthly samples, Five (5) taken during the wet season (11/08/2002-03/15/2003) and one (1) sample taken during the dry season (04/30/2003).
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Region 4

Water Segment: Calleguas Creek Reach 3 (Potrero Road upstream to confluence with Conejo Creek on 1998 303d list)

Pollutant: Chlordane

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.5 of the Listing Policy. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Two of the 7 samples exceeded the NAS Guideline (whole fish) and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: AG - Agricultural Supply, CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Matrix: Tissue

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Los Angeles RWQCB Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or human health.

<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	100 ng/g NAS Guideline (whole fish).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Two out of 7 samples exceeded the NAS Guideline. A total of 7 whole fish composite samples of fathead minnows and arroyo chub were collected. Fathead minnows were collected in 1992-97. Arroyo chub were collected in 2000-01. The guideline was exceeded in 1993 and 1997 samples of fathead minnows (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station located downstream of Lewis Road crossing.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected annually 1992 - 94, 1997, and 2000-01.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1992-93 and 1994-95 Data Reports. Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 1996-2000. Department of Fish and Game. Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 2001-2002. Department of Fish and Game.

Region 4

Water Segment: Calleguas Creek Reach 3 (Potrero Road upstream to confluence with Conejo Creek on 1998 303d list)

Pollutant: DDT

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.5 of the Listing Policy. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Three of the 3 samples exceeded the OEHHA Screening Value and 6 out of 7 samples exceeded NAS Guidelines (whole fish). This exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Matrix: Tissue

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Los Angeles RWQCB Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or human health.

<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	100 ng/g-OEHHA Screening Value. 1000 ng/g NAS Guideline (Whole Fish).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Three out of 3 samples exceeded OEHHA Screening Value. Six out of 7 samples exceeded NAS Guidelines. A total of 3 filet composite samples were collected: one fathead minnow (1994), one brown bullhead (1999), and one black bullhead (2001). All three samples exceeded the guidelines. A total of 7 whole fish composite samples were collected: five fathead minnow (1992-94 & 1997) and two arroyo chub (2000-01). All but one arroyo chub sample exceeded the guidelines (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station located downstream of Lewis Road crossing.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected annually 1992-94, 1997, 1999 -2001.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1992-93 and 1994-95 Data Reports. Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program,1996-2000. Department of Fish and Game. Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 2001-2002. Department of Fish and Game.

Region 4

Water Segment: Calleguas Creek Reach 3 (Potrero Road upstream to confluence with Conejo Creek on 1998 303d list)

Pollutant: Dieldrin

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.5 of the Listing Policy. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Two of the 3 samples exceeded the OEHA Screening Value and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Matrix: Tissue

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Los Angeles RWQCB Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or human health.

<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	2 ng/g - OEHHA Screening Value.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Two out of 3 samples exceeded. A total of 3 filet composite samples were collected: one fathead minnow (1994), one brown bullhead (1999), and one black bullhead sample (2001). Fathead minnow and brown bullhead exceeded the guideline (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station located downstream of Lewis Road crossing.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected 1994, 1999, 2001.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1994-95 Data Report. Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 1996-2000. Department of Fish and Game. Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 2001-2002. Department of Fish and Game.

Region 4

Water Segment: Calleguas Creek Reach 3 (Potrero Road upstream to confluence with Conejo Creek on 1998 303d list)

Pollutant: Toxaphene

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.5 of the Listing Policy. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Two of the 2 samples exceeded the OEHHA Screening Value and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Matrix: Tissue

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Los Angeles RWQCB Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or human health.

<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	30 ng/g OEHHA Screening Value. 100 ng/g NAS Guideline (Whole Fish).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Two out of 2 samples exceeded OEHHA Screening Value. Eight out of 8 samples exceeded NAS Guidelines (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station located downstream of Lewis Road crossing.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected annually 1992-94, 1997, 1999 -2001.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1992-93 and 1994-95 Data Reports. Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program,1996-2000. Department of Fish and Game. Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 2001-2002. Department of Fish and Game.

Region 4

Water Segment: Coyote Creek

Pollutant: Ammonia

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under sections 2.2 and 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under each of these sections of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

Three lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A remedial program other than a TMDL has been developed, approved, and is being implemented. This program is expected to result in attainment of the standard. This water segment-pollutant combination was moved off the section 303(d) list during the 2002 listing cycle. Data collected since the initiation of the remedial program show that the ammonia water quality objective is not met.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Ten of 18 samples exceeded the ammonia water quality objective and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because standards are not met and a program is in place to address this water quality problem.

Lines of Evidence:

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	In order to protect aquatic life, ammonia concentrations in inland surface waters characteristic of freshwater shall not exceed the values calculated for the appropriate instream conditions [both pH and temperature] shown in Tables 3-1 to 3-3 [in the Basin Plan] (per U.S. EPA's most recent criteria guidance document, '1999 Update of Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Ammonia').
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Based on 30-day average concentrations of ammonia, 10 samples out of 18 total samples exceed the ammonia objective. Ambient measurements of pH and temperature (30-day averages) were used to calculate the water quality objective (LACSD, 2004a).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Three stations.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected from June 2003 through November 2004. New management practices were begun at the beginning of this period and may have resulted in a change in water quality. Water quality measurements collected before the implementation of management measures were not considered representative of current conditions.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	NPDES quality assurance.

<i>Line of Evidence</i>	Remedial Program in Place
<i>Beneficial Use</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Information Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	<p>An alternative enforceable program is in place that will address ammonia water quality standards exceedances for this Reach. In June 1995, the seven water reclamation plants discharging in the San Gabriel River and Santa Clara River watersheds received NPDES permits containing requirements regarding compliance with the Basin Plan water quality objectives for ammonia. In accordance with these permits, the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts have been pursuing the addition of nitrification and denitrification facilities at each of these plants to comply with the ammonia objectives. By June 2003, it is expected that these new facilities will be operational and ammonia will be drastically reduced.</p> <p>Research facility operation shows that the monthly average ammonia concentration will fully comply with the chronic ammonia objective that are expected to be applicable in June 2003.</p>

It is probable that the majority of ammonia discharged to this water body was contributed by POTWs. Information in the record indicates that the majority (over 95%) of the ammonia in the Los Angeles River was contributed by POTWs. It is probable that the contribution in the San Gabriel River watershed is dominated by contributions from POTWs as well. Generally, concentrations of ammonia upstream of the treatment plants is much lower than downstream concentrations (up to an order of magnitude difference).

Region 4

Water Segment: Coyote Creek

Pollutant: Cyanide

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Four samples taken from 11/2001 to 4/2003 exceeded the Cyanide CTR Criteria Continuous Concentration.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Four of 9 samples exceeded the Cyanide CTR Criteria Continuous Concentration and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

Water Quality Objective/ CTR Criteria Continuous Concentration of 0.0052 mg/l is the highest

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	concentration of Cyanide to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (four days) without deleterious effects applicable to protect aquatic life BUs.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 9 samples taken from 11/24/01 to 4/30/03 at one to two-week sampling interval. Four (4) samples exceeded the Cyanide Continuous Criterion Concentration, which equals the highest concentration of a pollutant to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (4 days) without deleterious effects (LACDPW, 2004c).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sample site sampled during the dry and wet season beginning from 11/24/01 through 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Nine samples were taken during the wet and dry season from 11/24/01 to 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals as part of the Los Angeles County Storm water monitoring program prepared by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The Coyote Creek Monitoring Station (S13) is located at the existing ACOE stream gage station (Stream Gage No. F354-R) below Spring Street in the lower San Gabriel River watershed. The site assists in determining mass loading for the San Gabriel River watershed. At this location, the upstream tributary area is 150 square miles (extending into Orange County). The sampling site was chosen to avoid backwater effects from the San Gabriel River. Coyote Creek, at the gauging station, is a concrete lined trapezoidal channel. The Coyote Creek sampling location has been an active stream gauging station since 1963.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Region 4

Water Segment: Coyote Creek

Pollutant: Diazinon

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A number of samples exceed the Diazinon DFG fresh water hazard assessment criteria.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Two of 20 samples exceeded the Diazinon DFG fresh water hazard assessment criteria and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan narrative WQO for Pesticides.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	Numerical Diazinon guideline used to interpret Basin Plan narrative pesticide WQO. The numeric guidelines are 0.10 ug/l 4-day average and 0.16 ug/l 1-hour average generated by DFG as a fresh water hazard assessment criteria for the protection of aquatic life.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 22 samples taken from 10/12/00 to 4/30/03 at one to two-week sampling interval. Two samples out 22 exceeded the acute DFG fresh water hazard assessment criteria for the protection of aquatic life (LACDPW, 2004c).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sample site sampled during the dry and wet season beginning from 10/12/00 through 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Twenty-one samples were taken during the wet season and one sample was taken during the dry season from 10/12/00 to 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals as part of the Los Angeles County Storm water monitoring program prepared by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The Coyote Creek Monitoring Station (S13) is located at the existing ACOE stream gage station (Stream Gage No. F354-R) below Spring Street in the lower San Gabriel River watershed. The site assists in determining mass loading for the San Gabriel River watershed. At this location, the upstream tributary area is 150 square miles (extending into Orange County). The sampling site was chosen to avoid backwater effects from the San Gabriel River. Coyote Creek, at the gauging station, is a concrete lined trapezoidal channel. The Coyote Creek sampling location has been an active stream gauging station since 1963.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Region 4

Water Segment: Coyote Creek

Pollutant: Nitrogen, Nitrite

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. two samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

- 1.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
- 2.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
- 3.Two of 21 samples taken from 10/00 to 10/3 exceeded the nitrite - nitrogen water quality objective and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: MU - Municipal & Domestic

Matrix: Water

<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	The Basin Plan Water Quality Objective for Nitrite-Nitrogen of 1 mg/L.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 21 samples taken from 10/30/00 to 4/30/03 at one to two-week sampling interval. Two samples exceeded the Basin Plan WQO for Nitrite-Nitrogen (LACPWD, 2004c).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sample site sampled during the dry and wet season beginning from 10/12/00 through 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Twenty-one samples were taken during the wet and dry season from 10/12/00 to 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals as part of the Los Angeles County Storm water monitoring program prepared by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The Coyote Creek Monitoring Station (S13) is located at the existing ACOE stream gage station (Stream Gage No. F354-R) below Spring Street in the lower San Gabriel River watershed. The site assists in determining mass loading for the San Gabriel River watershed. At this location, the upstream tributary area is 150 square miles (extending into Orange County). The sampling site was chosen to avoid backwater effects from the San Gabriel River. Coyote Creek, at the gauging station, is a concrete lined trapezoidal channel. The Coyote Creek sampling location has been an active stream gauging station since 1963.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Region 4

Water Segment: Coyote Creek

Pollutant: pH

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A large number of samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. One of 15 samples taken during 10/00 and 1/02 was below the 6.5 pH WQO. However, 97 of 229 samples taken from 6/03 and 11/04 exceeded the pH water quality objective at three sampling stations and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan WQO for inland surface waters shall not be depressed below 6.5 or raised above 8.5 as a result of waster discharges to protect aquatic life BUs.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 15 samples taken from 10/12/00 to 1/28/02 at one to two-week sampling interval. One sample was below the 6.5 pH basin plan WQO for the protection of aquatic life beneficial uses (LACDPW, 2003a).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sample site sampled during the dry and wet season beginning from 10/12/00 through 1/28/02 at approximately one to two week intervals.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Fifteen samples where taken during the wet and dry season from 10/12/00 to 1/28/02 at approximately one to two week intervals as part of the Los Angeles County Storm water monitoring program prepared by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The Coyote Creek Monitoring Station (S13) is located at the existing ACOE stream gage station (Stream Gage No. F354-R) below Spring Street in the lower San Gabriel River watershed. The site assists in determining mass loading for the San Gabriel River watershed. At this location, the upstream tributary area is 150 square miles (extending into Orange County). The sampling site was chosen to avoid backwater effects from the San Gabriel River. Coyote Creek, at the gauging station, is a concrete lined trapezoidal channel. The Coyote Creek sampling location has been an active stream gauging station since 1963.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: The pH of inland surface waters shall not be depressed below 6.5 or raised above 8.5 as a result of waste discharges. Ambient pH levels shall not be changed more than 0.5 units from natural conditions as a result of waste discharge.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water</i>	Ninety-seven samples out of 229 total samples exceed the pH objective.

Quality:

Spatial Representation: Three stations.

Temporal Representation: Samples were collected weekly between June 2003 and November 2004.

Data Quality Assessment: NPDES quality assurance.

Region 4

Water Segment: Dominguez Channel (lined portion above Vermont Ave)

Pollutant: Aluminum

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. One line of evidence from sampling station S23 showed two exceedances, the other line of evidence from sampling station S28 showed one exceedance of the primary MCL.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing the water segment-pollutant combination corresponding to sampling station S23 on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Three of 18 samples exceeded the primary MCL for aluminum of and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: MU - Municipal & Domestic, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Table 64431A of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulation has been incorporated by reference into the Basin Plan to protect MUN beneficial uses. This table contains the primary MCL standards for inorganic chemicals. The primary MCL for aluminum is 1 mg/l.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Two out of 12 samples exceeded the 1 mg/L primary MCL for aluminum. Samples exceeding the primary MCL were taken in 10/00, and 1/01 (LACDPW, 2003a).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Samples were taken at the Dominguez Channel Monitoring Station (S23) which is located within the Dominguez Channel/Los Angeles Harbor watershed in Lennox, near Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). The monitoring station is near the intersection of 116th Street and Isis Avenue. The overall watershed land use is predominantly transportation, and includes areas of LAX and Interstate 105.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were taken in October 2000, and in January through April 2001.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	According to the County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Stormwater Monitoring Reports, 2000-2001 Monitoring Report samples were taken during storm events, the amount of rainfall was not noted.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. The reported detection limit is not consistent with the analytical results. Sample results were quantified down to 103.9 ug/L, however the detection limit is listed as 1,000 ug/L.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	MU - Municipal & Domestic, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Table 64431A of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulation has been incorporated by reference into the Basin Plan to protect MUN beneficial uses. This table contains the primary MCL standards for inorganic chemicals. The primary MCL for aluminum is 1 mg/l.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	One out of 6 samples exceeded the 1 mg/L primary MCL for aluminum. The sample exceeding the primary MCL was taken on 11/8/02 (LACDPW, 2003a).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Samples were taken at the Dominguez Channel Monitoring Station (S28) which is located at Dominguez Channel and Artesia Boulevard in the City of Torrance.

At this location, which was chosen to avoid tidal influence, the upstream tributary area is 33 square miles. The portion of the river where the monitoring site is located is a concrete-lined rectangular channel.

Temporal Representation: Samples were taken in October, November and December 2002, and in February, March and April 2003.

Environmental Conditions: According to the County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Stormwater Monitoring Reports, 2002-2003 Monitoring Report samples were taken during storm events, the amount of rainfall was not noted.

Data Quality Assessment: Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Region 4

Water Segment: Dominguez Channel (lined portion above Vermont Ave)

Pollutant: Enterococcus

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.3 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.3 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Three lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. All samples exceed the 17 CCR 7958 minimum protective enterococcus standards .

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. All 12 samples taken exceeded the minimum protective enterococcus standards and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.2 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: MU - Municipal & Domestic, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

Matrix: Water

<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	The minimum protective enterococcus standards for waters adjacent to public beaches and public water-contact sports areas shall be 104 MPN/100 milliliters in accordance with Title 17 section 7958 of the California Code of regulation.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Six of six samples exceeded the 104 MPN/100 ml. standard. Samples exceeding the objective ranged from 170 to 210,000 MPN/100 ml (LACDPW, 2003a).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Samples were taken at the Dominguez Channel Monitoring Station (S28) which is located at Dominguez Channel and Artesia Boulevard in the City of Torrance. At this location, which was chosen to avoid tidal influence, the upstream tributary area is 33 square miles. The portion of the river where the monitoring site is located is a concrete-lined rectangular channel.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were taken on 10/10/02, 11/8/02, 12/16/02, 2/11/03, 3/15/03 and 4/30/03; all exceeded the US EPA criteria.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	According to the County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Stormwater Monitoring Reports, 2002-2003 Monitoring Report samples were taken during storm events, the amount of rainfall was not noted. The REC-1 BU does not apply (effective early 2004) under certain conditions. "The High Flow Suspension shall apply on days with rainfall greater than or equal to 1/2 inch and the 24 hours following the end of the 1/2-inch or greater rain event, as measured at the nearest local rain gauge, using local Doppler radar, or using widely accepted rainfall estimation methods. The High Flow Suspension only applies to engineered channels, defined as inland, flowing surface water bodies with a box, V-shaped or trapezoidal configuration that have been lined on the sides and/or bottom with concrete." The sampling data is from prior to implementation of the High Flow Suspension. While the samples were reported as taken during rainfall, the amount of rainfall was not recorded.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	MU - Municipal & Domestic, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	The minimum protective enterococcus standards for waters adjacent to public beaches and public water-contact sports areas shall be 104 MPN/100 milliliters in accordance with Title 17 section 7958 of the California Code of regulation.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Four out of four samples exceeded the 104 MPN/100 ml. standard. Samples exceeding the objective ranged from 1,700 to 30,000 MPN (LACDPW, 2003a).

Spatial Representation: Samples were taken at the Dominguez Channel Monitoring Station (S23) which is located within the Dominguez Channel/Los Angeles Harbor watershed in Lennox, near Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). The monitoring station is near the intersection of 116th Street and Isis Avenue. The overall watershed land use is predominantly transportation, and includes areas of LAX and Interstate 105.

Temporal Representation: Samples were taken 1/30/01, 2/15/01, 2/28/01, and 3/7/01.

Environmental Conditions: According to the County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Stormwater Monitoring Reports, 2000-2001 Monitoring Report samples were taken during storm events, the amount of rainfall was not noted. The REC-1 BU does not apply (effective early 2004) under certain conditions. "The High Flow Suspension shall apply on days with rainfall greater than or equal to 1/2 inch and the 24 hours following the end of the 1/2-inch or greater rain event, as measured at the nearest local rain gauge, using local Doppler radar, or using widely accepted rainfall estimation methods. The High Flow Suspension only applies to engineered channels, defined as inland, flowing surface water bodies with a box, V-shaped or trapezoidal configuration that have been lined on the sides and/or bottom with concrete." The sampling data is from prior to implementation of the High Flow Suspension. While the samples were reported as taken during rainfall, the amount of rainfall was not recorded.

Data Quality Assessment: Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: MU - Municipal & Domestic, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* The minimum protective enterococcus standards for waters adjacent to public beaches and public water-contact sports areas shall be 104 MPN/100 milliliters in accordance with Title 17 section 7958 of the California Code of regulation.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: Two of 2 samples exceeded the 104 MPN/100 ml. standard. One sample was 11,000, the other 30,000 MPN (LACDPW, 2003a).

Spatial Representation: Samples were taken at the Dominguez Channel Monitoring Station (S28) which is located at Dominguez Channel and Artesia Boulevard in the City of Torrance. At this location, which was chosen to avoid tidal influence, the upstream tributary area is 33 square miles. The portion of the river where the monitoring site is located is a concrete-lined rectangular channel.

Temporal Representation: Samples were taken on 1/28/02 and 3/19/02.

Environmental Conditions:

According to the County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Stormwater Monitoring Reports, 2001-2002 Monitoring Report samples were taken during storm events, the amount of rainfall was not noted. The REC-1 BU does not apply (effective early 2004) under certain conditions. "The High Flow Suspension shall apply on days with rainfall greater than or equal to 1/2 inch and the 24 hours following the end of the 1/2-inch or greater rain event, as measured at the nearest local rain gauge, using local Doppler radar, or using widely accepted rainfall estimation methods. The High Flow Suspension only applies to engineered channels, defined as inland, flowing surface water bodies with a box, V-shaped or trapezoidal configuration that have been lined on the sides and/or bottom with concrete." The sampling data is from prior to implementation of the High Flow Suspension. While the samples were reported as taken during rainfall, the amount of rainfall was not recorded.

Data Quality Assessment:

Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Region 4

Water Segment: Dominguez Channel (lined portion above Vermont Ave)

Pollutant: Zinc

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Three lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A number of samples exceed the CTR criteria for the protection of aquatic life. This water body pollutant was placed in the 2002 303(d) list for zinc in tissue in both segments (S23 and S28) of Dominguez Channel sampling stations.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category for the dissolved zinc.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

- 1.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
- 2.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
- 3.Twelve of 12 samples at sampling station S23 and two of six samples in 2002-2003 at sampling station S28 exceeded the CTR criteria and both lines of evidence exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
- 4.Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded in both S23 and S28 sampling stations within Dominguez Channel and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: MU - Municipal & Domestic, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat,

WI - Wildlife Habitat

Matrix:

Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:*

CTR dissolved zinc criteria for continuous concentration (CCC) and maximum concentration (CMC) in water for the protection of aquatic life are expressed as a function of the total hardness of the water body. The aquatic life criteria will vary depending of total hardness reported at the sampling site. The CCC for dissolved zinc is the highest concentration to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (e.g., four days) without deleterious effects. The CMC for dissolved zinc is the highest concentration to which aquatic life can be exposed for a short period of time (e.g., one hour) without deleterious effects. These criteria are linked and applicable for the protection of aquatic life beneficial uses. Calculation of the criteria based on ambient hardness at the time of sampling resulted in a zinc CCC of 65.22 ug/l; and a CMC of 64.69 ug/L.

*Data Used to Assess Water
Quality:*

The single sample exceeded both the CCC and CMC (LACDPW, 2003a).

Spatial Representation:

Samples were taken at the Dominguez Channel Monitoring Station (S28) which is located at Dominguez Channel and Artesia Boulevard in the City of Torrance. At this location, which was chosen to avoid tidal influence, the upstream tributary area is 33 square miles. The portion of the river where the monitoring site is located is a concrete-lined rectangular channel.

Temporal Representation:

The single sample was taken on 1/28/02.

Environmental Conditions:

According to the County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Stormwater Monitoring Reports, 2001-2002 Monitoring Report samples were taken during storm events, the amount of rainfall was not noted.

Data Quality Assessment:

Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Numeric Line of Evidence

Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use:

MU - Municipal & Domestic, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

Matrix:

Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:*

CTR dissolved zinc criteria for continuous concentration (CCC) and maximum concentration (CMC) in water for the protection of aquatic life are expressed as a function of the total hardness of the water body. The aquatic life criteria will vary depending of total hardness reported at the sampling site.

The CCC for dissolved zinc is the highest concentration to which aquatic life can

be exposed for an extended period of time (e.g., four days) without deleterious effects. The CMC for dissolved zinc is the highest concentration to which aquatic life can be exposed for a short period of time (e.g., one hour) without deleterious effects. These criteria are linked and applicable for the protection of aquatic life beneficial uses.

Calculation of the criteria based on ambient hardness at the time of sampling resulted in zinc CCCs ranging from 30.21 to 221.52 ug/l; and CMCs ranging from 29.97 to 219.72 ug/L.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality:

Twelve out of 12 samples exceed both the CCC and CMC (LACDPW, 2003a).

Spatial Representation:

Samples were taken at the Dominguez Channel Monitoring Station (S23) which is located within the Dominguez Channel/Los Angeles Harbor watershed in Lennox, near Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). The monitoring station is near the intersection of 116th Street and Isis Avenue. The overall watershed land use is predominantly transportation, and includes areas of LAX and Interstate 105.

Temporal Representation:

Samples were taken in October 2000, and in January through April 2001.

Environmental Conditions:

According to the County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Stormwater Monitoring Reports, 2000-2001 Monitoring Report samples were taken during storm events, the amount of rainfall was not noted.

Data Quality Assessment:

Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Numeric Line of Evidence

Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use:

MU - Municipal & Domestic, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

Matrix:

Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:*

CTR dissolved zinc criteria for continuous concentration (CCC) and maximum concentration (CMC) in water for the protection of aquatic life are expressed as a function of the total hardness of the water body. The aquatic life criteria will vary depending of total hardness reported at the sampling site.

The CCC for dissolved zinc is the highest concentration to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (e.g., four days) without deleterious effects. The CMC for dissolved zinc is the highest concentration to which aquatic life can be exposed for a short period of time (e.g., one hour) without deleterious effects. These criteria are linked and applicable for the protection of aquatic life beneficial uses.

Calculation of the criteria based on ambient hardness at the time of sampling resulted in zinc CCCs ranging from 23.94 to 239.27 ug/l; and CMCs ranging from 23.75 to 237.33 ug/L.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality:

Two out of 6 samples exceeded both the CCC and CMC. The positive quantification limit (PQL) of 50 ug/L was too high to determine compliance of the sample taken on 3/15/03. If the PQL is used to determine compliance, then the sample taken on 3/15/03 also exceeded the criteria (LACDPW, 2003a).

Spatial Representation:

Samples were taken at the Dominguez Channel Monitoring Station (S28) which is located at Dominguez Channel and Artesia Boulevard in the City of Torrance. At this location, which was chosen to avoid tidal influence, the upstream tributary area is 33 square miles. The portion of the river where the monitoring site is located is a concrete-lined rectangular channel.

Environmental Conditions:

According to the County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Stormwater Monitoring Reports, 2002-2003 Monitoring Report samples were taken during storm events, the amount of rainfall was not noted.

Data Quality Assessment:

Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Region 4

Water Segment: Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave)

Pollutant: Benzo(a)pyrene (PAHs)

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.9 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.9 two lines of evidence are necessary to assess listing status.

Three lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceeded the sediment quality guideline. Although sediment toxicity has been observed it is not enough to establish a sufficiently strong association with the sediment pollutant concentration. However, significant benthic degradation has been recorded and this may be linked with this pollutant concentration in this water body segment.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. Data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Seven of 41 samples exceeded the sediment quality guideline. These data exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Based on section 3.9 of the Listing Policy significant benthic impact has been documented and the pollutant in sediment may be linked to the observed impacts.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Toxicity
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	The data were analyzed using the BPTCP reference envelope approach.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	One toxicity sample that showed 61 percent survival (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station at H. Ford Bridge (BPTCP station 47010.0).
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The sample was collected in 1996.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Population/Community Degradation
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	Evaluation of the benthic data were completed using the approaches developed by scientists associated with the BPTCP. The relative benthic index used is a calculated value considering the total fauna, total mollusk species, crustacean species and indicator species at a site. The index ranges from 0 to 1.0. An index value of less than or equal to 0.3 is an indication that pollutants or other factors are negatively impacting the benthic community (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	One benthic community sample with a benthic index of 0.21 (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station at H. Ford Bridge (BPTCP station 47010.0).

Temporal Representation: The sample was collected in 1996.

Environmental Conditions: Adjacent waters (Consolidated Slip) also has degraded benthic communities.

Data Quality Assessment: Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program (Stephenson et al., 1994).

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Sediment

Beneficial Use: ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat

Matrix: Sediment

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.

Evaluation Guideline: A sediment quality guideline of 763.22 ng/g was used (MacDonald et al., 1996).

*Data Used to Assess Water
Quality:* Of 41 sediment core samples, 7 exceeded the sediment quality guideline (LARWQCB and CCC, 2004).

Spatial Representation: Forty-one samples are spread throughout the water body.

Temporal Representation: The samples were collected in 2002.

Data Quality Assessment: Quality assurance is described in the Contaminated Sediments Task Force Database.

Region 4

Water Segment: Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave)

Pollutant: Chrysene (C1-C4)

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.9 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.9 two lines of evidence are necessary to assess listing status.

Three lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceeded the sediment quality guideline. Although sediment toxicity has been observed it is not enough to establish a sufficiently strong association with the sediment pollutant concentration. However, significant benthic degradation has been recorded and this may be linked with this pollutant concentration in this water body segment.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. Data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Eight of 41 samples exceeded the sediment quality guideline. These data exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Based on section 3.9 of the Listing Policy significant benthic impact has been documented and the pollutant in sediment may be linked to the observed impacts.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Toxicity
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	The data were analyzed using the BPTCP reference envelope approach.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	One toxicity sample that showed 61 percent survival (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station at H. Ford Bridge (BPTCP station 47010.0).
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The sample was collected in 1996.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Population/Community Degradation
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	Evaluation of the benthic data were completed using the approaches developed by scientists associated with the BPTCP. The relative benthic index used is a calculated value considering the total fauna, total mollusk species, crustacean species and indicator species at a site. The index ranges from 0 to 1.0. An index value of less than or equal to 0.3 is an indication that pollutants or other factors are negatively impacting the benthic community (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	One benthic community sample with a benthic index of 0.21 (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station at H. Ford Bridge (BPTCP station 47010.0).
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The sample was collected in 1996.

Environmental Conditions: Adjacent waters (Consolidated Slip) also has degraded benthic communities.

Data Quality Assessment: Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program (Stephenson et al., 1994).

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Sediment

Beneficial Use: ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat

Matrix: Sediment

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.

Evaluation Guideline: A sediment quality guideline of 845.98 ng/g was used (MacDonald et al., 1996).

*Data Used to Assess Water
Quality:* Of 41 sediment core samples, 8 exceeded the sediment quality guideline (LARWQCB and CCC, 2004).

Spatial Representation: Forty-one samples are spread throughout the water body.

Temporal Representation: The samples were collected in 2002.

Data Quality Assessment: Quality assurance is described in the Contaminated Sediments Task Force Database.

Region 4

Water Segment: Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave)

Pollutant: Phenanthrene

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.9 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.9 two lines of evidence are necessary to assess listing status.

Three lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceeded the sediment quality guideline. Although sediment toxicity has been observed it is not enough to establish a sufficiently strong association with the sediment pollutant concentration. However, significant benthic degradation has been recorded and this may be linked with this pollutant concentration in this water body segment.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. Data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Nine of 41 samples exceeded the sediment quality guideline. These data exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Based on section 3.9 of the Listing Policy significant benthic impact has been documented and the pollutant in sediment may be linked to the observed impacts.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Toxicity
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	The data were analyzed using the BPTCP reference envelope approach.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	One toxicity sample that showed 61 percent survival (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station at H. Ford Bridge (BPTCP station 47010.0).
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The sample was collected in 1996.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Population/Community Degradation
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	Evaluation of the benthic data were completed using the approaches developed by scientists associated with the BPTCP. The relative benthic index used is a calculated value considering the total fauna, total mollusk species, crustacean species and indicator species at a site. The index ranges from 0 to 1.0. An index value of less than or equal to 0.3 is an indication that pollutants or other factors are negatively impacting the benthic community (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	One benthic community sample with a benthic index of 0.21 (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station at H. Ford Bridge (BPTCP station 47010.0).
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The sample was collected in 1996.

Environmental Conditions: Adjacent waters (Consolidated Slip) also has degraded benthic communities.

Data Quality Assessment: Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program (Stephenson et al., 1994).

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Sediment

Beneficial Use: ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat

Matrix: Sediment

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.

Evaluation Guideline: A sediment quality guideline of 543.53 ng/g was used (MacDonald et al., 1996).

*Data Used to Assess Water
Quality:* Of 41 sediment core samples, 9 exceeded the sediment quality guideline (LARWQCB and CCC, 2004).

Spatial Representation: Forty-one samples are spread throughout the water body.

Temporal Representation: The samples were collected in 2002.

Data Quality Assessment: Quality assurance is described in the Contaminated Sediments Task Force Database.

Region 4

Water Segment: Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave)

Pollutant: Polychlorinated biphenyls

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.9 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.9 two lines of evidence are necessary to assess listing status.

Three lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceeded the sediment quality guideline. Although sediment toxicity has been observed it is not enough to establish a sufficiently strong association with the sediment pollutant concentration. However, significant benthic degradation has been recorded and this may be linked with this pollutant concentration in this water body segment.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. Data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Fifteen of 41 samples exceeded the sediment quality guideline. These data exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Based on section 3.9 of the Listing Policy significant benthic impact has been documented and the pollutant in sediment may be linked to the observed impacts.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Toxicity
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	The data were analyzed using the BPTCP reference envelope approach.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	One toxicity sample that showed 61 percent survival (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station at H. Ford Bridge (BPTCP station 47010.0).
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The sample was collected in 1996.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Population/Community Degradation
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	Evaluation of the benthic data were completed using the approaches developed by scientists associated with the BPTCP. The relative benthic index used is a calculated value considering the total fauna, total mollusk species, crustacean species and indicator species at a site. The index ranges from 0 to 1.0. An index value of less than or equal to 0.3 is an indication that pollutants or other factors are negatively impacting the benthic community (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	One benthic community sample with a benthic index of 0.21 (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station at H. Ford Bridge (BPTCP station 47010.0).

Temporal Representation: The sample was collected in 1996.

Environmental Conditions: Adjacent waters (Consolidated Slip) also has degraded benthic communities.

Data Quality Assessment: Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program (Stephenson et al., 1994).

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Sediment

Beneficial Use: ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat

Matrix: Sediment

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.

Evaluation Guideline: A sediment quality guideline of 400 ng/g was used (Fairey et al., 2001).

*Data Used to Assess Water
Quality:* Of 42 sediment core samples, 15 exceeded the sediment quality guideline (LARWQCB and CCC, 2004).

Spatial Representation: Forty-two samples are spread throughout the water body.

Temporal Representation: The samples were collected in 2002.

Data Quality Assessment: Quality assurance is described in the Contaminated Sediments Task Force Database.

Region 4

Water Segment: Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave)

Pollutant: Pyrene

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.9 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.9 two lines of evidence are necessary to assess listing status.

Three lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceeded the sediment quality guideline. Although sediment toxicity has been observed it is not enough to establish a sufficiently strong association with the sediment pollutant concentration. However, significant benthic degradation has been recorded and this may be linked with this pollutant concentration in this water body segment.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. Data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Thirteen of 41 samples exceeded the sediment quality guideline. These data exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Based on section 3.9 of the Listing Policy significant benthic impact has been documented and the pollutant in sediment may be linked to the observed impacts.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Toxicity
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	The data were analyzed using the BPTCP reference envelope approach.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	One toxicity sample that showed 61 percent survival (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station at H. Ford Bridge (BPTCP station 47010.0).
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The sample was collected in 1996.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Population/Community Degradation
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	Evaluation of the benthic data were completed using the approaches developed by scientists associated with the BPTCP. The relative benthic index used is a calculated value considering the total fauna, total mollusk species, crustacean species and indicator species at a site. The index ranges from 0 to 1.0. An index value of less than or equal to 0.3 is an indication that pollutants or other factors are negatively impacting the benthic community (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	One benthic community sample with a benthic index of 0.21 (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station at H. Ford Bridge (BPTCP station 47010.0).
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The sample was collected in 1996.

Environmental Conditions: Adjacent waters (Consolidated Slip) also has degraded benthic communities.

Data Quality Assessment: Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program (Stephenson et al., 1994).

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Sediment

Beneficial Use: ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat

Matrix: Sediment

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.

Evaluation Guideline: A sediment quality guideline of 1,397.4 ng/g was used (MacDonald et al., 1996).

*Data Used to Assess Water
Quality:* Of 41 sediment core samples, 13 exceeded the sediment quality guideline (LARWQCB and CCC, 2004).

Spatial Representation: Forty-one samples are spread throughout the water body.

Temporal Representation: The samples were collected in 2002.

Data Quality Assessment: Quality assurance is described in the Contaminated Sediments Task Force Database.

Region 4

Water Segment: Duck Pond Agricultural Drains/Mugu Drain/Oxnard Drain No 2

Pollutant: Chlordane

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.5 of the Listing Policy. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Two of the 2 samples exceeded the OEHHA Screening Value and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Matrix: Tissue

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Los Angeles RWQCB Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or human health.

<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	30 ng/g (OEHHA Screening Value).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Two out of 2 samples exceeded. A total of 2 filet composite samples of goldfish and brown bullhead were collected. Goldfish sample was collected in 1993 and brown bullhead was collected in 1994. The guideline was exceeded in both samples. In addition, one whole fish sample of fathead minnow was collected in 1994 and exceeded the guideline (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station located above culvert in Oxnard Drain #2 at Perimeter Road crossing.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected annually 1993-94.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1992-93 and 1994-95 Data Reports.

Region 4

Water Segment: Duck Pond Agricultural Drains/Mugu Drain/Oxnard Drain No 2

Pollutant: DDT

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.5 of the Listing Policy. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Two of the 2 samples exceeded the OEHHA Screening Value and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Matrix: Tissue

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Los Angeles RWQCB Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or human health.

<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	100 ng/g (OEHHA Screening Value).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Two out of 2 samples exceeded (note: Whole fish sample of fathead minnow exceeded NAS Guideline in 1994). A filet composite sample of goldfish and one individual sample of brown bullhead were collected. Goldfish were collected in 1993 while brown bullhead were collected in 1994. The guideline was exceeded in both samples (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station located above culvert in Oxnard Drain 2 at Perimeter Road crossing.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected in 1993-94.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1992-93 and 1994-95 Data Reports.

Region 4

Water Segment: Duck Pond Agricultural Drains/Mugu Drain/Oxnard Drain No 2

Pollutant: Toxaphene

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.5 of the Listing Policy. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Two of the 2 samples exceeded the OEHHA Screening Value and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Matrix: Tissue

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Los Angeles RWQCB Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or human health.

<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	30 ng/g (OEHHA Screening Value).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Two out of 2 samples exceeded. A total of 2 filet composite samples of goldfish and brown bullhead were collected. Goldfish sample was collected in 1993 and brown bullhead was collected in 1994. The guideline was exceeded in both samples. In addition, one whole fish sample of fathead minnow was collected in 1994 and exceeded the NAS Guideline (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station located above culvert in Oxnard Drain #2 at Perimeter Road crossing.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected annually 1993-94.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1992-93 and 1994-95 Data Reports.

Region 4

Water Segment: Echo Park Lake

Pollutant: Trash

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under sections 2.2 and 3.11 of the Listing Policy. Under these sections of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. This water segment-pollutant combination was moved off the section 303(d) list during the 2002 listing cycle only because a TMDL had been completed. No substantial evidence in the record shows that standards are met.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a TMDL has been approved by USEPA, an implementation plan has been approved, and applicable water quality standards are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: TMDL completed.

Region 4

Water Segment: Lake Lindero

Pollutant: Selenium

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.5 of the Listing Policy. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Two of the 2 samples exceeded the OEHHA Screening Value and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Matrix: Tissue

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Los Angeles RWQCB Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or human health.

<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	2 ug/g (OEHHA Screening Value).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Two out of 2 samples exceeded. Two filet samples of largemouth bass and carp were collected. Bass were collected in 1992 and carp in 1998. Both samples exceeded the guideline (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station located at Mainsail Cul-de-Sac off Lake Lindero Drive.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected in 1992 and 1998.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1992-93 Data Report. Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 1996-2000. Department of Fish and Game.

Region 4

Water Segment: Leo Carillo Beach (South of County Line)

Pollutant: Coliform Bacteria

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. The beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body and pollutant (coliform) should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a TMDL has been approved by USEPA and an implementation plan has been approved.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Lincoln Park Lake

Pollutant: Trash

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under sections 2.2 and 3.11 of the Listing Policy. Under these sections of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. This water segment-pollutant combination was moved off the section 303(d) list during the 2002 listing cycle only because a TMDL had been completed. No substantial evidence in the record shows that standards are met.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a TMDL has been approved by USEPA, an implementation plan has been approved, and applicable water quality standards are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: TMDL completed (SWRCB, 2003).

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles Harbor - Cabrillo Marina

Pollutant: DDT

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.4 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.4 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. An OEHHA fish consumption advisory has been established in this water body segment. Under section 3.4 of the Listing Policy any water body segment where a health advisory against consumption of edible resident organisms has been issued shall be placed on the section 303(d) list.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that an OEHHA fish consumption advisory has been established for this pollutant. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because an OEHHA fish consumption advisory has been established in this water body segment. Applicable water quality standards or guidelines are exceeded and this pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

<i>Line of Evidence</i>	Health Advisories
<i>Beneficial Use</i>	CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)
<i>Information Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	A fish consumption advisory has been established for the DDT in the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor area. The advisory was established by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	This pollutant has been detected in samples collected in this water segment.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles Harbor - Cabrillo Marina

Pollutant: Polychlorinated biphenyls

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.4 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.4 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. An OEHHA fish consumption advisory has been established in this water body segment. Under section 3.4 of the Listing Policy any water body segment where a health advisory against consumption of edible resident organisms has been issued shall be placed on the section 303(d) list.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that an OEHHA fish consumption advisory has been established for this pollutant. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because OEHHA fish consumption advisory has been established in this water body segment. Applicable water quality standards or guidelines are exceeded and this pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Sediment

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA), ES - Estuarine Habitat

Matrix: Sediment

Water Quality Objective/ Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use (LARWQCB, 1995)
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	A sediment quality guideline of 400 ug/g was used (MacDonald et al., 2000).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Of the 11 sediment core samples available, none exceeded the sediment quality guideline (LARWQCB and CCC, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The 11 samples are spread throughout the marina.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The samples were collected in 1995 and 2001.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program QAPP (Stephenson et al., 1994) Quality assurance for other samples presented in the Contaminated Sediments Task Force Database.

<i>Line of Evidence</i>	Health Advisories
<i>Beneficial Use</i>	CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA), ES - Estuarine Habitat
<i>Information Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	A fish consumption advisory has been established for the PCBs in the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor area. The advisory was established by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles Harbor - Inner Cabrillo Beach Area

Pollutant: Bacteria Indicators

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.2 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.2 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A large number of samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Of the 3,362 samples, 1,729 exceeded the bacteriological standard and this exceeds the allowable frequency of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Matrix: Water

Water Quality Objective/ The minimum protective bacteriological standards for waters adjacent to public beaches and public water-contact sports areas shall be as follows:

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	(1) Based on a single sample, the density of bacteria in water from each sampling station at a public beach or public water contact sports area shall not exceed: (A) 1,000 total coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters, if the ratio of fecal/total coliform bacteria exceeds 0.1; or (B) 10,000 total coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters; or (C) 400 fecal coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters; or (D) 104 enterococcus bacteria per 100 milliliters (LARWQCB, 1995)
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Of the 3,362 samples, 1,729 exceed the standards (Anderson et al., 1998; LARWQCB, 2004f).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Two shoreline stations.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected between April 1998 and December 2002.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Los Angeles Harbor Bacteria TMDL -- Inner Cabrillo Beach and Main Ship Channel. April 30, 2004.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles Harbor - Inner Cabrillo Beach Area

Pollutant: Copper

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.6 two lines of evidence are necessary to assess listing status.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceeded the sediment quality guideline and significant. Sediment toxicity has been documented within the water body segment.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Fourteen of 16 samples exceeded the 270 ug/g ERM sediment quality guideline and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Based on section 3.6 of the Listing Policy sediment toxicity has been documented and the pollutant in sediment may be linked to the observed toxicity.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Sediment

Beneficial Use: ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat

<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use (LARWQCB, 1995)
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	An Effects Range-Median of 270 ug/g was used (Long et al., 1995).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Of the 16 sediment grab samples, 14 exceeded the sediment quality guideline (LARWQCB and CCC, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The samples were spread throughout the Inner Cabrillo Beach area.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected between 1992 and 1994.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program QAPP (Stephenson et al., 1994).

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Toxicity
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use (LARWQCB, 1995)
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	Toxicity was assessed by statistical comparison to test control.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Seven of 52 sediment samples were toxic as compared to toxicity test controls (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The 52 samples were spread throughout the Inner Cabrillo Beach area.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The samples were collected between 1992 and 1997.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program QAPP (Stephenson et al., 1994).

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles Harbor - Inner Cabrillo Beach Area

Pollutant: DDT

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.4 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.4 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. OEHHA fish consumption advisory has been established in this water body segment. Under section 3.4 of the Listing Policy any water body segment where a health advisory against consumption of edible resident organisms has been issued shall be placed on the section 303(d) list.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that an OEHHA fish consumption advisory has been established for this pollutant. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because OEHHA fish consumption advisory has been established in this water body segment. Applicable water quality standards or guidelines are exceeded and this pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Sediment

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Matrix: Sediment

Water Quality Objective/ Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	A sediment quality guideline for this pollutant is not available that satisfies the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Listing Policy.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Eighteen sediment grab samples are available (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The 18 samples were collected throughout the Cabrillo Beach area (Anderson et al, 1998).
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The samples were collected between 1992 and 1997.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program.

<i>Line of Evidence</i>	Health Advisories
<i>Beneficial Use</i>	CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)
<i>Information Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	A fish consumption advisory has been established for the DDT in the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor area. The advisory was established by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles Harbor - Inner Cabrillo Beach Area

Pollutant: Polychlorinated biphenyls

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.4 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.4 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. OEHHA fish consumption advisory has been established in this water body segment. Under section 3.4 of the Listing Policy any water body segment where a health advisory against consumption of edible resident organisms has been issued shall be placed on the section 303(d) list.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that an OEHHA fish consumption advisory has been established for this pollutant. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because OEHHA fish consumption advisory has been established in this water body segment. Applicable water quality standards or guidelines are exceeded and this pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Health Advisories

Beneficial Use CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A fish consumption advisory has been established for the PCBs in the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor area. The advisory was established by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment.

*Data Used to Assess Water
Quality:*

After review of the Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program data, PCBs have been detected in sediments in the Cabrillo Beach area and other surrounding locations (Anderson et al., 1998).

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles River Estuary (Queensway Bay)

Pollutant: Trash

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.11 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.11 listing may be proposed based on the situation-specific weight of evidence.

Three lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. The first line of evidence is data on the tonnage of trash collected by the City of Long Beach from the Los Angeles River Estuary for the period from 1995-1999. The second line of evidence is photographic documentation of trash in the Los Angeles River estuary, which extends the assessment period into 2001. Based on this information the water segment is impaired. A TMDL and implementation plan has also been completed and is expected to correct the impairment. Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification to place this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. Data hand information has been evaluated that supports this decision.
2. The trash data over a period of four years exceeded the narrative objective in the estuary for protection of navigation, industrial, aquatic life and contact and non-contact recreational beneficial uses.
3. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, additional photographic documentation from 2001 is available indicating that the standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: IND, NAV, REC-1, REC-2, COMM, EST, MAR, WILD, RARE, MIGR, SPWN, SHELL, WET

Matrix: Water

<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Evaluation of applicable narrative water quality objective.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Sixteen quarterly samples measured the tonnage of trash collected from the estuary. Debris collection ranged from 3,091 to 4,162 tons per year (Long Beach, 2000).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sampling site in the estuary.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Quarterly samples taken over four years (1995-1999).
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	City of Long Beach, Department of Parks, Recreation and Marine –Storm Debris Removal Operations

<i>Line of Evidence</i>	Visual Assessment
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	IND, NAV, REC-1, REC-2, COMM, EST, MAR, WILD, RARE, MIGR, SPWN, SHELL, WET
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Narrative objective evaluated using numeric target of zero trash in estuary established in Los Angeles River Trash TMDL and other regional trash TMDLs.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Photographic documentation shows accumulations of trash along a beach, near a boat mooring location, and in channels near Long Beach (LARWQCB, 2001).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Photographs from various points in Los Angeles River estuary including Belmont Shores, City of Long Beach and Queensway Bay.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	February 16, 17, 2000 and January 12, 22, 24, 2001.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Photographs taken by various entities including: Rick Meyer (Los Angeles Times, January 22, 2001) and Lisa Billings (Long Beach Press Telegram February 17, 2000).

<i>Line of Evidence</i>	Remedial Program in Place
<i>Beneficial Use</i>	R2 - Non-Contact Recreation
<i>Information Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	TMDL completed (USEPA, 2002).

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles River Reach 1 (Estuary to Carson Street)

Pollutant: Cyanide

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed the CTR -CCC concentration of 0.0052 mg/l.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Seven of 17 samples exceeded the CTR Criteria continuous Concentration and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

Water Quality Objective/ CTR Criteria Continuous Concentration of 0.0052 mg/l is the highest concentration of Cyanide to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	period of time (four days) without deleterious effects applicable to protect aquatic life BUs.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 17 samples taken from 10/30/00 to 4/30/03 at one to two-week sampling interval. Seven (7) samples exceeded the CTR continuous cyanide concentration criterion (LACDPW, 2003).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sample site sampled during the dry and wet season beginning from 10/30/00 through 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Seventeen samples were taken during the wet and dry season from 10/30/00 to 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals as part of the Los Angeles County Storm water monitoring program prepared by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The Los Angeles River Monitoring Station is located at the existing stream gage station (Stream Gage No. F319-R) between Willow Street and Wardlow Road in the City of Long Beach. At this location, which was chosen to avoid tidal influences, the total upstream tributary drainage area for the Los Angeles River is 825 square miles. This river is the largest watershed outlet to the Pacific Ocean in Los Angeles County. At the site, the river is a concrete lined trapezoidal channel.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles River Reach 1 (Estuary to Carson Street)

Pollutant: Diazinon

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed the DFG Diazinon fresh water hazard assessment criteria used to interpret the basin plan narrative water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Two of 22 samples exceeded the chronic DFG Diazinon fresh water hazard assessment criteria and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:*

Basin Plan Narrative WQO for pesticides

Evaluation Guideline:

Numerical Diazinon guideline used to interpret Basin Plan narrative pesticide WQO. The numeric guidelines are 0.10 ug/l 4-day average and 0.16 ug/l 1-hour average generated by DFG as a fresh water hazard assessment criteria for the protection of aquatic life.

*Data Used to Assess Water
Quality:*

Numeric data generated from 22 samples taken from 10/12/00 to 4/30/03 at one to two-week sampling interval. All of the data reported from 2000 through the end of 2002 did not detect Diazinon. In 10/10/02 during the dry season, and 2/11/03 during the wet season, two (2) samples exceeded the chronic DFG fresh water hazard assessment criteria (one of which also exceeded the acute criteria) for the protection of aquatic life (LACDPW, 2004c).

Spatial Representation:

One sample site sampled during the dry and wet season beginning from 10/12/00 through 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals.

Temporal Representation:

Twenty two samples were taken during the wet and dry season from 10/12/00 to 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals as part of the Los Angeles County Storm water monitoring program prepared by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Environmental Conditions:

The Los Angeles River Monitoring Station is located at the existing stream gage station (Stream Gage No. F319-R) between Willow Street and Wardlow Road in the City of Long Beach. At this location, which was chosen to avoid tidal influences, the total upstream tributary drainage area for the Los Angeles River is 825 square miles. This river is the largest watershed outlet to the Pacific Ocean in Los Angeles County. At the site, the river is a concrete lined trapezoidal channel.

Data Quality Assessment:

Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles River Reach 1 (Estuary to Carson Street)

Pollutant: Nutrients (Algae)

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

Other related lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Los Angeles River Nitrogen TMDL was approved by RWQCB on August 19, 2003 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March 18, 2004. This TMDL will address this water body condition. The approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. The nutrients (algae), foam, and odor information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body and pollutant should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a TMDL has been approved by USEPA and an implementation plan has been approved.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Los Angeles River Nitrogen TMDL was approved by RWQCB on August 19, 2003 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March 18, 2004. This TMDL will address this water body condition.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles River Reach 1 (Estuary to Carson Street)

Pollutant: Trash

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under sections 2.2 and 3.11 of the Listing Policy. Under these sections of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. This water segment-pollutant combination was moved off the section 303(d) list during the 2002 listing cycle only because a TMDL had been completed. No substantial evidence in the record shows that standards are met.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a TMDL has been approved by USEPA and an implementation plan has been approved.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: TMDL completed (SWRCB, 2003).

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles River Reach 2 (Carson to Figueroa Street)

Pollutant: Trash

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under sections 2.2 and 3.11 of the Listing Policy. Under these sections of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. This water segment-pollutant combination was moved off the section 303(d) list during the 2002 listing cycle only because a TMDL had been completed. No substantial evidence in the record shows that standards are met.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a TMDL has been approved by USEPA, an implementation plan has been approved, and applicable water quality standards are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WE - Wetland Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: TMDL completed (SWRCB, 2003).

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles River Reach 3 (Figueroa St. to Riverside Dr.)

Pollutant: Ammonia

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a TMDL has been approved by USEPA and an implementation plan has been approved.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Los Angeles River Nitrogen TMDL was approved by RWQCB on August 19, 2003 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March 18, 2004.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles River Reach 3 (Figueroa St. to Riverside Dr.)

Pollutant: Trash

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under sections 2.2 and 3.11 of the Listing Policy. Under these sections of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. This water segment-pollutant combination was moved off the section 303(d) list during the 2002 listing cycle only because a TMDL had been completed. No substantial evidence in the record shows that standards are met.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a TMDL has been approved by USEPA and an implementation plan has been approved.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WE - Wetland Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: TMDL completed (SWRCB, 2003).

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles River Reach 4 (Sepulveda Dr. to Sepulveda Dam)

Pollutant: Trash

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under sections 2.2 and 3.11 of the Listing Policy. Under these sections of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. This water segment-pollutant combination was moved off the section 303(d) list during the 2002 listing cycle only because a TMDL had been completed. No substantial evidence in the record shows that standards are met.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a TMDL has been approved by USEPA and an implementation plan has been approved.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WE - Wetland Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: TMDL completed (SWRCB, 2003).

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles River Reach 5 (within Sepulveda Basin)

Pollutant: Trash

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under sections 2.2 and 3.11 of the Listing Policy. Under these sections of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. This water segment-pollutant combination was moved off the section 303(d) list during the 2002 listing cycle only because a TMDL had been completed. No substantial evidence in the record shows that standards are met.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the TMDL completed category.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use CO - Cold Freshwater Habitat, ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat, MI - Fish Migration, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, SA - Saline Water Habitat, SP - Fish Spawning, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WE - Wetland Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: Visual trash assessment-TMDL completed (SWRCB, 2003).

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles/Long Beach Inner Harbor

Pollutant: Copper

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.6 two lines of evidence are necessary to assess listing status.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceeded the sediment quality guideline and significant sediment toxicity has been documented within the water body segment.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. One hundred three of 605 sediment samples exceeded the sediment quality guideline and 9 of 84 sediment samples were toxic and these data exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Based on section 3.6 of the Listing Policy sediment toxicity has been documented and the pollutant in sediment may be linked to the observed toxicity. The Listing Policy requires evidence of observed toxicity to establish a connection between the pollutant in the sediment and toxicity impacts to the aquatic habitat in the water body segment.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence

Pollutant-Sediment

<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	An Effects Range-Median of 270 ug/g was used (Long et al., 1995).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Of the 605 core and grab samples available, 103 exceed the sediment quality guideline (Los Angeles RWQCB & CCC, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The 605 samples are spread through out the water segment.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The samples were collected between 1992 and 2001.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program QAPP. Quality assurance for other samples presented in the Contaminated Sediments Task Force Database.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Toxicity
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	Measures of significant toxicity relative to control were used.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Nine of 84 bedded sediment samples were toxic as compared to the toxicity test control (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The 84 samples were spread throughout the Inner Harbor.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The samples were collected between 1992 and 1997.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program QAPP.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles/Long Beach Inner Harbor

Pollutant: DDT

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.4 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.4 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Seven hundred and fourteen (714) samples were taken between 1992 and 2001, DDT was detected in the majority of samples. A sediment quality guideline for DDT is not available that satisfies the conditions of section 6.1.3 of the Listing Policy. Nevertheless, OEHHA fish consumption advisory has been established in this water body segment. Under section 3.4 of the Listing Policy any water body segment where a health advisory against consumption of edible resident organisms has been issued shall be placed on the section 303(d) list.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that an OEHHA fish consumption advisory has been established for this pollutant. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because OEHHA fish consumption advisory has been established in this water body segment. Applicable water quality standards or guidelines are exceeded and this pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Sediment

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	A sediment quality guideline for this pollutant is not available that satisfies the conditions of section 6.1.3 of the Listing Policy.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Seven hundred and fourteen samples are available. The pollutant is detected in the majority of these samples (Los Angeles RWCB & CC, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The 714 samples are spread throughout the water body.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The samples were collected between 1992 and 2001.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program QAPP. Quality assurance for other samples presented in the Contaminated Sediments Task Force Database.

<i>Line of Evidence</i>	Health Advisories
<i>Beneficial Use</i>	CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)
<i>Information Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	A fish consumption advisory has been established for the DDT in the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor area. The advisory was established by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles/Long Beach Inner Harbor

Pollutant: Polychlorinated biphenyls

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.4 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.4 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. OEHHA fish consumption advisory has been established in this water body segment. Under section 3.4 of the Listing Policy any water body segment where a health advisory against consumption of edible resident organisms has been issued shall be placed on the section 303(d) list.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that an OEHHA fish consumption advisory has been established for this pollutant. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because OEHHA fish consumption advisory has been established in this water body segment. Applicable water quality standards or guidelines are exceeded and this pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Sediment

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA), MA - Marine Habitat

Matrix: Sediment

Water Quality Objective/ Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	A sediment quality guideline of 400 ng/g was used (MacDonald et al., 2000).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Of the 626 core and grab sediment samples, 31 exceeded the sediment quality guideline (LARWQCB and CCC, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The 626 samples are spread throughout the water body.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The samples were collected between 1992 and 2002.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program QAPP. Quality assurance for other samples presented in the Contaminated Sediments Task Force Database.

<i>Line of Evidence</i>	Health Advisories
<i>Beneficial Use</i>	CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA), MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Information Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	A fish consumption advisory has been established for the PCBs in the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor area. The advisory was established by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles/Long Beach Inner Harbor

Pollutant: Zinc

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.6 two lines of evidence are necessary to assess listing status.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceeded the sediment quality guideline and significant sediment toxicity has been documented within the water body segment.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Sixty nine of 654 sediment samples exceeded the sediment quality guideline and nine of 84 sediment samples were toxic and these data exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Based on section 3.6 of the Listing Policy sediment toxicity has been documented and the pollutant in sediment may be linked to the observed toxicity.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Toxicity

Beneficial Use: MA - Marine Habitat

<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	Measures of significant toxicity relative to control were used.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Nine of 84 bedded sediment samples were toxic as compared to the toxicity test control (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The 84 samples were spread throughout the Inner Harbor.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The samples were collected between 1992 and 1997.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program QAPP.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Sediment
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA), MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	An Effects Range-Median of 410 ug/g was used (Long et al., 1995).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Of the 654 core and grab samples, 69 exceeded the sediment quality guideline (LARWQCB and CCC, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The 654 samples are spread throughout the Inner Harbor.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The samples were collected between 1992 and 2002.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program QAPP. Quality assurance for other samples presented in the Contaminated Sediments Task Force Database.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Tissue
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA), MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Tissue

<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or human health.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	There is no tissue guideline available for this pollutant that satisfies the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Listing Policy.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Ten measurements are available for mussel tissue (SMWP, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The measurements were take from samples collected at three stations in the Inner Harbor. Most of the data were collected at one station (601.0).
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The samples were collected between 1992 and 2000.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	State Mussel Watch Program.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles/Long Beach Outer Harbor (inside breakwater)

Pollutant: DDT

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under sections 2.1, 3.4, 3.5, and 3.6 of the Listing Policy. Under sections 3.5 and 3.6 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status while under section 3.4, a minimum of two lines of evidence are needed to assess listing status.

Four lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 3.6 the site has significant sediment toxicity but it is unknown if the pollutant is not likely to cause or contribute to the toxic effect because no sediment guideline is available. An OEHHA advisory has been issued for the location and tissue samples show levels exceeding tissue guidelines.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification for placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The tissue quality guideline used complies with the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
3. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
4. Four of 13 samples exceeded the tissue guideline, and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy. A health advisory has also been issued.
5. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Tissue
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA), MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Tissue
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or human health.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	An OEHHA screening value of 100 ug/kg was used (Brodberg and Pollock, 1999).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Of the 13 fish tissue samples collected, four exceeded the OEHHA screening value (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The 13 samples were spread throughout the Outer Harbor.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The samples were collected in 1997 and 1998.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program QAPP.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Sediment
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA), MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	A sediment quality guideline is not available for this pollutant that satisfies the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Listing Policy.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	A total of 82 samples are available (LARWQCB and CCC, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The 82 samples are spread throughout the Outer Harbor.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The samples were collected between 1992 and 2001.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program QAPP. Quality assurance for other samples presented in the Contaminated Sediments

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Toxicity
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	Toxicity measurements were evaluated by comparison to test control.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Four of 32 bedded samples were toxic when compared to the test control (Anderson, et al., 1998).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The 32 samples were spread throughout the water body.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The samples were collected in 1992, 1994, and 1996.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program.

<i>Line of Evidence</i>	Health Advisories
<i>Beneficial Use</i>	CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA), MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Information Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	A fish consumption advisory has been established for the DDT in the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor area. The advisory was established by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Cerritos Channel

Pollutant: Aluminum

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A large number of samples exceed the Primary MCL guideline for aluminum.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Twenty-one of 22 samples exceeded the Primary MCL guideline for aluminum and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: MU - Municipal & Domestic

Matrix: Water

Water Quality Objective/ Primary MCL guideline for Aluminum of 1mg/l shall not be exceeded to protect

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	MUN beneficial uses in accordance with Title 22 of the California Code of regulation table 64431-A of section 64431. This guideline has been incorporated by reference into the Basin Plan and is applicable.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 16 samples taken from 4 sample stations from which 15 samples exceeded the primary aluminum MCL guideline (City of Long Beach, 2003).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Four sampling sites within Los Cerritos Channel; Basin 14: Dominguez Gap, Basin 20 Bouton Creek, Basin 23: Belmont Pump Station, Basin 27: Los Cerritos Channel.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples taken during 11/11/02 though 2/25/03.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Wet weather sampling storm events.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	City of Long Beach Storm Water Monitoring Report 2002-2003 QA/QC Appendix A.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	MU - Municipal & Domestic
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Primary MCL guideline for Aluminum of 1mg/l shall not be exceeded to protect MUN beneficial uses in accordance with Title 22 of the California Code of regulation table 64431-A of section 64431. This guideline has been incorporated by reference into the Basin Plan and is applicable.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 6 samples taken from 3 sample stations from which 6 samples exceeded the primary aluminum MCL guideline (City of Long Beach, 2003).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Three sampling sites within Los Cerritos Channel; Basin 20 Bouton Creek, Basin 23: Belmont Pump Station, Basin 27: Los Cerritos Channel.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples taken during 11/12/01 and 11/24/01.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Wet weather sampling storm events.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	City of Long Beach Storm Water Monitoring Report 2002-2003 QA/QC Appendix A.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Cerritos Channel

Pollutant: Bis(2ethylhexyl)phthalate

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed the CTR criterion to protect human health from carcinogenic risk.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Three of four samples exceeded the CTR Criterion and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Matrix: Water

Water Quality Objective/ CTR criterion of 1.8 ug/l applicable to protect human health from carcinogenic

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	risk due to consumption of water and organisms in all surface waters of the state, which are not bays, estuaries, or ocean that include a MUN use designation.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from four samples taken in two sampling sites (Bouton Creek and Los Cerritos Channel monitoring stations in 11/01). Two samples exceeded the CTR value (City of Long Beach, 2003).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Two sampling sites (Bouton Creek and Los Cerritos Channel Monitoring Stations).
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were taken during 11/12/01 and 11/24/01.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Samples were taken during wet weather season.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	City of Long Beach Storm Water Monitoring Program QAPP 2002.

Region 4

Water Segment: Malibu Creek

Pollutant: Aluminum

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed the Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) for aluminum of 1000 ug/l to protect MUN beneficial uses.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Two of 20 samples exceeded the aluminum MCL for the to protection of MUN beneficial uses and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: MU - Municipal & Domestic

Matrix: Water

<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) for aluminum is 1000 ug/l is applicable to protect MUN.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 20 samples taken from 10/28/00 to 4/30/03 at one to two-week sampling interval. Two (2) samples exceeded the MCL values (LACDPW, 2004c).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sample site sampled during the dry and wet season from 10/28/00 through 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Twenty samples where taken during the wet and dry season from 10/28/00 to 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals as part of the Los Angeles County Storm water monitoring program prepared by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The Malibu Creek monitoring station is located at the existing stream gage station (Stream Gage No. F130-9-R) near Malibu Canyon Road, south of Piuma Road. At this location, the tributary watershed to Malibu Creek is 104.9 square miles. The entire Malibu Creek Watershed is 109.9 square miles.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Region 4

Water Segment: Malibu Creek

Pollutant: Selenium

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed the CTR total selenium criterion for continuous concentration.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Five of 20 samples exceeded the CTR criterion for total selenium and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

Water Quality Objective/ CTR total selenium criterion for continuous concentration in water for the

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	protection of aquatic life is 5.0 ug/l. The criterion is linked and applicable for the protection of aquatic life Beneficial Uses.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 20 samples taken from 10/28/00 to 4/30/03 at one to two-week sampling interval. Five (5) samples exceeded the CTR continuous total selenium concentration criterion (LACDPW, 2004c).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sample site sampled during the dry and wet season beginning from 10/28/00 through 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Twenty samples were taken during the wet and dry season from 10/12/00 to 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals as part of the Los Angeles County Storm water monitoring program prepared by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The Malibu Creek monitoring station is located at the existing stream gage station (Stream Gage No. F130-9-R) near Malibu Canyon Road, south of Pioma Road. At this location, the tributary watershed to Malibu Creek is 104.9 square miles. The entire Malibu Creek Watershed is 109.9 square miles.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Region 4

Water Segment: Malibu Creek

Pollutant: Sulfates

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.2 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.2 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed the MCL guideline for Sulfate.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Nine of a combined total of 22 samples taken from 10/00 to 3/04 exceeded the MCL and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.2 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: MU - Municipal & Domestic

Matrix: Water

Water Quality Objective/ Basin Plan Water Quality Objective of 500 mg/l is linked and applicable for the

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	protection of MUN.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 20 samples taken from 10/28/00 to 4/30/03 at one to two-week sampling interval. Seven (7) samples exceeded the Basin Plan Objective for Sulfate (LACDPW, 2004c).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sample site sampled during the dry and wet season beginning from 10/28/00 through 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Twenty samples were taken during the wet and dry season from 10/28/00 to 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals as part of the Los Angeles County Storm water monitoring program prepared by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The Malibu Creek monitoring station is located at the existing stream gage station (Stream Gage No. F130-9-R) near Malibu Canyon Road, south of Piuma Road. At this location, the tributary watershed to Malibu Creek is 104.9 square miles. The entire Malibu Creek Watershed is 109.9 square miles.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	MU - Municipal & Domestic
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	CCR- Title 22 Table 64449-B Secondary Maximum Contaminant Levels of 250 mg/l for Sulfate.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Two samples with two exceeding (SWAMP, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station at Malibu Creek: 34.0429 -118.6842.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected March 2003 through March 2004.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Malibu Creek Watershed: 404.21.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	SWAMP Quality Assurance Plan.

Region 4

Water Segment: Marina del Rey Harbor - Back Basins

Pollutant: Sediment Bioassays for Estuarine and Marine Water

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.6 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed the BPTCP reference envelope evaluation guideline.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

- 1.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
- 2.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
- 3.Six of seven samples exceeded the BPTCP reference envelope evaluation guideline and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
- 4.Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Toxicity

Beneficial Use: MA - Marine Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

Matrix: Sediment

Water Quality Objective/ Basin Plan: Existing habitats and associated populations of wetlands fauna and

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	<p>flora shall be maintained by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Maintaining substrate characteristics necessary to support flora and fauna which would be present naturally, -Protecting food supplies for fish and wildlife, -Protecting reproductive and nursery areas, and -Protecting wildlife corridors. <p>Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.</p>
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	BPTCP reference envelope approach used.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Seven samples, 6 samples considered toxic (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Samples were collected synoptically with sediment samples.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Summer-winter 1993, summer 1996, fall-winter 1997.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	BPTCP QAPP.

Region 4

Water Segment: Peck Road Park Lake

Pollutant: Trash

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under sections 2.2 and 3.11 of the Listing Policy. Under these sections of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. This water segment-pollutant combination was moved off the section 303(d) list during the 2002 listing cycle only because a TMDL had been completed. No substantial evidence in the record shows that standards are met.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a TMDL has been approved by USEPA and an implementation plan has been approved.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: TMDL completed (SWRCB, 2003).

Region 4

Water Segment:	Piru Creek (from gaging station below Santa Felicia Dam to headwaters)
Pollutant:	Chloride
Decision:	List
Weight of Evidence:	<p>This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.</p> <p>One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed the site specific chloride water quality objective.</p> <p>Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.2.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.3.Eight of 12 samples exceeded the site specific chloride water quality objective and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.4.Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation:	After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	AG - Agricultural Supply
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/</i>	The Basin Plan Site Specific Water Quality Objective for Piru Creek (Tributary

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	to Santa Clara River, Reach 4, shall not exceed 60 mg/l for the protection of Agricultural supply (AGR) BUs.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from a total of twelve samples taken from below the Santa Felicia Dam, from July 2001 through April 2004 on a quarterly basis throughout the Year. Eight samples exceeded the site specific WQO for Piru Creek tributary to Santa Clara River, Reach 4 (LACSD, 2004b).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sampling station sampled from July 2001 through April 2004.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Twelve samples taken on a quarterly basis from July 2001 through April 2004.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Results are from samples taken from July 2001 through April 2004 below Santa Felicia Dam.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Fruit Growers Laboratory Quality Manual.

Region 4

Water Segment: Port Hueneme Pier

Pollutant: Polychlorinated biphenyls

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.5 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.5 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Most of the samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Two of 3 samples exceeded the water quality objective and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Matrix: Tissue

Water Quality Objective/ Los Angeles RWQCB Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	or human health.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	20 ng/g (OEHHA Screening Value).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Two out of 3 samples exceeded. All 3 samples were filet composites representing the following species: barred surfperch, speckled sanddab, and walleye surfperch (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One stations was sampled.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected in April and October 1999.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	CFCP 1998 Year 1 QA Summary - Pesticides and PCBs. California Department of Fish and Game. CDFG Fish and Wildlife Water Pollution Control Laboratory Data Quality Assurance Report. 1999 Coastal Fish Contamination Program (CFCP Year 2). California Department of Fish and Game.

Region 4

Water Segment: Rio Hondo Reach 1 (Confl. LA River to Snt Ana Fwy)

Pollutant: Ammonia

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A remedial program other than a TMDL has been developed, approved, and is being implemented. This program is expected to result in attainment of the standard. This water segment-pollutant combination was moved off the section 303(d) list during the 2002 listing cycle.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a program is in place to address this water quality problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use CO - Cold Freshwater Habitat, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, SP - Fish Spawning, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WE - Wetland Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: An alternative enforceable program is in place that will address ammonia water quality standards exceedances for this reach (SWRCB, 2003).

In June 1995, the seven water reclamation plants discharging in the San Gabriel River and Santa Clara River watersheds received NPDES permits containing requirements regarding compliance with the Basin Plan water quality objectives for ammonia. In accordance with these permits, the Los

Angeles County Sanitation Districts have been pursuing the addition of nitrification and denitrification facilities at each of these plants to comply with the ammonia objectives. By June 2003, it is expected that these new facilities will be operational and ammonia will be drastically reduced. Research facility operation shows that the monthly average ammonia concentration will fully comply with the chronic ammonia objective. Objective is expected to be applicable in June 2003. It is probable that the majority of ammonia discharged to this water body was contributed by POTWs. Information in the record indicates that the majority (over 95%) of the ammonia in the Los Angeles River was contributed by POTWs. Also, it is probable that the contribution in the San Gabriel River watershed is dominated by contributions from POTWs as well. Generally, concentrations of ammonia upstream of the treatment plants are much lower than downstream concentrations (up to an order of magnitude difference).

Region 4

Water Segment: San Gabriel River Estuary

Pollutant: Ammonia as Nitrogen

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A remedial program other than a TMDL has been developed, approved, and is being implemented. This program is expected to result in attainment of the standard. This water segment-pollutant combination was moved off the section 303(d) list during the 2002 listing cycle.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a program is in place to address this water quality problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat, MI - Fish Migration, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, SP - Fish Spawning, WI - Wildlife Habitat

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* The water quality objectives for ammonia are listed in Tables 3-1 to 3-4 of the Los Angeles RWQCB Basin Plan.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: One-hundred and seventeen water samples, 34 samples exceeding (SWRCB, 2003).

Spatial Representation: Three sample sites.

Temporal Representation: Summer 1997, fall 1998, spring 2000.

Data Quality Assessment: Los Angeles County Sanitation District as part of the receiving water monitoring program for the San Jose Creek Water Reclamation plan.

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat, MI - Fish Migration, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, SP - Fish Spawning, WI - Wildlife Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: An alternative enforceable program is in place that will address ammonia water quality standards exceedances for this reach. In June 1995, the seven water reclamation plants discharging in the San Gabriel River and Santa Clara River watersheds received NPDES permits containing requirements regarding compliance with the Basin Plan water quality objectives for ammonia. In accordance with these permits, the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts have been pursuing the addition of nitrification and denitrification facilities at each of these plants to comply with the ammonia objectives. By June 2003, it is expected that these new facilities will be operational and ammonia will be drastically reduced. Research facility operation shows that the monthly average ammonia concentration will fully comply with the chronic ammonia objective that are expected to be applicable in June 2003.

It is probable that the majority of ammonia discharged to this water body was contributed by POTWs. Information in the record indicates that the majority (over 95%) of the ammonia in the Los Angeles River was contributed by POTWs. It is probable that the contribution in the San Gabriel River watershed is dominated by contributions from POTWs as well. Generally, concentrations of ammonia upstream of the treatment plants are much lower than downstream concentrations (up to an order of magnitude difference).

Region 4

Water Segment: San Gabriel River Reach 1 (Estuary to Firestone)

Pollutant: Ammonia

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A remedial program other than a TMDL has been developed, approved, and is being implemented. This program is expected to result in attainment of the standard. This water segment-pollutant combination was moved off the section 303(d) list during the 2002 listing cycle.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a program is in place to address this water quality problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* In order to protect aquatic life, ammonia concentrations in inland surface waters characteristic of freshwater shall not exceed the values calculated for the appropriate instream conditions [both pH and temperature] shown in Tables 3-1 to 3-3 [in the Basin Plan] (per U.S. EPA's most recent criteria guidance document, '1999 Update of Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Ammonia').

<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Based on 30-day average concentrations of ammonia, five samples out of 18 total samples exceed the ammonia objective. Ambient measurements of pH and temperature (30-day averages) were used to calculate the water quality objective (LACSD, 2004b).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Five stations.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected from June 2003 through November 2004. New management practices were begun at the beginning of this period and may have resulted in a change in water quality. Water quality measurements collected before the implementation of management measures were not considered representative of current conditions.

<i>Line of Evidence</i>	Remedial Program in Place
<i>Beneficial Use</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Information Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	<p>An alternative enforceable program is in place that will address ammonia water quality standards exceedances for this reach.</p> <p>In June 1995, the seven water reclamation plants discharging in the San Gabriel River and Santa Clara River watersheds received NPDES permits requirements regarding compliance with the Basin Plan water quality objectives for ammonia. In accordance with these permits, the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts have been pursuing the addition of nitrification and denitrification facilities at each of these plants to comply with the ammonia objectives. By June 2003, it is expected that these new facilities will be operational and ammonia will be drastically reduced. Research facility operation shows that the monthly average ammonia concentration will fully comply with the chronic ammonia objective that are expected to be applicable in June 2003.</p> <p>It is probable that the majority of ammonia discharged to this water body was contributed by POTWs. Information in the record indicates that the majority (over 95%) of the ammonia in the Los Angeles River was contributed by POTWs. It is probable that the contribution in the San Gabriel River watershed is dominated by contributions from POTWs as well. Generally, concentrations of ammonia upstream of the treatment plants is much lower than downstream concentrations (up to an order of magnitude difference).</p>

Region 4

Water Segment: San Gabriel River Reach 1 (Estuary to Firestone)

Pollutant: pH

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A Sufficient number of samples exceed the pH water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Eighty-five of 284 samples exceeded the pH water quality objective and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

Water Quality Objective/ Basin Plan: The pH of inland surface waters shall not be depressed below 6.5 or raised above 8.5 as a result of waste discharges. Ambient pH levels shall not be

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	changed more than 0.5 units from natural conditions as a result of waste discharge.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Eighty-five samples of 284 total samples exceed the pH objective (LACSD, 2004b).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Six stations.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Measurements were taken weekly between June 2003 and November 2004.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	NPDES quality assurance.

Region 4

Water Segment: San Gabriel River Reach 2 (Firestone to Whittier Narrows Dam)

Pollutant: Aluminum

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed the MCL primary guideline.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

- 1.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
- 2.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
- 3.Two of 12 samples exceeded the primary MCL guideline and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
- 4.Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: MU - Municipal & Domestic, R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Matrix: Water

Water Quality Objective/ 1 mg/L (MCLs; Title 22 Table 6444-A Primary).

Water Quality Criterion:

Data Used to Assess Water Quality:

Two out of 12 samples at this location exceeded the objective for total aluminum.

Summary of Results for the 2000-2001 Routine Monitoring at the San Gabriel River (Table B-5) (LACDPW, 2004c).

Spatial Representation:

The San Gabriel River Monitoring Station is located at an historic stream gage station (Stream Gage No. F263C-R), below San Gabriel River Parkway in Pico Rivera. At this location the upstream tributary area is 450 square miles. The San Gabriel River, at the gauging station, is a grouted rock-concrete stabilizer along the western levee and a natural section on the eastern side. Flow measurement and water sampling are conducted in the grouted rock area along the western levee of the river. The length of the concrete stabilizer is nearly 70 feet. The San Gabriel River sampling location has been an active stream gauging station since 1968.

Temporal Representation:

Samples taken between 10/28/2000 and 4/30/2003.

Environmental Conditions:

Samples taken on 10/10/2002 and 4/30/2003 were 'DRY' samples. All others were 'WET'.

Data Quality Assessment:

Detailed QA/QC contained in this report.

Region 4

Water Segment: San Gabriel River Reach 2 (Firestone to Whittier Narrows Dam)

Pollutant: Ammonia

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A remedial program other than a TMDL has been developed, approved, and is being implemented. This program is expected to result in attainment of the standard. This water segment-pollutant combination was moved off the section 303(d) list during the 2002 listing cycle.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a program is in place to address this water quality problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* In order to protect aquatic life, ammonia concentrations in inland surface waters characteristic of freshwater shall not exceed the values calculated for the appropriate instream conditions [both pH and temperature] shown in Tables 3-1 to 3-3 [in the Basin Plan] (per U.S. EPA's most recent criteria guidance document, '1999 Update of Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Ammonia').

<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Based on 30-day average concentrations of ammonia, no samples out of 3 total samples exceed the ammonia objective. Ambient measurements of pH and temperature (30-day averages) were used to calculate the water quality objective (LACSD, 2004b).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected between September 2004 and November 2004.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	NPDES quality assurance.

<i>Line of Evidence</i>	Remedial Program in Place
<i>Beneficial Use</i>	RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat
<i>Information Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	<p>An alternative enforceable program is in place that will address ammonia water quality standards exceedances for this reach (SWRCB, 2003).</p> <p>In June 1995, the seven water reclamation plants discharging in the San Gabriel River and Santa Clara River watersheds received NPDES permits containing requirements regarding compliance with the Basin Plan water quality objectives for ammonia. In accordance with these permits, the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts have been pursuing the addition of nitrification and denitrification facilities at each of these plants to comply with the ammonia objectives. By June 2003, it is expected that these new facilities will be operational and ammonia will be drastically reduced. Research facility operation shows that the monthly average ammonia concentration fully complies with the chronic ammonia objective that are expected to be applicable in June 2003.</p> <p>It is probable that the majority of ammonia discharged to this water body was contributed by POTWs. Information in the record indicates that the majority (over 95%) of the ammonia in the Los Angeles River was contributed by POTWs. It is probable that the contribution in the San Gabriel River watershed is dominated by contributions from POTWs as well. Generally, concentrations of ammonia upstream of the treatment plants is much lower than downstream concentrations (up to an order of magnitude difference).</p>

Region 4

Water Segment: San Gabriel River, East Fork

Pollutant: Trash

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under sections 2.2 and 3.11 of the Listing Policy. Under these sections of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. This water segment-pollutant combination was moved off the section 303(d) list during the 2002 listing cycle only because a TMDL had been completed. No substantial evidence in the record shows that standards are met.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a TMDL has been approved by USEPA and an implementation plan has been approved.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use MI - Fish Migration, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, SP - Fish Spawning, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: TMDL completed (SWRCB, 2003).

Region 4

Water Segment: San Jose Creek Reach 1 (SG Confluence to Temple St.)

Pollutant: Ammonia

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Two out of 17 samples exceed the ammonia objective, however, a remedial program other than a TMDL has been developed, approved, and is being implemented. This program is expected to result in attainment of the standard. This water segment-pollutant combination was moved off the section 303(d) list during the 2002 listing cycle.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a program is in place to address this water quality problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* In order to protect aquatic life, ammonia concentrations in inland surface waters characteristic of freshwater shall not exceed the values calculated for the appropriate instream conditions [both pH and temperature] shown in Tables 3-1 to 3-3 [in the Basin Plan] (per U.S. EPA's most recent criteria guidance document, '1999 Update of Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Ammonia').

<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Based on 30-day average concentrations of ammonia, 2 samples out of 17 total samples exceed the ammonia objective. Ambient measurements of pH and temperature (30-day averages) were used to calculate the water quality objective (LACSD, 2004b).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Five stations.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Data were collected between July 2003 and November 2004.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	NPDES quality assurance.

<i>Line of Evidence</i>	Remedial Program in Place
<i>Beneficial Use</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Information Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	<p>An alternative enforceable program is in place that will address ammonia water quality standards exceedances for this Reach (SWRCB, 2003).</p> <p>In June 1995, the seven water reclamation plants discharging in the San Gabriel River and Santa Clara River watersheds received NPDES permits containing requirements regarding compliance with the Basin Plan water quality objectives for ammonia. In accordance with these permits, the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts have been pursuing the addition of nitrification and denitrification facilities at each of these plants to comply with the ammonia objectives. By June 2003, it is expected that these new facilities will be operational and ammonia will be drastically reduced. Research facility operation shows that the monthly average ammonia concentration will fully comply with the chronic ammonia objective that are expected to be applicable in June 2003.</p> <p>It is probable that the majority of ammonia discharged to this water body was contributed by POTWs. Information in the record indicates that the majority (over 95%) of the ammonia in the Los Angeles River was contributed by POTWs. It is probable that the contribution in the San Gabriel River watershed is dominated by contributions from POTWs as well. Generally, concentrations of ammonia upstream of the treatment plants are much lower than downstream concentrations (up to an order of magnitude difference).</p>

Region 4

Water Segment: San Jose Creek Reach 2 (Temple to I-10 at White Ave.)

Pollutant: Ammonia

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A remedial program other than a TMDL has been developed, approved, and is being implemented. This program is expected to result in attainment of the standard. This water segment-pollutant combination was moved off the section 303(d) list during the 2002 listing cycle.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a program is in place to address this water quality problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use WI - Wildlife Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: In June 1995, the seven water reclamation plants discharging in the San Gabriel River and Santa Clara River watersheds received NPDES permits containing requirements regarding compliance with the Basin Plan water quality objectives for ammonia. In accordance with these permits, the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts have been pursuing the addition of nitrification and denitrification facilities at each of these plants to comply with the ammonia objectives. By June 2003, it is expected that these new facilities will be operational and ammonia will be drastically reduced. Research facility operation shows that the monthly average ammonia

concentration will fully comply with the chronic ammonia objective that are expected to be applicable in June 2003 (SWRCB, 2003).

It is probable that the majority of ammonia discharged to this water body was contributed by POTWs. Information in the record indicates that the majority (over 95%) of the ammonia in the Los Angeles River was contributed by POTWs. It is probable that the contribution in the San Gabriel River watershed is dominated by contributions from POTWs as well. Generally, concentrations of ammonia upstream of the treatment plants are much lower than downstream concentrations (up to an order of magnitude difference).

Data Used to Assess Water Quality:

New data was not submitted during the 2002 listing cycle that indicated that water quality standards are met.

Region 4

Water Segment: Santa Clara River Reach 1 (Estuary to Hwy 101 Bridge)

Pollutant: Toxicity

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.6 a water segment can be placed on the 303(d) list if the water segment exhibits significant toxicity and the observed toxicity is associated with a pollutant or pollutants. The water body segment may also be listed for toxicity alone.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed the evaluation guideline for toxicity and thus the basin plan narrative water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

- 1.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
- 2.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
- 3.Two of 2 samples exhibited significant USEPA 7-day Ceriodaphnia dubia test and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality toxicity guidelines are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: ES - Estuarine Habitat

Matrix: Water

<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations which are toxic to, or which produce detrimental physiological responses in, human, plant, animal, or aquatic life. Use of indicator organisms, analyses of species diversity, population density, growth anomalies, toxicity bioassays of appropriate duration shall determine compliance with this objective, or other appropriate methods as specified by the Regional Board.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	Toxicity samples were tested using the 7-day Ceriodaphnia dubia test, EPA 1994.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Two of two toxicity samples with significant results compared to negative control based on statistical test, alpha of less than 5%, and less than the evaluation threshold (SWAMP, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station: 34.23556 -119.24083.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were taken in November 2001, February 2003
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Santa Clara River Estuary-Between Highway 101 Bridge and Santa Clara River Estuary.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	SWAMP Quality Assurance Plan.

Region 4

Water Segment: Santa Clara River Reach 11 (Piru Creek, from confluence with Santa Clara River Reach 4 to gaging station below Santa Felicia Dam)

Pollutant: Boron

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1a a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed the Inland Surface Waters Site Specific Water Quality Objectives of 1.0 mg/l for Boron on table 3.8 of the Basin Plan. Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

- 1.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
- 2.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Three of 3 samples exceeded the Site Specific Water Quality Objective and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
- 4.Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: AG - Agricultural Supply

Matrix: Water

Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Objectives for Selected Constituents in Inland Surface Waters

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	shown in the Basin Plan on Table 3-8 (1.0 mg/L).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Three water samples; three samples exceeding the objective (SWAMP, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Three sampling stations.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected in February through June 2003.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Santa Clara River Segment 11. Piru Creek above gauging station below Santa Felicia Dam.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	SWAMP Quality Assurance Plan.

Region 4

Water Segment:	Santa Clara River Reach 11 (Piru Creek, from confluence with Santa Clara River Reach 4 to gaging station below Santa Felicia Dam)
Pollutant:	Sulfates
Decision:	List
Weight of Evidence:	<p>This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.2 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.2 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.</p> <p>One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed the exceed the Inland Surface Waters Site Specific Water Quality Objectives of 400 mg/l for Sulfate on table 3.8 of the Basin Plan.</p> <p>Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.2.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.3. Six of 13 samples exceeded the Site Specific Water Quality Objective and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.2 of the Listing Policy.4.Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation:	After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.
Lines of Evidence:	

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	AG - Agricultural Supply
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water

<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Water Quality Objectives for Selected Constituents in Inland Surface Waters shown in Table 3-8 of the Basin Plan (400 mg/l).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Thirteen samples with 6 samples exceeding (SWAMP, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Nine sampling stations.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected in February through June 2003.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Santa Clara River Segment 11. Piru Creek above gauging station below Santa Felicia Dam.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	SWAMP Quality Assurance Plan.

Region 4

Water Segment: Santa Clara River Reach 5 (Blue Cut gaging station to West Pier Hwy 99 Bridge)
(was named Santa Clara River Reach 7 on 2002 303(d) lists)

Pollutant: Aluminum

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed the CCR Title 22 Secondary MCLs Drinking Water Standards of 0.2 mg/l for Aluminum.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

- 1.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
- 2.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Two of 3 samples exceeded the MCLs Drinking Water Standards for Aluminum and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
- 4.Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: MU - Municipal & Domestic

Matrix: -N/A

<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	CCR Title 22 Secondary MCLs Drinking Water Standards of 0.2 mg/l for Aluminum : Table 64431-A and 64449-B.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Three samples with two exceeding (SWAMP, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Three sampling stations.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected in October and November of 2001.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The Santa Clara River Reach 5 monitoring stations are located within the Santa Clara River between West Pier Highway 99 and Blue Cut gaging station. Stations were located on Castaic Creek and Blue Cut.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	SWAMP Quality Assurance Plan.

Region 4

Water Segment:	Santa Clara River Reach 5 (Blue Cut gaging station to West Pier Hwy 99 Bridge) (was named Santa Clara River Reach 7 on 2002 303(d) lists)
Pollutant:	Ammonia
Decision:	List
Weight of Evidence:	<p>This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.</p> <p>One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A remedial program other than a TMDL has been developed, approved, and is being implemented. This program is expected to result in attainment of the standard. This water segment-pollutant combination was moved off the section 303(d) list during the 2002 listing cycle.</p> <p>Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.</p>
SWRCB Staff Recommendation:	After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a program is in place to address this water quality problem.
Lines of Evidence:	

<i>Line of Evidence</i>	Remedial Program in Place
<i>Beneficial Use</i>	MI - Fish Migration, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WE - Wetland Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat
<i>Information Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	<p>An alternative enforceable program is in place that will address ammonia water quality standards exceedances for this Reach.</p> <p>In June 1995, the seven water reclamation plants discharging in the San Gabriel River and Santa Clara River watersheds received NPDES permits containing requirements regarding compliance with the Basin Plan water quality objectives for ammonia. In accordance with these permits, the Los</p>

Angeles County Sanitation Districts have been pursuing the addition of nitrification and denitrification facilities at each of these plants to comply with the ammonia objectives. By June 2003, it is expected that these new facilities will be operational and ammonia will be drastically reduced. Research facility operation shows that the monthly average ammonia concentration fully complies with the chronic ammonia objective that are expected to be applicable in June 2003 (SWRCB, 2003).

It is probable that the majority of ammonia discharged to this water body was contributed by POTWs. Information in the record indicates that the majority (over 95%) of the ammonia in the Los Angeles River was contributed by POTWs. It is probable that the contribution in the San Gabriel River watershed is dominated by contributions from POTWs as well. Generally, concentrations of ammonia upstream of the treatment plants is much lower than downstream concentrations (up to an order of magnitude difference).

Data Used to Assess Water Quality:

New data was not submitted during the listing cycle that indicated that water quality standards are met.

Region 4

Water Segment: Santa Clara River Reach 5 (Blue Cut gaging station to West Pier Hwy 99 Bridge)
(was named Santa Clara River Reach 7 on 2002 303(d) lists)

Pollutant: Chloride

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

Three lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Two lines of evidence are numeric and one line of evidence documents that a TMDL was developed by RWQCB and it was approved by USEPA on May of 2005.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments being addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a TMDL to address this water body pollutant combination has been developed and approved for implementation.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: AG - Agricultural Supply

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Los Angeles Region site specific WQ Objective for Santa Clara River, Reach 5 is 100 mg/l.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: Forty one of 46 samples exceeded the site specific objective.

Spatial Representation: One sample site.

Temporal Representation: Samples were collected from 1/11/2000 to 1/27/2005.

Environmental Conditions: Data Collected by the United Water Conservation District during 2000 and 2005. Station sampled is located at Blue Cut Gaging Station near the county line.

Data Quality Assessment: United Water Conservation District QAPP.

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: AG - Agricultural Supply

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Los Angeles Region site specific WQ Objective for Santa Clara River, Reach 5 is 100 mg/l.

*Data Used to Assess Water
Quality:* Seven water samples, four samples exceeding (SWAMP, 2004).

Spatial Representation: Seven stations.

Temporal Representation: Samples were collected in October and November of 2001.

Environmental Conditions: The Santa Clara River Reach 5 monitoring stations are located within the Santa Clara River between West Pier Highway 99 and Blue Cut gauging station. Stations were located on Castaic Creek and Blue Cut.

Data Quality Assessment: SWAMP Quality Assurance Plan.

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use AG - Agricultural Supply

*Information Used to Assess
Water Quality:* A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Clara River Chloride TMDL was approved by SWRCB in July 2004 and subsequently approved by the Office of Administrative Law on November 15, 2004. USEPA approved the TMDL on May of 2005.

Region 4

Water Segment: Santa Clara River Reach 5 (Blue Cut gaging station to West Pier Hwy 99 Bridge)
(was named Santa Clara River Reach 7 on 2002 303(d) lists)

Pollutant: Diazinon

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed the CDFG Aquatic life toxicity one hour average 0.08 mg/l and 4 day average 0.05 mg/l.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

- 1.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
- 2.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Two of four samples exceeded the CDFG Diazinon guideline and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
- 4.Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	CDFG Hazard Assessment Criteria 0.16 ug/L 1-hour average (acute), 0.10 ug/L 4-day (chronic) average.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Four water samples, two samples exceeding (SWAMP, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Three stations.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected in October and November of 2001.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The Santa Clara River Reach 5 monitoring stations are located within the Santa Clara River between West Pier Highway 99 and Blue Cut gaging station. Stations were located on Castaic Creek and Blue Cut.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	SWAMP Quality Assurance Plan.

Region 4

Water Segment: Santa Clara River Reach 5 (Blue Cut gaging station to West Pier Hwy 99 Bridge)
(was named Santa Clara River Reach 7 on 2002 303(d) lists)

Pollutant: Polychlorinated biphenyls

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed the California Toxics Rule (CTR) fresh water criterion continuous concentration of 0.014mg/l.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

- 1.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
- 2.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Two of three samples exceeded the CTR chronic criterion and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.2 of the Listing Policy.
- 4.Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	California Toxics Rule (CTR) Criteria: Chronic FW .014 mg/l.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Three summations with 2 exceeding (SWAMP, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Three stations.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected in October and November of 2001.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The Santa Clara River Reach 5 monitoring stations are located within the Santa Clara River between West Pier Highway 99 and Blue Cut gaging station. Stations were located on Castaic Creek and Blue Cut.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	SWAMP Quality Assurance Plan.

Region 4

Water Segment:	Santa Clara River Reach 6 (W Pier Hwy 99 to Bouquet Cyn Rd) (was named Santa Clara River Reach 8 on 2002 303(d) lists)
Pollutant:	Ammonia
Decision:	List
Weight of Evidence:	<p>This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.</p> <p>One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A remedial program other than a TMDL has been developed, approved, and is being implemented. This program is expected to result in attainment of the standard. This water segment-pollutant combination was moved off the section 303(d) list during the 2002 listing cycle.</p> <p>Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.</p>
SWRCB Staff Recommendation:	After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a program is in place to address this water quality problem.
Lines of Evidence:	

<i>Line of Evidence</i>	Remedial Program in Place
<i>Beneficial Use</i>	MI - Fish Migration, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WE - Wetland Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat
<i>Information Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	<p>An alternative enforceable program is in place that will address ammonia water quality standards exceedances for this Reach.</p> <p>In June 1995, the seven water reclamation plants discharging in the San Gabriel River and Santa Clara River watersheds received NPDES permits containing requirements regarding compliance with the Basin Plan water quality objectives for ammonia. In accordance with these permits, the Los</p>

Angeles County Sanitation Districts have been pursuing the addition of nitrification and denitrification facilities at each of these plants to comply with the ammonia objectives. By June 2003, it is expected that these new facilities will be operational and ammonia will be drastically reduced. Research facility operation shows that the monthly average ammonia concentration fully complies with the chronic ammonia objective that are expected to be applicable in June 2003 (SWRCB, 2003).

It is probable that the majority of ammonia discharged to this water body was contributed by POTWs. Information in the record indicates that the majority (over 95%) of the ammonia in the Los Angeles River was contributed by POTWs. It is probable that the contribution in the San Gabriel River watershed is dominated by contributions from POTWs as well. Generally, concentrations of ammonia upstream of the treatment plants is much lower than downstream concentrations (up to an order of magnitude difference).

Data Used to Assess Water Quality:

New data was not submitted during the listing cycle that indicated that water quality standards are met (SWAMP, 2004).

Region 4

Water Segment:	Santa Clara River Reach 6 (W Pier Hwy 99 to Bouquet Cyn Rd) (was named Santa Clara River Reach 8 on 2002 303(d) lists)
Pollutant:	Chloride
Decision:	List
Weight of Evidence:	<p>This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.</p> <p>One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed by RWQCB and was approved by USEPA in May 2005.</p> <p>Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.</p>
SWRCB Staff Recommendation:	After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a TMDL has been developed and approved for implementation.

Lines of Evidence:

<i>Line of Evidence</i>	Remedial Program in Place
<i>Beneficial Use</i>	AG - Agricultural Supply
<i>Information Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Clara River Chloride TMDL was approved by SWRCB in July 2004 and subsequently approved by the Office of Administrative Law on November 15, 2004. USEPA approved the TMDL on May of 2005.

Region 4

Water Segment: Santa Clara River Reach 6 (W Pier Hwy 99 to Bouquet Cyn Rd) (was named Santa Clara River Reach 8 on 2002 303(d) lists)

Pollutant: Chlorpyrifos

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. An sufficient number of samples exceed the CDFG Chlorpyrifos 0.05 mg/l four day average aquatic life toxicity guideline.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

- 1.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
- 2.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
- 3.Nine of 31 samples exceeded the CDFG guideline. and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
- 4.Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	CDFG Aquatic life toxicity one hour average: 0.08 mg/l and 4 day average: 0.05 mg/l.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	31 water samples, 9 samples exceeding the 4 day average. All exceedances were from Station STCBQT (SWAMP, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Eight stations.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected from August 2002 through April 2003.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The Santa Clara River Reach 6 monitoring stations are located between Bouquet Canyon Road Bridge and West Point Highway 99.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	SWAMP Quality Assurance Plan

Region 4

Water Segment: Santa Clara River Reach 6 (W Pier Hwy 99 to Bouquet Cyn Rd) (was named Santa Clara River Reach 8 on 2002 303(d) lists)

Pollutant: Diazinon

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed the CDFG Diazinon Aquatic life toxicity guidelines of 0.08 mg/l one hour average and the 0.05 mg/l 4 day average.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

- 1.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
- 2.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Twenty eight of 29 samples exceeded the CDFG guidelines and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
- 4.Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	CDFG Hazard Assessment Criteria 0.16 ug/L 1-hour average (acute), 0.10 ug/L 4-day (chronic) average.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Twenty nine water samples, 28 samples exceeding (SWAMP, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Six stations.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected from August 2002 through April 2003.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The Santa Clara River Reach 6 monitoring stations are located between Bouquet Canyon Road Bridge and West Point Highway 99.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	SWAMP Quality Assurance Plan.

Region 4

Water Segment:	Santa Clara River Reach 6 (W Pier Hwy 99 to Bouquet Cyn Rd) (was named Santa Clara River Reach 8 on 2002 303(d) lists)
Pollutant:	Nitrogen, Nitrite
Decision:	List
Weight of Evidence:	<p>This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.</p> <p>Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed the water quality objective but a remedial program has been out in place to address nitrite problems in this segment.</p> <p>Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category. However, there is sufficient information to indicate that the nitrification/ de-nitrification treatment process installed will address the nitrite problem.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.3. Fifteen of 36 samples exceeded the water quality objective and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation:	After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem. However there has been a remedial program put in place to address this problem.

Lines of Evidence:

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	GW - Groundwater Recharge

<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Nitrate-nitrogen plus Nitrite-nitrogen WQO is 10 mg/L.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Thirty-six total measurements of nitrite-nitrogen. Fifteen samples exceed the water quality objective for nitrite-nitrogen (SWRCB, 2003).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Two sample sites.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Data were collected quarterly from 1997 through 2002.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Age of the data is up to five years.
<i>QA/QC Equivalent:</i>	NPDES monitoring and RWQCB staff monitoring related to TMDL development.

<i>Line of Evidence</i>	Remedial Program in Place
<i>Beneficial Use</i>	GW - Groundwater Recharge
<i>Information Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	<p>The Saugus Water Reclamation Plant, which discharges at the upstream end of the reach, is in the process of installing nitrification and denitrification (NDN) treatment processes to meet effluent limits in the plant's NPDES permit for ammonia and nitrate plus nitrite (SWRCB, 2003). The permit establishes a compliance date of June 12, 2003 to meet receiving water limits for ammonia. The permittee has stated and shown that the NDN facilities will be operational at the Saugus plant by the June, 2003 deadline. The contract has been awarded (nearly \$10 million) to construct the NDN processes.</p> <p>When the NDN facilities are operational the nitrite concentrations will be reduced drastically. Operation of a research NDN facility at the Whittier narrows WRP has shown that NDN will reduce nitrite levels well below the 1 mg/L nitrite water quality objective.</p> <p>The Saugus WRP is the principal (if not sole) source of nitrite in Reach 8. A measurement upstream of the treatment plant had a very low concentration of nitrite (well below the standard). Other measurements down stream show varying levels of nitrite depending on possible plant uptake, conversion of nitrite to other more stable forms of nitrogen, and dilution.</p>

Region 4

Water Segment: Santa Clara River Reach 6 (W Pier Hwy 99 to Bouquet Cyn Rd) (was named Santa Clara River Reach 8 on 2002 303(d) lists)

Pollutant: Toxicity

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.6 a water segment can be placed on the 303(d) list if the water segment exhibits significant toxicity and the observed toxicity is associated with a pollutant or pollutants. The water body segment may also be listed for toxicity alone.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed 7-day Ceriodaphnia dubia test and thus the narrative water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

- 1.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
- 2.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
- 3.Four of 4 samples exhibited significant Ceriodaphnia toxicity and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: CO - Cold Freshwater Habitat, MU - Municipal & Domestic, SP - Fish Spawning, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations which are toxic to, or which produce detrimental physiological responses in, human, plant, animal, or aquatic life. Use of indicator organisms, analyses of species diversity, population density, growth anomalies, toxicity bioassays of appropriate duration shall determine compliance with this objective, or other appropriate methods as specified by the Regional Board.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	Toxicity samples tests using the 7-day Ceriodaphnia dubia test.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Four of 4 toxicity samples with significant results compared to negative control based on statistical test, alpha of less than 5%, and less than the evaluation threshold (SWAMP, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station located at 34.42782 -118.54022.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were taken in November 2001, February 2003.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The Santa Clara River Reach 6 monitoring stations are located between Bouquet Canyon Road Bridge and West Point Highway 99.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	SWAMP Quality Assurance Plan.

Region 4

Water Segment: Sawpit Creek

Pollutant: Bis(2ethylhexyl)phthalate

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed the CTR 1.8 ug/l human health criterion for the risk of carcinogens due to consumption of water and organisms.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Six of 7 samples exceeded the CTR criterion and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: GW - Groundwater Recharge, MI - Fish Migration, MU - Municipal & Domestic, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	CTR criteria 1.8 ug/L (ppb) Human Health Freshwater (USEPA, 2000).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Six of seven samples exceeded the CTR criteria for Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (LACDPW, 2004c).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Samples were collected from seven sites.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected in November 2000, January, February, and March 2001.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Samples were collected during storm events.
<i>QA/QC Equivalent:</i>	Los Angeles Department of Public Works: Evaluation of analytes and QA/QC specification for Monitoring Programs. The report also included quality control data.

Region 4

Water Segment: Sawpit Creek

Pollutant: Fecal Coliform

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.3 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.3 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed the 400 MPN/100 ml fresh water single sample limit water quality objective for the protection of RE1 Beneficial Uses.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Five of 6 samples exceeded the fecal coliform 400 MPN/100 ml water quality objective and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.2 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: GW - Groundwater Recharge, MI - Fish Migration, MU - Municipal & Domestic, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan WQO: 400 MPN/100 ml fecal coliform.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Five of six samples exceeded the fecal coliform objective (LACDPW, 2004c).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Samples were collected from six sample sites
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected in November 2000, January, February, and March 2001.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Samples were collected during storm events.
<i>QA/QC Equivalent:</i>	Los Angeles Department of Public Works: Evaluation of analytes and QA/QC specification for Monitoring Programs.

Region 4

Water Segment: Ventura Marina Jetties

Pollutant: DDT

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.5 of the Listing Policy. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Two of the 6 samples exceeded the OEHHA Screening Value and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Matrix: Tissue

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Los Angeles RWQCB Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or human health.

<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	100 ng/g (OEHHA Screening Value).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Two of 6 samples exceeded. All 6 samples were filet composites representing the following species: Rainbow surfperch, shiner surfperch, white surfperch, and white croaker (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station were sampled.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected in September 1999.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	CFCP 1998 Year 1 QA Summary - Pesticides and PCBs. California Department of Fish and Game. CDFG Fish and Wildlife Water Pollution Control Laboratory Data Quality Assurance Report. 1999 Coastal Fish Contamination Program (CFCP Year 2). California Department of Fish and Game.

Region 4

Water Segment: Ventura Marina Jetties

Pollutant: Polychlorinated biphenyls

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.5 of the Listing Policy. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Two of the 6 samples exceeded the OEHHA Screening Value and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Matrix: Tissue

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Los Angeles RWQCB Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or human health.

<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	20 ng/g (OEHHA Screening Value).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Two of 6 samples exceeded. All 6 samples were filet composites representing the following species: Rainbow surfperch, shiner surfperch, white surfperch, and white croaker. Shiner surfperch and white croaker from the Ventura Marina Jetty exceeded guideline (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station were sampled.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected in July and September 1999.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	CFCP 1998 Year 1 QA Summary - Pesticides and PCBs. California Department of Fish and Game. CDFG Fish and Wildlife Water Pollution Control Laboratory Data Quality Assurance Report. 1999 Coastal Fish Contamination Program (CFCP Year 2). California Department of Fish and Game.

Page left blank intentionally.

Los Angeles Region (4)

DELIST

Recommendations to remove waters
and pollutants from the
section 303(d) List

Page left blank intentionally.

Region 4

Water Segment: Abalone Cove Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Arroyo Seco Reach 1 (LA River to West Holly Ave.)

Pollutant: Excess Algal Growth

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This condition is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of two lines of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this water body condition. A TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. Qualitative information on excess algal growth alone is not sufficient to support placement on the section 303(d) list (Listing Policy section 3.7).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because algal growth is not a pollutant, and it is uncertain if the growth data are backed by pollutant data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Los Angeles River Nitrogen TMDL was approved by RWQCB on August 19, 2003 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March 18, 2004. This TMDL will address this water body condition.

Region 4

Water Segment:	Arroyo Seco Reach 2 (Figueroa St. to Riverside Dr.)
Pollutant:	Excess Algal Growth
Decision:	Delist
Weight of Evidence:	After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because excess algal growth is not a pollutant and it is uncertain if the growth data are backed by pollutant data showing exceedances of water quality standards.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation:	After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because excess algal growth is not a pollutant and it is uncertain if the growth data are backed by pollutant data showing exceedances of water quality standards.
Lines of Evidence:	

<i>Line of Evidence</i>	Remedial Program in Place
<i>Beneficial Use</i>	R2 - Non-Contact Recreation
<i>Information Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Los Angeles River Nitrogen TMDL was approved by RWQCB on August 19, 2003 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March 18, 2004. This TMDL will address this water body condition.

Region 4

Water Segment: Ballona Creek

Pollutant: Cadmium

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. The Policy calls for the delisting of waters if the decision is found to be based faulty data and it is demonstrated that the listing would not have occurred in the absence of such faulty data. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

The data cannot be found that was used to list this pollutant. It is likely that data from Ballona Creek Estuary were applied inappropriately to the concrete lined Ballona Creek.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is insufficient justification for maintaining the listing for this water segment-pollutant combination.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that no data is available to assess the status of this water body for this pollutant. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because no data are available to support the listing.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Pollutant-Sediment

Beneficial Use WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: The written summary information that formed the basis for the 1998 303(d) list, provide only summary information on the chemical concentrations in sediments. The original data are no longer available; consequently, sample locations cannot be confirmed. This is important because there is a discrepancy in the nomenclature used to define Ballona Creek and the Estuary. In the Basin Plan, the transition between Creek and Estuary is at Centinela Blvd. Ballona Creek

(above Centinela) is concrete-lined. Ballona Creek estuary (below Centinela) is soft-bottomed. Anyone unfamiliar with this regulatory distinction may have inadvertently attributed samples collected from Ballona Creek Estuary to Ballona Creek. Sediment data used in the 1998 list appear to have been collected from soft-bottomed estuary sediments as opposed to the concrete-lined channel. Therefore, the listing for this pollutant in Ballona Creek was made in error.

Region 4

Water Segment: Ballona Creek

Pollutant: ChemA

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. The Policy calls for the delisting of waters if the decision is found to be based faulty data and it is demonstrated that the listing would not have occurred in the absence of such faulty data. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

The data that was used for the original listing was collected in the Ballona Creek Estuary and not the creek itself. It is likely that data from Ballona Creek Estuary were applied inappropriately to Ballona Creek.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is insufficient justification for maintaining the listing for this water segment-pollutant combination.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that no data is available to assess the status of this water body for this pollutant. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because no data are available to support the listing.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: To assess potential impairments associated with contaminant concentrations in fish and shellfish tissue, summary information that formed the basis for the 1998 303(d) list was reviewed. Tissue data used in the assessment were from the State Mussel Watch Program in the mid-1980s and data collected as part of the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program (TSMP) in 1993. A review of the original data sets revealed that both sets of data were from locations in Ballona Creek

Estuary. There are no data on fish tissue or mussel tissue for Ballona Creek. Consequently the Ballona Creek listing for this pollutant in tissue was made in error.

Region 4

Water Segment: Ballona Creek

Pollutant: Chlordane

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. The Policy calls for the delisting of waters if the decision is found to be based faulty data and it is demonstrated that the listing would not have occurred in the absence of such faulty data. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

The data that was used for the original listing was collected in the Ballona Creek Estuary and not the creek itself. It is likely that data from Ballona Creek Estuary were applied inappropriately to Ballona Creek.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is insufficient justification for maintaining the listing for this water segment-pollutant combination.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that no data is available to assess the status of this water body for this pollutant. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because no data are available to support the listing.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: To assess potential impairments associated with contaminant concentrations in fish and shellfish tissue, summary information that formed the basis for the 1998 303(d) list was reviewed. Tissue data used in the assessment were from the State Mussel Watch Program in the mid-1980s and data collected as part of the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program (TSMP) in 1993. A review of the original data sets revealed that both sets of data were from locations in Ballona Creek

Estuary. There are no data on fish tissue or mussel tissue for Ballona Creek. Consequently the Ballona Creek listing for this pollutant in tissue was made in error.

Region 4

Water Segment: Ballona Creek

Pollutant: DDT

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. The Policy calls for the delisting of waters if the decision is found to be based faulty data and it is demonstrated that the listing would not have occurred in the absence of such faulty data. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

The data that was used for the original listing was collected in the Ballona Creek Estuary and not the creek itself. It is likely that data from Ballona Creek Estuary were applied inappropriately to Ballona Creek.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is insufficient justification for maintaining the listing for this water segment-pollutant combination.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that no data is available to assess the status of this water body for this pollutant. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because no data are available to support the listing.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: To assess potential impairments associated with contaminant concentrations in fish and shellfish tissue, summary information that formed the basis for the 1998 303(d) list was reviewed. Tissue data used in the assessment were from the State Mussel Watch Program in the mid-1980s and data collected as part of the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program (TSMP) in 1993. A review of the original data sets revealed that both sets of data were from locations in Ballona Creek

Estuary. There are no data on fish tissue or mussel tissue for Ballona Creek. Consequently the Ballona Creek listing for this pollutant in tissue was made in error (SWAMP, 2004).

Region 4

Water Segment: Ballona Creek

Pollutant: Dieldrin

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. The Policy calls for the delisting of waters if the decision is found to be based faulty data and it is demonstrated that the listing would not have occurred in the absence of such faulty data. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

The data that was used for the original listing was collected in the Ballona Creek Estuary and not the creek itself. It is likely that data from Ballona Creek Estuary were applied inappropriately to Ballona Creek.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is insufficient justification for maintaining the listing for this water segment-pollutant combination.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that no data is available to assess the status of this water body for this pollutant. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because no data are available to support the listing.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: To assess potential impairments associated with contaminant concentrations in fish and shellfish tissue, summary information that formed the basis for the 1998 303(d) list was reviewed. Tissue data used in the assessment were from the State Mussel Watch Program in the mid-1980s and data collected as part of the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program (TSMP) in 1993. A review of the original data sets revealed that both sets of data were from locations in Ballona Creek

Estuary. There are no data on fish tissue or mussel tissue for Ballona Creek. Consequently the Ballona Creek listing for this pollutant in tissue was made in error.

Region 4

Water Segment: Ballona Creek

Pollutant: Lead

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under sections 4.1 of the Listing Policy. Four lines of evidence based, on different data sets, are available in the administrative record. The data sets address dissolved copper concentrations in water. An insufficient number of samples exceed the CTR criteria. Based on section 4.1 there is sufficient justification for removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

- 1.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
- 2.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
- 3.Six of 90 combined samples exceeded the dissolved lead CTR guidelines and this does not exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 4.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should not be removed from on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* CTR Lead Criterion for continuous concentration in water for the protection of aquatic life is expressed as a function of the total hardness of the water body. At a total hardness of 100 mg/l the continuous concentration for lead is 2.5 ug/l. The aquatic life criteria will vary depending of total hardness reported. The criterion is linked and applicable for the protection of aquatic life Beneficial Uses.

Data Used to Assess Water Numeric data generated from 22 samples taken from 10/12/00 to 4/30/03 at one

<i>Quality:</i>	to two-week sampling interval. One (1) sample exceeded the Lead Continuous Criterion Concentration, which equals the highest concentration of a pollutant to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (4days) without deleterious effects (LACDPW, 2004c).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sample site sampled during the dry and wet season beginning from 10/12/00 through 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Twenty-two (22) samples were taken during the wet and dry season from 10/12/00 to 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals as part of the Los Angeles County Storm water monitoring program prepared by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The Ballona Creek monitoring station is located at the existing stream gage station (Stream Gage No. F38C-R) between Sawtelle Boulevard and Sepulveda Boulevard in the City of Los Angeles. At this location, which was chosen to avoid tidal influences, the upstream tributary watershed of Ballona Creek is 88.8 square miles. The entire Ballona Creek Watershed is 127.1 square miles. At the gauging station, Ballona Creek is a concrete lined trapezoidal channel.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	CTR Lead Criterion for continuous concentration in water for the protection of aquatic life is expressed as a function of the total hardness of the water body. At a total hardness of 100 mg/l the continuous concentration for lead is 2.5 ug/l. The aquatic life criteria will vary depending of total hardness reported. The criterion is linked and applicable for the protection of aquatic life Beneficial Uses.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Thirty-eight water samples, 5 above chronic criterion (SWRCB, 2003).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Samples collected spatially along creek.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Fall, winter, spring, summer in different years.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Data 1-5 years old.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Los Angeles County Stormwater Program.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	CTR Lead Criterion for continuous concentration in water for the protection of aquatic life is expressed as a function of the total hardness of the water body. At a total hardness of 100 mg/l the continuous concentration for lead is 2.5 ug/l. The aquatic life criteria will vary depending of total hardness reported. The criterion is linked and applicable for the protection of aquatic life Beneficial Uses.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Seven of 48 measurements were analyzed. The dry weather detection limits in the City of Los Angeles data exceeded the water quality criterion and this precluded evaluation against the CTR standards. The detection limit was 10 ug/L (USEPA and LARWQCB, 2005).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The metals data from the City of Los Angeles were from four locations along Ballona Creek at National Boulevard, Overland Avenue, Centinela Boulevard, and Pacific Avenue. The data from National and Overland Boulevards are representative of Ballona Creek Reaches 1 and 2, respectively.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Sampled on a monthly basis between January 2002 through May 2003.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Samples are representative of dry-weather conditions. A hardness value of 300 mg/L was used to calculate the water quality criterion.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	CTR Lead Criterion for continuous concentration in water for the protection of aquatic life is expressed as a function of the total hardness of the water body. At a total hardness of 100 mg/l the continuous concentration for lead is 2.5 ug/l. The aquatic life criteria will vary depending of total hardness reported. The criterion is linked and applicable for the protection of aquatic life Beneficial Uses.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	None of 30 measurements exceeded the water criterion. The detection limit is 5 ug/L (USEPA and LARWQCB, 2003).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The metals data from SCCWRP were from a characterization study of Ballona Creek and Estuary to identify relative metals contributions of runoff discharges during dry conditions. 12 in-stream sites and at the discharge of 35-40 storm drains (number depended on whether there was flow from the drain on the sampling day). Nine of the in-stream sites were from the Creek and three of the

in-stream sites were from the estuary. One of the storm drains was Sepulveda Canyon Channel and this data was used to assess conditions for that listed reach.

Temporal Representation: Sampling was conducted on May 17, July 16, and September 24, 2003.

Environmental Conditions: Samples are representative of dry-weather conditions. A hardness value of 300 mg/L was used to calculate the water quality criterion.

Data Quality Assessment: Southern California Coastal Water Research Project.

Region 4

Water Segment: Ballona Creek

Pollutant: PCBs (dioxin-like)

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. The Policy calls for the delisting of waters if the decision is found to be based faulty data and it is demonstrated that the listing would not have occurred in the absence of such faulty data. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

The data that was used for the original listing was collected in the Ballona Creek Estuary and not the creek itself. It is likely that data from Ballona Creek Estuary were applied inappropriately to Ballona Creek.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is insufficient justification for maintaining the listing for this water segment-pollutant combination.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that no data is available to assess the status of this water body for this pollutant. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because no data are available to support the listing.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: To assess potential impairments associated with contaminant concentrations in fish and shellfish tissue, summary information that formed the basis for the 1998 303(d) list was reviewed. Tissue data used in the assessment were from the State Mussel Watch Program in the mid-1980s and data collected as part of the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program (TSMP) in 1993. A review of the original data

sets revealed that both sets of data were from locations in Ballona Creek Estuary. There are no data on fish tissue or mussel tissue for Ballona Creek. Consequently the Ballona Creek listing for this pollutant in tissue was made in error.

Region 4

Water Segment: Ballona Creek

Pollutant: Sediment Bioassays for Estuarine and Marine Water

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This condition is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. The Policy calls for the delisting of waters if the decision is found to be based faulty data and it is demonstrated that the listing would not have occurred in the absence of such faulty data. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

The data cannot be found that was used to list this condition. It is likely that data from Ballona Creek Estuary were applied inappropriately to the concrete lined Ballona Creek.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is insufficient justification for maintaining the listing for this water segment-condition combination.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that no data is available to assess the status of this water body for this pollutant. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because no data are available to support the listing.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Pollutant-Sediment

Beneficial Use WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: The written summary information that formed the basis for the 1998 303(d) list, provide only summary information on the toxicity in sediments. The original data are no longer available; consequently, sample locations cannot be confirmed. This is important because there is a discrepancy in the nomenclature used to define Ballona Creek and the Estuary. In the Basin Plan, the transition between Creek and Estuary is at Centinela Blvd. Ballona Creek (above

Centinela) is concrete-lined. Ballona Creek estuary (below Centinela) is soft-bottomed. Anyone unfamiliar with this regulatory distinction may have inadvertently attributed samples collected from Ballona Creek Estuary to Ballona Creek. Sediment data used in the 1998 list appear to have been collected from soft-bottomed estuary sediments as opposed to the concrete-lined channel. Therefore, the listing for this condition in Ballona Creek was made in error.

Region 4

Water Segment: Ballona Creek

Pollutant: Selenium

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 4.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess delisting status.

Five lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Lines of evidence summarizes data from 1997 to 2003, some of which was used to place the water -pollutant combination on the 303(d) originally. Over the 7 year period, six samples exceed the water quality criterion for selenium.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification for removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Six of 176 samples exceeded the selenium water quality criterion and this does not exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 4.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

Water Quality Objective/ CTR Criteria Continuous Concentration of 5 ug/l is the highest concentration of Selenium to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	(four days) without deleterious effects applicable to protect aquatic life BUs.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 22 samples taken from 10/12/00 to 4/30/03 at one to two-week sampling interval. One (1) sample exceeded the CTR Selenium Continuous Criterion Concentration (LACDPW, 2004c).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sample site sampled during the dry and wet season beginning from 10/12/00 through 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Twenty-two (22) samples were taken during the wet and dry season from 10/12/00 to 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals as part of the Los Angeles County Storm water monitoring program prepared by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The Ballona Creek monitoring station is located at the existing stream gage station (Stream Gage No. F38C-R) between Sawtelle Boulevard and Sepulveda Boulevard in the City of Los Angeles. At this location, which was chosen to avoid tidal influences, the upstream tributary watershed of Ballona Creek is 88.8 square miles. The entire Ballona Creek Watershed is 127.1 square miles. At the gauging station, Ballona Creek is a concrete lined trapezoidal channel.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	CTR Criteria Continuous Concentration of 5 ug/l is the highest concentration of Selenium to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (four days) without deleterious effects applicable to protect aquatic life BUs.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Twenty-five water samples, 3 samples exceeding (SWRCB, 2003).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sample site sampled mostly during the wet season.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples collected from 1997 through 1999 in the fall, spring, summer, and winter. Most samples collected during wet season.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
--	-----------------

<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	-N/A
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	CTR Criteria Continuous Concentration of 5 ug/l is the highest concentration of Selenium to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (four days) without deleterious effects applicable to protect aquatic life BUs.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Two measurements of 55 exceed the water quality criterion. Three measurements greater than detection limit (USEPA and LAWQCB, 2005).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sampling location.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples collected between 1996 and 2002.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	These are wet-weather data taken from the Ballona Creek Metals TMDL. These measurements overlap with other measurements collected by LACDPW.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Los Angeles Count Department of Public Works.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	CTR Saltwater Criteria Continuous Concentration of 71 ug/l is the highest concentration of Selenium to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (four days) without deleterious effects applicable to protect aquatic life BUs.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	No samples exceeding criterion out of 44 samples. Detection limit is 10 ug/L which is above the water quality criterion (USEPA and LAWQCB, 2005).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The metals data from the City of Los Angeles were from four locations along Ballona Creek at National Boulevard, Overland Avenue, Centinela Boulevard, and Pacific Avenue. The data from National and Overland Boulevards are representative of Ballona Creek Reaches 1 and 2, respectively.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Sampled on a monthly basis between January 2002 through May 2003.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	These samples were collected during dry-weather conditions.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	City of Los Angeles.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	CTR Criteria Continuous Concentration of 5 ug/l is the highest concentration of Selenium to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (four days) without deleterious effects applicable to protect aquatic life BUs.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	No samples exceed the water quality criterion out of 30 samples. The detection limit was 100 ug/L (USEPA and LARWQCB, 2005).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The metals data from SCCWRP were from a characterization study of Ballona Creek and Estuary to identify relative metals contributions of runoff discharges during dry conditions. Twelve in-stream sites and at the discharge of 35-40 storm drains (number depended on whether there was flow from the drain on the sampling day). Nine of the in-stream sites were from the Creek and three of the in-stream sites were from the estuary. One of the storm drains was Sepulveda Canyon Channel and this data was used to assess conditions for that listed reach.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Sampling was conducted on May 17, July 16, and September 24, 2003.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Samples represent dry-weather conditions.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Southern California Coastal Water Research Project.

Region 4

Water Segment: Ballona Creek

Pollutant: Silver

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. The Policy calls for the delisting of waters if the decision is found to be based faulty data and it is demonstrated that the listing would not have occurred in the absence of such faulty data. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

The data cannot be found that was used to list this pollutant. It is likely that data from Ballona Creek Estuary were applied inappropriately to the concrete lined Ballona Creek.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is insufficient justification for maintaining the listing for this water segment-pollutant combination.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that no data is available to assess the status of this water body for this pollutant. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because no data are available to support the listing.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Pollutant-Sediment

Beneficial Use WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: The written summary information that formed the basis for the 1998 303(d) list, provide only summary information on the chemical concentrations in sediments. The original data are longer available; consequently, sample locations cannot be confirmed. This is important because there is a discrepancy in the nomenclature used to define Ballona Creek and the Estuary. In the Basin Plan, the transition between Creek and Estuary is at Centinela Blvd. Ballona Creek (above

Centinela) is concrete-lined. Ballona Creek estuary (below Centinela) is soft-bottomed. Anyone unfamiliar with this regulatory distinction may have inadvertently attributed samples collected from Ballona Creek Estuary to Ballona Creek. Sediment data used in the 1998 list appear to have been collected from soft-bottomed estuary sediments as opposed to the concrete-lined channel. Therefore, the listing for this pollutant in Ballona Creek was made in error.

Region 4

Water Segment: Ballona Creek

Pollutant: Zinc

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 4.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess delisting status. Four lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. There are exceedances of the dissolved Zinc CTR criteria for continuous concentration in three lines of evidence. If all samples are combined only 9 measurements exceed the standard.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification for removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Nine of 154 samples exceeded the CTR criterion and this does not exceed the allowable frequency presented in Table 4.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* CTR Zinc Criterion for continuous concentration in water for the protection of aquatic life is expressed as a function of the total hardness of the water body. The aquatic life criteria will vary depending of total hardness reported. The criterion

is linked and applicable for the protection of aquatic life Beneficial Uses.

<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Fifty-five water samples, 6 water samples exceeded (USEPA and LAWQCB, 2005).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	To assess wet-weather conditions, evaluated dissolved metals and hardness data collected from Ballona Creek by the LACDPW storm water program at Sawtelle Boulevard.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples collected 1996 to 2000.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The storm water data were compared to the freshwater CTR values based on the actual hardness measured for each sample.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	CTR Zinc Criterion for continuous concentration in water for the protection of aquatic life is expressed as a function of the total hardness of the water body. At a total hardness of 100 mg/l the continuous concentration for Nickel is 120 ug/l. The aquatic life criteria will vary depending of total hardness reported. The criterion is linked and applicable for the protection of aquatic life Beneficial Uses.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 22 samples taken from 10/12/00 to 4/30/03 at one to two-week sampling interval. One (1) sample exceeded the Zinc Continuous Criterion Concentration, which equals the highest concentration of a pollutant to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (4days) without deleterious effects (LACDPW, 2004c; 2004d).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sample site sampled during the dry and wet season beginning from 10/12/00 through 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Twenty-two samples where taken during the wet and dry season from 10/12/00 to 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals as part of the Los Angeles County Storm water monitoring program prepared by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The Ballona Creek monitoring station is located at the existing stream gage station (Stream Gage No. F38C-R) between Sawtelle Boulevard and Sepulveda Boulevard in the City of Los Angeles. At this location, which was chosen to avoid tidal influences, the upstream tributary watershed of Ballona Creek is 88.8 square miles. The entire Ballona Creek Watershed is 127.1 square miles. At the

gauging station, Ballona Creek is a concrete lined trapezoidal channel.

Data Quality Assessment: Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* CTR Zinc Criterion for continuous concentration in water for the protection of aquatic life is expressed as a function of the total hardness of the water body. The aquatic life criteria will vary depending of total hardness reported. The criterion is linked and applicable for the protection of aquatic life Beneficial Uses.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: Thirty samples, no measurements exceed the water quality criterion. Detection limit was 20 ug/L (USEPA and LARWQCB, 2005).

Spatial Representation: The metals data from SCCWRP were from a characterization study of Ballona Creek and Estuary to identify relative metals contributions of runoff discharges during dry conditions. A total of 70 samples, twelve in-stream sites and at the discharge of 35-40 storm drains (number depended on whether there was flow from the drain on the sampling day).

Temporal Representation: Sampling was conducted on May 17, July 16, and September 24, 2003.

Environmental Conditions: Samples represent dry-weather conditions. The water quality criterion was calculated with a hardness value of 300 mg/L.

Data Quality Assessment: Southern California Coastal Water Research Project.

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* CTR Zinc Criterion for continuous concentration in water for the protection of aquatic life is expressed as a function of the total hardness of the water body. The aquatic life criteria will vary depending of total hardness reported. The criterion is linked and applicable for the protection of aquatic life Beneficial Uses.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: Forty-seven samples, 2 exceed the water quality criterion. Detection limit was 10 ug/L (USEPA and LARWQCB, 2005).

<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The metals data from the City of Los Angeles were from four locations along Ballona Creek at National Boulevard, Overland Avenue, Centinela Boulevard, and Pacific Avenue. The data from National and Overland Boulevards are representative of Ballona Creek Reaches 1 and 2, respectively.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Sampled on a monthly basis between January 2002 through May 2003.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Samples are representative of dry-weather conditions. A hardness value of 300 mg/L was used to calculate the water quality criterion.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	City of Los Angeles.

Region 4

Water Segment: Ballona Creek

Pollutant: pH

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4.2 of the Listing Policy. Under section 4.2 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. There are exceedances of the pH basin plan water quality objective in both lines of evidence.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Five of 40 samples exceeded the pH WQO in one line of evidence and 1 of 22 exceeded in the other. The first line of evidence does not exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 4.2 of the Listing Policy and there were insufficient number of samples taken in the other data set to make an appropriate determination
4. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards for the pollutant are not exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

Water Quality Objective/ Basin Plan WQO for inland surface waters shall not be depressed below 6.5 or

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	raised above 8.5 as a result of waster discharges to protect aquatic life BUs.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 22 samples taken from 10/12/00 to 4/30/03 at one to two-week sampling interval. Four (4) samples exceeded the Basin Plan WQO (LACDPW, 2004c; 2004d).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sample site sampled during the dry and wet season beginning from 10/12/00 through 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Twenty-two samples where taken during the wet and dry season from 10/12/00 to 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals as part of the Los Angeles County Storm water monitoring program prepared by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Data 1-5 years old, environmental data measured at site, samples collected during multiple seasons. The Ballona Creek monitoring station is located at the existing stream gage station (Stream Gage No. F38C-R) between Sawtelle Boulevard and Sepulveda Boulevard in the City of Los Angeles. At this location, which was chosen to avoid tidal influences, the upstream tributary watershed of Ballona Creek is 88.8 square miles. The entire Ballona Creek Watershed is 127.1 square miles. At the gauging station, Ballona Creek is a concrete lined trapezoidal channel.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan WQO for inland surface waters shall not be depressed below 6.5 or raised above 8.5 as a result of waster discharges to protect aquatic life BUs.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Five of 40 samples exceeded the water quality objective (SWRCB, 2003).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One site.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Fall and spring.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Los Angeles County Stormwater Program.

Region 4

Water Segment: Bluff Cove Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Burbank Western Channel

Pollutant: Cadmium

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 4.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Two samples in one sampling station exceed the CTR Dissolved Cadmium Criterion for continuous concentration (CCC) in water for the protection of aquatic life.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Two out of 95 samples exceeded the dissolved cadmium continuous criterion concentration and this does not exceed the maximum allowable frequency listed in Table 4.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards for the pollutant are not exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

Water Quality Objective/ CTR Dissolved Cadmium Criterion for continuous concentration (CCC) in water

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	for the protection of aquatic life is expressed as a function of the total hardness of the water body. The aquatic life criteria will vary depending of total hardness reported at the sampling site. The CCC for dissolved cadmium is the highest concentration to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (four days) without deleterious effects. This criterion is linked and applicable for the protection of aquatic life Beneficial Uses.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from a total of 95 samples taken at four different Burbank Western Channel sampling stations (sampling stations R1, R1.5, R2 and R5) covering a period from March 2002 to May 2004 at monthly sampling intervals. Two samples in station R5 taken 10/7/03 exceeded the dissolved cadmium continuous criterion concentration (City of Burbank, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Four Sample sites at receiving water stations consistent with the Burbank Water Reclamation Plant NPDES permit which included receiving water stations both upstream (R1) and downstream (R1.5, R2, and R5) of the reclamation plant and the BWP power plan discharges.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	A total of 95 samples were taken at four sites during 2002 and 2004 at monthly sampling intervals
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Standard Operating Procedures for Receiving Water Monitoring, Burbank Western Channel (United Water Burbank Water Reclamation Plant)

Region 4

Water Segment: Burbank Western Channel

Pollutant: Excess Algal Growth

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

The original line of evidence supporting the listing does not identify a pollutant but rather, a condition caused by a pollutant(s) (algal growth, foam, and odors). A TMDL was approved by RWQCB on August 19, 2003 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March 18, 2004 and this TMDL is expected to address this water body condition.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this listing from the 303(d) Water Quality Limited Segment list because the segment pollutant combinations is not a pollutant.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the pollutant is an ambient condition caused by pollutant(s). A TMDL is in place and is expected to address this water body condition.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Adverse Biological Responses

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Dissolved Oxygen Water Quality Objective of all surface waters designated as Warm Fresh Water Aquatic Habitat shall not be depressed below 5mg/l.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: Numeric data generated from six samples out of which one sample exceeded the WQO for protection of Warm Fresh Water Aquatic Habitat (SWRCB, 2003).

Spatial Representation: One (1) sample site.

Temporal Representation: Six monthly samples, Five (5) taken during the wet season (11/08/2002-03/15/2003) and one (1) sample taken during the dry season (04/30/2003).

Environmental Conditions: Data Age, 1-2 years.

Data Quality Assessment: Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: MU - Municipal & Domestic

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* WQO is linked and applicable to MUN BUs

*Data Used to Assess Water
Quality:* Numeric data generated from six samples out of which one sample exceeded the WQO for protection MUN (SWRCB, 2003).

Spatial Representation: One sampling site.

Temporal Representation: Six monthly samples, Five taken during the wet season (11/08/2002-03/15/2003) and one sample taken during the dry season (04/30/2003).

Environmental Conditions: Data age 1-2 years. Data taken during the wet and dry seasons. Documented exceedance recorded in 2/25/2003 (wet season).

Data Quality Assessment: Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: MU - Municipal & Domestic

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* The Basin Plan Water Quality Objective for Nitrite-Nitrogen of 1 mg/l is linked and applicable for the protection of drinking water supplies.

Data Used to Assess Water Numeric data generated from 27 samples taken from 3/6/02 to 5/25/04 at two to three monthly intervals. Three samples exceeded the Basin Plan Nitrite-N WQO

<i>Quality:</i>	(City of Burbank, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Three sample sites at receiving water stations consistent with the Burbank Water Reclamation Plant NPDES permit which included receiving water stations both upstream (R1) and downstream (R2, and R5) of the reclamation plant and the BWP power plan discharges.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Twenty-seven samples were taken from 5/7/02 through 5/25/04 at quarterly intervals from three sampling stations (R1, R2, and R5).
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Data was collected from 3/02 through 5/04 at three sampling stations. Sampling station R1 is located at the confluence of Burbank Western Channel and Lockheed Channel about 50 feet above the Burbank Reclamation Plant. Sampling station R2 is located at Burbank Western Wash at Verdugo Avenue. Sampling station R5 is located at Burbank Western Wash just upstream from the confluence with the Los Angeles River.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Standard Operating Procedures for Receiving Water Monitoring, Burbank Western Channel (United Water Burbank Water Reclamation Plant).

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	MU - Municipal & Domestic
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	The Basin Plan Water Quality Objective for Nitrate-Nitrogen of 10 mg/l is linked and applicable for the protection of drinking water supplies.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 27 samples taken from 3/6/02 to 5/25/04 at quarterly intervals. No sample exceeded the Basin Plan Objective for Nitrate-Nitrogen (City of Burbank, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Three sample sites at receiving water stations consistent with the Burbank Water Reclamation Plant NPDES permit which included receiving water stations both upstream (R1) and downstream (R2, and R5) of the reclamation plant and the BWP power plan discharges.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Twenty-seven samples were taken from 3/6/02 through 5/25/04 at quarterly intervals from three sampling stations (R1, R2, and R5).
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Data was collected from 3/02 through 5/25 at three sampling stations. Sampling station R1 is located at the confluence of Burbank Western Channel and Lockheed Channel about 50 feet above the Burbank Reclamation Plant. Sampling station R2 is located at Burbank Western Wash at Verdugo Avenue. Sampling station R5 is located at Burbank Western Wash just upstream from the confluence with the Los Angeles River.

Data Quality Assessment: Standard Operating Procedures for Receiving Water Monitoring, Burbank Western Channel (United Water Burbank Water Reclamation Plant).

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Los Angeles River Nitrogen TMDL was approved by RWQCB on August 19, 2003 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March 18, 2004. This TMDL will address this water body condition.

Region 4

Water Segment: Burbank Western Channel

Pollutant: Foam/Flocs/Scum/Oil Slicks

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

The original line of evidence supporting the listing does not identify a pollutant but rather, a condition caused by a pollutant(s) (algal growth, foam, and odors). A TMDL was approved by RWQCB on August 19, 2003 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March 18, 2004 and this TMDL is expected to address this water body condition.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing these listing from the 303(d) Water Quality Limited Segment list because the segment pollutant combinations is not a pollutant.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the pollutant is an ambient condition caused by pollutant(s). A TMDL is in place and is expected to address this water body condition.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: MU - Municipal & Domestic

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* The Basin Plan Water Quality Objective for Nitrate-Nitrogen of 10 mg/l is linked and applicable for the protection of drinking water supplies.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: Numeric data generated from 27 samples taken from 3/6/02 to 5/25/04 at quarterly intervals. No sample exceeded the Basin Plan Objective for Nitrate-Nitrogen (City of Burbank, 2004).

Spatial Representation: Three sample sites at receiving water stations consistent with the Burbank Water Reclamation Plant NPDES permit which included receiving water stations both upstream (R1) and downstream (R2, and R5) of the reclamation plant and the BWP power plan discharges.

Temporal Representation: Twenty-seven samples were taken from 3/6/02 through 5/25/04 at quarterly intervals from three sampling stations (R1, R2, and R5).

Environmental Conditions: Data was collected from 3/02 through 5/25 at three sampling stations. Sampling station R1 is located at the confluence of Burbank Western Channel and Lockheed Channel about 50 feet above the Burbank Reclamation Plant. Sampling station R2 is located at Burbank Western Wash at Verdugo Avenue. Sampling station R5 is located at Burbank Western Wash just upstream from the confluence with the Los Angeles River.

Data Quality Assessment: Standard Operating Procedures for Receiving Water Monitoring, Burbank Western Channel (United Water Burbank Water Reclamation Plant).

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* One hour average Basin Plan Water Quality Objectives for ammonia-N was revised in 2002. For freshwaters not designated COLD and/or MIGR the ammonia WQO is dependent on pH and fish species, but not temperature. The 30-day average WQO for waters not designated for spawning are dependent on pH and temperature. These WQOs have been adopted into the basin plan and are linked and applicable to protection of aquatic life beneficial uses.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: Numeric data generated from 27 samples taken from 5/7/02 to 5/25/04 at two to three monthly intervals. No sample exceeded the basin plan ammonia WQO. Data was compared against 2002 adopted ammonia WQO of which the 1-hour average objective is dependent on pH and fish species and the 30-day average is dependent on pH and temperature. It was not possible to determine any exceedances of the 1-hour average WQO or the 30-day average because pH and temperature data was not provided (City of Burbank, 2004).

Spatial Representation: Three sample sites sampled from May 2002 through May 2004 at two to three monthly intervals.

Temporal Representation: Twenty seven samples were taken at three sampling stations.

Environmental Conditions: Data was collected from May 2002 through May 2004 at 3 sampling stations. Sampling R1 is located at the confluence of Burbank Western Channel and Lockheed Channel about 50 feet above the Burbank Reclamation Plant. Station R2 is located at Burbank Western Wash at Verdugo Avenue. Station R5 is

located at Burbank Western Wash just upstream from the confluence with the L.A. River.

Data Quality Assessment: Standard Operating Procedures for Receiving Water Monitoring, Burbank Western Channel (United Water Burbank Water Reclamation Plant).

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: MU - Municipal & Domestic

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* WQO is linked and applicable to MUN BUs

*Data Used to Assess Water
Quality:* Numeric data generated from six samples out of which one sample exceeded the WQO for protection MUN (SWRCB, 2003).

Spatial Representation: One sampling site.

Temporal Representation: Six monthly samples, Five taken during the wet season (11/08/2002-03/15/2003) and one sample taken during the dry season (04/30/2003).

Environmental Conditions: Data age 1-2 years. Data taken during the wet and dry seasons. Documented exceedance recorded in 2/25/2003 (wet season).

Data Quality Assessment: Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: MU - Municipal & Domestic

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* The Basin Plan Water Quality Objective for Nitrite-Nitrogen of 1 mg/l is linked and applicable for the protection of drinking water supplies.

*Data Used to Assess Water
Quality:* Numeric data generated from 27 samples taken from 3/6/02 to 5/25/04 at two to three monthly intervals. Three samples exceeded the Basin Plan Nitrite-N WQO (City of Burbank, 2004).

Spatial Representation: Three sample sites at receiving water stations consistent with the Burbank Water Reclamation Plant NPDES permit which included receiving water stations both

upstream (R1) and downstream (R2, and R5) of the reclamation plant and the BWP power plan discharges.

Temporal Representation: Twenty-seven samples were taken from 5/7/02 through 5/25/04 at quarterly intervals from three sampling stations (R1, R2, and R5).

Environmental Conditions: Data was collected from 3/02 through 5/04 at three sampling stations. Sampling station R1 is located at the confluence of Burbank Western Channel and Lockheed Channel about 50 feet above the Burbank Reclamation Plant. Sampling station R2 is located at Burbank Western Wash at Verdugo Avenue. Sampling station R5 is located at Burbank Western Wash just upstream from the confluence with the Los Angeles River.

Data Quality Assessment: Standard Operating Procedures for Receiving Water Monitoring, Burbank Western Channel (United Water Burbank Water Reclamation Plant).

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Los Angeles River Nitrogen TMDL was approved by RWQCB on August 19, 2003 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March 18, 2004.

Region 4

Water Segment: Burbank Western Channel

Pollutant: Taste and odor

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

The original line of evidence supporting the listing does not identify a pollutant but rather, a condition caused by a pollutant(s) (algal growth, foam, and odors). A TMDL was approved by RWQCB on August 19, 2003 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March 18, 2004 and this TMDL is expected to address this water body condition.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing these listing from the 303 (d) Water Quality Limited Segment list because the segment pollutant combinations is not a pollutant.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the pollutant is an ambient condition caused by pollutant(s). A TMDL is in place and is expected to address this water body condition.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: MU - Municipal & Domestic

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* WQO is linked and applicable to MUN BUs

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: Numeric data generated from six samples out of which one sample exceeded the WQO for protection MUN (SWRCB, 2003).

<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sampling site.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Six monthly samples, Five taken during the wet season (11/08/2002-03/15/2003) and one sample taken during the dry season (04/30/2003).
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Data age 1-2 years. Data taken during the wet and dry seasons. Documented exceedance recorded in 2/25/2003 (wet season).
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	MU - Municipal & Domestic
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	The Basin Plan Water Quality Objective for Nitrite-Nitrogen of 1 mg/l is linked and applicable for the protection of drinking water supplies.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 27 samples taken from 3/6/02 to 5/25/04 at two to three monthly intervals. Three samples exceeded the Basin Plan Nitrite-N WQO (City of Burbank, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Three sample sites at receiving water stations consistent with the Burbank Water Reclamation Plant NPDES permit which included receiving water stations both upstream (R1) and downstream (R2, and R5) of the reclamation plant and the BWP power plan discharges.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Twenty-seven samples were taken from 5/7/02 through 5/25/04 at quarterly intervals from three sampling stations (R1, R2, and R5).
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Data was collected from 3/02 through 5/04 at three sampling stations. Sampling station R1 is located at the confluence of Burbank Western Channel and Lockheed Channel about 50 feet above the Burbank Reclamation Plant. Sampling station R2 is located at Burbank Western Wash at Verdugo Avenue. Sampling station R5 is located at Burbank Western Wash just upstream from the confluence with the Los Angeles River.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Standard Operating Procedures for Receiving Water Monitoring, Burbank Western Channel (United Water Burbank Water Reclamation Plant).

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	One hour average Basin Plan Water Quality Objectives for ammonia-N was revised in 2002. For freshwaters not designated COLD and/or MIGR the ammonia WQO is dependent on pH and fish species, but not temperature. The 30-day average WQO for waters not designated for spawning are dependent on pH and temperature. These WQOs have been adopted into the basin plan and are linked and applicable to protection of aquatic live beneficial uses.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 27 samples taken from 5/7/02 to 5/25/04 at two to three monthly intervals. No sample exceeded the basin plan ammonia WQO. Data was compared against 2002 adopted ammonia WQO of which the 1-hour average objective is dependent on pH and fish species and the 30-day average is dependent on pH and temperature. It was not possible to determine any exceedances of the 1-hour average WQO or the 30-day average because pH and temperature data was not provided (City of Burbank, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Three sample sites sampled from May 2002 through May 2004 at two to three monthly intervals.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Twenty seven samples were taken at three sampling stations.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Data was collected from May 2002 through May 2004 at 3 sampling stations. Sampling R1 is located at the confluence of Burbank Western Channel and Lockheed Channel about 50 feet above the Burbank Reclamation Plant. Station R2 is located at Burbank Western Wash at Verdugo Avenue. Station R5 is located at Burbank Western Wash just upstream from the confluence with the L.A. River.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Standard Operating Procedures for Receiving Water Monitoring, Burbank Western Channel (United Water Burbank Water Reclamation Plant).

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	MU - Municipal & Domestic
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	The Basin Plan Water Quality Objective for Nitrate-Nitrogen of 10 mg/l is linked and applicable for the protection of drinking water supplies.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 27 samples taken from 3/6/02 to 5/25/04 at quarterly intervals. No sample exceeded the Basin Plan Objective for Nitrate-Nitrogen (City of Burbank, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Three sample sites at receiving water stations consistent with the Burbank Water Reclamation Plant NPDES permit which included receiving water stations both upstream (R1) and downstream (R2, and R5) of the reclamation plant and the

BWP power plan discharges.

Temporal Representation: Twenty-seven samples were taken from 3/6/02 through 5/25/04 at quarterly intervals from three sampling stations (R1, R2, and R5).

Environmental Conditions: Data was collected from 3/02 through 5/25 at three sampling stations. Sampling station R1 is located at the confluence of Burbank Western Channel and Lockheed Channel about 50 feet above the Burbank Reclamation Plant. Sampling station R2 is located at Burbank Western Wash at Verdugo Avenue. Sampling station R5 is located at Burbank Western Wash just upstream from the confluence with the Los Angeles River.

Data Quality Assessment: Standard Operating Procedures for Receiving Water Monitoring, Burbank Western Channel (United Water Burbank Water Reclamation Plant).

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Los Angeles River Nitrogen TMDL was approved by RWQCB on August 19, 2003 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March 18, 2004.

Region 4

Water Segment: Calleguas Creek Reach 4 (was Revolon Slough Main Branch: Mugu Lagoon to Central Avenue on 1998 303d list)

Pollutant: Excess Algal Growth

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

The original line of evidence supporting the listing does not identify a pollutant but rather, a condition caused by a pollutant(s) (excess algal growth). A TMDL was approved by RWQCB on October, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA on June, 2003 and this TMDL is expected to address this water body condition.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing these listing from the 303(d) Water Quality Limited Segment list because the segment pollutant combinations is not a pollutant.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the pollutant is an ambient condition caused by pollutant(s). A TMDL is in place and is expected to address this water body condition.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL for this water segment-pollutant combination was approved by the RWQCB in October 2002. The TMDL has an approved implementation plan. USEPA approved the TMDL on June 20, 2003. This TMDL will address this water body condition.

Region 4

Water Segment: Calleguas Creek Reach 5 (was Beardsley Channel on 1998 303d list)

Pollutant: Excess Algal Growth

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

The original line of evidence supporting the listing does not identify a pollutant but rather, a condition caused by a pollutant(s) (excess algal growth). A TMDL was approved by RWQCB on October, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA on June, 2003 and this TMDL is expected to address this water body condition.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing these listing from the 303 (d) Water Quality Limited Segment list because the segment pollutant combinations is not a pollutant.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the pollutant is an ambient condition caused by pollutant(s). A TMDL is in place and is expected to address this water body condition.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL for this water segment-pollutant combination was approved by the RWQCB in October 2002. The TMDL has an approved implementation plan. USEPA approved the TMDL on June 20, 2003. This TMDL will address this water body condition.

Region 4

Water Segment: Calleguas Creek Reach 9B (was part of Conejo Creek Reaches 1 and 2 on 1998 303d list)

Pollutant: Excess Algal Growth

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

The original line of evidence supporting the listing does not identify a pollutant but rather, a condition caused by a pollutant(s) (algal growth). A TMDL was approved by RWQCB on October, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA on June, 2003 and this TMDL is expected to address this water body condition.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing these listing from the 303 (d) Water Quality Limited Segment list because the segment pollutant combinations is not a pollutant.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the pollutant is an ambient condition caused by pollutant(s). A TMDL is in place and is expected to address this water body condition.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL for this water segment-pollutant combination was approved by the RWQCB in October 2002. The TMDL has an approved implementation plan. USEPA approved the TMDL on June 20, 2003. This TMDL will address this water body condition.

Region 4

Water Segment: Calleguas Creek Reach 10 (Conejo Creek (Hill Canyon)-was part of Conejo Crk Reaches 2 & 3, and lower Conejo Crk/Arroyo Conejo N Fk on 1998 303d list)

Pollutant: Excess Algal Growth

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

The original line of evidence supporting the listing does not identify a pollutant but rather, a condition caused by a pollutant(s) (algal growth). A TMDL was approved by RWQCB on October, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA on June, 2003 and this TMDL is expected to address this water body condition.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing these listing from the 303(d) Water Quality Limited Segment list because the segment pollutant combinations is not a pollutant.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the pollutant is an ambient condition caused by pollutant(s). A TMDL is in place and is expected to address this water body condition.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL for this water segment-pollutant combination was approved by the RWQCB in October 2002. The TMDL has an approved implementation plan. USEPA approved the TMDL on June 20, 2003. This TMDL will address this water body condition.

Region 4

Water Segment: Calleguas Creek Reach 11 (Arroyo Santa Rosa, was part of Conejo Creek Reach 3 on 1998 303d list)

Pollutant: Excess Algal Growth

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

The original line of evidence supporting the listing does not identify a pollutant but rather, a condition caused by a pollutant(s) (algal growth). A TMDL was approved by RWQCB on October, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA on June, 2003 and this TMDL is expected to address this water body condition.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing these listing from the 303(d) Water Quality Limited Segment list because the segment pollutant combinations is not a pollutant.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the pollutant is an ambient condition caused by pollutant(s). A TMDL is in place and is expected to address this water body condition.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL for this water segment-pollutant combination was approved by the RWQCB in October 2002. The TMDL has an approved implementation plan. USEPA approved the TMDL on June 20, 2003. This TMDL will address this water body condition.

Region 4

Water Segment: Calleguas Creek Reach 13 (Conejo Creek South Fork, was Conejo Cr Reach 4 and part of Reach 3 on 1998 303d list)

Pollutant: Excess Algal Growth

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

The original line of evidence supporting the listing does not identify a pollutant but rather, a condition caused by a pollutant(s) (algal growth). A TMDL was approved by RWQCB on October, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA on June, 2003 and this TMDL is expected to address this water body condition.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing these listing from the 303(d) Water Quality Limited Segment list because the segment pollutant combinations is not a pollutant.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the pollutant is an ambient condition caused by pollutant(s). A TMDL is in place and is expected to address this water body condition.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use CO - Cold Freshwater Habitat, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL for this water segment-pollutant combination was approved by the RWQCB in October 2002. The TMDL has an approved implementation plan. USEPA approved the TMDL on June 20, 2003. This TMDL will address this water body condition.

Region 4

Water Segment: Carbon Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Coyote Creek

Pollutant: Abnormal Fish Histology (Lesions)

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This water quality condition is being considered for delisting under sections 4.8 of the Listing Policy. A single line of evidence (3.8) documenting adverse biological response measured in resident individuals in water can be listed when these impacts are associated with specific pollutant concentrations.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this condition, none of which associate these impacts with a pollutant. Based on numeric and descriptive data, it appears that fish below the Coyote Creek Waste Reclamation Plant outfall below Willow Street show evidence of tissue alteration, which is higher in prevalence and more severe than at other sites. Although evidence is accumulating indicating that metals and some organics interfere with the immune system of the resident organisms, the association has not yet been established. Therefore, at this time it is not possible to directly attribute this infectious process to toxicity or pollutant concentrations.

The weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category. Although, adverse biological responses have been documented these impacts have not been associated with toxicity or pollutant concentrations.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Four of 5 observations were judged to indicate that beneficial uses are not supported but there is nothing in the administrative record associating these impacts to toxicity or pollutant concentrations.
4. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the biological impacts documented were not associated with toxicity or pollutant concentrations.

Lines of Evidence:

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Adverse Biological Responses
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	-N/A
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that are toxic to, or that produce detrimental physiological response in, human, plant, animal, or aquatic life. Compliance with this objective will be determined by use of indicator organisms, analyses of species diversity, population density, growth anomalies, bioassays of appropriate duration or other appropriate methods as specified by the State or Regional Board.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	<p>With a thorough prior knowledge of normal fish anatomy, the investigators used histological analysis to detect alterations in tissues and organs caused by exposure to toxicants. When the concentration of a toxicant is sufficient to result only in cellular injury, but not in death of the cells, sublethal (adaptive) changes may be observed in affected cells.</p> <p>A combination of the necropsy-based approach and the histological condition index was used in this study. Alterations from the expected normal gross anatomy and microscopic anatomy of resident fishes, fathead minnow (<i>Pimephales promelas</i>), goldfish (<i>Cyprinus carpio</i>), white croaker (<i>Genyonemus lineatus</i>) mosquito fish (<i>Gambusia affinis</i>), and tilapia (<i>Tilapia sp.</i>) were included in the investigation. Lesions were compared to reference populations.</p>
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	<p>Coyote Creek Above Outfall at Willow Street (LACSD, 2004b):</p> <p>Fish collected at this site included 19 Tilapia (<i>Tilapia sp.</i>) and 3 <i>Gambusia affinis</i>. Optical nerve damage was observed in these fish. A 5% frequency of gill parasitism was observed.</p> <p>Inflammation of the gill and adjacent bronchial cavity wall was seen at 27% incidence. Within livers, 3 of the 22 individuals showed inflammation and necrosis (a 14% frequency).</p> <p>Coyote Creek Below the Outfall (LACSP, 2004b):</p> <p>Fifteen Tilapia fish were collected from this site. When the head region of one of these fish was sectioned in a parasagittal plane, various organs could be identified and analyzed. Inflammation of the eye was observed in one fish. However, the same type of inflammation much more frequently observed in nerve tissue (73% frequency). In the gill, no parasites were observed. However, necrosis of certain types of cells was seen with a 33% frequency. The livers of these fish were free of alterations. In addition, there were no adhesions, granuloma, or other inflammation. Degeneration of kidney cells was seen at high frequency (60%).</p>
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Fish were collected from four sites in the lower San Gabriel River watershed. The sites included Coyote Creek above and below the Long Beach wastewater

treatment plant outfall, the San Gabriel River at the confluence of Coyote Creek, and from the tidal prism at College Park Drive.

Temporal Representation: Samples were collected between 1992 and 1993.

Data Quality Assessment: Quality Assurance and methods well described in the report: "Toxicity study of the Santa Clara, San Gabriel River, and Calleguas Creek" (Bailey et al., 1996, in LACSD, 2004b).

Line of Evidence Narrative Description Data

Beneficial Use WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: In the fish from the downstream site of Coyote Creek below the outfall, a higher percentage showed inflammation of the trigeminal nerve. Also, necrosis of mitochondria-rich (chloride) cells and pavement epithelium of secondary lamellae were seen. Gills of fish from contaminated sites have been shown to contain various lesions and necrosis in the above cell types is a common finding. Also, kidney tubular epithelial cell degeneration was present at higher prevalence than at the upstream site. Taken together, it would appear that fish below the outfall show evidence of tissue alteration, which is higher in prevalence and more severe than at other sites. Clearly, these fish are not normal and would likely be susceptible to additional stress from deteriorating water quality.

Inflammatory foci of both eye and the fifth cranial or the trigeminal nerve were prominent findings in fish collected from Coyote Creek above the outfall at Willow Street. It would be impossible to directly attribute this infectious process to toxicity. However, evidence is accumulating which indicates that metals and some organics such as polychlorinated biphenyls interfere with the immune system of the host. With a compromise in the immune system, parasites and bacteria may establish infestation. It is possible that the infectious lesions of eye and trigeminal nerve reflect prior immunoincompetence. An additional finding was inflammation of the liver in penhepatic venous sites. This condition could have followed prior hepatocyte necrosis.

Even if the inflammation was not associated with contaminants, the fact that a sizeable fraction (25%) of the fish examined showed disease, indicates that the fish are compromised and would likely be endangered further by deterioration of water quality.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: This evaluation of data came from the report: "Toxicity study of the Santa Clara, San Gabriel River, and Calleguas Creek" (Bailey et al., 1996 in LACSD, 2004b).

Region 4

Water Segment: Coyote Creek

Pollutant: Excess Algal Growth

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This condition is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4.7 of the Listing Policy. Ammonia is already listed in the 303(d) list and Nitrite- Nitrogen is also currently being recommended for placement on the 2004-303(d) list as well. These pollutants are usually associated with causing or contributing to excessive algae growth conditions. In addition, a subjective ranking system was used to document the presence of algae within the water body between 1992 and 1995. This information was probably used to place the water body on the 303(d) list originally.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list. Although, nuisance pollution has been documented in the past, these impacts can be associated with nutrient pollutants already proposed for listing on the Section 303(d) list.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. It is unknown whether the data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Some observations of algae presence, using a subjective ranking system, were judged to be not supporting beneficial uses. Although, excessive algae condition was documented this condition can be most effectively addressed by focusing on reducing or eliminating the nutrient pollutants proposed for listing or already on the 303(d) list.
4. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because this condition can be most effectively addressed by focusing on reducing or eliminating the nutrient pollutants proposed for listing or already on the 303(d) list.

Lines of Evidence:

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	In order to protect aquatic life, ammonia concentrations in inland surface waters characteristic of freshwater shall not exceed the values calculated for the appropriate instream conditions [both pH and temperature] shown in Tables 3-1 to 3-3 [in the Basin Plan] (per U.S. EPA's most recent criteria guidance document, '1999 Update of Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Ammonia').
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Based on 30-day average concentrations of ammonia, 10 samples out of 18 total samples exceed the ammonia objective. Ambient measurements of pH and temperature (30-day averages) were used to calculate the water quality objective (LACSD, 2004a).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Three stations.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected from June 2003 through November 2004. New management practices were begun at the beginning of this period and may have resulted in a change in water quality. Water quality measurements collected before the implementation of management measures were not considered representative of current conditions.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	NPDES quality assurance.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	MU - Municipal & Domestic
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	The Basin Plan Water Quality Objective for Nitrite-Nitrogen of 1 mg/L.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 21 samples taken from 10/30/00 to 4/30/03 at one to two-week sampling interval. Two samples exceeded the Basin Plan WQO for Nitrite-Nitrogen (LACPWD, 2004c).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sample site sampled during the dry and wet season beginning from 10/12/00 through 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Twenty-one samples were taken during the wet and dry season from 10/12/00 to 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals as part of the Los Angeles

County Storm water monitoring program prepared by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Environmental Conditions: The Coyote Creek Monitoring Station (S13) is located at the existing ACOE stream gage station (Stream Gage No. F354-R) below Spring Street in the lower San Gabriel River watershed. The site assists in determining mass loading for the San Gabriel River watershed. At this location, the upstream tributary area is 150 square miles (extending into Orange County). The sampling site was chosen to avoid backwater effects from the San Gabriel River. Coyote Creek, at the gauging station, is a concrete lined trapezoidal channel. The Coyote Creek sampling location has been an active stream gauging station since 1963.

Data Quality Assessment: Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Line of Evidence Pollutant-Nuisance

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Non-Numeric Objective: Basin Plan: Waters shall not contain biostimulatory substances in concentrations that promote aquatic growth to the extent that such growth causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.

Evaluation Guideline: The presence of algae in the water segment. The rankings were subjective and assigned to water bodies by one person for consistency (LACSD, 2004a).

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: Five observations with 4 of the observations judged to be not supporting beneficial uses.

Spatial Representation: One sampling location.

Temporal Representation: Observations made between 1992 and 1995. Samples taken in different seasons and no greater than two time within one year.

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: An alternative enforceable program is in place that will address ammonia water quality standards exceedances for this Reach. In June 1995, the seven water reclamation plants discharging in the San Gabriel River and Santa Clara River watersheds received NPDES permits containing requirements regarding compliance with the Basin Plan water quality objectives for ammonia. In accordance with these permits, the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts have been pursuing the addition of nitrification and denitrification facilities at each of these plants to comply with the ammonia objectives. By June 2003, it is

expected that these new facilities will be operational and ammonia will be drastically reduced.

Research facility operation shows that the monthly average ammonia concentration will fully comply with the chronic ammonia objective that are expected to be applicable in June 2003.

It is probable that the majority of ammonia discharged to this water body was contributed by POTWs. Information in the record indicates that the majority (over 95%) of the ammonia in the Los Angeles River was contributed by POTWs. It is probable that the contribution in the San Gabriel River watershed is dominated by contributions from POTWs as well. Generally, concentrations of ammonia upstream of the treatment plants is much lower than downstream concentrations (up to an order of magnitude difference).

Region 4

Water Segment: Coyote Creek

Pollutant: Selenium

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 4.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status. Two applicable lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Five samples exceed the total selenium CTR criterion for continuous concentration.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Five of 102 samples exceeded the total selenium CTR criterion for continuous concentration and this does not exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 4.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards for the pollutant are not exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* CTR Selenium Criterion for Continuous Concentration in water for the protection of aquatic life is 5 ug/l, expressed in the total recoverable form. The criterion is linked and applicable for the protection of aquatic life Beneficial

Uses.

<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 64 samples taken from 11/10/97 to 1/13/04 at one to two-week sampling interval. Four samples exceeded the total selenium continuous criterion concentration, which equals the highest concentration of a pollutant to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time without deleterious effects (LACDPW, 2004c).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Samples collected at one sampling site from during primarily the wet season beginning from 11/10/97 through 1/13/04 at approximately one to two week intervals.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Sixty-four samples taken during primarily the wet season from 11/10/97 to 1/13/04 at approximately one to two week intervals.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Results are from samples taken from 1997 to 2004 by the LADPW. Sampling was carried out at Spring Street station (S13) on Coyote Creek during primarily wet season conditions.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	CTR Selenium Criterion for Continuous Concentration in water for the protection of aquatic life is 5 ug/l, expressed in the total recoverable form. The criterion is linked and applicable for the protection of aquatic life Beneficial Uses.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from a total of 38 samples taken at three different Los Angeles County Sanitation District sampling stations (sampling stations RA1, RA, R9E) between 8/3/95 and 5/11/04 at different sampling intervals. One sample in station RA1 taken 7/14/03 exceeded the total selenium continuous criterion concentration, which equals the highest concentration of a pollutant to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (4days) without deleterious effects (LACSD, 2004b).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Three (3) sample sites sampled between 8/3/95 and 5/11/04 at different sampling intervals.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Thirty-eight samples were taken at three sampling stations primarily during the dry season between 8/3/95 to 5/11/04.

Environmental Conditions: Results are from samples taken from 1995 to 2004 by the LA County Sanitation Districts. Data primarily reflects dry weather conditions.

Data Quality Assessment: Quality Assurance Document Of The County Sanitation Districts Of Los Angeles County. July 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Coyote Creek

Pollutant: Zinc

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 4.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Five samples exceed dissolved Zinc CTR criterion for continuous concentration.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

- 1.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
- 2.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
- 3.Five of 64 samples exceeded the dissolved Zinc CTR criterion for continuous concentration and this does not exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 4.1 of the Listing Policy.
- 4.Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards for the pollutant are not exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* CTR Dissolved Zinc Criterion for continuous concentration (CCC) in water for the protection of aquatic life is expressed as a function of the total hardness of the water body. The aquatic life criteria will vary depending of total hardness reported at the sampling site. The CCC for dissolved zinc is the highest

concentration to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (four days) without deleterious effects. This criterion is linked and applicable for the protection of aquatic life Beneficial Uses.

<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 64 samples taken from 10/14/97 to 1/13/04 at one to two-week sampling interval. Five samples exceeded the dissolved zinc continuous criterion concentration, which equals the highest concentration of a pollutant to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (4 days) without deleterious effects (LACDPW, 2004b); (LACSD, 2004b).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sampling station sampled from 10/14/97 to 1/13/04. Los Angeles Department of Public Works mass emission station at Spring Street on Coyote Creek.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Sixty-three samples taken primarily during the wet season from 10/14/97 to 1/13/04 at approximately one to two week intervals.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Results are from samples taken from 1997 to 2004. Sampling was carried out at Spring Street on Coyote Creek during the wet season.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	MU - Municipal & Domestic, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	There is no fresh water WQO or criteria for Total Zinc applicable with protection of Warm Fresh Water Habitat or MUN BUs.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 21 samples taken from 10/12/00 to 4/30/03 at one to two-week sampling interval. Total Zinc was detected in 14 samples. Data reported could not be compared against any applicable criteria or WQO established for total Zinc for the protection of any beneficial use in fresh water (LACDPW, 2004b).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sample site sampled during the dry and wet season beginning from 10/12/00 through 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Twenty-one (21) samples were taken during the wet and dry season from 10/12/00 to 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals as part of the Los Angeles County Storm water monitoring program prepared by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The Coyote Creek Monitoring Station (S13) is located at the existing ACOE stream gage station (Stream Gage No. F354-R) below Spring Street in the lower

San Gabriel River watershed. The site assists in determining mass loading for the San Gabriel River watershed. At this location, the upstream tributary area is 150 square miles (extending into Orange County). The sampling site was chosen to avoid backwater effects from the San Gabriel River. Coyote Creek, at the gauging station, is a concrete lined trapezoidal channel. The Coyote Creek sampling location has been an active stream gauging station since 1963.

Data Quality Assessment:

Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Region 4

Water Segment: Dockweiler Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

The original line of evidence supporting the listing does not identify a pollutant but rather, a condition caused by a pollutant(s) (algal growth). A dry weather TMDL was approved by the RWQCB on 1/24/02, and a wet weather TMDL was approved on 12/12/04, and subsequently approved by USEPA on 6/19/03. These TMDLs are expected to address this water body condition.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing these listing from the 303(d) Water Quality Limited Segment list because the segment pollutant combinations is not a pollutant. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the pollutant is an ambient condition caused by pollutant(s). A TMDL is in place and is expected to address this water body condition.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Dominguez Channel (lined portion above Vermont Ave)

Pollutant: Aldrin

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. The Policy calls for the delisting of waters if the decision is found to be faulty and it is demonstrated that the listing would not have occurred in the absence of such faulty data. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

The original listing was based on Maximum Residue Level (MTRL) . The Listing Policy does not allow the use of MTRL in listing or delisting decisions. Only one sample was taken at one station.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is insufficient justification for maintaining the listing for this water segment-pollutant combination.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings an inappropriate guideline was originally used to assess the available data, and there were insufficient data upon which to base an assessment of the status of this water body for this pollutant. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the listing was based on faulty data and it is unknown whether applicable water quality standards or guidelines for the pollutant are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Matrix: Tissue

Water Quality Objective/ Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	human health.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	A NS guideline of 100 ug/kg is available for this pollutant (NAS, 1972). Previous assessment for this pollutant and water body relied upon the use of an Maximum Tissue Residue Level (MTRL). The Listing Policy does not allow the use of MTRLs.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	There was one measurement (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	One sample event in 1992.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Toxic Substances Monitoring Program.

Region 4

Water Segment: Dominguez Channel (lined portion above Vermont Ave)

Pollutant: ChemA

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. The Policy calls for the delisting of waters if the decision is found to be faulty and it is demonstrated that the listing would not have occurred in the absence of such faulty data. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

There is no tissue guideline for this pollutant that meets the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Listing Policy. The original listing was based on an Elevated Data Level (EDL). The Listing Policy does not allow the use of EDLs in listing or delisting decisions. Only one sample was taken and the data was collected downstream from this segment and is not representative.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is insufficient justification for maintaining the listing for this water segment-pollutant combination.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that no data is available to assess the status of this water body for this pollutant. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the listing was based on faulty data and it is unknown whether applicable water quality standards or guidelines for the pollutant are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Matrix: Tissue

Water Quality Objective/ Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or human health.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	There is no tissue guideline for this pollutant that meets the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Listing Policy. The original listing was based on an Elevated Data Level (EDL). The Listing Policy does not allow the use of EDLs in listing or delisting decisions.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	The data that was used for the original listing was collected downstream of this water segment (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station. The data were not collected in this water segment.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	One sample event in 1992.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Toxic Substances Monitoring Program.

Region 4

Water Segment: Dominguez Channel (lined portion above Vermont Ave)

Pollutant: Chlordane

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. The Policy calls for the delisting of waters if the decision is found to be faulty and it is demonstrated that the listing would not have occurred in the absence of such faulty data. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

The original listing was based on exceedances of a maximum tissue residue level (MTRL) and Elevated Data Level (EDL). Pursuant to section 6.1.3 of the Listing Policy, these two guidelines cannot be used to evaluate fish and shellfish tissue data. An OEHHA tissue guideline for chlordane of 30 ug/kg is available (Brodberg and Pollock, 1999) but application to this water segment is questionable. The listing data used to list this pollutant cannot be found. Only one sample was taken and the sample was not collected in the water segment.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is insufficient justification for maintaining the listing for this water segment-pollutant combination.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that no data is available to assess the status of this water body for this pollutant. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the listing was based on faulty data and it is unknown whether applicable water quality standards or guidelines for the pollutant are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Matrix: Tissue

<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or human health.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	The original listing was based on exceedance of a maximum tissue residue level (MTRL) and Elevated Data Level (EDL). Pursuant to section 6.1.3 of the Listing Policy, these two guidelines cannot be used to evaluate fish and shellfish tissue data. An OEHHA tissue guideline for chlordane of 30 ug/kg is available (Brodberg and Pollock, 1999) but application to this water segment is questionable.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	One sample is available (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Data were not collected in the water segment. Data from one downstream location were applied to this water segment.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The sample was collected in 1992.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Toxic substance Monitoring Program.

Region 4

Water Segment: Dominguez Channel (lined portion above Vermont Ave)

Pollutant: DDT

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. The Policy calls for the delisting of waters if the decision is found to be faulty and it is demonstrated that the listing would not have occurred in the absence of such faulty data. Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. One line of evidence pertains to pollutant in sediment and the other pertains to pollutant in tissue.

There is no sediment quality guideline for DDT that meets the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Listing Policy. Furthermore, there was no sediment sample collected in this water segment. This particular segment is concrete lined. In addition, one downstream measurement was used to list this segment based on an Elevated Data Level (EDL) and Maximum Tissue Residue Level (MTRL). The Listing Policy does not allow the use of EDLs or MTRLs in listing or delisting decisions. Furthermore, only one sample was taken from a downstream segment and therefore the sample was not representative or sufficient in number to support the listing

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is insufficient justification for maintaining the listing for this water segment-pollutant combination.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that no data is available to assess the status of this water body for this pollutant. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the listing was based on faulty data and it is unknown whether applicable water quality standards or guidelines for the pollutant are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Sediment

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	There is no sediment quality guideline for this pollutant that meets the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Listing Policy.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	No sediment samples were ever collected in this water segment. The segment is concrete lined.
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	No data collected in this water segment.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	No data collected in this water segment.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Tissue
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)
<i>Matrix:</i>	Tissue
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or human health.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	An NAS guideline of 1,000 ug/kg is available (NAS, 1972). The original listing was based on an Elevated Data Level (EDL) and Maximum Tissue Residue Level (MTRL). The Listing Policy does not allow the use of EDLs or MTRLs in listing or delisting decisions.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	One measurement. Data used to place this segment on the section 303(d) list was collected in a downstream segment (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station. Data were collected in a downstream section of this water body.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The sample was collected in 1992.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Toxic Substances Monitoring Program.

Region 4

Water Segment: Dominguez Channel (lined portion above Vermont Ave)

Pollutant: Dieldrin

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. The Policy calls for the delisting of waters if the decision is found to be faulty and it is demonstrated that the listing would not have occurred in the absence of such faulty data. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

The original listing was based on Maximum Tissue Residue Level (MTRL). The Listing Policy does not allow the use of MTRL in listing or delisting decisions. Only one sample was taken in 1992 and this is no longer representative.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is insufficient justification for maintaining the listing for this water segment-pollutant combination.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that an inappropriate guideline was used to assess the status of this water body for this pollutant and there were an insufficient number of samples taken to make a listing assessment. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the listing was based on faulty data and it is unknown whether applicable water quality standards or guidelines for the pollutant are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA), RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

Matrix: Tissue

Water Quality Objective/ Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or human health.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	NAS Screening Value: 100 ug/kg (NAS, 1972). The original listing was based on the use of a Maximum Tissue Residue Level (MTRL). Section 6.1.3 of the Listing Policy does not allow the use of MTRLs to evaluate fish and shellfish tissue data.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	One tissue sample is available (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station. The data used is from a station that is located in a downstream section of the water body.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The sample was collected in 1992.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Toxic Substances Monitoring Program.

Region 4

Water Segment: Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave)

Pollutant: Aldrin

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. The Policy calls for the delisting of waters if the decision is found to be faulty and it is demonstrated that the listing would not have occurred in the absence of such faulty data. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

Although the original listing was based on Maximum Tissue Residue Level (MTRL), which is not allowed in the Listing Policy to make listing or delisting decisions, it is unknown what data was used to support this specific listing. The nearest State Mussel Watch (SMW) station is downstream of the water body segment. Aldrin has never been detected at this SMW station. There is no data available to compare with applicable guideline.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is insufficient justification for maintaining the listing for this water segment-pollutant combination.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that there is no data to compare with available NAS guideline to assess the status of this water body for this pollutant. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the listing was based on unknown data and it is unknown whether applicable water quality guidelines for the pollutant are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Matrix: -N/A

<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or human health.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	An aldrin guideline of 100 ug/kg is available (NAS, 1972). The original listing was based on comparison to MTRL.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	It is unknown what data were used to support the original listing. The nearest State Mussel Watch Station is downstream of the water body and this pollutant has never been detected at that site.
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	No data are available to compare to guideline.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	No data are available to compare to guideline.

Region 4

Water Segment: Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave)

Pollutant: ChemA

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. The Policy calls for the delisting of waters if the decision is found to be faulty and it is demonstrated that the listing would not have occurred in the absence of such faulty data. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

There is no tissue guideline for this pollutant that meets the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Listing Policy. The original listing was based on an Elevated Data Level (EDL). The Listing Policy does not allow the use of EDLs in listing or delisting decisions. Only one sample was taken in 1992.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is insufficient justification for maintaining the listing for this water segment-pollutant combination.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that a non applicable guidelines was used to assess the status of this water body for this pollutant. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the listing was based on faulty data and it is unknown whether applicable water quality standards or guidelines for the pollutant are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: ES - Estuarine Habitat

Matrix: Tissue

Water Quality Objective/ Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	human health.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	There is no tissue guideline for this pollutant that meets the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Listing Policy. The original listing was based on an Elevated Data Level (EDL). The Listing Policy does not allow the use of EDLs in listing or delisting decisions.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	One tissue sample (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The sample was collected in 1992.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Toxic Substances Monitoring Program.

Region 4

Water Segment: Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave)

Pollutant: Chlordane

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. The Policy calls for the delisting of waters if the decision is found to be faulty and it is demonstrated that the listing would not have occurred in the absence of such faulty data. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

The original listing was based on Maximum Tissue Residue Level (MTRL). The Listing Policy does not allow the use of MTRL and EDLs in listing or delisting decisions. Only one sample was taken in 1992 and this is no longer representative.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is insufficient justification for maintaining the listing for this water segment-pollutant combination.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that an inappropriate guideline was used to assess the status of this water body for this pollutant and there were an insufficient number of samples taken to make a listing assessment. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the listing was based on faulty data and it is unknown whether applicable water quality standards or guidelines for the pollutant are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Matrix: Tissue

Water Quality Objective/ Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	human health.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	An OEHHA tissue guideline of 30 ug/kg is available (Brodberg and Pollock, 1999). The original listing was based on comparisons to a MTRL and an EDL. The Listing Policy does not allow the use of EDLs or MTRLs in listing or delisting decisions.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	One tissue sample (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sample.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The sample was collected in 1992.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Toxic Substances Monitoring Program.

Region 4

Water Segment:	Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave)
Pollutant:	Chromium (total)
Decision:	Delist
Weight of Evidence:	<p>This pollutant is being considered for delisting under sections 4.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 4.6 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.</p> <p>One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 4.6, there is no known significant toxicity data associated with this pollutant and the number of pollutant exceedances does not exceed the frequency allowed by the Listing Policy.</p> <p>Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1.The sediment quality guideline used complies, with the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Policy.2.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.3.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.4.Four of 93 samples exceeded the Effects Range Medium sediment guideline, There is no known toxicity data associated with the pollutant exceedances, and the exceedances recorded do not exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 4.1 of the Listing Policy.5.Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation:	After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards for the pollutant are not exceeded.
Lines of Evidence:	

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Sediment
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	An Effects Range-Median of 370 ug/g was used (Long et al., 1995).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Four of 93 samples exceed the ERM (LARWQCB and CCC, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Ninety-three samples spread throughout the water body.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected between 1994 and 2002.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Contaminated Sediments Task Force Database.

Region 4

Water Segment: Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave)

Pollutant: DDT

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. The Policy calls for the delisting of waters if the decision is found to be faulty and it is demonstrated that the listing would not have occurred in the absence of such faulty data. Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. One line of evidence pertains to pollutant in sediment and the other pertains to pollutant in tissue.

There is no sediment quality guideline for DDT that meets the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Listing Policy. In addition, one downstream measurement was used to list this segment based on an Elevated Data Level (EDL) and Maximum Tissue Residue Level (MTRL). The Listing Policy does not allow the use of EDLs or MTRLs in listing or delisting decisions. The tissue sample taken is not representative and the number of samples was insufficient to support the listing.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is insufficient justification for maintaining the listing for this water segment-pollutant combination.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that there is no guideline applicable to assess the sediment status of this water body and an inappropriate tissue guideline was used to assess the tissue concentration for this pollutant. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the listing was based on faulty data and it is unknown whether applicable water quality standards or guidelines for the pollutant are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA), ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat

<i>Matrix:</i>	Tissue
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or human health.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	OEHHA Screening Value: 100 ug/kg (Brodberg and Pollock, 1999). The original listing was based on an EDL and MTRL. The Listing Policy does not allow the use of EDLs or MTRLs in listing or delisting decisions.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	One measurement (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The sample was collected in 1992.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Toxic Substances Monitoring Program.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Sediment
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA), ES - Estuarine Habitat, MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	There is no tissue guideline for this pollutant that meets the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Listing Policy.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Forty-three samples are available (LARWQCB and CCC, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Forty-three samples are spread throughout the water body.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected between 1994 and 2002.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program. Contaminated Sediments Task Force Database.

Region 4

Water Segment: Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave)

Pollutant: Dieldrin

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. The Policy calls for the delisting of waters if the decision is found to be faulty and it is demonstrated that the listing would not have occurred in the absence of such faulty data. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

The original listing was based on Maximum Tissue Residue Level (MTRL). The Listing Policy does not allow the use of MTRL in listing or delisting decisions. Only one sample was taken downstream from the water segment in 1992 and this is not representative.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is insufficient justification for maintaining the listing for this water segment-pollutant combination.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that an inappropriate guideline was used to assess the status of this water body for this pollutant. The sample was not taken at the appropriate segment and there were an insufficient number of samples taken to make a listing assessment. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the listing was based on faulty data and it is unknown whether applicable water quality standards or guidelines for the pollutant are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA), ES - Estuarine Habitat

Matrix: Tissue

Water Quality Objective/ Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or human health.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	An OEHHA guideline of 2.0 ug/g is available (Brodberg and Pollock, 1999). The original listing was based on an MTRL. The Listing Policy does not allow the use of MTRLs in listing or delisting decisions.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	No data are available for this water segment. The data previously used was from a station downstream of the water segment (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	No data collected in the water segment.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The sample was collected in 1992.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Toxic Substances Monitoring Program.

Region 4

Water Segment: Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave)

Pollutant: Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs) (Aquatic Ecosystems)

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 3.9 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.9 two lines of evidence are necessary to assess listing status.

Five lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. In four new individual lines of evidence, independently recommended for placement on the 303(d) list under section 3.9 of the Listing Policy, a sufficient number of samples exceeded the sediment quality guideline for the following PAHs: Pyrene, Phenanthrene, Chrysene, and Benzo (a) pyrene. Although sediment toxicity has been observed, significant benthic degradation has been recorded and this may be linked with these specific PAH pollutant concentrations in this water body segment.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing the PAH sediment-pollutant combination and replacing this general PAH listing with the individually listings of Pyrene, Phenanthrene, Chrysene, and Benzo (a) pyrene on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. In the new available data a sufficient number of samples exceeded the specific PAH sediment quality guideline for each PAH. The benthic community impacts may be better linked with the effects of these individual pollutants in the sediment of this water body segment.
2. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met due to other PAHs.

**SWRCB Staff
Recommendation:**

After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list for PAH in sediment and replace this general PAH listing with the individually listings of Pyrene, Phenanthrene, Chrysene, and Benzo (a) pyrene on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category. New individual lines of evidence, independently recommended for placement on the 303(d) list under section 3.9 of the Listing Policy, exhibit a sufficient number of samples exceeded the sediment quality guideline for the following PAHs: Pyrene, Phenanthrene, Chrysene, and Benzo (a) pyrene. The significant benthic degradation recorded may be better linked with these specific PAH pollutant concentrations in this water body segment.

Lines of Evidence:

<i>Line of Evidence</i>	Adverse Biological Responses
<i>Beneficial Use</i>	ES - Estuarine Habitat
<i>Non-Numeric Objective:</i>	Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	This water body pollutant combination is listed on the 2002 section 303(d) list for PAH in sediment. New data sets are now available recommending the listing of the following specific PAHs, Pyrene, Phenanthrene, Chrysene, and Benzo(a)pyrene. The present 303(d) listing for PAH in sediment should therefore be replaced with the specific listings of these PAHs.

Region 4

Water Segment: Escondido Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Flat Rock Point Beach Area

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Hermosa Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Inspiration Point Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: La Costa Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Las Tunas Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles Harbor - Consolidated Slip

Pollutant: Dieldrin

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant was placed on the 2002-303(d) list because originally a faulty guideline was used. Section 6.1.3 of the Listing Policy does not allow the use of MTRs to evaluate fish and shellfish tissue data. Upon further reevaluation of the single line of evidence used to originally place the water body - pollutant combination on the 303(d) list by applying the correct OEHHA screening value, none of the samples were in exceedances.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Zero of three samples exceeded the 2.0 ug/kg OEHHA screening value and this does not exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 4.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards for the pollutant are not exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Sediment

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Matrix: Sediment

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use (LARWQCB, 1995).

<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	An Effects Range-Median of 8 ng/g was used (Long et al., 1995).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Of 38 sediment samples (cores or grabs), 10 exceeded the sediment guideline (LARWQCB and CCC, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Thirty-eight samples spread throughout the estuary.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples collected between 1992 and 1997.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Contaminated Sediments Task Force Database (Stephenson et al. 1994) Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Tissue
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)
<i>Matrix:</i>	Tissue
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or human health (LARWQCB, 1995).
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	OEHHA Screening Value: 2.0 ug/kg (Brodberg and Pollock, 1999).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	The guideline is not exceeded in any of the 12 measurements. The original listing was based on exceeding background levels rather than valid assessment guidelines (SMWP, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples collected annually from 1992 through 2003.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	State Mussel Watch Program.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles Harbor - Consolidated Slip

Pollutant: Nickel

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This water body-pollutant combination was originally placed on the 2002-303(d) list in error. BPTCP data was used as the basis for determining whether the water body combination would be placed on the 303(d) list. However, nickel is not identified in the Consolidated Toxic Hot Spots Cleanup Plan as a chemical contributing to the creation or maintenance of the toxic hot spot within this water body because there is no available sediment quality guideline that meets the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Listing Policy.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. No guideline is available to evaluate this data.
4. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because it cannot be determined if applicable water quality standards for the pollutant are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Sediment

Beneficial Use: MA - Marine Habitat

Matrix: Sediment

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use

(LARWQCB, 1995)

<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	There is no available sediment quality guideline that meets the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Listing Policy.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	A total of 26 samples are available. BPTCP sediment samples ranging in concentration from 23 ppm to 53.6 ppm. Nickel is not identified in the Consolidated Toxic Hot Spots Cleanup Plan as a chemical contributing to the creation or maintenance of the toxic hot spot (LARWQCB and CCC, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Samples were collected throughout water body.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples collected from 1992 through 1997.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	BPTCP Quality Assurance Project Plan (Stephenson et al., 1994) Contaminated Sediments Task Force Database.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles Harbor - Consolidated Slip

Pollutant: Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs) (Aquatic Ecosystems)

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for delisting under sections 4.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 4.6 two lines of evidence are necessary to assess listing status.

Three lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 4.6, there is known significant toxicity and bioassessment data associated with this water body segment but the number of pollutant sediment exceedances does not exceed the frequency allowed by the Listing Policy.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The sediment quality guideline used complies, with the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
3. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
4. One of 41 samples taken between 1992 and 1997 exceeded the 1,800 ug/g Effects Range Medium sediment guideline. Further sampling in 2002, recorded no exceedances out of 120 samples. Although significant toxicity data and benthic community impacts are associated with this water body segment, pollutant sediment concentrations does not exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 4.1 of the Listing Policy.
5. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should not be removed from the section 303(d) list because it cannot be determined if applicable water quality guidelines are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Sediment
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	A sediment quality guideline of 1,800 ug/g was used (Fairey et al., 2001).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Of the 120 core and grab samples from 2002, none exceed the guideline. For the 41 samples collected between 1992 and 1997, one exceed the sediment guideline (LARWQCB and CCC, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The samples were collected throughout the water body.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The samples were collected between 1992 and 1997.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Bay Protection and Toxic Clean up Program. Contaminated Sediments Task Force Database.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Toxicity
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Existing habitats and associated populations of wetlands fauna and flora shall be maintained by: -Maintaining substrate characteristics necessary to support flora and fauna which would be present naturally, -Protecting food supplies for fish and wildlife, -Protecting reproductive and nursery areas, and -Protecting wildlife corridors. (LARWQCB, 1995).
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	Significant toxicity as compared to control conditions.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Thirteen of 17 samples were significantly toxic (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Samples were collected throughout the estuary.

<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected in 1994 and 1996.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	BPTCP Quality Assurance Project Plan (Stephenson et al., 1994).
<hr/>	
<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Population/Community Degradation
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	MA - Marine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	<p>Basin Plan: Existing habitats and associated populations of wetlands fauna and flora shall be maintained by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Maintaining substrate characteristics necessary to support flora and fauna which would be present naturally, -Protecting food supplies for fish and wildlife, -Protecting reproductive and nursery areas, and -Protecting wildlife corridors. <p>Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use (LARWQCB, 1995)</p>
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	Evaluation of the benthic data were completed using the approaches developed by scientists associated with the BPTCP. The relative benthic index used is a calculated value considering the total fauna, total mollusk species, crustacean species and indicator species at a site. The index ranges from 0 to 1.0. An index value of less than or equal to 0.3 is an indication that pollutants or other factors are negatively impacting the benthic community (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Eleven samples are available with 5 exhibiting degraded conditions and 6 with transitional community characteristics (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The samples were collected throughout the water body.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected in 1992 and 1996.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	BPTCP Quality Assurance Project Plan (Stephenson et al., 1994)
<hr/>	

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles River Estuary (Queensway Bay)

Pollutant: DDT

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for delisting under sections 4.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 4.6 two lines of evidence are necessary to assess listing status.

Three lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 4.6, there is known significant toxicity and bioassessment data associated with this water body segment but there is no sediment quality guideline for DDT that meets the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Listing Policy.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Although significant toxicity and bioassessment data are associated with this water body segment, there is no sediment quality guideline for DDT that meets the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because there is no sediment quality guideline that meets the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Listing Policy and it cannot be determined if applicable water quality standards or guidelines are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Sediment

Beneficial Use: ES - Estuarine Habitat

Matrix: Sediment

<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Existing habitats and associated populations of wetlands fauna and flora shall be maintained by: -Maintaining substrate characteristics necessary to support flora and fauna which would be present naturally, -Protecting food supplies for fish and wildlife, -Protecting reproductive and nursery areas, and -Protecting wildlife corridors. Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	A guideline that meets the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Listing Policy is not available.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Nine samples ranging in concentration from 16.1 ppb to 75.8 ppb (Anderson et al., 1998).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Samples were collected synoptically with toxicity samples.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples taken in 2 different years.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	BPTCP Quality Assurance Project Plan.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Toxicity
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	ES - Estuarine Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Sediment
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: Existing habitats and associated populations of wetlands fauna and flora shall be maintained by: -Maintaining substrate characteristics necessary to support flora and fauna which would be present naturally, -Protecting food supplies for fish and wildlife, -Protecting reproductive and nursery areas, and -Protecting wildlife corridors. Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	BPTCP reference envelope approach used.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Four out of six sediment samples were found to be significantly toxic to amphipods (Anderson et al., 1998).

Spatial Representation: Samples were collected synoptically with sediment samples.

Temporal Representation: Samples taken in 2 different years.

Data Quality Assessment: BPTCP Quality Assurance Project Plan.

Numeric Line of Evidence Population/Community Degradation

Beneficial Use: ES - Estuarine Habitat

Matrix: Sediment

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Basin Plan: Existing habitats and associated populations of wetlands fauna and flora shall be maintained by:

- Maintaining substrate characteristics necessary to support flora and fauna which would be present naturally,
- Protecting food supplies for fish and wildlife,
- Protecting reproductive and nursery areas, and
- Protecting wildlife corridors.

Basin Plan: Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.

Evaluation Guideline: Evaluation of the benthic data were completed using the approaches developed by scientists associated with the BPTCP. The relative benthic index used is a calculated value considering the total fauna, total mollusk species, crustacean species and indicator species at a site. The index ranges from 0 to 1.0. An index value of less than or equal to 0.3 is an indication that pollutants or other factors are negatively impacting the benthic community.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: The benthic community was classified as transitional (Anderson et al., 1998).

Spatial Representation: Samples were collected synoptically with sediment and toxicity samples.

Temporal Representation: Samples taken in 2 different years.

Data Quality Assessment: BPTCP Quality Assurance Project Plan.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles River Reach 1 (Estuary to Carson Street)

Pollutant: Cadmium

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 4.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess delisting status.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. The CTR criterion for cadmium for the protection of aquatic life was exceeded from data collected between 1996 and 2002 and no samples exceeded CCR Title 22 MCL guidelines for the protection of MUN beneficial uses in data collected between 2000 and 2003.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification for removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Three of 42 samples exceeded the CTR - CMC acute criterion, and CCC chronic criterion and zero of 22 samples exceeded CCR Title 22 MCL guidelines this does not exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 4.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards for the pollutant are not exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: MU - Municipal & Domestic, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Primary MCL guideline for Cadmium of .005 mg/l shall not be exceeded to protect MUN beneficial uses in accordance with Title 22 of the California Code of regulation table 64431-A of section 64449.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	No sample exceeded the Primary MCL guideline for Cadmium (LACDPW, 2003a).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sample site.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Twenty-two samples were taken during the wet and dry season from 10/12/00 to 4/30/03 at approximately one to two week intervals as part of the Los Angeles County Storm water monitoring program prepared by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The Los Angeles River Monitoring Station is located at the existing stream gage station (Stream Gage No. F319-R) between Willow Street and Wardlow Road in the City of Long Beach. At this location, which was chosen to avoid tidal influences, the total upstream tributary drainage area for the Los Angeles River is 825 square miles. This river is the largest watershed outlet to the Pacific Ocean in Los Angeles County. At the site, the river is a concrete lined trapezoidal channel.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	MU - Municipal & Domestic, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	California Toxic Rule: The criterion for cadmium at 100 mg/L hardness is 2.24 ug/L.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Forty-two samples with three exceeding the water quality criterion (LACDPW, 2003a).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station (Wardlow gage) sampled during approximately 5 storm events.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples collected between 1996 and 2002.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Data are representative of wet-weather conditions.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	NPDES MS4 monitoring conducted by Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles River Reach 2 (Carson to Figueroa Street)

Pollutant: Foam/Flocs/Scum/Oil Slicks

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

The original line of evidence supporting the listing does not identify a pollutant but rather, a condition caused by a pollutant(s) (algal growth). The Los Angeles River Nitrogen TMDL was approved by RWQCB on August, 2003 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March 2004 and this TMDL is expected to address this water body condition.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing these listing from the 303 (d) Water Quality Limited Segment list because the segment pollutant combinations is not a pollutant.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the pollutant is an ambient condition caused by pollutant(s). A TMDL is in place and is expected to address this water body condition.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Los Angeles River Nitrogen TMDL was approved by RWQCB on August 19, 2003 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March 18, 2004. This TMDL will address this water body condition.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles River Reach 2 (Carson to Figueroa Street)

Pollutant: Nutrients (Algae)

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

The original line of evidence supporting the listing does not identify a pollutant but rather, a condition caused by a pollutant(s) (algal growth). The Los Angeles River Nitrogen TMDL was approved by RWQCB on August, 2003 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March 2004 and this TMDL is expected to address this water body condition.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing these listing from the 303 (d) Water Quality Limited Segment list because the segment pollutant combinations is not a pollutant.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the pollutant is an ambient condition caused by pollutant(s). A TMDL is in place and is expected to address this water body condition.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Los Angeles River Nitrogen TMDL was approved by RWQCB on August 19, 2003 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March 18, 2004. This TMDL will address this water body condition.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles River Reach 2 (Carson to Figueroa Street)

Pollutant: Taste and odor

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

The original line of evidence supporting the listing does not identify a pollutant but rather, a condition caused by a pollutant(s) (algal growth). The Los Angeles River Nitrogen TMDL was approved by RWQCB on August, 2003 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March 2004 and this TMDL is expected to address this water body condition.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing these listing from the 303 (d) Water Quality Limited Segment list because the segment pollutant combinations is not a pollutant.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the pollutant is an ambient condition caused by pollutant(s). A TMDL is in place and is expected to address this water body condition.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Los Angeles River Nitrogen TMDL was approved by RWQCB on August 19, 2003 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March 18, 2004. This TMDL will address this water body condition.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles/Long Beach Outer Harbor (inside breakwater)

Pollutant: Polychlorinated biphenyls

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for delisting under sections 4.4 of the Listing Policy. Under section 4.4 two lines of evidence are necessary to assess listing status.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 4.4, a health advisory has been issued for this water segment but mussel watch data do not exceed the tissue guideline or the narrative water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The sediment quality guideline used complies with the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
3. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
4. None of 9 samples exceeded the tissue guideline.
5. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards for the pollutant are not exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Matrix: Tissue

Water Quality Objective/ Basin Plan: Toxic pollutants shall not be present at levels that will

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to aquatic life or human health.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	OEHHA PCB Screening Value: 20 ug/kg (Brodberg and Pollock, 1999).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Nine measurements with none exceeding the tissue guideline.
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station (Los Angeles Harbor, Angels Gate).
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	One sample collected per year from 1990 through 2000.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	California State Mussel Watch Program.

<i>Line of Evidence</i>	Health Advisories
<i>Beneficial Use</i>	CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)
<i>Information Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	A fish consumption advisory has been established for the PCBs in the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor area. The advisory was established by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment.

Region 4

Water Segment: Lunada Bay Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Malaga Cove Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Malibu Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Manhattan Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Nicholas Canyon Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Ormond Beach

Pollutant: Bacteria Indicators

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4.3 of the Listing Policy. Under section 4.2 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess delisting status. Three lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Thirty-three out of 279 samples exceeded the bacteriological Standard and this does not exceed the allowable frequency of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards for the pollutant are not exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* 17 CCR 7958 (in part): The minimum protective bacteriological standards for waters adjacent to public beaches and public water-contact sports areas shall be as follows:
(1) Based on a single sample, the density of bacteria in water from each sampling station at a public beach or public water contact sports area shall not exceed:
(A) 1,000 total coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters, if the ratio of fecal/total

coliform bacteria exceeds 0.1; or
(B) 10,000 total coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters; or
(C) 400 fecal coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters; or
(D) 104 enterococcus bacteria per 100 milliliters.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: Eighty-four samples, 2 samples exceeding (SWRCB, 2003).

Spatial Representation: One station: VC(44000). This station represents the beach 50 yards on either side of the sampling point. Samples were collected at Arnold Road.

Temporal Representation: Data collected in 1999, 2000, and 2001.

Data Quality Assessment: County Health Department.

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* 17 CCR 7958 (in part): The minimum protective bacteriological standards for waters adjacent to public beaches and public water-contact sports areas shall be as follows:
(1) Based on a single sample, the density of bacteria in water from each sampling station at a public beach or public water contact sports area shall not exceed:
(A) 1,000 total coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters, if the ratio of fecal/total coliform bacteria exceeds 0.1; or
(B) 10,000 total coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters; or
(C) 400 fecal coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters; or
(D) 104 enterococcus bacteria per 100 milliliters.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: Ninety-nine samples, 13 samples exceeding (SWRCB, 2003).

Spatial Representation: One station: VC(42000). This station represents the beach 50 yards on either side of the sampling point. Samples were collected 50 yards south of the J Street drain.

Temporal Representation: Data collected in 1999, 2000, and 2001.

Data Quality Assessment: County Health Department.

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	R1 - Water Contact Recreation
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	<p>17 CCR 7958 (in part): The minimum protective bacteriological standards for waters adjacent to public beaches and public water-contact sports areas shall be as follows:</p> <p>(1) Based on a single sample, the density of bacteria in water from each sampling station at a public beach or public water contact sports area shall not exceed:</p> <p>(A) 1,000 total coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters, if the ratio of fecal/total coliform bacteria exceeds 0.1; or</p> <p>(B) 10,000 total coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters; or</p> <p>(C) 400 fecal coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters; or</p> <p>(D) 104 enterococcus bacteria per 100 milliliters.</p>
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Ninety-six samples, 18 samples exceeding (SWRCB, 2003).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station: VC(43000). This station represents the beach 50 yards on either side of the sampling point. Samples were collected 50 yards north of the Oxnard Industrial drain.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Data collected in 1999, 2000, and 2001.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	County Health Department.

Region 4

Water Segment: Point Dume Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Point Fermin Park Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Point Vicente Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Portuguese Bend Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Puerco Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Resort Point Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Rocky Point Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Royal Palms Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: San Buenaventura Beach

Pollutant: Bacteria Indicators

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4.2 of the Listing Policy. Under section 4.2 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Four lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A total of 44 samples from three sampling stations from all four lines of evidence exceeded the bacteriological standard.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. 44 of 401 samples taken at three sampling stations exceeded the bacteriological standard and this does not exceed the allowable frequency of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards for the pollutant are not exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* 17 CCR 7958 (in part): The minimum protective bacteriological standards for waters adjacent to public beaches and public water-contact sports areas shall be as follows:

- (1) Based on a single sample, the density of bacteria in water from each sampling station at a public beach or public water contact sports area shall not exceed:
- (A) 1,000 total coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters, if the ratio of fecal/total coliform bacteria exceeds 0.1; or
 - (B) 10,000 total coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters; or
 - (C) 400 fecal coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters; or
 - (D) 104 enterococcus bacteria per 100 milliliters.

<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Ninety-seven samples, 2 samples exceeding (SWRCB, 2003).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station: VC(20000). This station represents the beach 50 yards on either side of the sampling point. Samples were collected south of drain at Weymouth.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Data collected in 1999, 2000, and 2001.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	County Health Department.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	R1 - Water Contact Recreation
<i>Matrix:</i>	-N/A
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	17 CCR 7958 (in part): The minimum protective bacteriological standards for waters adjacent to public beaches and public water-contact sports areas shall be as follows: (1) Based on a single sample, the density of bacteria in water from each sampling station at a public beach or public water contact sports area shall not exceed: (A) 1,000 total coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters, if the ratio of fecal/total coliform bacteria exceeds 0.1; or (B) 10,000 total coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters; or (C) 400 fecal coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters; or (D) 104 enterococcus bacteria per 100 milliliters.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	One-hundred and three samples, 20 samples exceeding (SWRCB, 2003).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station: VC(19000). This station represents the beach 50 yards on either side of the sampling point. Samples were collected south of the drain at San Jon Road.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Data collected in 1999, 2000, and 2001.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Samples were collected by the County Health Department.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	R1 - Water Contact Recreation
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	17 CCR 7958 (in part): The minimum protective bacteriological standards for waters adjacent to public beaches and public water-contact sports areas shall be as follows: (1) Based on a single sample, the density of bacteria in water from each sampling station at a public beach or public water contact sports area shall not exceed: (A) 1,000 total coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters, if the ratio of fecal/total coliform bacteria exceeds 0.1; or (B) 10,000 total coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters; or (C) 400 fecal coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters; or (D) 104 enterococcus bacteria per 100 milliliters.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	One-hundred samples, 8 samples exceeding (SWRCB, 2003).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station: VC(20000). This station represents the beach 50 yards on either side of the sampling point. Samples were collected south of drain at Dover Lane.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Data collected in 1999, 2000, and 2001.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	County Health Department.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	R1 - Water Contact Recreation
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	17 CCR 7958 (in part): The minimum protective bacteriological standards for waters adjacent to public beaches and public water-contact sports areas shall be as follows: (1) Based on a single sample, the density of bacteria in water from each sampling station at a public beach or public water contact sports area shall not exceed: (A) 1,000 total coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters, if the ratio of fecal/total coliform bacteria exceeds 0.1; or (B) 10,000 total coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters; or (C) 400 fecal coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters; or (D) 104 enterococcus bacteria per 100 milliliters.

<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	One-hundred and one samples, 14 samples exceeding (SWRCB, 2003).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One station: VC(18000). This station represents the beach 50 yards on either side of the sampling point. Samples were collected between Kalorama Street and Sanjon testing sites.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Data collected in 1999, 2000, and 2001.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	County Health Department.

Region 4

Water Segment: San Gabriel River Estuary

Pollutant: Abnormal Fish Histology (Lesions)

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for delisting under sections 4.8 of the Listing Policy. Under section 4.8 delisting is appropriate when documented adverse biological responses are not associated with water or sediment numeric pollutant specific evaluation guidelines.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 4.8, adverse biological responses have been documented in fish taken from the site. Although a small portion of the fish collected exhibited impacts from toxicity, the majority of the fish samples collected from the San Gabriel River and its tributaries were victims of infectious disease. Therefore, there is insufficient information to conclude that the documented adverse biological responses are associated with specific pollutant(s).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. The majority of the fish collected showed adverse biological responses associated with infectious disease and not due to pollutant caused toxicity.
4. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards for the pollutant are not exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence

Adverse Biological Responses

<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that are toxic to, or that produce detrimental physiological response in, human, plant, animal, or aquatic life. Compliance with this objective will be determined by use of indicator organisms, analyses of species diversity, population density, growth anomalies, bioassays of appropriate duration or other appropriate methods as specified by the State or Regional Board.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	<p>With a thorough prior knowledge of normal fish anatomy, the investigators used histological analysis to detect alterations in tissues and organs caused by exposure to toxicants. When the concentration of a toxicant is sufficient to result only in cellular injury, but not in death of the cells, sublethal (adaptive) changes may be observed in affected cells.</p> <p>A combination of the necropsy-based approach and the histological condition index was used in this study. Alterations from the expected normal gross anatomy and microscopic anatomy of resident fishes, fathead minnow (<i>Pimephales promelas</i>), goldfish (<i>Cyprinus carpio</i>), white croaker (<i>Genyonemus lineatus</i>) mosquito fish (<i>Gambusia affinis</i>), and tilapia (<i>Tilapia sp.</i>) were included in the investigation. Lesions were compared to reference populations.</p>
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	<p>San Gabriel River Tidal Prism at Confluence of Coyote Creek (LACSD, 2004):</p> <p>A total of 21 tilapia (<i>Tilapia sp.</i>) were collected at this site. Extensive inflammation of the trigeminal ganglion was observed with cells that had characteristics of eosinophilic granular leukocytes. The cells in question were associated with a swollen feature of the nerve indicating damage to the glial cells. The frequency of this abnormality was 33%. Gill necrosis was observed in 3 of the animals studied and this involved mitochondria-rich (chloride) cells and pavement respiratory epithelium. The frequency for this lesion was 14%. Inflammation of gill arches and branchial cavity epithelium was observed in 2 of the individuals studied. The frequency of this alteration was 9%. Two of the individuals showed renal pathology. In one of these, extensive severe tubular epithelial hyalinization had occurred. This was associated with disruption of the nephron wall at that site. In another individual, interstitial inflammation was observed. Skin necrosis was found in 2 of the 21 animals observed. One gut parasite was found and appeared to be a tapeworm.</p> <p>San Gabriel River Tidal Prism at College Park Drive (LACSD, 2004b):</p> <p>A total of 30 tilapia (<i>Tilapia sp.</i>) and 1 white croaker (<i>Genyonemus lineatus</i>) were examined h m this site. Histopathologic examination revealed severe inflammation in submucosa and circular muscularis of the stomach. The inflammatory cells were eosinophilic granular leukocytes or macrophages which contained eosinophilic granules. In addition to this change, the white croaker showed mild inflammation around bile structures in the liver and inflammatory response in the wall of the heart. In addition, macrophage aggregates were present in the liver at a frequency of 3 per 10 X field. The white croaker also showed mild inflammation of the gill and two flukes (parasitic trematodes) were</p>

attached to gill structures. In the 30 tilapia, fairly consistent involvement of the eosinophilic granular leukocytes in inflammatory foci around the trigeminal ganglion and branches of the trigeminal nerve were seen. The frequency of this lesion was 30%. In addition to the changes within the 5th cranial nerve, alterations were seen in gills that indicated that 3 of the 30 individuals showed aneurysm formation in blood vessels of secondary lamellae. In addition, inflammation of gill arch and filaments and adjacent regions of the branchial cavity wall were seen. The frequency for this lesion was 17%. Inflammation of the liver in areas adjacent to arterial structures and large tributaries of the hepatic venous system were seen. The inflammatory cells were usually eosinophilic granular leukocytes. The frequency for this change was 13%. Two of the fish showed inclusion bodies within hepatocytes. These were quite frequently seen and were close in resemblance to the tubular epithelium hyaline granules of the kidney. In addition, 4 fish showed interstitial inflammation of the kidney and 5 showed extensive degeneration with tubular epithelium showing hyaline change. The frequency for the latter was 17%. Some of the tubular degenerative changes had advanced to the formation of tubular deposits of calcium and this characterized 2 of the 30 individuals. Heart ventricular mineralization was also seen in 4 of the 30 individuals examined. Skin necrosis involved 2 of the 30 individuals and was a consistent change in the affected fish. A large skin lesion was observed on one tilapia. One fish showed a parasite within the gut lumen.

<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Fish were collected from four sites in the lower San Gabriel River watershed. The sites included Coyote Creek above and below the Long Beach wastewater treatment plant outfall, the San Gabriel River at the confluence of Coyote Creek, and from the tidal prism at College Park Drive.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected between 1992 and 1993.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Quality Assurance and methods well described in the report: "Toxicity study of the Santa Clara, San Gabriel River, and Calleguas Creek" (Bailey et al., 1996 in LACSD, 2004b).

<i>Line of Evidence</i>	Narrative Description Data
<i>Beneficial Use</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Information Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Toxicity Identification Evaluations were completed and it was suggested that diazinon, chlorpyrifos, and ammonia were the cause of the toxicity. Studies of upstream and downstream sites in the San Gabriel River Tidal Prism revealed toxicity. Inflammatory lesions were prevalent at about 30% in fish from both sites. Gill toxicity reactions were seen at equal frequency. In the upper site, only two fish showed extensive tubular epithelial hyalinization of kidney while 5 of their counterparts from the lower site were positive for the same lesion. In addition, the lesions had advanced in the downstream affected fish to the point at which tubular deposits of calcium were prominent in two fish. Heart ventricle also showed mineralization, a likely sequel to systemic infection. Skin necrosis, likely a direct result of toxicity in the water column characterized two of the 30 fish at the lower site.

The analysis of fish collected from the San Gabriel River and its tributaries

suggests that a sizeable portion of the individuals are victims of infectious disease and a smaller portion reveal signs of toxicity. These are not healthy fish and their tissue conditions do not resemble those of fishes from reference habitats previously investigated by this group.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality:

This evaluation of data came from the report: "Toxicity study of the Santa Clara, San Gabriel River, and Calleguas Creek" (Bailey et al., 1996 in LACSD, 2004b).

Region 4

Water Segment: San Gabriel River Reach 1 (Estuary to Firestone)

Pollutant: Abnormal Fish Histology (Lesions)

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for delisting under sections 4.8 of the Listing Policy. Under section 4.8 delisting is appropriate when documented adverse biological responses are not associated with water or sediment numeric pollutant specific evaluation guidelines.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 4.8, adverse biological responses have been documented in fish taken from the site. Although a small portion of the fish collected exhibited impacts from toxicity, the majority of the fish samples collected from the San Gabriel River and its tributaries were victims of infectious disease. Therefore there is insufficient information to conclude that the documented adverse biological responses are associated with specific pollutant(s).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

- 1.The sediment quality guideline used complies, with the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Policy.
- 2.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
- 3.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
- 4.The majority of the fish collected showed adverse biological responses are associated with infectious disease and not due to pollutant caused toxicity.
- 5.Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the documented adverse biological responses can not be associated with water or sediment numeric-specific evaluation guidelines.

Lines of Evidence:

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Adverse Biological Responses
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that are toxic to, or that produce detrimental physiological response in, human, plant, animal, or aquatic life. Compliance with this objective will be determined by use of indicator organisms, analyses of species diversity, population density, growth anomalies, bioassays of appropriate duration or other appropriate methods as specified by the State or Regional Board.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	<p>With a prior knowledge of normal fish anatomy, the investigators used histological analysis to detect alterations in tissues and organs caused by exposure to toxicants. When the concentration of a toxicant is sufficient to result only in cellular injury, but not in death of the cells, sublethal (adaptive) changes may be observed in affected cells.</p> <p>A combination of the necropsy-based approach and the histological condition index was used in this study. Alterations from the expected normal gross anatomy and microscopic anatomy of resident fishes, fathead minnow (<i>Pimephales promelas</i>), goldfish (<i>Cyprinus carpio</i>), white croaker (<i>Genyonemus lineatus</i>) mosquito fish (<i>Gambusia affinis</i>), and tilapia (<i>Tilapia sp.</i>) were included in the investigation. Lesions were compared to reference populations.</p>
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	<p>San Gabriel River Tidal Prism at Confluence of Coyote Creek (LACSD, 2004b).</p> <p>A total of 21 tilapia (<i>Tilapia sp.</i>) were collected at this site. Extensive inflammation of nerve tissue was observed. The cells in question were associated with a swollen feature of the nerve indicating damage. The frequency of this abnormality was 33%. Gill necrosis was observed in 3 of the animals studied. The frequency for this lesion was 14%. Skin necrosis was found in 2 of the 21 animals observed. One gut parasite was found and appeared to be a tapeworm.</p> <p>San Gabriel River Tidal Prism at College Park Drive (LACSD, 2004b).</p> <p>A total of 30 tilapia (<i>Tilapia sp.</i>) and 1 white croaker (<i>Genyonemus lineatus</i>) were examined from this site. Histopathologic examination revealed severe inflammation in the stomach. The white croaker showed mild inflammation in the liver and inflammatory response in the wall of the heart. In the 30 tilapia, fairly consistent nerve inflammation were observed. The frequency of this lesion was 30%. Inflammation of the liver were also observed. The frequency for this change was 13%. A large skin lesion was observed on one tilapia. One fish showed a parasite within the gut.</p>
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Fish were collected from four sites in the lower San Gabriel River watershed. The sites included Coyote Creek above and below the Long Beach wastewater

treatment plant outfall, the San Gabriel River at the confluence of Coyote Creek, and from the tidal prism at College Park Drive.

Temporal Representation: Samples were collected between 1992 and 1993.

Data Quality Assessment: Quality Assurance and methods well described in the report: "Toxicity study of the Santa Clara, San Gabriel River, and Calleguas Creek" (Bailey et al., 1996 in LACSD, 2004b).

Line of Evidence Narrative Description Data

Beneficial Use WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: Toxicity Identification Evaluations were completed and it was suggested that diazinon, chlorpyrifos, and ammonia were the cause of the toxicity. Studies of upstream and downstream sites in the San Gabriel River Tidal Prism revealed toxicity. Inflammatory lesions were prevalent at about 30% in fish from both sites. Gill toxicity reactions were seen at equal frequency. In the upper site, only two fish showed extensive tubular epithelial hyalinization of kidney while 5 of their counterparts from the lower site were positive for the same lesion. In addition, the lesions had advanced in the downstream affected fish to the point at which tubular deposits of calcium were prominent in two fish. Heart ventricle also showed mineralization, a likely sequel to systemic infection. Skin necrosis, likely a direct result of toxicity in the water column characterized two of the 30 fish at the lower site.

The analysis of fish collected from the San Gabriel River and its tributaries suggests that a sizeable portion of the individuals are victims of infectious disease and a smaller portion reveal signs of toxicity. These are not healthy fish and their tissue conditions do not resemble those of fishes from reference habitats previously investigated by this group.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: This evaluation of data came from the report: "Toxicity study of the Santa Clara, San Gabriel River, and Calleguas Creek" (Bailey et al., 1996 in LACSD, 2004b).

Region 4

Water Segment: San Gabriel River Reach 1 (Estuary to Firestone)

Pollutant: Excess Algal Growth

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4.7 of the Listing Policy. Under section 4.7 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Two of the samples were judged to exceed a subjective algae ranking guideline.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. Two of 4 samples exceeded the Subjective algae guideline and this does not exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 4.1 of the Listing Policy.
2. Excess algae growth information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).
3. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

**SWRCB Staff
Recommendation:**

After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because it cannot be determined if the guideline used was applicable and water quality standards were exceeded. Furthermore, excess algae growth information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Adverse Biological Responses

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Non-Numeric Objective: Basin Plan: Waters shall not contain biostimulatory substances in concentrations that promote aquatic growth to the extent that such growth causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.

<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	The presence of algae in the water segment was used as the guideline. The rankings were subjective and assigned to water bodies by one person for consistency.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Four observations with 2 of the observations judged to be not supporting beneficial uses (SWRCB, 2003).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sampling location.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Observations made between 1992 and 1995. Samples taken in different seasons and no greater than two time within one year.

Region 4

Water Segment:	San Gabriel River Reach 1 (Estuary to Firestone)
Pollutant:	Toxicity
Decision:	Delist
Weight of Evidence:	<p>This pollutant is being considered for delisting under sections 4.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 4.6 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.</p> <p>One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 4.6, the site does not have significant water toxicity.</p> <p>Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1.The sediment quality guideline used complies, with the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Policy.2.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.3.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.4.None of the 46 samples exceeded the NOEC indicating that the receiving water was not toxic and these do not exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 4.1 of the Listing Policy.5.Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation:	After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards for the pollutant are not exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Adverse Biological Responses
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:*

Basin plan narrative toxicity WQO.

Evaluation Guideline:

No observed effect concentration (NOEC) is the highest tested concentration of toxicant to which organisms are exposed in a full life-cycle or partial life-cycle (short-term) test that causes no observable adverse effect on the test organisms. The guideline is used and recommended to determine the highest concentration of toxicant at which the values of the observed responses are not statistically significantly different from the control.

*Data Used to Assess Water
Quality:*

Numeric toxicity results generated from a total of ten samples none of which were found to be toxic. This was a collaborative toxicity study conducted by the U.S. EPA and the Districts in August through October 2003. The study generated a total of 16 samples taken for Reach 1. Six (6) samples were taken in August 2003 (2 from R-3-1, 2 from R-4, and 2 from R-9W), 4 samples were taken in September 2003 (2 from R-3-1, 2 from R-4, and 1 from R-9W) and 6 samples were taken in October 2003 (2 from R-3-1, 2 from R-4, and 2 from R-9W). The August 2003, sampling results (6 samples) were excluded from analysis due a short-term operational upset that occurred while sampling was being carried out in the San Jose Creek WRP located within Reach 1 (LACSD, 2004b).

Spatial Representation:

Three (3) sample sites sampled from 8/2003 through 10/2003 at a monthly interval. Station R-3-1 is located towards the upstream end of Reach 1, upstream of the Los Coyotes Water Reclamation Plant (WRP). Receiving water station R-4 is located downstream of the discharge of the Los Coyotes WRP. Receiving water station R-9W is located at the lower end of Reach 1, just upstream of the San Gabriel River Estuary. All sampling stations are all located in Reach 1 of the San Gabriel River.

Temporal Representation:

A total of 16 samples were taken, six (6) samples were taken in August 2003 (2 from R-3-1, 2 from R-4, and 2 from R-9W), 4 samples were taken in September 2003 (2 from R-3-1, 2 from R-4, and 1 from R-9W) and 6 samples were taken in October 2003 (2 from R-3-1, 2 from R-4, and 2 from R-9W).

Environmental Conditions:

Data is one year old. The August 2003, sampling results (6 samples) were excluded from analysis due a short-term operational upset that occurred while sampling was being carried out in the San Jose Creek WRP located within Reach 1.

Data Quality Assessment:

Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Numeric Line of Evidence

Adverse Biological Responses

Beneficial Use:

WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix:

Water

<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Narrative Toxicity Basin Plan WQO is applicable to the protection of aquatic life BUs.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	No observed effect concentration (NOEC) is the highest tested concentration of toxicant to which organisms are exposed in a full life-cycle or partial life-cycle (short-term) test that causes no observable adverse effect on the test organisms. The guideline is used and recommended to determine the highest concentration of toxicant at which the values of the observed responses are not statistically significantly different from the control.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from a total of 36 samples (12 samples per sampling stations) from Reach 1 stations R-1-3-1, R-9, and R-9 W respectively, taken from 6/2003 to 5/2004 on a monthly interval. No adverse effects (100 percent survival and growth) were observed in all toxicity results from all three sampling stations (LACSD, 2004b).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Three (3) sample sites sampled from 6/2003 through 5/2004 at a monthly interval. Station R-3-1 is located towards the upstream end of Reach 1, upstream of the Los Coyotes Water Reclamation Plant (WRP). Receiving water station R-4 is located downstream of the discharge of the Los Coyotes WRP. Receiving water station R-9W is located at the lower end of Reach 1, just upstream of the San Gabriel River Estuary. All sampling stations are all located in Reach 1 of the San Gabriel River.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Thirty-six (36) samples were taken from 6/2003 through 5/2004 at a monthly interval from three sampling stations within Reach 1 of the San Gabriel River.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The submitted toxicity results are from 2003-04. In June 2003, the LA County Sanitation Districts completed conversion of water reclamation plants in the San Gabriel River watershed to nitrification/denitrification (NDN) mode.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Region 4

Water Segment: San Gabriel River Reach 2 (Firestone to Whittier Narrows Dam)

Pollutant: Lead

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 4.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Four samples exceeded the CTR dissolved lead criteria continuous concentration the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Four of 63 samples exceeded the CTR criteria and this does not exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 4.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards for the pollutant are not exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* CTR dissolved lead criterion for continuous concentration (CCC) in water for the protection of aquatic life is expressed as a function of the total hardness of the water body. The aquatic life criteria will vary depending of total hardness

reported at the sampling site. The CCC for dissolved lead is the highest concentration to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (four days) without deleterious effects. This criterion is linked and applicable for the protection of aquatic life Beneficial Uses.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality:

Numeric data generated from 63 samples taken from 10/14/97 to 1/13/04 at one to two-week sampling interval. Four samples exceeded the dissolved lead continuous criterion concentration, which equals the highest concentration of a pollutant to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (4 days) without deleterious effects (LACDPW, 2004c).

Spatial Representation:

One sampling station sampled from 10/14/97 to 1/13/04.

Temporal Representation:

Sixty-three samples taken during the wet and dry season from 10/14/97 to 1/13/04 at approximately one to two week intervals.

Environmental Conditions:

Results are from samples taken from 1997 to 2004. The dissolved lead criterion was exceeded in 4 out of 63 measurements. The 3 exceedances occurred during the El Niño rain season in the winter of 1997 and one exceedance occurred during the wet season in November 2001.

Data Quality Assessment:

Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Region 4

Water Segment: San Gabriel River Reach 2 (Firestone to Whittier Narrows Dam)

Pollutant: Zinc

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 4.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Seven samples from combined exceedances of the two lines of evidence exceed the CTR zinc criteria continuous concentration.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

- 1.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
- 2.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
- 3.Seven of 89 samples exceeded the CTR Criteria and this does not exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 4.1 of the Listing Policy.
- 4.Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards for the pollutant are not exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

Matrix: Water

Water Quality Objective/ California Toxics Rule: The Criteria Continuous Concentration for dissolved zinc is dependent on the water hardness. After considering the event specific

<i>Water Quality Criterion:</i>	hardness values, the range of acceptable concentrations is 2.38 ug/L to 266 ug/L.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Twenty-six water samples, 4 samples exceeding (LACDPW, 2004c).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sample site.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Fall, winter, and spring (1997-2000).
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Stormwater Monitoring Program.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	CTR Dissolved Zinc Criterion for continuous concentration (CCC) in water for the protection of aquatic life is expressed as a function of the total hardness of the water body. The aquatic life criteria will vary depending of total hardness reported at the sampling site. The CCC for dissolved zinc is the highest concentration to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (four days) without deleterious effects. This criterion is linked and applicable for the protection of aquatic life Beneficial Uses.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 63 samples taken from 10/14/97 to 1/13/04 at one to two-week sampling interval. Three samples exceeded the dissolved Zinc Continuous Criterion Concentration, which equals the highest concentration of a pollutant to which aquatic life can be exposed for an extended period of time (4 days) without deleterious effects (LACDPW, 2004c).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sampling station sampled from 10/14/97 to 1/13/04.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Sixty-two samples taken during the wet and dry season from 10/14/97 to 1/13/04 at approximately one to two week intervals.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	Results are from samples taken from 1997 to 2004. The dissolved zinc criterion was exceeded in 3 out of 63 measurements. The exceedances occurred during the El Niño rain season in the winter of 1997.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Evaluation of Analytes and QA/QC Specifications for Monitoring Program (Woodward-Clyde, 1996) Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Region 4

Water Segment: San Jose Creek Reach 1 (SG Confluence to Temple St.)

Pollutant: Excess Algal Growth

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This condition is being considered for delisting under section 4.7 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. It is not known if the algae information is backed by pollutant data. Algae should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the Section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because it cannot be determined if the guideline used was applicable and water quality standards were exceeded. Furthermore, excess algae growth information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Adverse Biological Responses

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Non-Numeric Objective: Basin Plan: Waters shall not contain biostimulatory substances in concentrations that promote aquatic growth to the extent that such growth causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.

Evaluation Guideline: The presence of algae in the water segment was used as the guideline. The rankings were subjective and assigned to water bodies by one person for consistency.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: Seven observations with 2 of the observations judged to be not supporting beneficial uses (LACSD, 2004b).

Spatial Representation: One sampling location.

Temporal Representation: Observations made between 1990 and 1993. Samples taken in different seasons with 4 observations in 1992.

Region 4

Water Segment: San Jose Creek Reach 2 (Temple to I-10 at White Ave.)

Pollutant: Excess Algal Growth

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This condition is being considered for delisting under section 4.7 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. It is not known if the algae information is backed by pollutant data. Algae should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the Section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because it cannot be determined if the guideline used was applicable and water quality standards were exceeded. Furthermore, excess algae growth information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Adverse Biological Responses

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Non-Numeric Objective: Basin Plan: Waters shall not contain biostimulatory substances in concentrations that promote aquatic growth to the extent that such growth causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.

Evaluation Guideline: The presence of algae in the water segment was used as the guideline. The rankings were subjective and assigned to water bodies by one person for consistency.

<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Six observations with 2 of the observations judged to be partially not supporting beneficial uses (LACSD, 2004b).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	One sampling location. In 1996, San Jose Creek was defined as a single segment. When the segment was split the listing was applied to both segments. There is no assessment in Reach 2 as currently defined.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Observations made between 1990 and 1993. Samples taken in different seasons and 4 samples taken in 1992.

Region 4

Water Segment: Sea Level Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Topanga Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

The original line of evidence supporting the listing does not identify a pollutant but rather, a condition caused by a pollutant(s) (beach closures). The dry weather TMDL was approved by the RWQCB on 1/24/02, and the wet weather TMDL was approved on 12/12/04, and subsequently approved by USEPA on 6/19/03. These TMDLs are expected to address this water body condition.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this listing from the 303(d) Water Quality Limited Segment list because the segment pollutant combinations is not a pollutant. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the pollutant is an ambient condition caused by pollutant(s). A TMDL is in place and is expected to address this water body condition.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Torrance Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

The original line of evidence supporting the listing does not identify a pollutant but rather, a condition caused by a pollutant(s) (beach closures). The dry weather TMDL was approved by the RWQCB on 1/24/02, and the wet weather TMDL was approved on 12/12/04, and subsequently approved by USEPA on 6/19/03. These TMDLs are expected to address this water body condition.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this listing from the 303(d) Water Quality Limited Segment list because the segment pollutant combinations is not a pollutant. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the pollutant is an ambient condition caused by pollutant(s). A TMDL is in place and is expected to address this water body condition.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Trancas Beach (Broad Beach)

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

The original line of evidence supporting the listing does not identify a pollutant but rather, a condition caused by a pollutant(s) (beach closures). The dry weather TMDL was approved by the RWQCB on 1/24/02, and the wet weather TMDL was approved on 12/12/04, and subsequently approved by USEPA on 6/19/03. These TMDLs are expected to address this water body condition.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this listing from the 303(d) Water Quality Limited Segment list because the segment pollutant combinations is not a pollutant. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the pollutant is an ambient condition caused by pollutant(s). A TMDL is in place and is expected to address this water body condition.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Tujunga Wash (LA River to Hansen Dam)

Pollutant: Foam/Flocs/Scum/Oil Slicks

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

The original line of evidence supporting the listing does not identify a pollutant but rather, a condition caused by a pollutant(s) (Scum/Foam). The TMDL was approved by the RWQCB on 8/19/03 and subsequently approved by USEPA on 31804 The TMDL is expected to address this water body condition.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this listing from the 303(d) Water Quality Limited Segment list because the segment pollutant combinations is not a pollutant.

Foam and scum information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because they are not pollutants or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the pollutant is an ambient condition caused by pollutant(s). A TMDL is in place and is expected to address this water body condition.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Los Angeles River Nitrogen TMDL was approved by RWQCB on August 19, 2003 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March 18, 2004. This TMDL will address this water body condition.

Region 4

Water Segment: Tujunga Wash (LA River to Hansen Dam)

Pollutant: Taste and odor

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

The original line of evidence supporting the listing does not identify a pollutant but rather, a condition caused by a pollutant(s) (algal growth). A TMDL was approved by RWQCB in August, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March, 2003 and this TMDL is expected to address this water body condition.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing these listing from the 303 (d) Water Quality Limited Segment list because the segment pollutant combinations is not a pollutant.

Taste and odor information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because they are not pollutants or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the pollutant is an ambient condition caused by pollutant(s). A TMDL is in place and is expected to address this water body condition.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Los Angeles River Nitrogen TMDL was approved by RWQCB on August 19, 2003 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March 18, 2004. This TMDL will address this water body condition.

Region 4

Water Segment: Venice Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

The original line of evidence supporting the listing does not identify a pollutant but rather, a condition caused by a pollutant(s) (beach closures). The dry weather TMDL was approved by the RWQCB on 1/24/02, and the wet weather TMDL was approved on 12/12/04, and subsequently approved by USEPA on 6/19/03. These TMDLs are expected to address this water body condition.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this listing from the 303(d) Water Quality Limited Segment list because the segment pollutant combinations is not a pollutant. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the pollutant is an ambient condition caused by pollutant(s). A TMDL is in place and is expected to address this water body condition.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Ventura River Estuary

Pollutant: Fecal Coliform

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4.3 of the Listing Policy. Under section 4.3 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Six samples exceed the fecal coliform 400 MPN/100 ml single sample limit water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Six of 37 samples exceeded the fecal coliform water quality objective and this does not exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 4.2 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards for the pollutant are not exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: R1 - Water Contact Recreation, SH - Shellfish Harvesting

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Basin Plan: In waters designated for water contact recreation (REC-1), the fecal coliform concentration shall not exceed a log mean of 200/100 ml (based on a minimum of not less than four samples for any 30-day period), nor shall more

than 10 percent of total samples during any 30-day period exceed 400/100 ml.

<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Thirty seven bacteria samples. Six samples exceeding the 400 MPNM/100ml objective (Planetwater, various years); (SWRCB, 2003).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	1 site.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Different seasons and years.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Ojai Valley River Volunteer Monitoring Program Methods.

Region 4

Water Segment: Verdugo Wash Reach 1 (LA River to Verdugo Rd.)

Pollutant: Excess Algal Growth

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This water quality condition is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this water body condition. A TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. Qualitative information on excess algal growth alone is not sufficient to support continued placement on the section 303(d) list (Listing Policy section 3.7).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because algal growth is not a pollutant and it is uncertain if the growth listing is backed by pollutant data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Los Angeles River Nitrogen TMDL was approved by RWQCB on August 19, 2003 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March 18, 2004. This TMDL will address this water body condition.

Region 4

Water Segment: Verdugo Wash Reach 2 (Above Verdugo Road)

Pollutant: Excess Algal Growth

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This water quality condition is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this water body condition. A TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. Qualitative information on excess algal growth alone is not sufficient to support continued placement on the section 303(d) list (Listing Policy section 3.7).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because algal growth is not a pollutant and it is uncertain if the growth listing is backed by pollutant data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Los Angeles River Nitrogen TMDL was approved by RWQCB on August 19, 2003 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March 18, 2004. This TMDL will address this water body condition.

Region 4

Water Segment: Whites Point Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Will Rogers Beach

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

The original line of evidence supporting the listing does not identify a pollutant but rather, a condition caused by a pollutant(s) (beach closures). The dry weather TMDL was approved by the RWQCB on 1/24/02, and the wet weather TMDL was approved on 12/12/04, and subsequently approved by USEPA on 6/19/03. These TMDLs are expected to address this water body condition.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this listing from the 303(d) Water Quality Limited Segment list because the segment pollutant combinations is not a pollutant. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because the pollutant is an ambient condition caused by pollutant(s). A TMDL is in place and is expected to address this water body condition.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Region 4

Water Segment: Zuma Beach (Westward Beach)

Pollutant: Beach Closures

Decision: Delist

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. It is not known if the beach closure information is backed by coliform data. Beach closure information should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because it is not a pollutant or toxicity (section 2 of the Listing Policy).

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because beach closures are not pollutants and it is uncertain if the closures are backed by data showing exceedances of water quality standards.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Dry Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on January 24, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA. The Santa Monica Bay Bacteria Wet Weather TMDL was approved by RWQCB on December 12, 2004 and approved by USEPA on June 19, 2003.

Los Angeles Region (4)

Area Change

Recommendations to change the area
affected by pollutants on the
section 303(d) List

Page left blank intentionally.

Region 4

Water Segment: Dominguez Channel (lined portion above Vermont Ave)

Pollutant:

Decision: Accept Area Change

Weight of Evidence: The data and information in the administrative record supports this change in estimated size affected.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the estimated size affected should be changed as presented.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Narrative Description Data

Beneficial Use AG - Agricultural Supply

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: The water segments in the vicinity of the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor should be changed to better reflect the Basin Plan Water body naming scheme (Los Angeles RWQCB, 2004g). The water body names in the 2002 section 303(d) list are not reflective of the listings made in 1996 and leave some uncertainty about the boundaries of the areas covered by the listings. Also, from a hydrologic point of view, some water bodies were grouped together inappropriately. New maps have been included in the administrative record and all data reviews have used these new water segments.

Region 4

Water Segment: Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave)

Pollutant:

Decision: Accept Area Change

Weight of Evidence: The data and information in the administrative record supports this change in estimated size affected.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the estimated size affected should be changed as presented.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Narrative Description Data

Beneficial Use AG - Agricultural Supply

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: The water segments in the vicinity of the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor should be changed to better reflect the Basin Plan Water body naming scheme (Los Angeles RWQCB, 2004g). The water body names in the 2002 section 303(d) list are not reflective of the listings made in 1996 and leave some uncertainty about the boundaries of the areas covered by the listings. Also, from a hydrologic point of view, some water bodies were grouped together inappropriately. New maps have been included in the administrative record and all data reviews have used these new water segments.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles Harbor - Cabrillo Marina

Pollutant:

Decision: Accept Area Change

Weight of Evidence: The data and information in the administrative record supports this change in estimated size affected.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the estimated size affected should be changed as presented.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Narrative Description Data

Beneficial Use AG - Agricultural Supply

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: The water segments in the vicinity of the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor should be changed to better reflect the Basin Plan Water body naming scheme (Los Angeles RWQCB, 2004g). The water body names in the 2002 section 303(d) list are not reflective of the listings made in 1996 and leave some uncertainty about the boundaries of the areas covered by the listings. Also, from a hydrologic point of view, some water bodies were grouped together inappropriately. New maps have been included in the administrative record and all data reviews have used these new water segments.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles Harbor - Consolidated Slip

Pollutant:

Decision: Accept Area Change

Weight of Evidence: The data and information in the administrative record supports this change in estimated size affected.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the estimated size affected should be changed as presented.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Narrative Description Data

Beneficial Use AG - Agricultural Supply

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: The water segments in the vicinity of the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor should be changed to better reflect the Basin Plan Water body naming scheme (Los Angeles RWQCB, 2004g). The water body names in the 2002 section 303(d) list are not reflective of the listings made in 1996 and leave some uncertainty about the boundaries of the areas covered by the listings. Also, from a hydrologic point of view, some water bodies were grouped together inappropriately. New maps have been included in the administrative record and all data reviews have used these new water segments.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles Harbor - Fish Harbor

Pollutant:

Decision: Accept Area Change

Weight of Evidence: The data and information in the administrative record supports this change in estimated size affected.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the estimated size affected should be changed as presented.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Narrative Description Data

Beneficial Use AQ - Aquaculture

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: The water segments in the vicinity of the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor should be changed to better reflect the Basin Plan Water body naming scheme (Los Angeles RWQCB, 2004g). The water body names in the 2002 section 303(d) list are not reflective of the listings made in 1996 and leave some uncertainty about the boundaries of the areas covered by the listings. Also, from a hydrologic point of view, some water bodies were grouped together inappropriately. New maps have been included in the administrative record and all data reviews have used these new water segments.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles Harbor - Inner Cabrillo Beach Area

Pollutant:

Decision: Accept Area Change

Weight of Evidence: The data and information in the administrative record supports this change in estimated size affected.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the estimated size affected should be changed as presented.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Narrative Description Data

Beneficial Use AG - Agricultural Supply

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: The water segments in the vicinity of the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor should be changed to better reflect the Basin Plan Water body naming scheme (Los Angeles RWQCB, 2004g). The water body names in the 2002 section 303(d) list are not reflective of the listings made in 1996 and leave some uncertainty about the boundaries of the areas covered by the listings. Also, from a hydrologic point of view, some water bodies were grouped together inappropriately. New maps have been included in the administrative record and all data reviews have used these new water segments.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles/Long Beach Inner Harbor

Pollutant:

Decision: Accept Area Change

Weight of Evidence: The data and information in the administrative record supports this change in estimated size affected.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the estimated size affected should be changed as presented.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Narrative Description Data

Beneficial Use AG - Agricultural Supply

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: The water segments in the vicinity of the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor should be changed to better reflect the Basin Plan Water body naming scheme (Los Angeles RWQCB, 2004g). The water body names in the 2002 section 303(d) list are not reflective of the listings made in 1996 and leave some uncertainty about the boundaries of the areas covered by the listings. Also, from a hydrologic point of view, some water bodies were grouped together inappropriately. New maps have been included in the administrative record and all data reviews have used these new water segments.

Region 4

Water Segment: Los Angeles/Long Beach Outer Harbor (inside breakwater)

Pollutant:

Decision: Accept Area Change

Weight of Evidence: The data and information in the administrative record supports this change in estimated size affected.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the estimated size affected should be changed as presented.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Narrative Description Data

Beneficial Use AG - Agricultural Supply

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: The water segments in the vicinity of the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor should be changed to better reflect the Basin Plan Water body naming scheme (Los Angeles RWQCB, 2004g). The water body names in the 2002 section 303(d) list are not reflective of the listings made in 1996 and leave some uncertainty about the boundaries of the areas covered by the listings. Also, from a hydrologic point of view, some water bodies were grouped together inappropriately. New maps have been included in the administrative record and all data reviews have used these new water segments.

Region 4

Water Segment: San Pedro Bay Near/Off Shore Zones

Pollutant:

Decision: Accept Area Change

Weight of Evidence: The data and information in the administrative record supports this change in estimated size affected.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the estimated size affected should be changed as presented.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Narrative Description Data

Beneficial Use IN - Industrial Service Supply

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: The water segments in the vicinity of the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor should be changed to better reflect the Basin Plan Water body naming scheme (Los Angeles RWQCB, 2004g). The water body names in the 2002 section 303(d) list are not reflective of the listings made in 1996 and leave some uncertainty about the boundaries of the areas covered by the listings. Also, from a hydrologic point of view, some water bodies were grouped together inappropriately. New maps have been included in the administrative record and all data reviews have used these new water segments.

Page left blank intentionally.