Regional Water Quality Control Board

SANTA ANA REGION (8)

SECTION 303 (d) LIST PROPOSALS

Page left blank intentionally.

Region 8: Anaheim Bay
Metals and Pesticides

Water Body	Anaheim Bay
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Metals and organics/Tissue and Water/Fish Consumption, Human Health
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	QA used by CFCP, County.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	MTRLs from CFCP. WQOs for bacteria.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical standard directly.
Water Body-specific Information	Data age = 1-4 Years.
Data used to assess water quality	Reviewed data from Coastal Fish Contamination Program (CFCP), Orange County PFRD. No exceedances for metals, endosulfans, 4 exceedances for pesticides.
Spatial representation	Targeted in waterbody. Locations unknown.
Temporal representation	1997-2001.
Data type	MTRLs, WQOs are numeric.
Use of standard method	Standard analytical methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	None.
RWQCB Recommendation	More monitoring needed. Water Quality assessment underway.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the Monitoring List because the data are inadequate to determine if applicable water quality standards are exceeded. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited insufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Water quality standard used is applicable. 4. The evaluation guideline used to interpret narrative water quality standards is adequate. 5. Standard methods were used. 6. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. An inadequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is low.

Region 8: Bolsa Chica
Metals

Water Body	Bolsa Chica
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Metals/Water/MAR, EST, REC-1
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	QA used for metals analyses by county.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	WQOs for metals.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical standard directly.
Water Body-specific Information	Not enough information is available.
Data used to assess water quality	Orange County PFRD data for metals. Less than 10 data points are available. For this assessment, it cannot be determined if standards are attained. Cadmium: 4 samples with 0 exceeding standards. Chromium: 4 samples with 0 exceeding standards. Copper: 4 samples with 4 exceeding standards. Lead: 4 samples with 0 exceeding standards. Nickel: 4 samples with 4 exceeding standards. Zinc: 4 samples with 0 exceeding standards. Bolsa Chica State Beach Life Guard Station posted one time in three years. Other Bolsa Chica beaches not posted in the last three years.
Spatial representation	Unknown.
Temporal representation	Unknown.
Data type	Data values are numeric.
Use of standard method	Standard analytical methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	None.
RWQCB Recommendation	More monitoring needed.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the Monitoring List because the data are inadequate to determine if applicable water quality standards are exceeded. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited insufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Water quality standards are applicable. 4. Data are numerical. 5. Standard methods were used.

Region 8: Bolsa Chica
Metals

An inadequate amount of water quality measurements are available to determine if water quality standards are exceeded.

Region 8: Buck Gully Creek
Total and Fecal coliform

Water Body	Buck Gully Creek
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Total and Fecal coliform/Water/Beneficial uses not established in the Basin Plan for this water body but there are existing REC-1 and REC-2 beneficial uses downstream of Pacific Coast Highway.
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	QA used by county health agency.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	No water quality standards established in the Basin Plan specifically for this water body. The guideline used by the RWQCB is appropriate for this type of water body.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical guidelines or standards established for other water bodies.
Water Body-specific Information	Data age = 1-4 Years.
Data used to assess water quality	Violations of fecal coliform in 18/56 samples for guidelines related to REC 2 and 13/56 samples for guidelines related to REC 1.
Spatial representation	All samples collected from creek, unknown number of sites, 239 samples
Temporal representation	Data were collected between 1997 and 2001.
Data type	Numerical data.
Use of standard method	Standard bacteriological methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	None.
RWQCB Recommendation	List for total and fecal coliform.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because an existing beneficial use is impacted and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem. The water body should be listed for total and fecal coliform on the portion of the Creek downstream of Pacific Coast Highway. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses have not been established but there is an existing use downstream of Pacific Coast Highway. 4. The evaluation guideline is adequate. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered.

Region 8: Buck Gully Creek
Total and Fecal coliform

An adequate number of the water quality measurements showed impacts on an existing beneficial use. The staff confidence is high.

Region 8: Canyon Lake-East Bay
Sediment

Water Body	Canyon Lake-East Bay
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Sediment/sediment/WARM/REC-1, REC-2
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	Suitt and Assoc. Report :QA used only for 1986 data, using standard geological methods for estimating water depth and sediment depth. 1997 information collected by non-standard method (fishfinder used by local resident) with no QA. UC Riverside 2nd Quarterly Report, 2001: QA used.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	Unknown.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Unknown.
Water Body-specific Information	Water depth, water elevation and lake bottom elevation data collected in 1986. Water depth collected in 1997. Sediment traps used in 2001 study by UCR.
Data used to assess water quality	Unknown for data reported in Suitt and Assoc., due to use of non-standard method for collecting data used to estimate sediment accumulation. Sediment trap results from UCR 2001 quarterly report provide more quantitative information.
Spatial representation	5 sample locations.
Temporal representation	Calculations from Suitt and Assoc. 1986 and 1997. Study by UC Riverside in 2001.
Data type	Estimates of sedimentation rate.
Use of standard method	Suitt and Assoc. report: 1986 data only. UCR Report: quantitative sedimentation rates.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	Unknown.
RWQCB Recommendation	List for impairment of REC-1, REC-2, and WARM beneficial uses.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Water quality standard used is applicable. 4. The evaluation guideline used to interpret narrative water quality standards is adequate. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Non-standard methods were used.

Region 8: Canyon Lake-East Bay
Sediment

An adequate amount of the water quality measurements shows that the water quality standard is not exceeded.

Do not list for sedimentation. More recent data from UCR 2001 study indicates sedimentation rates not as large as estimated by earlier study. UCR analysis indicates that algae are the largest source of particulates. Canyon Lake is already listed for nutrients and studies for TMDL are underway.

Region 8: Chino Creek, Reach 1 and Reach 2
Metals

Water Body	Chino Creek, Reach 1 and Reach 2
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Metals/Water/REC1, REC2, WARM, WILD
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	QA used by county.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	WQOs.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical standard directly.
Water Body-specific Information	Insufficient data to make a determination.
Data used to assess water quality	Reviewed water quality data from Orange County Water District. Insufficient data to make a determination.
Spatial representation	Insufficient data to make a determination.
Temporal representation	1997-2001.
Data type	Data are numeric values.
Use of standard method	Standard analytical methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	None.
RWQCB Recommendation	Insufficient data to make a determination. More monitoring needed.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the Monitoring List because the data are inadequate to determine if applicable water quality standards are exceeded. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited insufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Water quality standards are applicable. 4. Data are numerical. 5. Standard methods were used. An inadequate amount of water quality measurements are available to determine if water quality standards are exceeded.

Region 8: Cucamonga Creek, Mountain Reach
Metals

Water Body	Cucamonga Creek, Mountain Reach
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Metals/Water/MUN, REC-1, REC-2, WILD, COLD
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	QA used by county.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	WQOs.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical standard directly
Water Body-specific Information	Insufficient data to make a determination
Data used to assess water quality	Reviewed water quality data from Orange County Water District. Insufficient data to make a determination
Spatial representation	Insufficient data to make a determination.
Temporal representation	1997-2001.
Data type	Data are numeric values.
Use of standard method	Standard analytical methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	None.
RWQCB Recommendation	Insufficient data to make a determination. More monitoring needed.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the Monitoring List because the data are inadequate to determine if applicable water quality standards are exceeded. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited insufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Water quality standards are applicable. 4. Data are numerical. 5. Standard methods were used. An inadequate amount of water quality measurements are available to determine if water quality standards are exceeded.

Region 8: Huntington Beach at Magnolia Street
Enterococcus

Water Body	Huntington Beach at Magnolia Street
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Enterococcus/Water/REC-1
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	QA used by county health agency.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	Exceedances of single sample AB 411 standards may result in beach postings by Orange Count Health Care Agency. Bacterial water quality standards are linked to REC-1 beneficial use attainment.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Data can be compared directly to standards.
Water Body-specific Information	Data age = 1-4 Years. Data were collected during both wet and dry seasons.
Data used to assess water quality	109 samples exceeded standard out of a total of 712 samples.
Spatial representation	1 station. Sampling location represents 50 yards on either side of the sampling location.
Temporal representation	Data were collected between 1999 and August 2002.
Data type	Numerical data.
Use of standard method	Standard bacteriological methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	None.
RWQCB Recommendation	List for enterococcus.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body 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. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including season and the age of the data were considered. An adequate number of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.

Region 8: Huntington Harbour
Metals and pesticides

Water Body	Huntington Harbour
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Metals and pesticides/Water and Tissue/Fish consumption
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	QA used by county, Mussel Watch.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	MTRLs, WQOs.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical guideline directly.
Water Body-specific Information	Data age = 1-4 Years.
Data used to assess water quality	Reviewed the Orange County PFRD and State Mussel Watch Program. Less than 10 data points are available. For this type of assessment, it cannot be determined if standards are attained. No exceedances for SMW data except dieldrin. Huntington Harbor already listed for pesticides.
Spatial representation	Targeted in waterbody.
Temporal representation	Data were collected between 1997 and 2001.
Data type	MTRLs, WQOs are numeric.
Use of standard method	Standard analytical methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	None.
RWQCB Recommendation	More monitoring needed.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the Monitoring List because the data are inadequate to determine if applicable water quality standards are exceeded. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited insufficient spatial coverage. 3. Water quality standards are applicable. 4. Data are numerical. 5. Standard methods were used. An inadequate amount of water quality measurements are available to determine if water quality standards are exceeded.

Region 8: Huntington Harbour
Caulerpa taxifolia

Water Body	Huntington Harbour
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Caulerpa taxifolia (an invasive marine algae)/Water/Aquatic Life
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	The information used to develop this listing is taken from two summary documents developed by the National Marine Fisheries Service.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	The Basin Plan contains narrative water quality objectives for the protection of bay and estuarine communities and populations of vertebrate, invertebrate, and plant species.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	In areas where the Caulerpa has become well established, it has caused ecological and economic devastation by overgrowing and eliminating native seaweeds, seagrasses, and other communities. In the Mediterranean, it is reported to have harmed tourism and pleasure boating, devastated recreational diving, and had a costly impact on commercial fishing both by altering the distribution of fish as well as creating a considerable impediment to net fisheries. The dense carpet that this species can form on the bottom could inhibit the establishment of juveniles of many reef species, and its establishment offshore could seriously impact sport and commercial fisheries and navigation through quarantine restrictions to prevent the spread of this species.
Water Body-specific Information	This alga poses a substantial threat to marine ecosystems to Southern California, particularly to the extensive eelgrass meadows and other benthic environments that make coastal waters such a rich and productive environment for fish and birds. The eelgrass beds and other coastal resources that could be directly impacted by an invasion of Caulerpa are part of a food web that is critical to the survival of numerous native marine species including the commercially and recreationally important spiny lobster, California halibut, and sand basses.
Data used to assess water quality	The discovery of this species in southern California, recently reported in the journal Nature to be genetically identical to the strain in the Mediterranean, confirms that it nevertheless continues to invade marine ecosystems, such as the ecologically rich eelgrass beds that thrive in many of our coastal lagoons. It is likely that the alga was released from an aquarium at the locations in California where it has been discovered, a practice banned under California law. As of September 24, 2001 when Governor Gray Davis signed into law Assembly Bill 1334, it is now unlawful to sell, import, transport, transfer, or possess C. taxifolia and a number of look-alike species and other invasive Caulerpa species.
Spatial representation	The infestation of Huntington Harbour and Agua Hedionda are the first know infestations along the Pacific Coast of North America.
Temporal representation	Caulerpa was found in Huntington Harbour in August 2000. It is probable that Caulerpa has been present since 1996.
Data type	The information used was not numerical.
Use of standard method	N/A

Region 8: Huntington Harbour
Caulerpa taxifolia

Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	It is likely that the alga was released from an aquarium near the Harbour. This practice is now banned by State law (AB 1334 (2001)).
Alternative Enforceable Program	RWQCB staff is coordinating efforts to define the spatial extent of the infestation, working with other agencies and interested parties to confine the infestation, examining available technologies for Caulerpa removal potential and educating the public as to its source and impact to the harbor.
RWQCB Recommendation	Use existing activities to prevent and eradicate Caulerpa taxifolia.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because a pollutant does not contribute to or causes the problem.

Region 8: Lake Forest
Temperature, clarity, and dissolved oxygen

Water Body	Lake Forest
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Temperature, clarity, and dissolved oxygen/Water/There are existing aquatic life beneficial uses.
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	The information provided for this water body was narrative descriptions of the types of water quality factors that can impact water quality (such as water clarity, aquatic vegetation growth, and fish kills.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	No water quality standards are established for this water body.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	No measurements or observations were provided.
Water Body-specific Information	A description of the Lake and the characteristics of the Lake that could be influenced by runoff or other sources of pollutants is provided.
Data used to assess water quality	No data or visual observations from the Lake were provided. The information provided is a descriptive summary of the characteristics
Spatial representation	No water quality measurements provided.
Temporal representation	No water quality measurements provided.
Data type	Non-numerical information.
Use of standard method	N/A
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Runoff.
Alternative Enforceable Program	
RWQCB Recommendation	Basin Plan water quality objectives are met. Do not list.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded. No data were provided that indicate standards are not met or existing beneficial uses are impacted.

Region 8: Little Corona Beach
Bacteria

Water Body	Little Corona Beach
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Bacteria/Water/MUN, REC-1, REC-2
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	QA used by county health agency
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	3 WQOs for total coliform (MUN) and fecal coliform (REC-1, REC-2).
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical standard directly.
Water Body-specific Information	Insufficient data to make a determination.
Data used to assess water quality	Insufficient data to make a determination.
Spatial representation	Insufficient data to make a determination
Temporal representation	Data were collected between 1997 and 2001.
Data type	3 WQOs for total and fecal coliform for MUN, REC-1, REC-2
Use of standard method	Standard bacteriological methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	None.
RWQCB Recommendation	Insufficient data to make a determination. Place on high priority for monitoring.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the Monitoring List because the data are inadequate to determine if applicable water quality standards are exceeded. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited insufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. An inadequate amount of water quality measurements is available.

Region 8: Los Trancos Creek
Total and Fecal coliform

Water Body	Los Trancos Creek
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Total and Fecal coliform/Water/Beneficial uses not established in the Basin Plan for this water body but there are existing REC-1 and REC-2 beneficial uses downstream of Pacific Coast Highway.
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	QA used by county health agency.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	No water quality standards established in the Basin Plan specifically for this water body. The guideline used by the RWQCB is appropriate for this type of water body.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical guidelines or standards established for other water bodies.
Water Body-specific Information	Data age = 1-4 Years.
Data used to assess water quality	Over 450 violations of guidelines for total and fecal coliform.
Spatial representation	All samples collected from creek, at least 4 sample sites, approximately 500 samples.
Temporal representation	The data were collected between 1997 and 2001.
Data type	Numerical data.
Use of standard method	Standard bacteriological methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	The Irvine Company is committed to diverting dry weather flows of the Creek. The problem is likely to only exist during the wet season.
RWQCB Recommendation	List for total and fecal coliform.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the section 303(d) list because an existing beneficial use is impacted and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem. List for total and fecal coliform on the portion of the Creek downstream of Pacific Coast Highway during the wet season. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses have not been established for the water body but there is an existing beneficial use downstream of the Pacific Coast Highway . 4. A water quality standard is not established. 5. The evaluation guideline used is adequate. 6. Data are numerical. 7. Standard methods were used. 8. Other water body- or site-specific information including the season and

age of the data were considered.

Most of the water quality measurements indicate the beneficial use is impacted. The staff confidence is high.

Region 8: Lower Newport Bay
Nutrients

Water Body	Lower Newport Bay
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Nutrients/Water/Aquatic Life
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	N/A
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	N/A
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	N/A
Water Body-specific Information	N/A
Data used to assess water quality	N/A
Spatial representation	N/A
Temporal representation	N/A
Data type	N/A
Use of standard method	N/A
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	N/A
Alternative Enforceable Program	N/A
RWQCB Recommendation	Delist because TMDL has been incorporated into Basin plan, and has been approved by USEPA.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the TMDLs Completed List because a TMDL has been developed for the water body-pollutant combination. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that the TMDL has been completed, has been incorporated into Basin Plan, and has been approved by USEPA.

Region 8: Lower Newport Bay
Siltation

Water Body	Lower Newport Bay
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Siltation/Water/Aquatic Life
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	N/A
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	N/A
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	N/A
Water Body-specific Information	N/A
Data used to assess water quality	N/A
Spatial representation	N/A
Temporal representation	N/A
Data type	N/A
Use of standard method	N/A
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	N/A
Alternative Enforceable Program	N/A
RWQCB Recommendation	Delist because TMDL has been incorporated into Basin plan, and has been approved by USEPA.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the TMDLs Completed List because a TMDL has been developed for the water body-pollutant combination. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that the TMDL has been completed, has been incorporated into Basin Plan, and has been approved by USEPA.

Region 8: Lower Newport Bay
Fecal coliform

Water Body	Lower Newport Bay
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Fecal coliform/Water/MUN, REC-1, REC-2.
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	N/A
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	N/A
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	N/A
Water Body-specific Information	N/A
Data used to assess water quality	N/A
Spatial representation	N/A
Temporal representation	N/A
Data type	N/A
Use of standard method	N/A
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	N/A
Alternative Enforceable Program	N/A
RWQCB Recommendation	Delist because TMDL has been incorporated into Basin plan, and has been approved by USEPA.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the TMDLs Completed List because a TMDL has been developed for the water body-pollutant combination. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that the TMDL has been completed, has been incorporated into Basin Plan, and has been approved by USEPA.

Region 8: Lower Newport Bay
Metals

Water Body	Lower Newport Bay
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Metals/Water/Aquatic Life
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	N/A
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	N/A
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	N/A
Water Body-specific Information	USEPA has approved a TMDL for this water body-pollutant combination.
Data used to assess water quality	N/A
Spatial representation	N/A
Temporal representation	N/A
Data type	N/A
Use of standard method	N/A
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	N/A
Alternative Enforceable Program	N/A
RWQCB Recommendation	None.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the TMDLs Completed List because a plan to implement the TMDL has not been adopted or approved even though the TMDL has been approved by USEPA.

Region 8: Lower Newport Bay
Pesticides

Water Body	Lower Newport Bay
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Pesticides/Water/Aquatic Life
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	N/A
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	N/A
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	N/A
Water Body-specific Information	USEPA has approved a TMDL for this water body-pollutant combination.
Data used to assess water quality	N/A
Spatial representation	N/A
Temporal representation	N/A
Data type	N/A
Use of standard method	N/A
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	N/A
Alternative Enforceable Program	N/A
RWQCB Recommendation	None.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the TMDLs Completed List because a plan to implement the TMDL has not been adopted or approved even though the TMDL has been approved by USEPA.

Region 8: Lower Newport Bay
Priority Organics

Water Body	Lower Newport Bay
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Priority Organics/Water/Aquatic Life
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	N/A
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	N/A
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	N/A
Water Body-specific Information	USEPA has approved a TMDL for this water body-pollutant combination.
Data used to assess water quality	N/A
Spatial representation	N/A
Temporal representation	N/A
Data type	N/A
Use of standard method	N/A
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	N/A
Alternative Enforceable Program	N/A
RWQCB Recommendation	None.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the TMDLs Completed List because a plan to implement the TMDL has not been adopted or approved even though the TMDL has been approved by USEPA.

Region 8: Mill Creek (Prado Area)
Metals

Water Body	Mill Creek (Prado Area)
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Metals/Water/various beneficial uses
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	Reviewed water quality data from Orange County Water District. QA used by county.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	WQOs.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical standard directly.
Water Body-specific Information	
Data used to assess water quality	Antimony: 8 samples, with 0 exceeding. Copper: 8 samples with 0 exceeding. Mercury: 8 samples with 0 exceeding. Nickel: 8 samples with 0 exceeding.
Spatial representation	Insufficient data to make a determination.
Temporal representation	1997-2001.
Data type	Data are numeric values.
Use of standard method	Standard analytical methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	
RWQCB Recommendation	Insufficient data to make a determination. More monitoring needed.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the Monitoring List because the data are inadequate to determine if applicable water quality standards are exceeded. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. The data is considered to be of adequate, inadequate quality. 2. The data exhibited insufficient spatial and temporal coverage. An inadequate amount of the water quality measurements were available to assess if the water quality standard was exceeded.

Region 8: Muddy Creek
Total and Fecal coliform

Water Body	Muddy Creek
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Total and Fecal coliform/Water/Beneficial uses are not established in the Basin Plan for this water body.
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	QA used by county health agency.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	No water quality objectives are established in the Basin Plan specifically for this water body.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical guidelines or standards established for other water bodies.
Water Body-specific Information	Data age = 1-4 Years.
Data used to assess water quality	77/110 samples exceeded the total coliform guideline related to MUN. 16/53 samples exceeded the fecal coliform guideline related to REC 2. 11/54 samples exceeded the fecal coliform guideline related to REC 1.
Spatial representation	Samples collected in creek or creek mouth.
Temporal representation	Data were collected between 1997 and 2001.
Data type	Numerical data.
Use of standard method	Standard bacteriological methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	None.
RWQCB Recommendation	List for total and fecal coliform.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because there are no applicable beneficial uses and water quality standards. There is also no evidence of an existing beneficial use. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. Beneficial uses have not been established and do not apply to the water body. 2. Water quality standards are not established. RWQCB should consider adoption of beneficial uses and water quality objectives for this water body.

Region 8: Newport Bay
DDT, Mercury and endosulfans

Water Body	Newport Bay
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	DDT, Mercury and endosulfans/tissue/Fish consumption
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	QA used by CFCP.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	MTRLs.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical standard directly.
Water Body-specific Information	Data age = 1-4 Years.
Data used to assess water quality	Reviewed data from Coastal Fish Contamination Program. No exceedances for mercury, endosulfan. 11/19 fish tissue samples exceeded MTRL for DDT. Already listed for pesticides.
Spatial representation	5 sampling locations.
Temporal representation	1997-2001.
Data type	MTRLs are numeric.
Use of standard method	Standard analytical methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	None.
RWQCB Recommendation	More monitoring needed.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body is already on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. The evaluation guideline used to interpret narrative water quality standards is adequate. 6. Data are numerical. 7. Standard methods were used. 8. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. Most of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard, but the water body is already listed for pesticides. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.

Region 8: Orange County Beaches
Trash

Water Body	Orange County Beaches
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Trash/Water/REC-2, Aquatic Life
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	The sampling procedures, collection approach, data analysis, and estimation procedures are clearly described (Moore et al., 2000. Composition and distribution of beach debris in Orange County, California)
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	The Basin Plan has narrative water quality objectives to prevent solids from causing nuisance or adversely affecting beneficial uses.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	The measures used in the study were abundance of trash particles and the weight of trash along the coastline. These data were compared to California Coastal Cleanup Day collection data.
Water Body-specific Information	Estimates were made of the percent of shoreline affected, types of habitat affected (sandy beach and rocky shore), Trash type (including plastics, cigarette butts, paper, wood metal glass rubber, pet and bird droppings, cloth, and other trash).
Data used to assess water quality	Estimated total abundance of trash was 106 million items weighing 13 tons. Pre-production plastic pellets, foamed plastics and hard plastics made up 99% of the total abundance and 51% of the total weight. Cigarette butts were fourth in total abundance and accounted for less than 1% of the abundance and weight. Data collected by volunteers during the annual California Coastal Cleanup Day (1998) was 50 times lower than the data collected in the trash survey.
Spatial representation	Beach debris was surveyed and collected at 43 sites from Seal Beach to San Clemente on the Orange County coast. The data were collected using a stratified random design, stratified by shoreline type.
Temporal representation	Data were collected between August 2 and September 18, 1998.
Data type	Numerical data.
Use of standard method	See Quality Assurance section above. Data were collected using approaches from other debris studies outside the U.S.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Four sources were identified: (1) littering by beachgoers, (2) wind currents from upland sources, (3) runoff from land-based activities, and (4) overboard disposal form boating activities (including accidental spills). The data suggest that water-based sources (runoff and overboard disposal) were more important than direct littering or wind.
Alternative Enforceable Program	The North/Central Orange County Areawide Urban Stormwater Runoff Permit, Order No. R8-2002-0010 issued to Orange County and its incorporated cities has enforceable provisions in place to address litter, debris and trash in this water body.
RWQCB Recommendation	None.

Region 8: Orange County Beaches
Trash

SWRCB Staff Recommendation

After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body 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.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:
1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality.
2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage.
3. Beneficial uses apply.
4. Water quality standard used is applicable.
5. Data are numerical.
6. Standard methods were used.
7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the effects of different sources and age of the data were considered.

An adequate amount of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is moderate.

Region 8: Pelican Hill Waterfall
Total and Fecal coliform

Water Body	Pelican Hill Waterfall
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Total and Fecal coliform/Water/beneficial uses are not established in the Basin Plan for this water body.
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	QA used by county health agency.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	No water quality objectives are established in the Basin Plan specifically for this water body.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical guidelines directly.
Water Body-specific Information	Data age = 1-4 Years.
Data used to assess water quality	14/64 exceedances of fecal coliform WQO for REC-2. 208/220 exceedances of total coliform WQO. 11/56 exceedances of fecal coliform WQO for REC-1.
Spatial representation	Targeted in waterbody.
Temporal representation	Data were collected between 1997 and 2001.
Data type	Numerical data.
Use of standard method	Standard bacteriological methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	None.
RWQCB Recommendation	List for total and fecal coliform.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because there are no applicable beneficial uses or water quality standards. There is no evidence in the record that there is an existing beneficial use. RWQCB should consider adoption of beneficial uses and water quality objectives for this water body. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. Beneficial uses have not been established and do not apply to the water body. 2. Water quality standards have not been established.

Region 8: Pelican Point Creek
Total and Fecal coliform

Water Body	Pelican Point Creek
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Total and Fecal coliform/Water/Beneficial uses have not been established in the Basin Plan for this water body.
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	QA used by county health agency.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	No water quality objectives are established in the Basin Plan specifically for this water body.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical guidelines directly.
Water Body-specific Information	Data age = 1-4 Years.
Data used to assess water quality	225/230 exceedances of total coliform guideline. 31/55 exceedances of fecal coliform guideline for REC-2. 48/56 exceedances of fecal coliform guideline for REC-1.
Spatial representation	Targeted in waterbody.
Temporal representation	Data collected between 1997 and 2001.
Data type	3 WQOs for total and fecal coliform for MUN, REC-1, REC-2.
Use of standard method	Standard bacteriological methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	None.
RWQCB Recommendation	List for total and fecal coliform.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because there are no applicable beneficial uses or water quality standards. There is no evidence in the record that there is an existing beneficial use. RWQCB should consider adoption of beneficial uses and water quality objectives for this water body. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. Beneficial uses have not been established and do not apply to the water body. 2. Water quality standards have not been established.

Region 8: Pelican Point Middle Creek
Total and Fecal coliform

Water Body	Pelican Point Middle Creek
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Total and Fecal coliform/Water/Beneficial uses are not established in the Basin Plan for this water body.
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	QA used by county health agency.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	No water quality objectives are established in the Basin Plan specifically for this water body.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical guidelines directly.
Water Body-specific Information	Data age = 1-4 Years.
Data used to assess water quality	126/133 exceedances of total coliform guideline. 12/50 exceedances of fecal coliform WQO for REC-1 guideline. 11/50 exceedances of fecal coliform guideline for REC-2.
Spatial representation	Targeted in waterbody.
Temporal representation	Data were collected between 1997 and 2001.
Data type	Numerical data.
Use of standard method	Standard bacteriological methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	None.
RWQCB Recommendation	List for total and fecal coliform.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because there are no applicable beneficial uses or water quality standards. There is no evidence in the record that there is an existing beneficial use. RWQCB should consider adoption of beneficial uses and water quality objectives for this water body. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. Beneficial uses have not been established and do not apply to the water body. 2. Water quality standards have not been established.

Region 8: San Diego Creek Reach 1
Pesticides

Water Body	San Diego Creek Reach 1
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Pesticides/Water/Aquatic Life
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	N/A
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	N/A
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	N/A
Water Body-specific Information	USEPA has approved a TMDL for this water body-pollutant combination.
Data used to assess water quality	N/A
Spatial representation	N/A
Temporal representation	N/A
Data type	N/A
Use of standard method	N/A
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	N/A
Alternative Enforceable Program	N/A
RWQCB Recommendation	None.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the TMDLs Completed List because a plan to implement the TMDL has not been adopted or approved even though the TMDL has been approved by USEPA.

Region 8: San Diego Creek Reach 1
Metals

Water Body	San Diego Creek Reach 1
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Metals/Water/Aquatic Life
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	N/A
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	N/A
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	N/A
Water Body-specific Information	USEPA has approved a TMDL for this water body-pollutant combination.
Data used to assess water quality	N/A
Spatial representation	N/A
Temporal representation	N/A
Data type	N/A
Use of standard method	N/A
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	N/A
Alternative Enforceable Program	N/A
RWQCB Recommendation	None.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the TMDLs Completed List because a TMDL has been established for this water body-pollutant combination by USEPA.

Region 8: San Diego Creek Reach 2
Metals

Water Body	San Diego Creek Reach 2
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Metals/Water/Aquatic Life
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	N/A
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	N/A
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	N/A
Water Body-specific Information	USEPA has approved a TMDL for this water body-pollutant combination.
Data used to assess water quality	N/A
Spatial representation	N/A
Temporal representation	N/A
Data type	N/A
Use of standard method	N/A
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	N/A
Alternative Enforceable Program	N/A
RWQCB Recommendation	None.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the TMDLs Completed List because a plan to implement the TMDL has not been adopted or approved even though the TMDL has been approved by USEPA.

Region 8: San Diego Creek, Reach 1
Nutrients

Water Body	San Diego Creek, Reach 1
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Nutrients/Water/Aquatic Life
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	N/A
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	N/A
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	N/A
Water Body-specific Information	N/A
Data used to assess water quality	N/A
Spatial representation	N/A
Temporal representation	N/A
Data type	N/A
Use of standard method	N/A
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	N/A
Alternative Enforceable Program	N/A
RWQCB Recommendation	Delist because TMDL has been incorporated into Basin plan, and has been approved by USEPA.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the TMDLs Completed List because a TMDL has been developed for the water body-pollutant combination. The TMDL has been incorporated into Basin Plan and has been approved by USEPA.

Region 8: San Diego Creek, Reach 1
Siltation

Water Body	San Diego Creek, Reach 1
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Siltation/Water/Aquatic Life
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	N/A
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	N/A
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	N/A
Water Body-specific Information	N/A
Data used to assess water quality	N/A
Spatial representation	N/A
Temporal representation	N/A
Data type	N/A
Use of standard method	N/A
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	N/A
Alternative Enforceable Program	N/A
RWQCB Recommendation	Delist because TMDL has been incorporated into Basin plan, and has been approved by USEPA
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the TMDLs Completed List because a TMDL has been developed for the water body-pollutant combination. The TMDL has been incorporated into Basin Plan and has been approved by USEPA.

Region 8: San Diego Creek, Reach 1
Fecal coliform

Water Body	San Diego Creek, Reach 1
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Fecal coliform/Water/REC-1, REC-2
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	QA used by county health agency.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	3 WQOs for total coliform (MUN) and fecal coliform (REC-1, REC-2)
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical standard directly.
Water Body-specific Information	Data age = 1-4 Years
Data used to assess water quality	22/22 exceedances of total and fecal coliform WQOs.
Spatial representation	Targeted in waterbody.
Temporal representation	1997-2001.
Data type	3 WQOs for total and fecal coliform for MUN, REC-1, REC-2
Use of standard method	Standard bacteriological methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	None.
RWQCB Recommendation	List for total and fecal coliform
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body 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. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including the age of the data were considered. All of the water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high.

Region 8: San Diego Creek, Reach 2
Siltation

Water Body	San Diego Creek, Reach 2
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Siltation/Water/Aquatic Life
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	N/A
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	N/A
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	N/A
Water Body-specific Information	N/A
Data used to assess water quality	N/A
Spatial representation	N/A
Temporal representation	N/A
Data type	N/A
Use of standard method	N/A
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	N/A
Alternative Enforceable Program	N/A
RWQCB Recommendation	Delist because TMDL has been incorporated into Basin plan, and has been approved by USEPA
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the TMDLs Completed List because a TMDL has been developed for the water body-pollutant combination. The TMDL has been incorporated into Basin Plan and has been approved by USEPA.

Region 8: San Diego Creek, Reach 2
Nutrients

Water Body	San Diego Creek, Reach 2
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Nutrients/Water/Aquatic Life
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	N/A
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	N/A
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	N/A
Water Body-specific Information	N/A
Data used to assess water quality	N/A
Spatial representation	N/A
Temporal representation	N/A
Data type	N/A
Use of standard method	N/A
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	N/A
Alternative Enforceable Program	N/A
RWQCB Recommendation	Delist because TMDL has been incorporated into Basin plan, and has been approved by USEPA.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the TMDLs Completed List because a TMDL has been developed for the water body-pollutant combination. The TMDL has been incorporated into Basin Plan and has been approved by USEPA.

Region 8: San Jacinto River North Fork (Reach 7)
Metals

Water Body	San Jacinto River North Fork (Reach 7)
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Metals/Water/MUN
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	Reviewed water quality data from Lake Hemet Municipal Water District. QA used by water district.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	WQOs.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical standard directly.
Water Body-specific Information	
Data used to assess water quality	Aluminum: 4 samples with 1 exceeding MCL. Antimony: 4 samples with 0 exceeding MCL. Arsenic: 4 samples with 0 exceeding MCL. Barium: 4 samples with 0 exceeding MCL. Beryllium: 4 samples with 0 exceeding MCL. Cadmium: 4 samples with 0 exceeding MCL. Iron: 4 samples with 0 exceeding MCL.
Spatial representation	Insufficient data to make a determination.
Temporal representation	1997-2001.
Data type	Data are numeric values.
Use of standard method	Standard analytical methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	None
RWQCB Recommendation	Insufficient data to make a determination. More monitoring needed.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the Monitoring List because the data are inadequate to determine if applicable water quality standards are exceeded. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited insufficient spatial and temporal coverage.

Region 8: San Jacinto River South Fork (Reach 7)
Salinity, Total Dissolved Solids

Water Body	San Jacinto River South Fork (Reach 7)
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Salinity, Total Dissolved Solids/Water/MUN
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	Reviewed water quality data from Lake Hemet Municipal Water District. QA used by water district.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	WQOs.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical standard directly.
Water Body-specific Information	
Data used to assess water quality	Primary and secondary MCL: 4 samples with 0 exceeding. Sodium: 4 samples with 4 Basin Plan Objective. Sulfate: 4 samples with 0 exceeding BP Objective. Chloride: 4 samples with 3 exceeding BP Objective. TDS: 4 samples with 4 exceeding BP objective.
Spatial representation	Insufficient data to make a determination.
Temporal representation	1997-2001.
Data type	Data are numeric values.
Use of standard method	Standard analytical methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	None.
RWQCB Recommendation	Insufficient data to make a determination. More monitoring needed.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the Monitoring List because the data are inadequate to determine if applicable water quality standards are exceeded. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited insufficient spatial and temporal coverage.

Region 8: Santa Ana Delhi Channel
Fecal coliform

Water Body	Santa Ana Delhi Channel
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Fecal coliform/Water/Beneficial uses are not established in the basin Plan for this water body.
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	QA used by county health agency.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	No water quality standards are established in the Basin Plan specifically for this water body.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical guidelines directly.
Water Body-specific Information	Data age = 1-4 Years.
Data used to assess water quality	11/11 exceedances of total coliform guidelines. 22/22 exceedances of total and fecal guidelines.
Spatial representation	Targeted in waterbody.
Temporal representation	Data collected between 1997 and 2001.
Data type	Numerical data.
Use of standard method	Standard bacteriological methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	None.
RWQCB Recommendation	List for total and fecal coliform.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because there are no applicable beneficial uses or water quality standards. There is no evidence in the record that there is an existing beneficial use. RWQCB should consider adoption of beneficial uses and water quality objectives for this water body. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. Beneficial uses have not been established and do not apply to the water body. 2. Water quality standards have not been established.

Region 8: Santa Ana River (Reaches 4 and 5)
Metals

Water Body	Santa Ana River (Reaches 4 and 5)
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Metals/Water/WARM, WILD, RARE
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	QA used by county.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	WQOs.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical standard directly.
Water Body-specific Information	Insufficient data to make a determination.
Data used to assess water quality	Reviewed water quality data from Orange County Water District. Reach 4: Arsenic: 1 sample with 0 exceeding standard. Reach 4: Copper: 1 sample with 0 exceeding standard. Reach 4: Nickel: 1 sample with 0 exceeding standard. Reach 5: Copper: 3 sample with 0 exceeding standard. Reach 5: Lead: 1 sample with 0 exceeding standard. Reach 5: Nickel: 1 sample with 0 exceeding standard.
Spatial representation	Insufficient data to make a determination
Temporal representation	1997-2001.
Data type	Data are numeric values.
Use of standard method	Standard analytical methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	None.
RWQCB Recommendation	Insufficient data to make a determination. More monitoring needed.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the Monitoring List because the data are inadequate to determine if applicable water quality standards are exceeded. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited insufficient spatial and temporal coverage.

Region 8: Santa Ana River, Reach 1
Trash

Water Body	Santa Ana River, Reach 1
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Trash/Water/Human-related: REC-2; Aquatic Life: WARM, WILD, RARE
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	No quality assurance information was provided.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	The narrative water quality objectives to prevent floatables from causing nuisance or adversely affecting beneficial uses.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Photographs can indicate gross impacts on beneficial uses and whether standards have been exceeded. Measurements of the amounts of trash can provide a relative measure of the potential for nuisance.
Water Body-specific Information	Photographs appear to be taken on at least two occasions. The data for trash collection is for beaches in the cities of Newport Beach and Huntington Beach.
Data used to assess water quality	Trash carried down the Santa Ana River generally finds its way onto beaches in the cities of Huntington Beach and Newport Beach. After storms, 929 tons of trash and debris were collected in 1999 along Huntington Beach city beaches. During the same period, approximately 970 tons of trash and debris were collected on Newport Beach city beaches. Fifteen photographs were submitted depicting several locations in along the Santa Ana River with trash scattered in several locations. The trash included plastic bottles, styrofoam and paper cups, paper wrappers, plastic bags, a shopping cart, and other unidentifiable debris.
Spatial representation	The photographs were taken at seven locations along the Santa Ana River from McFadden to McAurthur Blvd.
Temporal representation	The date the photographs were taken is unknown but it is apparent from the time stamp on some of the photographs that they were taken on two different days.
Data type	The photographs are qualitative information. Data on trash collections from the Newport Beach and Huntington Beach city beaches are numerical.
Use of standard method	Documentation methods are not described.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Trash can enter the River from urban runoff or by being blown directly into the water body.
Alternative Enforceable Program	The North/Central Orange County Areawide Urban Stormwater Runoff Permit, Order No. R8-2002-0010 issued to Orange County and its incorporated cities has enforceable provisions in place to address litter, debris and trash in this water body.
RWQCB Recommendation	Use the provisions of the storm water permit to correct the trash problem in Upper Newport Bay.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB

documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the Monitoring List because the data are inadequate to determine if applicable water quality standards are exceeded.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:
1. The data is considered to be of unknown quality.
2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and unknown temporal coverage.
3. Water quality standard used is applicable.
4. Data are both numerical and not numerical.
5. Cannot tell if standard methods were used.

An inadequate amount of the measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is low.

Region 8: Santa Ana River, Reach 3
Total Dissolved Solids

Water Body	Santa Ana River, Reach 3
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Total Dissolved Solids/Water/MUN
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	QA used by Regional Board.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	WQO is 700 mg/L.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical standard directly.
Water Body-specific Information	Data age = 1-4 Years.
Data used to assess water quality	17/18 samples did not exceed WQO (700 mg/L)
Spatial representation	Targeted in waterbody. Locations unknown.
Temporal representation	1997-2001.
Data type	Data values are numeric.
Use of standard method	Standard analytical methods used.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	None.
Alternative Enforceable Program	None.
RWQCB Recommendation	Delist because recent data indicate WQO is being met.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including age of the data were considered. Most of the water quality measurements did not exceed the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is high.

Region 8: Santa Ana River, Reach 3
Nitrogen

Water Body	Santa Ana River, Reach 3
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Nitrogen/Water/Aquatic Life
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	QA used by Regional Board.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	WQO is 10 mg/L.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical standard directly.
Water Body-specific Information	Data age = 1-4 Years.
Data used to assess water quality	54/55 samples did not exceed the WQO (10 mg/L).
Spatial representation	Targeted in waterbody.
Temporal representation	1997-2001.
Data type	Data values are numeric.
Use of standard method	Standard analytical methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	None.
Alternative Enforceable Program	None.
RWQCB Recommendation	Delist because recent data indicate WQO is being met.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including age of the data were considered. Most of the water quality measurements did not exceed the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were not exceeded is high.

Region 8: Seal Beach, Projection of First Street Enterococcus

Water Body	Seal Beach, Projection of First Street
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Enterococcus/Water/REC-1, REC-2
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	QA used by county health agency.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	Exceedances of single sample AB 411 standards may result in beach postings by Orange Count Health Care Agency. Bacterial water quality standards are linked to REC-1 beneficial use attainment.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical standard directly.
Water Body-specific Information	Data age = 1-4 Years. Data were collected during both wet and dry seasons.
Data used to assess water quality	25 samples exceeded standard out of a total of 150 samples.
Spatial representation	1 station. Sampling location represents 50 yards on either side of the sampling location.
Temporal representation	Data collected between 1999 and August 2002.
Data type	Numerical data.
Use of standard method	Standard bacteriological methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	None.
RWQCB Recommendation	List for enterococcus.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body 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. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and temporal coverage. 3. Beneficial uses apply to the water body. 4. Water quality standard used is applicable. 5. Data are numerical. 6. Standard methods were used. 7. Other water body- or site-specific information including season and the age of the data were considered. An adequate number of water quality measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is high. List for total and fecal coliform

Region 8: Strawberry Creek
Salinity, total dissolved solids

Water Body	Strawberry Creek
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Salinity, total dissolved solids/Water/MUN, COLD WILD
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	Reviewed water quality data from Lake Hemet Municipal Water District. QA used by water district
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	WQOs
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical standard directly.
Water Body-specific Information	Insufficient data to make a determination.
Data used to assess water quality	Reviewed water quality data from Lake Hemet Municipal Water District. Hardness: 4 samples with 0 exceeding the standard. Sodium: 4 samples with 4 exceeding the standard. Sulfate: 4 samples with 0 exceeding the standard. Chloride: 4 samples with 3 exceeding the standard. Total dissolved solids: 4 samples with 3 exceeding the standard.
Spatial representation	Insufficient data to make a determination.
Temporal representation	1997-2001.
Data type	Data are numeric values.
Use of standard method	Standard analytical methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	None.
RWQCB Recommendation	Insufficient data to make a determination. More monitoring needed.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the Monitoring List because the data are inadequate to determine if applicable water quality standards are exceeded. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited insufficient spatial and temporal coverage. An inadequate amount of the water quality measurements are available to determine if the water quality standards are exceeded.

Region 8: Temescal Creek
Metals

Water Body	Temescal Creek
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Metals/Water/WARM, WILD, RARE
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	Reviewed water quality data from Orange County Water District. QA used by county.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	WQOs
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Measurement can be compared to numerical standard directly.
Water Body-specific Information	Measurements were compared to hardness-adjusted standards.
Data used to assess water quality	Reviewed water quality data from Orange County Water District. Arsenic: 4 sample with 0 exceeding standard. Cadmium: 4 samples with 0 exceeding standard. Copper: 4 samples with 0 exceeding standard. Lead: 4 samples with 0 exceeding standard. Nickel: 4 samples with 0 exceeding standard. Selenium: 4 samples with 0 exceeding standard. Zinc: 4 samples with 0 exceeding standard.
Spatial representation	Insufficient data to make a determination.
Temporal representation	1997-2000.
Data type	Data are numeric values.
Use of standard method	Standard analytical methods.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Unknown.
Alternative Enforceable Program	None.
RWQCB Recommendation	Insufficient data to make a determination. More monitoring needed.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the Monitoring List because the data are inadequate to determine if applicable water quality standards are exceeded. This conclusion is based on the staff findings that: 1. The data is considered to be of adequate quality. 2. The data exhibited insufficient spatial and temporal coverage. An inadequate amount of the water quality measurements are available to determine if the water quality standards are exceeded.

Region 8: Upper Newport Bay
Fecal coliform

Water Body	Upper Newport Bay
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Fecal coliform/Water/REC-1, REC-2
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	N/A
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	N/A
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	N/A
Water Body-specific Information	N/A
Data used to assess water quality	N/A
Spatial representation	N/A
Temporal representation	N/A
Data type	N/A
Use of standard method	N/A
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	N/A
Alternative Enforceable Program	N/A
RWQCB Recommendation	Delist because TMDL has been incorporated into Basin plan, and has been approved by USEPA.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the TMDLs Completed List because a TMDL has been developed for the water body-pollutant combination. The TMDL has been incorporated into Basin Plan and has been approved by USEPA.

Region 8: Upper Newport Bay
Siltation

Water Body	Upper Newport Bay
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Siltation/Water/Aquatic Life
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	N/A
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	N/A
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	N/A
Water Body-specific Information	N/A
Data used to assess water quality	N/A
Spatial representation	N/A
Temporal representation	N/A
Data type	N/A
Use of standard method	N/A
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	N/A
Alternative Enforceable Program	N/A
RWQCB Recommendation	Delist because TMDL has been incorporated into Basin Plan, and has been approved by USEPA.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the TMDLs Completed List because a TMDL has been developed for the water body-pollutant combination. The TMDL has been incorporated into Basin Plan and has been approved by USEPA.

Region 8: Upper Newport Bay
Nutrients

Water Body	Upper Newport Bay
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Nutrients/Water/Aquatic Life
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	N/A
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	N/A
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	N/A
Water Body-specific Information	N/A
Data used to assess water quality	N/A
Spatial representation	N/A
Temporal representation	N/A
Data type	N/A
Use of standard method	N/A
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	N/A
Alternative Enforceable Program	N/A
RWQCB Recommendation	Delist because TMDL has been incorporated into Basin plan, and has been approved by USEPA.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the TMDLs Completed List because a TMDL has been developed for the water body-pollutant combination. The TMDL has been incorporated into Basin Plan and has been approved by USEPA.

Region 8: Upper Newport Bay
Trash

Water Body	Upper Newport Bay
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Trash/Water/Human-related: REC-2; Aquatic Life: WILD, RARE, EST, MAR
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	No quality assurance information was provided.
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	The narrative water quality objectives to prevent solids from causing nuisance or adversely affecting beneficial uses.
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	Photographs can indicate gross impacts on beneficial uses and whether standards have been exceeded. Measurements of the amounts of trash can provide a relative measure of the potential for nuisance.
Water Body-specific Information	Photographs appear to be taken on at least one occasion.
Data used to assess water quality	Cleanup crews have documented trash in Newport Bay. Large amounts of trash were collected in Upper Newport Bay as follows: Year — Amount (pounds) 1999 — 53,500 2000 — 46,500 2001 — 42,900 Twelve photographs were submitted depicting several locations in Newport Bay with trash scattered in several intertidal locations. The trash included plastic bottles, styrofoam cups, paper wrappers, wood debris, aluminum cans, plastic pipes, personal floatation device, and other unidentifiable debris.
Spatial representation	The photographs were taken at 11 locations in Upper Newport Bay. The locations cover a number of widely scattered stations.
Temporal representation	It cannot be determined when the photographs were taken.
Data type	The photographs are qualitative information. Data on trash collections from the Upper Newport Bay are numerical.
Use of standard method	Documentation methods are not described.
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	Trash can enter the Bay from urban runoff or by being blown directly into the water body.
Alternative Enforceable Program	The North/Central Orange County Areawide Urban Stormwater Runoff Permit, Order No. R8-2002-0010 issued to Orange County and its incorporated cities has enforceable provisions in place to address litter, debris and trash in this water body.
RWQCB Recommendation	Use the provisions of the storm water permit to correct the trash problem in Upper Newport Bay.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB

documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed on the Monitoring List because the data are inadequate to determine if applicable water quality standards are exceeded.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:
1. The data is considered to be of unknown quality.
2. The data exhibited sufficient spatial and unknown temporal coverage.
3. Water quality standard used is applicable.
4. Data are both numerical and not numerical.
5. Cannot tell if standard methods were used.
6. Other water body- or site-specific information including the effects of season, storm events, and age of the data were not considered.

An inadequate amount of the measurements exceeded the water quality standard. The staff confidence that standards were exceeded is low.

Region 8: Upper Newport Bay Ecological Reserve
Metals

Water Body	Upper Newport Bay Ecological Reserve
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Metals/Water/Aquatic Life
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	N/A
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	N/A
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	N/A
Water Body-specific Information	USEPA has approved a TMDL for this water body-pollutant combination.
Data used to assess water quality	N/A
Spatial representation	N/A
Temporal representation	N/A
Data type	N/A
Use of standard method	N/A
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	N/A
Alternative Enforceable Program	N/A
RWQCB Recommendation	None.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the TMDLs Completed List because a plan to implement the TMDL has not been adopted or approved even though the TMDL has been approved by USEPA.

Region 8: Upper Newport Bay Ecological Reserve
Pesticides

Water Body	Upper Newport Bay Ecological Reserve
Stressor/Media/Beneficial Use	Pesticides/Water/Aquatic Life
Data quality assessment. Extent to which data quality requirements met.	N/A
Linkage between measurement endpoint and benefical use or standard	N/A
Utility of measure for judging if standards or uses are not attained	N/A
Water Body-specific Information	USEPA has approved a TMDL for this water body-pollutant combination.
Data used to assess water quality	N/A
Spatial representation	N/A
Temporal representation	N/A
Data type	N/A
Use of standard method	N/A
Potential Source(s) of Pollutant	N/A
Alternative Enforceable Program	N/A
RWQCB Recommendation	None.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation	After reviewing the available data and information and the RWQCB documentation for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should not be placed on the TMDLs Completed List because a plan to implement the TMDL has not been adopted or approved even though the TMDL has been approved by USEPA.

Reference List for Region 8

Staff Report

California Regional Water Quality Control Board. Santa Ana Region. 2001. Staff Report on the Update of the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List of Impaired Waterbodies within the Santa Ana Region. December 19, 2001.

Data Sources

Big Bear Lake Municipal Water District, Water Column Chemistry, Big Bear Lake, 2000. Wet & Dry.

Big Bear Lake Municipal Water District, Water Column Chemistry, Boulder Creek, 2000. Wet & Dry.

Big Bear Lake Municipal Water District, Water Column Chemistry, Grout Creek, 2000. Wet & Dry.

Big Bear Lake Municipal Water District, Water Column Chemistry, Knickerbocker Creek, 2000. Wet & Dry.

Big Bear Lake Municipal Water District, Water Column Chemistry, Metcalf Creek, 2000. Wet & Dry.

Big Bear Lake Municipal Water District, Water Column Chemistry, Rathbun Creek, 2000. Wet & Dry.

City of Canyon Lake, Sediment, Canyon Lake, 1986-1997. Season not applicable.

Lake Hemet Municipal Water District, Water Column Chemistry, San Jacinto Creek, 1998-2001. Wet Only.

Lake Hemet Municipal Water District, Water Column Chemistry, Strawberry Creek, 1998-2001. Wet Only.

NPDES/WDR discharger monitoring data , Water Column Chemistry , Varies throughout the Region, 1998-2000. Wet & Dry.

Orange County Health Care Agency , Water Column Chemistry, Buck Gully Creek, 1997- 2001. Wet & Dry.

Orange County Health Care Agency, Water Column Chemistry, Huntington Beach State Park, Wet & Dry.

Orange County Health Care Agency, The Irvine Company , Water Column Chemistry, Los Trancos Creek, 1997-2001. Wet & Dry.

Orange County Health Care Agency, The Irvine Company, Water Column Chemistry, Muddy Creek, 1997-2001. Wet & Dry.

Orange County Health Care Agency, Water Column Chemistry, Newport Beaches, 1999-2001. Wet Only.

Orange County Health Care Agency, Water Column Chemistry, Pelican Point Creek, 1997-2001. Wet & Dry.

Orange County Health Care Agency, Water Column Chemistry, Pelican Point Middle Creek, 1997-2001. Wet & Dry.

Orange County Health Care Agency, Water Column Chemistry, Pelican Hill Waterfall, 1997-2001. Wet & Dry.

Orange County Health Care Agency, RWQCB 8 Nov 24, 1998 Newport Bay TMDL Problem Statement, Water Column Chemistry, Santa Ana Delhi Channel, 1997,1998. Wet & Dry.

Orange County Health Care Agency, Water Column Chemistry , Seal Beach, 1999-2001. Wet & Dry.

Orange County Public Facilities Resource Dept, Water Column Chemistry, Anaheim Bay, 1999, 2000. Wet & Dry.

Orange County Public Facilities Resource Dept, Water Column Chemistry, Bolsa Chica, 1999, 2000. Wet & Dry.

Orange County Public Facilities Resource Dept, Water Column Chemistry , Huntington Harbour, 1999, 2000. Wet & Dry.

Orange County Water District, Water Column Chemistry, Cucamonga Creek, 1998,2000,2001. Wet Only

Orange County Water District, Water Column Chemistry, Chino Creek, 1997-2000. Wet & Dry.

Orange County Water District, Water Column Chemistry, *Mill Creek*, 1997-2000. Wet & Dry.

Orange County Water District, RWQCB 8 Monitoring data, Water Column Chemistry, Santa Ana River Reaches 2, 3, 4, 5, 1997-2000. Wet & Dry.

Orange County Water District, Water Column Chemistry, Temescal Creek, 1997-2000. Dry Only

RWQCB 8 Nov 24, 1998 Newport Bay TMDL Problem Statement, Water Column Chemistry, San Diego Creek, 1997,1998. Wet & Dry.

State Water Resources Control Board, Coastal Fish Contamination Program, Fish Tissue, *Anaheim Bay*, 1999, 2000. Season not applicable.

State Water Resources Control Board, Coastal Fish Contamination Program , Fish Tissue, Huntington Beach State Park, 1999, 2000. Season not applicable.

State Water Resources Control Board, Coastal Fish Contamination Program, Fish Tissue, Newport Bay, 1999, 2000. Season not applicable.

State Water Resources Control Board, Coastal Fish Contamination Program , Fish Tissue , Newport Beaches, 1999, 2000. Season not applicable.

State Water Resources Control Board, Coastal Fish Contamination Program , Fish Tissue, Ocean Waters (oil platforms), 1999, 2000. Season not applicable.

State Water Resources Control Board, Coastal Fish Contamination Program , Fish Tissue, Seal Beach, 1999,2000. Season not applicable.

State Water Resources Control Board, Mussel Watch, Mussel Tissue , Huntington Harbour, 1998-2000. Season not applicable.

Yucaipa Valley Municipal Water District, No ambient data received only outfall data, San Timoteo Creek, Not applicable.