10/25/06 BdMtg Item 10
303(d) List
Deadline: 10/20/06 5pm

COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICTS
OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

1955 Workman Mill Road, Whittier, CA 90601-1400
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 4998, Whittier, CA 90607-4998
Telephone: (562) 699-7411, FAX: (562) 699-5422
www.lacsd.org

JAMES F. STAHL
Chief Engineer and General Manager

October 20, 2006
File No. 31-370.40.4A

Via electronic mail

Ms. Tam Doduc, Chair and Members
State Water Resources Control Board
1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Chair Doduc and Members of the Board:

Comments on the September 2006 Proposed Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments for California
October 25, 2006 Board Meeting, Agenda Item 10

The Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (Districts) appreciate the opportunity to comment on the September 2006 proposed Revision of the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments for California (hereafter referred to as the 303(d) list) distributed by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board). The Districts are a consortium of 24 independent special districts serving the wastewater and solid waste management needs of over 5 million people and 3,300 industries in Los Angeles County, California. The Districts serve 78 cities and unincorporated areas within the County. We currently operate and maintain over 1,300 miles of trunk sewers and 11 wastewater treatment plants that collectively treat over 650 million gallons per day of wastewater. Of the 11 wastewater treatment plants, 7 discharge to inland surface waters in the San Gabriel River, Santa Clara River, and Rio Hondo watersheds (all in the Los Angeles Region), 1 discharges to the ocean (on the Palos Verdes Shelf), and 3 discharge to land and/or supply water for water recycling purposes. The Districts submitted comments on the proposed September 2005 303(d) list in a written submittal on January 31, 2006.[1]

1. Commend the State Board Staff for Outstanding Implementation of the Listing Policy

First and foremost, the Districts want to take this opportunity to commend the State Board staff for their diligent efforts to respond to the large volumes of comments they received on the September 2005 draft of the 303(d) list and for their outstanding implementation of the State Water Quality Control Policy for Developing California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List ("Listing Policy") to produce, for the most part, a well-documented and scientifically valid 303(d) list.

[1] Hereby incorporated by reference.

2. Request that the State Board Reschedule Adoption of the List to a November 2006 Board Meeting

However, the Districts have reviewed the proposed 303(d) list in the month since it was publicly noticed, and there are a few remaining concerns we have identified with the currently proposed list. In most cases, these concerns are with what appear to be inadvertent errors or oversights we believe were made in putting together the final draft 303(d) list. These items are described in detail in Attachment 1 to this letter. We realize that the State Board is planning on adopting the proposed 303(d) list on October 25, 2006. Given the complexity of the proposed list, and the importance of the 303(d) list for use in prioritizing use of Regional Board resources and the resources of other parties, the legal ramifications of the improper inclusion of a water body-pollutant combination on the 303(d) list, and the use of the 303(d) list as a "barometer" for assessing water quality trends on a statewide basis, the Districts request that the State Board reschedule the adoption of the list for a November 2006 Board meeting to allow the staff adequate time to review the comments received on the September 2006 version of the list and develop final recommendations based on this round of public comments. With only five days currently scheduled between submittal of comments and the Board meeting, it is difficult to see how due consideration can be given to the comments the Board will receive. Given the significance of the 303(d) list, the level of quality of most components of the list, and the amount of time it will likely be before the next listing cycle takes place, it would be a shame if the State Board chose to adopt the 2006 list without diligent efforts to address these remaining concerns.

3. Support Proposed Delisting of Previous Listings in San Gabriel River Watershed Based on Conditions, Not Pollutants

The Districts wish to highlight its support for the State Board's reconsideration of both the "abnormal fish histology" and "excess algal growth" listings for San Gabriel River Watershed. Several water bodies in the San Gabriel River Watershed had at least one of these listings. The "abnormal fish histology" listings were based on a single study conducted in the watershed in 1992 and 1993. At the time, these water body-pollutant combinations were first included on the 303(d) list, there were no scientific impairment guidelines available for use by the Regional Boards. In fact, there never has been any rationale provided to the public to explain how the study's findings resulted in an impairment determination. Not only was there no indication of what criteria were used to create the listings, there have not been any standards identified to determine when the 303(d) listings could be removed. Similarly, to our knowledge, no efforts have ever been made by the Regional Board to determine if the condition identified in the early 1990s was a sustained condition nor were any causes of this condition ever identified. Additionally, conditions in the watershed may have changed substantially since the study was conducted. Finally, as noted in the Fact Sheet prepared by the State Board, the adverse biological response originally identified could not be associated with water or sediment numeric-specific evaluation guidelines, and thus the water body-pollutant combinations did not qualify for listing under the Listing Policy. Thus, the Districts support the State Board's delisting of the San Gabriel River Watershed reaches for this impairment.

The "excess algal growth" delistings were similarly necessary because the original listings were based on a subjective assessment of algal growth. The watershed listings originated from data that were over a decade old (1990 through 1993) comprised of visual assessments of algal presence in the water bodies. It was not established at the time (or since that time) if the algae present were impacting beneficial uses of the water bodies. Moreover, as pointed out in the September 2006 Response to Comments, excess algal growth is considered a condition and not a pollutant, and thus is not a valid basis in and of itself for listing. *See* State Board Staff Report, Volume IV, Response to Comments, Comment Number 43.34. Therefore, the Districts strongly support the State Board's proposed delistings in the San Gabriel River Watershed for excess algal growth.

4. Recommend Scheduling Santa Clara River Watershed Salt Listings for TMDL Completion During the Next Listing Cycle

The Districts request that the State Board reconsider making all of the salt-related listings in the Santa Clara River Watershed for which TMDLs (or TMDL Implementation Plans) have not yet been established a high priority and to schedule them for TMDL completion within the next listing cycle (i.e., by 2008). In all, there are 14 existing or proposed salt-related listings in the Santa Clara River Watershed. The Districts commented on this previously, and the State Board made no revision, stating: "while some efficiency may be gained by placing these on the same timeline, the Regional Water Boards are taking a different approach with other pressing water quality problems that can be addressed more quickly." While the Districts realize that the Regional Boards face many water quality problems and have limited resources, the Los Angeles Regional Board has made it clear that salt loadings to the Santa Clara River are a high priority and should be addressed expeditiously. More information about this is included in Attachment 1. In light of the significant benefits to be gained by taking an integrated watershed-based approach to the salt listings in the Santa Clara River Watershed, the Districts respectfully request that the State Board revise this decision.

In conclusion, the Districts commend the State Board for its efforts in revising the proposed 2006 303(d) list. We believe the changes made will help focus the attention of the TMDL process on those waters and impairments for which attainment of water quality standards will yield the greatest potential water quality benefits. Given the limited resources available for the development and implementation of TMDLs, we believe it is important for the State Board to concentrate on those waters where problems are documented and understood, and where a TMDL is the appropriate tool to solve the problem. We urge the State Board to take the final step in revising this list and to consider the information and analysis we are submitting to complete the development of a scientifically and legally defensible list with a sound and consistent basis. We hope that the State Board will take the time necessary to review our comments and make the appropriate changes to the list. If you have any questions regarding our comments or the information and data we are providing to you, please contact the undersigned or Beth Bax at (562) 699-7411.

Very truly yours,
James F. Stahl

Sharon N. Green

Sharon N. Green
Legislative and Regulatory Liaison
Technical Services Department

SNG:BCB:drs
Enclosures

cc: Craig J. Wilson, SWRCB

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ATTACHMENT 1: COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC LISTINGS

WATER SEGMENTS: **Los Angeles River Reach 1**

POLLUTANT: **Aluminum**

PROPOSED DECISION: **List in Being Addressed category**

STATE BOARD STAFF RECOMMENDATION: **Water body-pollutant combination should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the 303(d) list because a TMDL has been approved.**

DISTRICTS' COMMENT & RECOMMENDATION: **The original listing was faulty. There is no applicable objective. The TMDL contains no targets or allocations for aluminum. The water body-pollutant combination should be delisted.**

The State Board received numerous comments on its September 2005 listing recommendations that the potential MUN* designation is conditional and has been determined by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) to have no legal effect, and thus water quality objectives associated with the MUN beneficial use should not be applied to potential MUN* waters. (See pages 35-36 of Attachment 2 in the Districts' January 31, 2006 submittal.) This particular listing for aluminum in Reach 1 of the Los Angeles River was originally made because the aluminum data for this reach were mistakenly compared to the MCL for aluminum. (The Los Angeles Basin Plan specifically describes Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) as applicable criteria for waters designated MUN.) The beneficial uses for the water body contain potential MUN* but not MUN. Thus, there is no aluminum objective for the reach and the original listing is faulty.

In response to comments received, the State Board reanalyzed water bodies with proposed listings based on the potential MUN* use designation but, perhaps inadvertently, did not reevaluate this particular listing. It is maintained on the list as being addressed in an EPA-approved TMDL. However, the Los Angeles River Metals TMDL (effective January 2006) contains no targets or allocations for aluminum. In fact, after extensive review of the available data, the Staff Report (page 22) for the TMDL concluded: "we find that a TMDL for aluminum is not warranted to protect a conditional use." Inasmuch as the listing was based on an inapplicable objective (and thus there was no basis for the original listing) and that the TMDL does not address aluminum, this listing should not be carried over to the next listing cycle.

Therefore, the Districts request that the State Board delist aluminum for Los Angeles River Reach 1.

WATER SEGMENTS: **Coyote Creek**

POLLUTANT: **Nitrite**

PROPOSED DECISION: **List**

STATE BOARD STAFF RECOMMENDATION: **Applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.**

DISTRICTS' COMMENT & RECOMMENDATION: **Available receiving water data show that the water segment is not impaired; therefore, this water body should not be listed for nitrite.**

The Districts provided comments on this water body – pollutant combination in our January 31, 2006 comments. The comments for that specific listing included substantial evidence that this segment is not impaired for nitrite. The table and figure from our January 31, 2006 submittal (originally submitted in Appendix P as Table P.1 and Figure P.1) are resubmitted for your convenience with these comments in Appendix A. The data for Coyote Creek demonstrate that the water body is in attainment with the Basin Plan objectives for nitrite.

Data between June 2003 and August 2005 were submitted in January 2006 for a total of 319 points with an average of 0.145 mg/L. The fact sheet for the proposed listing (currently on page 453 of the Los Angeles Region fact sheets (Volume II) and on page 52 of the September 2005 Los Angeles Region fact sheets) lists 21 other samples of which 2 exceeded the standard of 1.0 mg/L. The Districts also believe it is incorrect to apply this objective to this water body, because Table 3.8 of the Los Angeles Basin Plan clearly states "no waterbody-specific objectives" apply for nitrogen for Coyote Creek. That notwithstanding, with these data, there would be only 2 exceedances of 1.0 mg/L of nitrite out of 340 samples.

Clearly, these sampling results demonstrate that this water body is not impaired for nitrite, and therefore this water body–pollutant combination should not be listed as impaired on the 303(d) list. All of the Districts' nitrite data for this reach were submitted in the January 2006 comments. There is no new fact sheet in the September 2006 proposed 303(d) list package for the nitrite listing for Coyote Creek. It is possible that these data supporting a "do not list" decision were inadvertently overlooked. In any event, the Districts request that the State Board remove this listing prior to adopting the 303(d) list.

There are potential ramifications of being on the 303(d) list even if the water body is not really impaired for a certain pollutant. Allocations for nitrite would be required to be included in a future TMDL for nitrite for Coyote Creek. The State Board's Listing Policy represents a major step toward the creation of a 303(d) list that represents actual impairments in California's waterbodies and will therefore result in a focus on real water quality problems that deserve the attention and resources of the community. All the Districts are requesting in this instance is that this listing be removed to be consistent with this policy and thereby improve the validity of the proposed list.

WATER SEGMENT: **San Gabriel River Reach 2**

POLLUTANT: **Lead**

PROPOSED DECISION: **Do not delist**

STATE BOARD STAFF RECOMMENDATION: **Water body-pollutant combination should not be removed from the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards for the pollutant are exceeded.**

DISTRICTS' COMMENT & RECOMMENDATION: **The data were not analyzed properly in accordance with the Listing Policy. If analyzed properly, available receiving water data show that the water segment is not impaired for lead, and therefore should be delisted.**

In September 2005, the State Board proposed to delist lead because it asserted the water segment met water quality standards for lead. In September 2006, the State Board changed its recommendation, stating that five of 58 samples exceeded the water quality standard for lead and therefore lead should remain listed. The State Board used the continuous criterion for lead, an aquatic life criterion from the California Toxics Rule, to determine impairment. This standard is the highest concentration of dissolved lead to which aquatic life can be exposed for a period of four days without deleterious effects. According to Section 6.1.5.6 of the Listing Policy, "If the water quality objectives, criteria, or guidelines state a specific averaging period and/or mathematical transformation, the data should be evaluated in a consistent manner prior to conducting any statistical analysis for placement of the water on the section 303(d) list." Accordingly, all samples that fall within a single four-day period should be averaged before the data are evaluated. The Districts reviewed the existing and readily available lead data and found that only 4 out of 52 samples exceeded the aquatic life criterion for lead. Thus, the available water quality data for Reach 2 of the San Gabriel River indicate that the water segment meets the criteria for delisting under Section 4.1 of the Listing Policy for lead.

The data and impairment assessment are included as Table B.1, B.2 and B.3 of Appendix B. This dataset includes both wet and dry weather dissolved lead data from Reach 2. These data were collected at the Los Angeles County Department of Public Work's mass emission station located in Reach 2 of the San Gabriel River. Whenever two samples were taken within a single four-day period, the lead measurements were averaged. In the cases where a first sample (sample 1) was taken, and a second sample (sample 2) was taken 3 days later, and then a third sample (sample 3) was taken 3 days after that, sample 1 and 2 were averaged together, but sample 3 (being 6 days away from sample 1) was left to stand alone. In an effort to be conservative, whenever data were averaged, the lower hardness value was used to determine if the criterion was exceeded. Out of 52 lead measurements, there were only 4 exceedances of the CTR criteria for lead. This meets the criteria for delisting, per Table 4.1 of the Listing Policy, and thus the water body–pollutant combination should be delisted from the 303(d) list.

WATER SEGMENT: **Santa Clara River Reach 7**

POLLUTANTS: **Chloride and Nitrate + Nitrite**

PROPOSED DECISION: **List in Being Addressed Category**

STATE BOARD STAFF RECOMMENDATION: **Water body-pollutant combination should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the 303(d) list because a TMDL has been approved.**

DISTRICTS' COMMENT & RECOMMENDATION: **Disagree. The water body is not impaired for either pollutant and the existing TMDLs for these compounds contain no allocations for this reach. These listings appear to be oversights and should be removed from the 303(d) list.**

These listings were not proposed in September 2005 by the State Board for the 2006 303(d) list and there were no fact sheets provided at that time for these water body-pollutant combinations. The listings appeared for the first time in September 2006 and the fact sheets for the listings do not include any data (Refer to Table C.1 of Appendix C). Both listings state they are being listed with one line of evidence: "a TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water body-pollutant combination" (Pages 329-330 of the Los Angeles Region fact sheets (Volume II)).

The reaches of the Santa Clara River have historically been denoted by two different numbering systems: one from the Regional Board and one from USEPA. On the 1998 list, USEPA's numbering was used, and the reaches of the Santa Clara River were numbered from Reach 1 to Reach 9. On the September 2002 proposed list, the State Board adopted the Regional Board's numbering convention. Therefore, in the text of this comment, the reaches of the Santa Clara River will be specified by both its Regional Board and USEPA designation to avoid confusion. Figure C.1 in Appendix C illustrates the two different numbering systems for the upper portion of the watershed, and provides clarification on the reach designations.

In 2005, USEPA approved the Basin Plan Amendment for the Upper Santa Clara River Chloride TMDL. In this TMDL, there is no numeric target for chloride in Regional Board Reach 7/USEPA Reach 9. The Basin Plan Amendment (Page 2) explicitly states: "The numeric target for this TMDL pertains to Reaches 5 and 6 of the Santa Clara River..." (Regional Board Reaches 5 and 6, USEPA Reaches 7 and 8).

In 2004, USEPA approved the Basin Plan Amendment for the Santa Clara River Nitrogen Compounds TMDL. In this TMDL, there is no numeric target for any nitrogen compounds that apply to Regional Board Reach 7/USEPA Reach 9. Numeric targets for nitrate + nitrite were adopted for Regional Board Reaches 3, 5 and 6 only. The TMDL lists the average nitrate + nitrite concentration in Regional Board Reach 7/USEPA Reach 9 as being 0.5 mg/L (Pages 31-32 of the Staff Report). Therefore, in comparison to an objective for nitrate + nitrite of 5.0 mg/L, Regional Board Reach 7/USEPA Reach 9 is clearly not impaired.

In addition, Regional Board Reach 7/USEPA Reach 9 is usually dry, except during wet weather. It is upstream of any major point source and typically only has continuous flow after major storm events and as a result of groundwater dewatering projects. Flow is intermittent in this reach; the reach has no flow at least 90% of the time. The Districts monitor one receiving water station in Regional Board Reach 7/USEPA Reach 9, Station RA (refer to Figure C.1). In the last fifteen years, we have taken ten samples for chloride and eleven samples for nitrate + nitrite at station RA (shown on Figure C.1). These data are

shown in Tables C.2 and C.3. The average chloride concentration measured at station RA was 39 mg/L, which is well below the objective of 100 mg/L. Likewise, the average nitrate + nitrite measured at RA (2.5 mg/L) was below the objective of 5 mg/L in the reach.

It is likely that these listings were accidentally assigned to Regional Board Reach 7/USEPA Reach 9 because they were considered for listing in Regional Board Reach 5/USEPA Reach 7. In the case of the listings for Regional Board Reach 5/USEPA Reach 7, the State Board determined that the chloride listing is being addressed by a USEPA-approved TMDL, and that the nitrate + nitrite listing should be removed from the list because water quality standards are being met (discussed on page 426 of the Los Angeles Region fact sheets). The Districts agree with these decisions.

There is no available evidence that Regional Board Reach 7/USEPA Reach 9 is impaired for either chloride or nitrate + nitrite or that the adopted TMDLs and implementation plans apply to this reach. The Districts therefore request that these listings be removed from the 2006 303(d) list.

WATER SEGMENT: **Santa Clara River Reach 6**

POLLUTANT: **Chlorpyrifos**

PROPOSED DECISION: **List**

SWRCB STAFF RECOMMENDATION: **Applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.**

DISTRICTS' COMMENT & RECOMMENDATION: **Available receiving water data show that the water segment is not impaired for chlorpyrifos; therefore, this water body should not be listed. The tributary with the impairment should be identified, not the downstream water body.**

The Districts submitted comments on the State Board's proposed listing of Santa Clara River Reach 6 as impaired for chlorpyrifos in its January 31, 2006 submittal (Page 47 of Attachment 2 of that submittal), and at that time recommended that Reach 6 not be listed for chlorpyrifos. Based on the Districts' review of available water quality data for Reach 6, none of the samples exceeded the chlorpyrifos evaluation guideline applied by the State Board (the chronic California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) Aquatic Life guideline of 0.05 ug/L). All of the supporting chlorpyrifos data were collected by the Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) program in Bouquet Canyon Creek, a tributary to the Santa Clara River identified separately from the mainstem of the river in the Los Angeles Region Basin Plan (see Basin Plan, Table 2-1 and Figure 2-3), and not in Reach 6 itself.

In its January 31, 2006 submittal, the Districts submitted six water quality samples collected in Reach 6 by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works between August 2002 and April 2003. None of the samples exceeded the CDFG evaluation guideline for chlorpyrifos. These data, in contrast to the SWAMP data, were collected in Reach 6 of the Santa Clara River itself and are downstream of where Bouquet Canyon enters the river. They demonstrate that, despite the contribution from Bouquet Canyon, Reach 6 is not impaired for chlorpyrifos.

It is unclear why the State Board is proposing to list a reach of the Santa Clara River (in which collected data demonstrate there is no impairment) instead of just listing Bouquet Canyon. In its Response to Comments, the State Board stated: "The Bouquet Canyon monitoring site is part of the Santa Clara River Reach 6, therefore the data can be applied to Reach 6" (Page 95). However, Table 2.1 of the Los Angeles Basin Plan (Beneficial Uses of Inland Surface Waters) lists Bouquet Canyon as a separate waterbody with independent beneficial uses. The Listing Policy specifically states that "At a minimum, data shall be aggregated by the water body segments as defined in the Basin Plans. In the absence of a Basin Plan segmentation system, the Regional Boards should define distinct reaches based on hydrology and relatively homogeneous land use." It would seem that since the Regional Board specifically identifies Bouquet Canyon as an individual segment, any proposed 303(d) listing should be applied to it specifically. This precedent has already been established for the watershed; there are many tributary creeks in the Santa Clara River Watershed that are listed individually, including Brown/Barranca Canyon, Mint Canyon, Hopper Creek, Pole Creek, Torrey Canyon Creek and Wheeler Canyon.

The goal of the 303(d) list should be to identify actual water quality impairments so that resources can be allocated to address the problems most worthy of attention. Furthermore, a TMDL for Reach 6 may be very differently focused than a TMDL for Bouquet Canyon, since the watershed area tributary to Reach 6 has different sources and land uses than Bouquet Canyon. It is unclear why the State Board is specifically

choosing to list Reach 6 instead of Bouquet Canyon; the Districts request that the listing, if valid, be just for Bouquet Canyon.

WATER SEGMENT: **San Gabriel River Reach 3**

POLLUTANT: **Toxicity**

PROPOSED DECISION: **Delist**

STATE BOARD STAFF RECOMMENDATION: **The water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are not exceeded.**

DISTRICTS' COMMENT & RECOMMENDATION: **Agree. The Districts submitted incorrect data in January 2006; revised data (included herein) also support the delisting.**

The Districts submitted toxicity test results in January 2006 in support of delisting this water body – pollutant combination. Subsequently, the Districts discovered a few inaccuracies in the submitted data (Appendix K of the Districts' January 31, 2006 submittal). Thus, the toxicity results are resubmitted herein in Appendix D. (The data are provided in strikeout/redline format so that the changes can be easily identified.) Line 4 in the State Board's Weight-of Evidence for this listing stated that two of the 38 samples exceeded the No Observable Effect Concentration (NOEC). Based on the corrected data, this should be changed to indicate that three samples exceeded 1.0 toxicity units out of 38 samples. Alternately, it could be changed to say the NOEC was reduced in three of 38 samples. (The NOEC is actually 100% in non-toxic samples and is < 100% in toxic samples using USEPA guidelines for hypothesis testing. Thus, the NOEC is not "exceeded" in samples identified as toxic – but rather reduced.) Notwithstanding this data correction, the water body-pollutant combination still meets the criteria for delisting under Section 4.1 of the Listing Policy. Therefore, this listing should still be removed from the 303(d) list.

WATER SEGMENT: **Walnut Creek**

POLLUTANT: **Toxicity**

PROPOSED DECISION: **List**

DISTRICTS' COMMENT & RECOMMENDATION: **Available receiving water data show that the water segment is not impaired; therefore, this water body should be delisted for toxicity.**

Summary

Available water quality data for Walnut Creek indicate that the water quality standard is attained. Based on an analysis of relevant available water quality data for the reach, only three samples out of a total of 41 samples showed evidence of statistically significant toxicity (i.e. experienced a NOEC below 100%). This dataset therefore meets the criteria for delisting under Section 4.1 of the Listing Policy. Therefore, this listing should be removed from the 303(d) list.

Discussion

The original 303(d) listing for toxicity on Walnut Creek was based on a 1996 UC Davis Study ("Toxicity Study of the Santa Clara River, San Gabriel River and Calleguas Creek") and first appeared on the Los Angeles Region's 303(d) list in 1996. The UC Davis Study took samples quarterly from 12 locations in the San Gabriel River Watershed between June 1992 and March 1993. The study found evidence of toxicity throughout the watershed. The study included one site on Walnut Creek. Samples from this site were used to test toxicity to three species. The samples had no effect on one species throughout the tests, but had multiple effects on the other species used in the testing. Three out of the four samples taken were toxic to at least one of the species tested. The one Toxicity Identification Evaluation performed on a sample from Walnut Creek indicated an organic constituent was most likely responsible for the observed toxicity in that sample. The causes of the observed toxicity in the watershed were never positively determined.

In recognition of the lack of relevant toxicity data reflecting current conditions, follow-up testing to verify the toxicity listings was performed in two separate efforts, between August and October 2003 (Tables E.1 and E.2) and between December 2004 and March 2006 (Tables E.3 and E.4). Both efforts were collaborative testing programs involving USEPA, the Regional Board, the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project, and the Districts. Both efforts sampled two locations on Walnut Creek. Thirty-eight samples were taken in dry weather and 3 were collected during wet weather. The results of these collaborative testing efforts are included in Appendix E.

For this analysis, toxicity is defined as a reduction of the NOEC (NOEC < 100%). The NOEC is determined using hypothesis testing conducted following USEPA guidelines. In the first study, between August 2003 and October 2003, the Districts conducted baseline toxicity testing on both *Ceriodaphnia dubia* and *Pimephales promelas* specimens. In the second sampling effort, between December 2004 and March 2006, baseline toxicity testing was performed using only *Ceriodaphnia dubia*. Out of 41 total tests from both studies, only three samples taken from Walnut Creek were identified as toxic. These tests indicate that the current conditions do not show the same persistence or frequency of toxicity as that observed in the watershed in 1992 and 1993 in the UC Davis Study.

Thus, the available evidence suggests there is not currently a consistent toxicity problem in Walnut Creek and that the current 303(d) listing is not representative of current conditions in the creek. The State Board is also recommending to delist toxicity for Reaches 1 and 3 of the San Gabriel River (which is appropriate

in light of supporting data). If the Walnut Creek toxicity listing remains on the 303(d) list, the State Board should be aware that a TMDL will need to be established by either the Regional Board or by USEPA by March 2007 under the Los Angeles Region consent decree for the development of TMDLs. However, no specific pollutant has been identified as causing or contributing to the limited instances of toxicity that were observed in the 2003-2006 timeframe and therefore it will be very difficult to develop a TMDL or effectively and meaningfully address the cause(s) of the observed toxicity. Because the existing data for toxicity for Walnut Creek show that delisting is warranted and appropriate under the State Listing Policy, we believe that the State Board must delist toxicity for Walnut Creek at this time.

WATER SEGMENT: **Santa Clara River Reach 3, Santa Clara River Reach 5, Santa Clara River Reach 6, Hopper Creek, Santa Clara River Reach 11, Piru Creek, Pole Creek, Sespe Creek, Wheeler Canyon/Todd Barranca**

POLLUTANT: **Salts (Total Dissolved Solids, Sulfates, Boron, Chloride)**

PROPOSED DECISION: **Varied**

DISTRICTS' COMMENT & RECOMMENDATION: **All of the salt-related listings within this watershed for which TMDLs (or TMDL Implementation Plans) do not yet exist should be identified as high priority and scheduled for TMDL completion within the next listing cycle.**

The Districts request that the State Board reconsider making all of the salt-related listings in the Santa Clara River Watershed for which TMDLs (or TMDL Implementation Plans) have not yet been established a high priority and to schedule them for TMDL completion within the next listing cycle (i.e. by 2008). In all, there are 14 existing or proposed salt-related listings in the Santa Clara River Watershed (see Figure F.1). Eleven of these listings were included on previous 303(d) lists (8 for the 2002 303(d) list and 3 for the 1998 303(d) list), and three additional water body-pollutant combinations for salt-related compounds in the watershed are newly proposed for the 2006 303(d) list. These listings include some that address the mainstem of the Santa Clara River, and several that apply to tributaries that flow into the mainstem of the river. Currently, it is our understanding from the Staff Report that, with the exception of the already established Chloride TMDL for the Upper Santa Clara River applicable to Reaches 5 and 6 and the TMDL for chloride for Reach 3 that was established by USEPA (but which does not include a TMDL Implementation Plan and has not been adopted into the Basin Plan), these TMDLs are not specifically scheduled for completion (i.e., they are not listed in Table 9 with specific dates assigned), meaning that they may not be completed until 2019.

The State Board should be aware that the Regional Board has made the chloride TMDL for the Upper Santa Clara River watershed an extremely high priority. This emphasis was based on stated concerns about salt-sensitive crops grown in the Ventura County portion of the watershed and potential adverse impacts to groundwater in Ventura County. In fact, the Regional Board recently shortened the implementation schedule of the Upper Santa Clara River Chloride TMDL based on the premise that salt problems in the watershed were threatening salt-sensitive agricultural crops grown in the watershed in Ventura County. Furthermore, in the Fillmore Wastewater Treatment Plant (FWTP) Time Schedule Order No. R4-2006-050, adopted on May 11, 2006, the Regional Board specifically stated in Finding No. 10: "the Discharger [FWTP] may not able to achieve full compliance with the water quality objective of chloride and boron. Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (The Regional Board) is considering a **regional** solution for the area of Fillmore, Santa Paula, and Piru. The reconsideration and action taken is tentatively scheduled for reopener by September 2008." Given these most recent actions, it is difficult to understand why the Regional Board would not want to take expeditious action to address these inter-related problems (i.e. chloride and other salt-related compounds) on a regional basis.

The Upper Santa Clara River Chloride TMDL was approved by the Los Angeles Regional Board in May 2004, and took effect in May 2005. As a result of the development of this TMDL, agricultural interests became concerned about the effects of salt and chloride on salt-sensitive local crops, like avocados and strawberries. These and other salt-sensitive crops grown in the Oxnard Plain and Santa Clara River Valley represent a large economic interest for Ventura County farmers. As part of this TMDL's Implementation Plan, there are required studies to 1) further characterize the surface and subsurface flow and fate of chloride in the upper Santa Clara River watershed and 2) investigate the impacts of chloride on

salt sensitive crops. A Groundwater-Surface Water Interaction Model is currently under development for the upper watershed to fulfill the first requirement. It would clearly be of benefit to the development of the additional TMDLs that will be required – and to stakeholders throughout the watershed – if this model is extended to the lower watershed. Although discussions about doing this have occurred and the Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District has offered partial funding for this endeavor, it appears that other entities may have little impetus to bring this effort to fruition unless a concrete schedule is set forth for these additional TMDLs. During the implementation of the TMDL, Ventura County agricultural stakeholders have expressed great concern about the potential impacts of salts from Los Angeles County (Reaches 5 and 6) on their crops, so it is clear that the 12 other salt-related listings in Ventura County should be an equal or even higher priority issue for these stakeholders.

Notwithstanding this, to date the Los Angeles Regional Board has shown little interest in developing TMDLs for the salt-related listings in this watershed on a coordinated watershed basis, or in implementing the June 2003 Chloride TMDL established for Reach 3 by USEPA. In February 2003, the State Water Board itself directed the Regional Board to consider developing the TMDLs for this watershed as a single comprehensive TMDL that represents an integrated solution. *See* SWRCB Resolution 2003-0014. However, apparently because a number of these listings were not yet finalized (and because a separate nitrogen TMDL was already under development), the Regional Board chose not to do so. *See* Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board Resolution No. R03-008. Nonetheless, the rationale for the State Water Board's direction to the Regional Board to approach these TMDLs on an integrated, watershed basis is sound public policy, and bears reexamination in light of the many salt-related listings that have been added to the 303(d) list in the last and the current listing cycles.

The Districts continue to believe that it would be beneficial for all parties, including the Regional Board, if all of the salt-related listings in this watershed are made a high priority and scheduled for completion during the next listing cycle. In particular, this will be beneficial so that the groundwater-surface water interaction model can encompass all of the salt-related impairments in the watershed on the approximately same timeline with combined resources. This would allow more expeditious and efficient development of these TMDLs, and will enable the watershed to attain applicable water quality standards for salts as quickly as possible. Most importantly, the coordinated and expeditious development of these TMDLs on a regional basis will facilitate the development of cost-effective solutions likely to be of greater benefit to the watershed than solutions developed by individual entities in isolation and on different timelines from each other.

Appendix A: Table P.1 Nitrite Data for Coyote Creek (June 2003 - August 2005)

RecordID	SiteID	Waterbody	Classification	Constituent	NumQual	Result	Units	SampleDate
17445	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.122	mg/L	14-Sep-04
17453	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.144	mg/L	13-Oct-04
17475	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.052	mg/L	24-Aug-04
17483	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.098	mg/L	31-Aug-04
17491	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.112	mg/L	07-Sep-04
17499	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.104	mg/L	28-Sep-04
17507	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.103	mg/L	17-Aug-04
17515	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.079	mg/L	03-Aug-04
17523	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.071	mg/L	20-Sep-04
17531	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.086	mg/L	04-Oct-04
17539	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.06	mg/L	26-Oct-04
17547	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.138	mg/L	17-Feb-04
17555	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.174	mg/L	13-Apr-04
17563	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.13	mg/L	18-May-04
17598	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.175	mg/L	08-Jul-03
17606	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.06	mg/L	06-Jan-04
17614	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.128	mg/L	20-Jul-04
17629	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.075	mg/L	10-Feb-04
17637	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.138	mg/L	13-Jul-04
17644	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.106	mg/L	07-Oct-03
17651	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.103	mg/L	02-Dec-03
17658	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.244	mg/L	08-Jun-04
17665	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.183	mg/L	12-Nov-03
17673	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.365	mg/L	15-Jun-04
17679	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.084	mg/L	24-Nov-03
17741	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.217	mg/L	17-Jun-03
17748	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.221	mg/L	24-Jun-03
17755	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.2	mg/L	01-Jul-03
17762	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.211	mg/L	15-Jul-03
17769	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.208	mg/L	22-Jul-03
17776	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.25	mg/L	19-Aug-03
17783	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.284	mg/L	26-Aug-03
17790	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.195	mg/L	09-Sep-03
17797	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.134	mg/L	16-Sep-03
17804	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.112	mg/L	23-Sep-03
17811	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.138	mg/L	30-Sep-03
17818	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.116	mg/L	14-Oct-03
17825	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.109	mg/L	21-Oct-03
17832	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.058	mg/L	18-Nov-03
17840	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.112	mg/L	02-Feb-04
17848	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.051	mg/L	25-Feb-04
17856	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.112	mg/L	09-Mar-04
17864	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.121	mg/L	16-Mar-04
17872	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.202	mg/L	11-May-04
17880	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.15	mg/L	25-May-04
17888	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.135	mg/L	29-Jun-04
17896	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.205	mg/L	06-Jul-04
17903	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.117	mg/L	09-Dec-03

Appendix A: Table P.1 Nitrite Data for Coyote Creek (June 2003 - August 2005)

17908	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.127	mg/L	06-Apr-04
17916	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.087	mg/L	20-Apr-04
17924	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.194	mg/L	05-May-04
17932	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.276	mg/L	22-Jun-04
17940	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.16	mg/L	29-Jun-04
17947	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.161	mg/L	12-Aug-03
17954	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.093	mg/L	28-Oct-03
17961	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.082	mg/L	05-Nov-03
17969	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.166	mg/L	20-Jan-04
17977	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.159	mg/L	27-Jan-04
17985	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.133	mg/L	23-Mar-04
17993	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.119	mg/L	29-Mar-04
18001	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.38	mg/L	28-Apr-04
18009	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.216	mg/L	01-Jun-04
18017	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.137	mg/L	13-Jan-04
18031	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.104	mg/L	05-Aug-03
18038	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.111	mg/L	02-Sep-03
18045	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.085	mg/L	31-Jul-03
18067	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.089	mg/L	27-Jul-04
18075	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.119	mg/L	10-Aug-04
18090	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.066	mg/L	01-Mar-04
18098	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.04	mg/L	14-Feb-05
18105	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.05	mg/L	15-Mar-05
18113	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.1	mg/L	12-Apr-05
18121	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.07	mg/L	25-Jan-05
18129	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.09	mg/L	22-Mar-05
18137	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.12	mg/L	21-Jun-05
18144	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.16	mg/L	09-Aug-05
18148	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.04	mg/L	31-Jan-05
18156	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.15	mg/L	09-May-05
18164	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.07	mg/L	30-Mar-05
18172	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.083	mg/L	15-Nov-04
18180	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.041	mg/L	22-Nov-04
18188	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.32	mg/L	27-Dec-04
18196	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.23	mg/L	01-Mar-05
18204	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.11	mg/L	05-Apr-05
18212	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.053	mg/L	30-Nov-04
18220	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.105	mg/L	13-Dec-04
18228	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.17	mg/L	21-Dec-04
18236	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.1	mg/L	08-Feb-05
18244	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.14	mg/L	19-Apr-05
18252	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.1	mg/L	26-Apr-05
18260	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.07	mg/L	03-May-05
18268	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.23	mg/L	24-May-05
18276	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.07	mg/L	08-Mar-05
18284	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.26	mg/L	07-Jun-05
18292	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.2	mg/L	14-Jun-05
18300	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.21	mg/L	28-Jun-05
18308	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.12	mg/L	05-Jul-05

Appendix A: Table P.1 Nitrite Data for Coyote Creek (June 2003 - August 2005)

18316	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.1	mg/L	12-Jul-05
18324	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.17	mg/L	26-Jul-05
18331	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.22	mg/L	02-Aug-05
18338	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.077	mg/L	08-Nov-04
18346	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.53	mg/L	17-May-05
18354	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.14	mg/L	19-Jul-05
18362	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.051	mg/L	01-Nov-04
18370	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.187	mg/L	07-Dec-04
18378	SG-R9E	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.36	mg/L	31-May-05
20420	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.124	mg/L	14-Sep-04
20428	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.098	mg/L	13-Oct-04
20450	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.043	mg/L	24-Aug-04
20458	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.085	mg/L	31-Aug-04
20466	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.071	mg/L	07-Sep-04
20474	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.087	mg/L	28-Sep-04
20482	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.079	mg/L	17-Aug-04
20490	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.059	mg/L	03-Aug-04
20498	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.053	mg/L	20-Sep-04
20506	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.074	mg/L	04-Oct-04
20514	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.058	mg/L	26-Oct-04
20522	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.11	mg/L	17-Feb-04
20530	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.157	mg/L	13-Apr-04
20538	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.116	mg/L	18-May-04
20573	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.163	mg/L	08-Jul-03
20581	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.061	mg/L	06-Jan-04
20589	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.097	mg/L	20-Jul-04
20604	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.073	mg/L	10-Feb-04
20612	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.134	mg/L	13-Jul-04
20619	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.101	mg/L	07-Oct-03
20626	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.071	mg/L	02-Dec-03
20633	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.227	mg/L	08-Jun-04
20640	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.08	mg/L	12-Nov-03
20648	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.334	mg/L	15-Jun-04
20654	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.082	mg/L	24-Nov-03
20716	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.262	mg/L	17-Jun-03
20723	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.229	mg/L	24-Jun-03
20730	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.196	mg/L	01-Jul-03
20737	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.18	mg/L	15-Jul-03
20744	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.21	mg/L	22-Jul-03
20751	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.23	mg/L	19-Aug-03
20758	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.166	mg/L	26-Aug-03
20765	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.193	mg/L	09-Sep-03
20772	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.189	mg/L	16-Sep-03
20779	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.104	mg/L	23-Sep-03
20786	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.121	mg/L	30-Sep-03
20793	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.105	mg/L	14-Oct-03
20800	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.094	mg/L	21-Oct-03
20808	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.1	mg/L	02-Feb-04
20816	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.054	mg/L	25-Feb-04

Appendix A: Table P.1 Nitrite Data for Coyote Creek (June 2003 - August 2005)

20824	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.097	mg/L	09-Mar-04
20832	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.116	mg/L	16-Mar-04
20840	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.114	mg/L	11-May-04
20848	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.132	mg/L	25-May-04
20856	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.134	mg/L	29-Jun-04
20864	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.194	mg/L	06-Jul-04
20871	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.082	mg/L	18-Nov-03
20878	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.105	mg/L	09-Dec-03
20883	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.094	mg/L	06-Apr-04
20891	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.089	mg/L	20-Apr-04
20899	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.16	mg/L	05-May-04
20907	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.332	mg/L	22-Jun-04
20914	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.197	mg/L	16-Sep-03
20922	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.101	mg/L	20-Jan-04
20929	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.121	mg/L	12-Aug-03
20936	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.078	mg/L	28-Oct-03
20943	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.094	mg/L	05-Nov-03
20951	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.134	mg/L	27-Jan-04
20959	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.117	mg/L	23-Mar-04
20967	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.056	mg/L	29-Mar-04
20975	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.139	mg/L	28-Apr-04
20983	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.247	mg/L	01-Jun-04
20991	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.106	mg/L	13-Jan-04
21005	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.078	mg/L	05-Aug-03
21012	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	<	0.1	mg/L	02-Sep-03
21019	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.068	mg/L	31-Jul-03
21041	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.074	mg/L	27-Jul-04
21049	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.206	mg/L	10-Aug-04
21064	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.069	mg/L	01-Mar-04
21072	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.05	mg/L	14-Feb-05
21080	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.06	mg/L	18-Jan-05
21088	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.08	mg/L	25-Jan-05
21096	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.16	mg/L	12-Apr-05
21104	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.09	mg/L	22-Mar-05
21112	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.13	mg/L	21-Jun-05
21119	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.16	mg/L	09-Aug-05
21123	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.04	mg/L	31-Jan-05
21131	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.12	mg/L	09-May-05
21139	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.07	mg/L	30-Mar-05
21147	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.21	mg/L	02-Aug-05
21154	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.141	mg/L	15-Nov-04
21162	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.04	mg/L	22-Nov-04
21170	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.14	mg/L	27-Dec-04
21178	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.05	mg/L	01-Mar-05
21186	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.14	mg/L	05-Apr-05
21194	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.051	mg/L	30-Nov-04
21202	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.072	mg/L	13-Dec-04
21210	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.15	mg/L	21-Dec-04
21218	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.09	mg/L	08-Feb-05

Appendix A: Table P.1 Nitrite Data for Coyote Creek (June 2003 - August 2005)

21225	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.08	mg/L	15-Mar-05
21233	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.13	mg/L	19-Apr-05
21241	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.14	mg/L	26-Apr-05
21249	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.12	mg/L	03-May-05
21257	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.25	mg/L	24-May-05
21265	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.07	mg/L	08-Mar-05
21273	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.24	mg/L	07-Jun-05
21281	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.2	mg/L	14-Jun-05
21289	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.15	mg/L	28-Jun-05
21297	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.21	mg/L	05-Jul-05
21302	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.07	mg/L	12-Jul-05
21310	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.15	mg/L	26-Jul-05
21317	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.061	mg/L	08-Nov-04
21325	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.56	mg/L	17-May-05
21333	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.12	mg/L	19-Jul-05
21341	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.047	mg/L	01-Nov-04
21349	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.156	mg/L	07-Dec-04
21357	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.3	mg/L	31-May-05
21788	SG-RA	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.21	mg/L	23-Jun-05
21919	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.138	mg/L	14-Sep-04
21927	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.212	mg/L	13-Oct-04
21949	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.098	mg/L	24-Aug-04
21957	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.137	mg/L	31-Aug-04
21965	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.149	mg/L	07-Sep-04
21973	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.195	mg/L	28-Sep-04
21981	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.16	mg/L	17-Aug-04
21989	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.098	mg/L	03-Aug-04
21997	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.143	mg/L	20-Sep-04
22005	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.156	mg/L	04-Oct-04
22013	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.06	mg/L	26-Oct-04
22021	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.201	mg/L	17-Feb-04
22029	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.249	mg/L	13-Apr-04
22037	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.145	mg/L	18-May-04
22045	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.054	mg/L	06-Jan-04
22053	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.148	mg/L	20-Jul-04
22088	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.144	mg/L	08-Jul-03
22103	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.085	mg/L	10-Feb-04
22111	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.143	mg/L	13-Jul-04
22118	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.218	mg/L	07-Oct-03
22125	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.137	mg/L	02-Dec-03
22132	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.159	mg/L	08-Jun-04
22139	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.225	mg/L	12-Nov-03
22147	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.235	mg/L	15-Jun-04
22153	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.091	mg/L	24-Nov-03
22173	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.2	mg/L	14-Oct-03
22180	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.197	mg/L	21-Oct-03
22188	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.184	mg/L	02-Feb-04
22196	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.031	mg/L	25-Feb-04
22204	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.14	mg/L	09-Mar-04

Appendix A: Table P.1 Nitrite Data for Coyote Creek (June 2003 - August 2005)

22212	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.213	mg/L	16-Mar-04
22220	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.184	mg/L	11-May-04
22228	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.103	mg/L	25-May-04
22236	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.11	mg/L	29-Jun-04
22244	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.249	mg/L	06-Jul-04
22251	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.084	mg/L	18-Nov-03
22258	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.171	mg/L	09-Dec-03
22263	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.09	mg/L	06-Apr-04
22271	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.105	mg/L	20-Apr-04
22279	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.168	mg/L	05-May-04
22287	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.254	mg/L	22-Jun-04
22336	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.163	mg/L	17-Jun-03
22343	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.244	mg/L	24-Jun-03
22350	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.157	mg/L	01-Jul-03
22357	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.31	mg/L	15-Jul-03
22364	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.198	mg/L	22-Jul-03
22371	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.182	mg/L	19-Aug-03
22378	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.265	mg/L	26-Aug-03
22385	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.25	mg/L	09-Sep-03
22392	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.21	mg/L	23-Sep-03
22399	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.199	mg/L	30-Sep-03
22406	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.21	mg/L	12-Aug-03
22413	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	<	0.02	mg/L	28-Oct-03
22420	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.134	mg/L	05-Nov-03
22428	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.28	mg/L	20-Jan-04
22436	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.247	mg/L	27-Jan-04
22444	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.271	mg/L	23-Mar-04
22452	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.299	mg/L	29-Mar-04
22460	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.16	mg/L	01-Jun-04
22468	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.212	mg/L	28-Apr-04
22476	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.19	mg/L	13-Jan-04
22490	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.169	mg/L	02-Sep-03
22497	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.118	mg/L	05-Aug-03
22504	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.217	mg/L	31-Jul-03
22526	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.078	mg/L	27-Jul-04
22534	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.176	mg/L	10-Aug-04
22549	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.057	mg/L	01-Mar-04
22557	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.08	mg/L	14-Feb-05
22565	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.06	mg/L	18-Jan-05
22573	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.13	mg/L	25-Jan-05
22581	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.22	mg/L	12-Apr-05
22589	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.16	mg/L	22-Mar-05
22597	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.11	mg/L	21-Jun-05
22604	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.19	mg/L	09-Aug-05
22608	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.06	mg/L	31-Jan-05
22616	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.16	mg/L	09-May-05
22624	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.24	mg/L	02-Aug-05
22631	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.11	mg/L	30-Mar-05
22639	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.182	mg/L	15-Nov-04

Appendix A: Table P.1 Nitrite Data for Coyote Creek (June 2003 - August 2005)

22647	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.033	mg/L	22-Nov-04
22655	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.07	mg/L	01-Mar-05
22663	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.17	mg/L	05-Apr-05
22671	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.27	mg/L	27-Dec-04
22679	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.059	mg/L	30-Nov-04
22687	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.125	mg/L	13-Dec-04
22695	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.32	mg/L	21-Dec-04
22703	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	<	0.03	mg/L	08-Feb-05
22710	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.11	mg/L	15-Mar-05
22718	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.16	mg/L	19-Apr-05
22726	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.18	mg/L	26-Apr-05
22734	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.13	mg/L	03-May-05
22742	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.27	mg/L	24-May-05
22750	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.11	mg/L	08-Mar-05
22758	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.24	mg/L	07-Jun-05
22766	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.25	mg/L	14-Jun-05
22774	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.23	mg/L	28-Jun-05
22782	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.2	mg/L	05-Jul-05
22790	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.13	mg/L	12-Jul-05
22798	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.17	mg/L	26-Jul-05
22805	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.13	mg/L	08-Nov-04
22813	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.23	mg/L	17-May-05
22821	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.23	mg/L	19-Jul-05
22829	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.067	mg/L	01-Nov-04
22837	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.044	mg/L	07-Dec-04
22845	SG-RA1	Coyote Creek	Nutrient	Nitrite as N	=	0.28	mg/L	31-May-05

Figure P.1 Nitrite Concentrations in Coyote Creek (June 2003 - August 2005)



Table B.1: Original San Gabriel River Reach 2 lead data (dates to be averaged in gray)

site ID	date sampled	hardness	dissolved lead	total lead	Comments
S14	10/14/1997	238	0	0	
S14	11/10/1997	195	0	0	
S14	11/13/1997	128	0	0	
S14	11/26/1997	100	35.5	44	
S14	12/5/1997	132	18	24.6	
S14	1/4/1998	1	0	0	data point not used because of bad hardness value
S14	1/9/1998	120	20.4	27.9	
S14	1/29/1998	134	0	6.8	
S14	2/2/1998	120	0	7	
S14	2/6/1998	100	0	15.9	
S14	11/8/1998	230	0	0	
S14	12/6/1998	80	0	0	
S14	1/20/1999	276	0	0	
S14	1/25/1999	184	0	0	
S14	1/31/1999	280	0	0	
S14	2/6/1999	256	0	0	
S14	2/9/1999	286	0	0	
S14	3/15/1999	126	0	0	
S14	3/20/1999	265	0	0	
S14	3/25/1999	290	0	0	
S14	4/6/1999	178	0	0	
S14	4/8/1999	230	0	0	
S14	4/11/1999	110	0	0	
S14	1/26/2000	95	0	6.1	
S14	2/3/2000	170	0	0	
S14	2/12/2000	160	0	0	
S14	2/15/2000	128	0	0	
S14	2/17/2000	112	0	0	
S14	2/22/2000	95.2	0	0	
S14	2/25/2000	192	0	0	
S14	2/29/2000	230	0	0	
S14	3/7/2000	85	0	0	
S14	3/9/2000	198	0	0	
S14	10/28/2000	266	0	0	
S14	11/1/2000	190	0	5.24	
S14	1/8/2001	300	0	0	
S14	1/17/2001	160	0	0	
S14	1/26/2001	360	0	0	
S14	2/14/2001	220	0	0	
S14	2/20/2001	240	0	0	
S14	2/28/2001	140	0	0	
S14	3/6/2001	210	0	0	
S14	11/12/2001	180	0	0.77	
S14	11/27/2001	120	3.19	5.01	
S14	11/30/2001	200	0	0.59	

Table B.1

site ID	date sampled	hardness	dissolved lead	total lead	Comments
S14	12/3/2001	230	0.76	1.77	
S14	12/27/2001	172	0	0.77	
S14	1/31/2002	150	0	0	
S14	10/10/2002	270	0	1.38	
S14	11/8/2002	210	0.67	56	
S14	12/16/2002	108	1.21	2.52	
S14	2/11/2003	80	1.55	2.16	
S14	3/15/2003	103	0	5.39	
S14	**10/28/2003**	**210**	**0**	**1.04**	
S14	**10/31/2003**	**260**	**0**	**3.34**	
S14	12/25/2003	320	0.92	1.72	
S14	1/1/2004	305	1.46	2.14	
S14	1/13/2004	195	0	0.72	
S14	10/17/2004	208	0	3.78	
S14	10/26/2004	130	0	4.42	
S14	12/5/2004	130	0	9.05	
S14	1/7/2005	124	11.4	37.5	
S14	3/17/2005	340	0	1.17	
S14	6/21/2005	330	0	1.07	
	No. Samples		63		

Table B.2: Averaged San Gabriel River Reach 2 lead data (averaged data is shown in red font within the gray highlighted area)

site ID	date sampled	hardness	dissolved lead	total lead	Comments
S14	10/14/1997	238	0	0	
S14	11/10/1997	195			
S14	11/13/1997	128	0	0	
S14	11/26/1997	100	35.5	44	
S14	12/5/1997	132	18	24.6	
S14	1/4/1998	1	0	0	data point not used because of bad hardness value
S14	1/9/1998	120	20.4	27.9	
S14	1/29/1998	134	0	6.8	
S14	2/2/1998	120			
S14	2/6/1998	100	0	11.45	
S14	11/8/1998	230	0	0	
S14	12/6/1998	80	0	0	
S14	1/20/1999	276	0	0	
S14	1/25/1999	184	0	0	
S14	1/31/1999	280	0	0	
S14	2/6/1999	256	0	0	
S14	2/9/1999	286			
S14	3/15/1999	126	0	0	
S14	3/20/1999	265	0	0	
S14	3/25/1999	290	0	0	
S14	4/6/1999	178	0	0	
S14	4/8/1999	230			
S14	4/11/1999	110	0	0	
S14	1/26/2000	95	0	6.1	
S14	2/3/2000	170	0	0	
S14	2/12/2000	160			
S14	2/15/2000	128	0	0	
S14	2/17/2000	112			
S14	2/22/2000	95.2	0	0	
S14	2/25/2000	192	0	0	
S14	2/29/2000	230			
S14	3/7/2000	85	0	0	
S14	3/9/2000	198			
S14	10/28/2000	266			
S14	11/1/2000	190	0	2.62	
S14	1/8/2001	300	0	0	
S14	1/17/2001	160	0	0	
S14	1/26/2001	360	0	0	
S14	2/14/2001	220	0	0	
S14	2/20/2001	240	0	0	
S14	2/28/2001	140	0	0	
S14	3/6/2001	210	0	0	
S14	11/12/2001	180	0	0.77	

Table B.2

site ID	date sampled	hardness	dissolved lead	total lead	Comments
S14	11/27/2001	120	1.595	2.8	
S14	11/30/2001	200			
S14	12/3/2001	230	0.76	1.77	
S14	12/27/2001	172	0	0.77	
S14	1/31/2002	150	0	0	
S14	10/10/2002	270	0	1.38	
S14	11/8/2002	210	0.67	56	
S14	12/16/2002	108	1.21	2.52	
S14	2/11/2003	80	1.55	2.16	
S14	3/15/2003	103	0	5.39	
S14	10/28/2003	210	0	2.19	
S14	10/31/2003	260			
S14	12/25/2003	320	0.92	1.72	
S14	1/1/2004	305	1.46	2.14	
S14	1/13/2004	195	0	0.72	
S14	10/17/2004	208	0	3.78	
S14	10/26/2004	130	0	4.42	
S14	12/5/2004	130	0	9.05	
S14	1/7/2005	124	11.4	37.5	
S14	3/17/2005	340	0	1.17	
S14	6/21/2005	330	0	1.07	
	No. Samples		52		

Table B.3: Averaged San Gabriel River Reach 2 lead data compared to applicable CTR criteria

date sampled	hardness	Lead acute CTR	Exceed?	Lead chronic CTR	Exceed ?
10/14/1997	238	164		6.4	
11/10/1997	195	133		5.2	
11/13/1997	128	84		3.3	
11/26/1997	100	65		2.5	Yes
12/5/1997	132	87		3.4	Yes
~~1/4/1998~~	~~1~~	~~0~~		~~0.0~~	
1/9/1998	120	79		3.1	Yes
1/29/1998	134	89		3.5	
2/2/1998	120	79		3.1	
2/6/1998	100	65		2.5	
11/8/1998	230	158		6.2	
12/6/1998	80	51		2.0	
1/20/1999	276	191		7.5	
1/25/1999	184	125		4.9	
1/31/1999	280	194		7.6	
2/6/1999	256	177		6.9	
2/9/1999	286	198		7.7	
3/15/1999	126	83		3.2	
3/20/1999	265	183		7.1	
3/25/1999	290	201		7.8	
4/6/1999	178	120		4.7	
4/8/1999	230	158		6.2	
4/11/1999	110	72		2.8	
1/26/2000	95	61		2.4	
2/3/2000	170	114		4.5	
2/12/2000	160	107		4.2	
2/15/2000	128	84		3.3	
2/17/2000	112	73		2.8	
2/22/2000	95.2	61		2.4	
2/25/2000	192	130		5.1	
2/29/2000	230	158		6.2	
3/7/2000	85	54		2.1	
3/9/2000	198	135		5.2	
10/28/2000	266	184		7.2	
11/1/2000	190	129		5.0	
1/8/2001	300	209		8.1	
1/17/2001	160	107		4.2	
1/26/2001	360	252		9.8	
2/14/2001	220	151		5.9	
2/20/2001	240	165		6.4	
2/28/2001	140	93		3.6	
3/6/2001	210	143		5.6	
11/12/2001	180	122		4.7	
11/27/2001	120	79		3.1	
11/30/2001	200	136		5.3	

Table B.3

date sampled	hardness	Lead acute CTR	Exceed?	Lead chronic CTR	Exceed ?
12/3/2001	230	158		6.2	
12/27/2001	172	116		4.5	
1/31/2002	150	100		3.9	
10/10/2002	270	187		7.3	
11/8/2002	210	143		5.6	
12/16/2002	108	70		2.7	
2/11/2003	80	51		2.0	
3/15/2003	103	67		2.6	
10/28/2003	210	143		5.6	
10/31/2003	260	180		7.0	
12/25/2003	320	223		8.7	
1/1/2004	305	212		8.3	
1/13/2004	195	133		5.2	
10/17/2004	208	142		5.5	
10/26/2004	130	86		3.3	
12/5/2004	130	86		3.3	
1/7/2005	124	82		3.2	Yes
3/17/2005	340	238		9.3	
6/21/2005	330	230		9.0	
Exceedances			**0**		**4**

Table C.1: 303(d) Listing Summary for Regional Board Reach 7 of the Santa Clara River

Waterbody	2002	2006 (proposed) (September 2005)	September 2006 SWRCB recommendation		
	303(d) List	303(d) List	Current recommendation	303(d) List	proposed TMDL Completion date
Santa Clara River Reach 7 (Reach 9 on 2002 list) (Bouquet Cyn Rd. To Above Lang gauging station)	High Coliform Count	High Coliform Count	Coliform Bacteria	Coliform Bacteria	2019
		Wasn't on September 2005 proposed list	Change: listing new pollutant	Nitrate and Nitrite	2003
		Wasn't on September 2005 proposed list	Change: listing new pollutant	Chloride	2004

Table C.2: Chloride Measurements for Regional Board Reach 7 (Receiving Water Station RA)

Sampling Date	Location	Sublocation	Value	Unit
5/21/1998	SCR	RA	44.6	MG/L
3/2/2005	SCR	RA	21.6	MG/L
4/13/2005	SCR	RA	64.6	MG/L
1/18/2006	SCR	RA	33	MG/L
2/15/2006	SCR	RA	23.6	MG/L
3/15/2006	SCR	RA	28.9	MG/L
4/19/2006	SCR	RA	35.4	MG/L
5/17/2006	SCR	RA	34	MG/L
7/19/2006	SCR	RA	45.3	MG/L
8/23/2006	SCR	RA	59.6	MG/L

Table C.3: Nitrate + Nitrite Measurements for Regional Board Reach 7 (Receiving Water Station RA)

Sampling Date	Location	Sublocation	NO3+NO2	Unit
3/12/1993	SCR	RA	2.7	MG/L
5/21/1998	SCR	RA	3.26	MG/L
3/2/2005	SCR	RA	1.8	MG/L
4/13/2005	SCR	RA	3.95	MG/L
1/18/2006	SCR	RA	2.13	MG/L
2/15/2006	SCR	RA	1.25	MG/L
3/15/2006	SCR	RA	1.99	MG/L
4/19/2006	SCR	RA	2.26	MG/L
5/17/2006	SCR	RA	2.17	MG/L
7/19/2006	SCR	RA	2.67	MG/L
8/23/2006	SCR	RA	3.56	MG/L



Figure C.1 Upper Santa Clara River Regional Board and USEPA Reach Designations

Appendix D: Resubmittal of Chronic Toxicity Summary for San Gabriel River Reach 3

Table D.1: Chronic Toxicity Monitoring Result Summary – Receiving Water Station-R11

Test Species	TEST DATE	Endpoint	NOEC	TUc (NOEC)	EC/IC25 (95% CI)	% EFFECT IN 100% SAMPLE (95% CI)
Ceriodaphnia dubia	08/14/03	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0% (N/A)
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	5.9% (0.1 to 11.7)
Pimephales promelas	08/14/03	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0% (-5.0 to 5.0)
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	3.6% (-3.6 to 10.9)
Ceriodaphnia dubia	10/23/03	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-11.1% (N/A)
		Reproduction	<20%	>5.0	18.3% (N/A)	27.0% (17.4 to 36.6)
Pimephales promelas	11/04/03	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-11.4% (-17.0 to -5.8)
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-21.7% (-34.1 to -9.2)
Pimephales promelas	2/10/04	Survival	≤100%	≥1.0	76.9%~~>100%~~ (N/A)	32.5% (8.0 to 57.0)
		Growth	≤100%	≥1.0	>100% (N/A)	23.6% (-5.5 to 52.6)
Pimephales promelas	5/11/04	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	2.7% (-5.9 to 11.4)
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-52.1% (-74.8 to -29.4)
Ceriodaphnia dubia	05/18/04[a]	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0% (N/A)
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	12.3% (4.7 to 19.9)
~~*Pimephales promelas*~~	~~8/17/04~~	~~Survival~~	~~100%~~	~~1.0~~	~~>100% (N/A)~~	~~-2.94% (-14.0 to 8.1)~~
		~~Growth~~	~~100%~~	~~1.0~~	~~>100% (N/A)~~	~~-21.0% (-45.2 to 3.2)~~
Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata	08/26/04	Cell Density	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-33.5 (-40.0 to -27.0)
Pimephales promelas	08/31/04	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-2.6% (N/A)
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-19.8% (-23.0 to -16.5)
Pimephales promelas	11/09/04	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	2.6% (-7.5 to 12.6)
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-17.2% (-35.1 to 0.6)
Pimephales promelas	03/08/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-5.4% (-10.7 to -0.1)
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-23.5% (-34.5 to -12.4)
Pimephales promelas	05/03/05	Survival	80%	1.3	>100% (N/A)	21.6% (5.7 to 37.5)
		Growth	80%	1.3	>100% (N/A)	11.7% (-5.2 to 28.5)
Pimephales promelas	08/26/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0.0%(-6.7 to 6.7)
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	10.0%(0.00 to 19.9)
~~*Pimephales promelas*~~	~~8/27/05~~	~~Survival~~	~~100%~~	~~1.0~~	~~>100% (N/A)~~	~~5.7%(0.3 to 11.3)~~
		~~Growth~~	~~100%~~	~~1.0~~	~~>100% (N/A)~~	~~-26.2%(-45.6 to -6.9)~~
Pimephales promelas	11/03/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	2.6%(-3.2 to 8.4)
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-6.1%(-13.2 to 1.0)

a: Test conducted with a single sample.

Table D.2: Chronic Toxicity Monitoring Result Summary – TMDL Station #4 (San Gabriel River at Peck Rd.)

Test Species	TEST DATE	Endpoint	NOEC	TUc (NOEC)	EC/IC25 (95% CI)	% EFFECT IN 100% SAMPLE (95% CI)
Ceriodaphnia dubia	04/01/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0% (N/A)
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-13% (-25.2 to -0.4)
Ceriodaphnia dubia	04/21/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0% (N/A)
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	7.0 (-14.7 to 28.6)
Ceriodaphnia dubia	05/19/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0% (N/A)
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-7.4 (-11.1 to -3.6)
Ceriodaphnia dubia	06/23/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0% (N/A)
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-26.1 (-44.9 to -7.2)
Ceriodaphnia dubia	07/28/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	10% (-9.6 to 29.6)
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-3.2
Ceriodaphnia dubia	08/18/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	10% (-12.49.6 to 12.429.6)
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-240.2%(-63.8 to 15.5)
Ceriodaphnia dubia	09/29/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0% (N/A)
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-32.1%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	10/27/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0% (N/A)
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-104.8%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	11/15/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0% (N/A)
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-24.7%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	12/09/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0% (N/A)
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	6.2%

a: All TMDL tests were conducted using a single sample.

Table D.3: Chronic Toxicity Monitoring Result Summary – Receiving Water Station WN-RA

Test Species	TEST DATE	Endpoint	NOEC	TUc (NOEC)	EC/IC25 (95% CI)	% EFFECT IN 100% SAMPLE (95% CI)
Pimephales promelas	11/04/03	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	7.9% (2.7 to 13.1)
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-20.8% (-30.8 to 10.7)
Pimephales promelas	03/16/04	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0% (N/A)
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-15.6 (-18.5 to –12.7)
Pimephales promelas	08/31/04	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-2.6% (N/A)
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-6.6% (-13.4 to 0.2)
Pimephales promelas	03/08/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-5.6% (-11.8 to 0.7)
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-16.0% (-20.1 to -11.9)
Pimephales promelas	05/03/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	2.6% (-2.5 to 7.8)
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-4.3% (-11.7 to 3.2)
Pimephales promelas	05/12/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	12.8 (-6.4 to 32.1)
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	17.3 (0.3 to 34.3)
Pimephales promelas	08/09/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	5.1 (.1 to 10.2
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-.05 (-3.7 to 2.7)
Pimephales promelas	11/15/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-5.3% (N/A)
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-15.0% (-27.3 to -2.7)

Table D.4: Chronic Toxicity Monitoring Result Summary – 2003 Pre-TMDL Study with USEPA[a]

Test Species	TEST DATE	Endpoint	NOEC	TUc (NOEC)	EC/IC25 (95% CI)	% EFFECT IN 100% SAMPLE (95% CI)
Pimephales promelas	8/14/03[b]	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-2.6% (-7.8 to 2.5)
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	15.4% (9.6 to 21.1)
Ceriodaphnia dubia	8/14/03[b]	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0% (N/A)
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0.3% (-17.8 to 18.4)
Pimephales promelas	9/16/03[c]	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	5.0% (-4.8 to 14.8)
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-33.3% (-62.2 to - 4.3)
Ceriodaphnia dubia	9/16/03[c]	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0% (N/A)
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	12.8% (3.5 to 22.1)
Pimephales promelas	10/28/03[c]	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0.0% (-5.0 to 5.0)
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	3.6% (-0.4 to 7.5)
Ceriodaphnia dubia	10/28/03[c]	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	10.0% (-9.6 to 29.6)
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	18.3% (-1.2 to 37.7)

a: All TMDL tests were conducted using a single sample.
b: Sample collected near R11 location.
c: Sample collected at Peck Rd.

Table D.5: Chronic Toxicity Monitoring Result Summary – 2005 San Gabriel River Regional Monitoring Program-2005 Targeted Chronic Toxicity Testing at R-11

Test Species	TEST DATE	Endpoint	NOEC	TUc (NOEC)	EC/IC25 (95% CI)	% EFFECT IN 100% SAMPLE (95% CI)
Ceriodaphnia dubia	06/21/2005	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0% (N/A)
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-15.3% (-32.6 to 1.9)

Appendix E: Chronic Toxicity Summary for Walnut Creek

Table E.1: Chronic Toxicity Monitoring Result Summary – Walnut Creek at Baldwin Park Blvd. (Site 2 on Figure E.1) – 2003 Collaborative Study[a]

Test Species	TEST DATE	Endpoint	NOEC	TUc (NOEC)	EC/IC25	% EFFECT IN 100% SAMPLE
Pimephales promelas	8/14/03	Survival	100%	1.0	>100%	0%
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100%	14.9%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	8/14/03	Survival	100%	1.0	>100%	0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100%	1.3%
Pimephales promelas	9/16/03	Survival	100%	1.0	>100%	0%
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100%	-47.9%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	9/16/03	Survival	100%	1.0	>100%	0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100%	-0.7%
Pimephales promelas	10/28/03	Survival	100%	1.0	>100%	5.1%
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100%	9.6%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	10/28/03	Survival	100%	1.0	>100%	0%
		Reproduction	<100%	>1.0	>100%	16.4%

a: All tests were conducted using a single sample.

Table E.2: Chronic Toxicity Monitoring Result Summary – Walnut Creek at Merced Ave. (Site 1 on Figure E.1) - 2003 Collaborative Study[a]

Test Species	TEST DATE	Endpoint	NOEC	TUc (NOEC)	EC/IC25	% EFFECT IN 100% SAMPLE
Pimephales promelas	8/14/03	Survival	100%	1.0	>100%	-5.3%
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100%	6.6%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	8/14/03	Survival	100%	1.0	>100%	0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100%	-1.6%
Pimephales promelas	9/16/03	Survival	100%	1.0	>100%	10%
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100%	-45.9%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	9/16/03	Survival	<100%	>1.0	<100%	90%
		Reproduction	<100%	>1.0	<100%	37.0%
Pimephales promelas	10/28/03	Survival	100%	1.0	>100%	0%
		Growth	100%	1.0	>100%	5.3%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	10/28/03	Survival	100%	1.0	>100%	0%
		Reproduction	<100%	>1.0	>100%	22.5%

a: All tests were conducted using a single sample.

Table E.3: Chronic Toxicity Monitoring Result Summary – Walnut Creek at Merced Ave. (Site 1 on Figure E.1) – 2004-2006 Collaborative Study[a]

Test Species	SAMPLE DATE	Endpoint	NOEC	TUc (NOEC)	EC/IC25 (95% CI)	% EFFECT IN 100% SAMPLE
Ceriodaphnia dubia	03/31/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	9.0%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	04/21/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	5.0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-74%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	05/26/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-11.1%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-64%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	06/23/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	5.0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-51%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	07/28/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-75%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	08/18/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-5.0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-38%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	09/29/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-64%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	10/27/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-5.0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-58%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	11/15/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-43%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	12/08/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-42%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	01/19/06	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-21%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	02/23/06	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	16%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-10%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	03/23/06	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	5.0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-38%

a: All tests were conducted using a single sample.

Table E.4: Chronic Toxicity Monitoring Result Summary – Walnut Creek at Baldwin Park Blvd. (Site 2 on Figure E.1) - 2004-2006 Collaborative Study[a]

Test Species	SAMPLE DATE	Endpoint	NOEC	TUc (NOEC)	EC/IC25 (95% CI)	% EFFECT IN 100% SAMPLE
Ceriodaphnia dubia	12/28/04[b]	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-19%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	02/11/05[b]	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-11%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-25%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	03/31/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	3.0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	10%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	04/21/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-77%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	05/26/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-11%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-46%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	06/23/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-43%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	07/28/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	5.0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-85%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	08/18/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-5.0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-71%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	09/29/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-63%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	10/27/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-5.0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-70%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	11/15/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-42%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	12/08/05	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-41%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	01/01/06[b]	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	3%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-5%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	01/19/06	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-22%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	02/23/06	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-5.0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-22%
Ceriodaphnia dubia	03/23/06	Survival	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	0%
		Reproduction	100%	1.0	>100% (N/A)	-60%

a: All tests were conducted using a single sample.
b: Wet weather sampling event.


Big Dalton Wash
Walnut Creek
San Gabriel River
San Jose Creek
10
605
1
2
Figure E.1
Walnut Creek
Toxicity Sampling
Sampling Locations
Major Roads
Freeways
0
0.25
0.5
1
Miles
N

Impaired Waterbody	Map Location	County	Existing 303(d) Listing	Proposed 303(d) Listing
SCR - Reach 6	A	Los Angeles	chloride	
SCR - Reach 5	B	Los Angeles	chloride	
Piru Creek (from gaging station below Santa Felicia Dam to headwaters)	C	Ventura		chloride
Reach 11 (Piru Creek, from conf with SCR to gaging station)	D	Ventura		boron, sulfates
Hopper Creek	E	Ventura	sulfates, TDS	
Pole Creek (trib to Reach 3)	F	Ventura	sulfates, TDS	
Sespe Creek (trib to Reach 3)	G	Ventura	chloride	
SCR - Reach 3	H	Ventura	chloride, TDS	
Wheeler Canyon/Todd Barranca	I	Ventura	sulfates, TDS	



Figure F.1: Existing and Proposed 303(d) Salt-related Listings in the Santa Clara River Watershed