

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGIONS II AND III

TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOADS FOR
POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS (PCBs)
FOR ZONES 2 - 5 OF THE TIDAL
DELAWARE RIVER

_____/s/_____
Walter E. Mugdan
Director
Division of Environmental Planning
and Protection
EPA Region II

_____/12/15/03_____
Date

_____/s/_____
Jon M. Capacasa
Director
Water Protection Division
EPA Region III

_____/12/15/03_____
Date

Prepared by the
DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION
WEST TRENTON, NJ

Authority

These TMDLs are established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency under the authority of Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1251 *et seq.*, and in accordance with EPA's implementing regulations, 40 C.F.R., § 130.

Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by the Delaware River Basin Commission staff: Carol R. Collier, Executive Director. Dr. Thomas J. Fikslin and Dr. Namsoo Suk were the principal authors of the report. Dr. Fikslin is the Head of the Commission's Modeling & Monitoring Branch. Dr. Suk is a Water Resources Engineer/Modeler in the Modeling & Monitoring Branch. Significant technical contributions were made by Gregory J. Cavallo, Dr. Daniel S. L. Liao, Dr. Ronald A. MacGillivray, and John R. Yagecic. Richard W. Greene is gratefully acknowledged for his efforts in summarizing fish tissue data for PCBs, and for providing Figures 2 and 3 of the report. Technical recommendations were provided by the Commission's Toxic Advisory Committee and its TMDL Policies and Procedures Subcommittee.

Final decision and technical recommendations were provided by the Region II and Region III offices of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The principal participants at EPA Region II included: Kevin Bricke, Deputy Director of the Division of Environmental Planning & Protection, and Susan Schulz. The principal participants at EPA Region III included: Joseph Piotrowski, Associate Director, Water Protection Division, Thomas Henry, TMDL Program Manager, Carol Ann Davis, Evelyn MacKnight, Chief of the DE/PA/WV Branch, Office of Watersheds, Mary Kuo and Cornelius Carr.

Special acknowledgment is made to the following organizations for their support in development of the report and the studies leading up to it:

Delaware Department of Natural Resources & Environmental Control
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection
Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region II
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III
Rutgers University
Limno-Tech, Inc.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

On behalf of the states of Delaware, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, and in cooperation with the Delaware River Basin Commission, the United States Environmental Protection Agency Regions II and III (EPA) establish these total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) in the Delaware River Estuary. EPA establishes these TMDLs in order to achieve and maintain the applicable water quality criteria for PCBs designed to protect human health from the carcinogenic effects of eating the contaminated fish now found in the Delaware Estuary. In accordance with Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and its implementing regulations, these TMDLs provide allocations to point sources (WLAs) discharging PCBs as well as allocations to nonpoint sources (LAs) of PCBs, and an explicit margin of safety to account for uncertainties. This TMDL report and its appendices set forth the basis for these TMDLs and allocations and discusses follow up strategies that will be necessary to achieve these substantial reductions of PCBs. EPA will continue to work with the Commission and the States to develop enhanced Stage 2 PCB TMDLs based on information to be collected and analyzed over the next several years. While EPA acknowledges that implementation of these TMDLs will be difficult and may take decades to fully achieve, the establishment of these TMDLs sets forth a framework and specific goals to protect human health and restore the Delaware River from the effects of PCB pollution.

Background

The states of Delaware, New Jersey and Pennsylvania have identified the Delaware Estuary as impaired on their respective lists pursuant to Section 303(d) of the CWA. The States identified the impairments based on their findings of elevated levels of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) in the tissue of fish caught in this portion of the Delaware River. The listing was based upon failure to attain one of the estuary's primary designated uses – fishable waters – and the inherent protection of human health from consumption of unsafe fish. When water quality standards, including a numeric criterion and a designated use, are not attained despite the technology-based control of industrial and municipal wastewater (point sources), the Clean Water Act requires that the impaired water be identified on the state's Section 303(d) list of impaired waters and that a total maximum daily load (TMDL) be developed. A TMDL expresses the maximum amount of a pollutant that a water body can receive and still attain standards. Once the load is calculated, it is allocated to all sources in the watershed – point and nonpoint – which then must reduce loads to the allocated levels in order to achieve and maintain the applicable water quality standards.

For management purposes, the Delaware River Estuary has been designated by the Delaware River Basin Commission (also referred to in this report as the Commission) as that section of the main stem of the Delaware River and the tidal portions of the tributaries thereto, between the head of Delaware Bay

(River Mile 48.2) and the head of the tide at Trenton, New Jersey (River Mile 133.4). The portion of the Delaware where the river meets the sea, the estuary is characterized by varying degrees of salinity and complex water movements affected by river flows, wind and ocean tides. A map of the estuary showing the water quality management zones 2 through 5 that comprise the tidal Delaware River appears on the following page.

In the late 1980s, the states of Delaware, New Jersey and Pennsylvania began issuing fish consumption advisories for portions of the Delaware Estuary due to elevated concentrations of PCBs measured in fish tissue. Today, the states' advisories cover the entire estuary and bay. The advisories range from a no-consumption recommendation for all species taken between the C&D Canal and the Delaware-Pennsylvania border to consumption of no more than one meal per month of striped bass or white perch in Zones 2 through 4. Why the need for such advisories? PCBs are classified as a probable human carcinogen by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). They also have been shown to have an adverse impact on human reproductive and immune systems and may act as an endocrine disruptor.

PCBs are a class of synthetic compounds that were typically manufactured through the progressive chlorination of batches of biphenyl to achieve a target percentage of chlorine by weight. Individual PCB compounds called congeners can have up to 10 chlorine atoms attached to a basic biphenyl structure consisting of two connected rings of six carbon atoms each. There are 209 patterns in which chlorine atoms may be attached, resulting in 209 possible PCB compounds. These compounds can be grouped into "homologs" defined by the number of chlorine atoms attached to the carbon rings. Thus, for example, PCB compounds that contain five chlorine atoms comprise a homolog referred to as pentachlorobiphenyls or penta-PCBs.



Due to their stable properties, PCBs were used in hundreds of industrial and commercial applications, including electrical, heat transfer, and hydraulic equipment; as plasticizers in paints, plastics and rubber products; and in pigments, dyes and carbonless copy paper, among other applications. PCB laden oil is often associated with electrical transformers. More than 1.5 billion pounds of PCBs were manufactured in the United States before their manufacture and general use, with a few small exceptions, was banned by the EPA in the late 1970s. Existing uses in some electrical equipment continue to be allowed. PCBs are hydrophobic and thus tend to bind to organic particles in sediment and soils. Their chemical stability allows them to persist in the environment for years. PCBs accumulate in the tissue of fish and other wildlife, entering the organism through absorption or ingestion. As a result, they may be present in fish and marine mammals at levels many times higher than in the surrounding water and at levels unsuitable for human consumption.

The water quality standards that form the basis for the TMDLs are the current Delaware River Basin Commission water quality criteria for total PCBs for the protection of human health from carcinogenic effects. These criteria were identified as the TMDL targets by a letter dated April 16, 2003 from the Regional Administrators of EPA Regions II and III to the Executive Director of the Delaware River Basin Commission. The criteria are 44.4 picograms per liter in Zones 2 and 3, 44.8 picograms per liter in Zone 4 and the upper portion of Zone 5, and 7.9 picograms per liter in lower Zone 5. The more stringent criterion in the lower estuary reflects a higher fish consumption rate utilized by the Commission and the State of Delaware, based upon an evaluation of fish consumption there. A consequence of the inconsistency in criteria is that a critical location occurs at the point between upper and lower Zone 5 where the criteria drop sharply from 44.8 picograms per liter to 7.9 picograms per liter. Achieving the lower standard in a portion of Zone 5 will require much larger reductions in the upper zones than would otherwise be necessary. Significant reductions are required throughout the estuary in any case, as ambient concentrations of PCBs in the water body currently exceed the criteria by two to three orders of magnitude.

PCBs have been dispersed throughout the environment by human activity. They enter the atmosphere as a gas, spill into soils and waterways, and lodge in sediments. They continue to be generated as a byproduct by some industrial processes. Thus, the sources of PCBs to the Delaware Estuary are multiple. They include loadings from the air, the main stem Delaware River above Trenton, tributaries to the Delaware both above and below Trenton, industrial and municipal point source discharges, combined sewer overflows, and storm water runoff, including runoff from seriously contaminated sites. For purposes of these TMDLs, point sources include all municipal and industrial discharges subject to regulation by the NPDES permit program, including combined sewer overflows and stormwater discharges. All other discharges are considered nonpoint sources.

Interagency and Interstate Cooperation

In the latter half of the 1990s, the three estuary states included the portions of Zones 2 through 5 of the Delaware River within their borders on their lists of impaired waters under Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act, due to elevated levels of PCBs in estuary fish. This action required the states and EPA to agree upon a schedule for establishing TMDLs for PCBs. In order to provide for a single TMDL adoption process for the shared water body, one date for completion of the TMDLs – December 15, 2003 – was established. This is the date set for completion of the PCB TMDLs by a 1997 Consent Decree and Settlement Agreement in an action entitled *American Littoral Society and Sierra Club v. the United States Environmental Protection Agency et al.*, which established dates for adoption of TMDLs in the Delaware Estuary. Because a unified legal process for issuance of the TMDLs could not be accomplished easily through independent state actions, at the request of the states, EPA agreed to issue the TMDLs for PCBs in the estuary on the states' behalf.

In the spring of 2000, the states and EPA asked the Delaware River Basin Commission to take the lead in developing the technical basis for the estuary PCB TMDLs. In consultation with its Toxics Advisory Committee (TAC), comprised of representatives from the states, EPA Regions II and III, municipal and industrial dischargers, academia, agriculture, public health, environmental organizations and fish and wildlife interests, the Commission undertook to do so. In September of 2000, the Commission established a panel of scientists expert in the modeling of hydrophobic contaminants such as PCBs to advise it and the TAC on the development of the complex hydrodynamic and water quality model required to develop the TMDLs. The Commission also initiated an extensive program of scientific investigations and data collection efforts. In response to a recommendation of the expert panel, in May of 2002 the Commission engaged a consultant experienced in water quality modeling to work closely with Commission staff to develop the model.

In consultation with the TAC, the Commission staff and the Delaware Estuary Program developed a strategy to address contamination of the Delaware Estuary by PCBs (the PCB Strategy). The PCB Strategy includes the following nine components: (1) determination of the water quality targets for PCBs; (2) characterization of PCB concentrations in the estuary ecosystem; (3) identification and quantification of all point and nonpoint sources and pathways of PCBs; (4) determination of the transport and fate of PCB loads to the estuary; (5) calculation of the TMDLs, including the wasteload and load allocations required for a TMDL; (6) development of an implementation plan to reduce PCBs entering the estuary; (7) initiation of an effort to increase public awareness of toxicity issues in the estuary; (8) long-term monitoring of PCB concentrations in air, water and sediments of the estuary; and (9) long-term monitoring of PCB concentrations in living resources of the estuary and impacts upon living resources of the estuary. The PCB Strategy is one component of EPA's reasonable assurance that the allocations of these TMDLs will ultimately be achieved.

In a cooperative effort, EPA, the Commission, the states, municipal and industrial dischargers and other stakeholders, have now completed the PCB Strategy components necessary for issuance of the TMDLs. This TMDL report discusses the identification of water quality targets for the TMDLs and calculation of the TMDLs in more detail below (components 1 and 5). An extensive program of

scientific investigations and data collection efforts to further characterize PCB sources, concentrations and pathways in the estuary ecosystem is ongoing (components 2, 3 and 8). To date, studies have been assembled or undertaken on fish tissue, ambient water quality, sediment, air deposition, air-water exchange, bioaccumulation pathways, tributary loading, point source discharges, and stormwater loadings. The transport and fate of PCBs in the estuary ecosystem (component 4) has been established through the development of a complex mathematical model, also discussed below. The Commission has established a TMDL Implementation Advisory Committee (IAC) to develop strategies over the next two years for reducing PCB loads to the estuary and achieving the TMDLs (component 6). An effort to educate the public about toxicity issues in the estuary (component 7) began with a series of public information sessions in February and March of 2001. In October of 2002, a coalition of municipal and industrial dischargers sponsored a science symposium, at which the various scientific investigators presented their findings to date. A meeting among regulators and stakeholders on the TMDLs and their regulatory implications was held in April, 2003 (see Appendix 1).

EPA with assistance from the Commission and the States held three informational meetings about the proposed TMDLs on September 22, 24 and 25, 2003, and conducted a public hearing on the proposed TMDLs on October 16, 2003. During the public comment period EPA received numerous written comments in addition to the testimony provided at the public hearing. EPA considered those comments in finalizing these TMDLs and prepared a Response to Comments document that is part of the record of this decision. Ongoing education initiatives regarding these issues continue to be carried out through the Delaware Estuary Program and the Partnership for the Delaware Estuary.

Development of the TMDLs

The three-year schedule for development of the estuary TMDLs by December 15, 2003 resulted in a decision to develop the TMDLs using a staged approach. The Stage 1 and Stage 2 TMDLs will each comply fully with EPA requirements and guidance. The staged approach will provide for adaptive implementation through execution of load reduction strategies while additional monitoring and modeling efforts proceed. As discussed below, these Stage 1 TMDLs are based on the best water quality-related monitoring data, modeling and scientific analysis available at this time. EPA expects that additional monitoring data and modeling results will be collected and developed following issuance of the Stage 1 TMDLs. This additional information will enable a more refined analysis to form the basis of the Stage 2 TMDLs. EPA will continue to work with the Commission and the States to develop and complete the Stage 2 TMDLs. Until the Stage 1 TMDLs are amended or replaced, the Stage 1 TMDLs are the final and effective TMDLs for purposes of the CWA.

EPA's regulations implementing Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act provide that a TMDL must be expressed as the sum of the individual wasteload allocations (WLA) for point sources plus the load allocation (LA) for nonpoint sources plus a margin of safety (MOS). This definition may be expressed as the equation: $TMDL = WLA + LA + MOS$. A separate TMDL has been developed for each water

quality management zone of the estuary. Each of the TMDLs must provide for achievement of the applicable water quality standards within the zone and also must ensure that water quality in downstream zones is adequately protected.

In June of 2002, the expert panel recommended that for the TMDLs to be completed by December 15, 2003, the Commission should develop and calibrate a water quality model for only one of the PCB homologs and use it to develop a set of TMDLs from which TMDLs for total PCBs could be extrapolated. This process became known as Stage 1 of an iterative approach to establishing the TMDLs for PCBs in the estuary. Since pentachlorobiphenyls were the dominant homolog in fish tissue monitored in the estuary, and since ambient data indicated that throughout the estuary this homolog represents approximately 25 percent of the total PCBs present, the pentachlorobiphenyls (penta-PCBs) were selected. Based on these recommendations and a review of the available data, EPA adopted this approach. Thus, based on the best scientific estimates and analysis as discussed further below, the Stage 1 TMDLs, WLAs and LAs for total PCBs were extrapolated, using a factor of 4 to 1, from TMDLs and allocations developed for penta-PCBs. EPA, the Commission and the States expect that the Stage 2 TMDLs, WLAs and LAs will be based on the summation of the PCB homolog groups, without the use of extrapolation. The partners intend that the Stage 2 TMDLs will be developed using all additional data collected and modeling performed after the establishment of these TMDLs. It is anticipated that the Stage 2 WLAs will be based upon an enhanced allocation methodology. When they are developed and established, the partners expect that the Stage 2 TMDLs will replace the Stage 1 TMDLs.

The TMDLs were calculated using both a conservative chemical model and a penta-PCB water quality model run until equilibrium was observed. This procedure was used because hydrophobic contaminants like PCBs sorb to particulates and interact significantly with the sediments of the estuary. Sediments respond more slowly than the water column to changes in PCB concentrations in either medium, and allowing the water column and sediments to come into equilibrium is necessary to ensure that water quality criteria are met. A modified version of the TOX15 water quality model was used (DRBC 2003a and 2003b). Both models utilized outputs from a DYNHYD5 hydrodynamic model that was extended from the head of the Delaware Bay to the mouth of the bay (DRBC 2003a). The models cycled inputs from the period February 1, 2002 until January 31, 2003. This one-year period was considered to be representative of long-term hydrological conditions for two important reasons. First, during this period flows of the two main tributaries to the estuary – the main stem Delaware River and the Schuylkill River – reasonably represent the flows during the approximately 90- and 70-year periods of record, respectively, for the two tributaries (see Figures 5 and 6). Precipitation data during the one-year period also is in good agreement with the long-term precipitation record with respect to the number and percentage of days with and without precipitation. Upon the recommendation of the expert panel, in order to maintain hydrological and meteorological relationships between the various inputs to the model, effluent flows were based upon data for the same one-year period, rather than on design flows. The same approach was used for inputs such as air temperature, water temperature and wind speed.

Penta-PCB TMDLs were calculated in a four step procedure. The procedure initially utilized the conservative chemical model to establish contribution factors for two of the major tributaries to the estuary – the Delaware River at Trenton and the Schuylkill River – and each of the four estuary zones. The contribution factor reflects the influence of the loading attributable to each tributary or zone on the PCB concentration at the critical location in Zone 5 where the water quality criterion for PCBs drops from 44.4 picograms per liter to 7.9 picograms per liter. If the criterion at this location is met, then the water quality criteria are met throughout the estuary. Once the contribution factors were established, the TMDLs were calculated over a one-year period to determine an annual median loading. The annual median was used in order to be consistent with the model simulations and the 70-year exposure for human health criteria. A description of the four steps follows:

1. Calculate the contribution factor (CF) for each of the estuary zones and two of the tributary model boundaries to that critical location in Zone 5 where the criterion of 7.9 picograms per liter (approximately 2.0 picograms per liter of penta-PCBs) is controlling.
2. Calculate the allowable loadings from each of these sources that will still ensure that the water quality target is met at the critical location utilizing the CF and the proportion of the assimilative capacity at the critical location allocated to each source. Iteratively determine the amount of assimilative capacity (in picograms per liter) provided by the sediments, and add this concentration to the penta-PCB water quality target. Recalculate the allowable loadings from each of the six sources using this revised water quality target.
3. Utilize the water quality model for penta-PCBs with these allowable loadings to confirm that the sediment concentrations have reached pseudo-steady state, and confirm that the penta-PCB water quality target is met in Zones 2 through 5.
4. Estimate the gas phase concentrations that would be in equilibrium with the penta-PCB water concentrations when the water quality targets are met, include these in the water quality model, and then iteratively adjust the gas phase concentration of penta-PCBs in the air until the water quality target is reached.

For purposes of calculating the TMDLs, EPA notes that the model assumes that PCB loads from the ocean, the C&D Canal, the major tributaries and the air are at levels that ensure that the water quality standards are achieved, rather than at the actual levels, which in every case are higher. Thus, in developing the TMDLs, both the ocean boundary and the C&D Canal boundary were set to an equivalent penta-PCB criterion of 2.0 picograms per liter, corresponding to a total PCB water quality criterion of 7.9 picograms per liter, the criterion in lower Zone 5 where each of these water bodies meets the estuary. Other programs and factors beyond the scope of these TMDLs will be necessary to reduce PCB loads from these sources. The actual concentration at the mouth of the Bay exceeds the water quality criterion by one to two orders of magnitude, while the current concentration at the C&D

Canal boundary exceeds this value by almost three orders of magnitude. Similarly, the Schuylkill and Delaware River boundary conditions were set to 9.68 picograms per liter and 10.72 picograms per liter respectively, although the actual concentrations in the two water bodies at the point where they enter the estuary are 1800 and 1600 picograms per liter respectively. The air concentration of PCBs also is considered by the model. When water quality standards are achieved, however, there will be no significant net exchange between dissolved PCBs in water and gas phase PCBs in the air. Because gas phase PCBs do not provide a load to the estuary when the water quality standards are met, they are not allocated any portion of the TMDLs. Actual air concentrations in the estuary region, however, currently exceed the levels required for equilibrium by two orders of magnitude.

The TMDLs for penta-PCBs calculated with the four-step procedure were 64.34 milligrams per day for Zone 2, 4.46 milligrams per day for Zone 3, 14.18 milligrams per day for Zone 4, and 12.02 milligrams per day for Zone 5. The higher TMDLs in Zones 2 and 4 are the result of the assimilative capacity provided by the flows from the main stem Delaware River in Zone 2 and the Schuylkill River in Zone 4.

Each of the zone TMDLs was then apportioned into three components: the WLA, LA and MOS. EPA has based these allocations upon recommendations of the Commission's TAC. The committee recommended that an explicit MOS of 5% be allocated in each estuary zone, and further recommended that for the Stage 1 TMDLs, the proportion of the TMDLs allocated to WLAs and LAs should be based upon the current proportion of loadings from the various PCB source categories to each of the zones during the one-year cycling period of February 1, 2002 to January 31, 2003.

Stage 1 TMDLs were then calculated using the ratio of penta-PCBs to total PCBs observed in ambient water samples collected during five surveys that encompass the range of hydrological conditions typically observed in the estuary. Median penta- to total PCB ratios of 0.23, 0.25, 0.25 and 0.23 were observed in Zones 2 to 5, respectively. For these TMDLs, a fixed value of 0.25 was used for all zones to scale up the zone-specific TMDLs, WLAs, LAs and MOSs. The following table summarizes the TMDLs for each estuary zone for total PCBs as well as the allocations to WLAs, LAs and the MOSs.

Stage 1 TMDLs for Total PCBs


| Estuary Zone | TMDL | WLA | LA | MOS |
|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | mg/day | mg/day | mg/day | mg/day |
| Zone 2 | 257.36 | 11.03 | 233.46 | 12.87 |
| Zone 3 | 17.82 | 5.67 | 11.26 | 0.89 |
| Zone 4 | 56.71 | 6.54 | 47.34 | 2.84 |
| Zone 5 | 48.06 | 15.62 | 30.04 | 2.40 |
| Sum | 379.96 | 38.86 | 322.10 | 19.00 |

In the proposed PCB TMDLs, the LAs contained the loadings from municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s), which are regulated as NPDES point sources. Loadings from MS4s are now identified and included as part of the WLAs with the LAs adjusted accordingly.

The portion of the TMDLs allocated to non-point sources is higher than the portion of the TMDLs allocated to point sources in all four estuary zones when the current loading proportions are used as the basis for allocating the zone TMDLs. This result is not unexpected. Nonpoint sources include, among other sources, contaminated sites, non-point source runoff, and the two main tributaries, which contribute greater loadings to the zones than the NPDES discharges (including stormwater discharges and combined sewer overflows) that comprise the point source contributions. The proportions vary between zones, with Zones 3 and 5 having the highest allocations to point sources (approximately 30%).

Implementing Load Reductions to Achieve the TMDLs

The following figure compares the current penta-PCB loadings for water quality management Zones 2 through 5 and the Delaware and Schuylkill Rivers to the Stage 1 TMDL penta-PCB loadings:



The chart illustrates that existing loadings are roughly two to three orders of magnitude higher than the TMDLs. Achieving the water quality standards for PCBs in the Delaware Estuary will require significant reductions from current loadings from both point and nonpoint sources. In addition to reducing PCB loads from sources discharging directly to the estuary, reductions from sources in the non-tidal portion of the river, local and regional air emissions, and sources contributing to elevated PCB concentrations in the Atlantic Ocean will be necessary to achieve and maintain the applicable PCB standards and adequately protect human health.

These TMDLs focus on the instream conditions which need to be met to protect human health and establish individual wasteload allocations (WLAs) for 142 point sources that are deemed to be potential sources of penta-PCBs (see Appendix 2). In order to begin to implement these TMDLs, the NPDES permitting authorities believe that it is appropriate for these discharges to receive non-numeric water quality-based effluent limits (WQBELs) consistent with their respective individual WLAs when their NPDES permits are reissued or otherwise modified.¹ The Delaware River Basin Commission may also

¹The States have indicated that a typical permit will include, among other requirements, the requirement to monitor the discharge using Method 1668A and to implement a PCB pollutant

separately require actions to implement these TMDLs. On December 3, 2003, the DRBC passed Resolution 2003-27 authorizing and directing the Executive Director to require dischargers and other responsible parties to conduct monitoring and/or other data collection and analyses to further characterize point and non-point loadings of toxic contaminants, including PCBs, to the Delaware Estuary for purposes of developing and implementing TMDLs or actions under the DRBC Water Quality Regulations. Requirements in NPDES permits or through DRBC regulations may include: (1) the use of Method 1668A, a highly sensitive analytical method capable of detecting very small amounts of PCBs, for any monitoring of influent and effluent to better quantify individual PCB congeners; (2) the development of a PCB minimization plan; and (3) implementation of appropriate PCB minimization measures identified through PCB minimization planning. The respective NPDES permitting authorities will determine the discharge-specific effluent controls consistent with the WLAs, and may consider the following factors: the relative loading of penta-PCBs, the type of discharge, the type of analytical method used to measure the 19 penta-PCB congeners, the number of the penta-PCB congeners that were detected, and the proportion of the zone WLA that is represented by the discharge loading. When Stage 2 TMDLs are issued, it is expected that all NPDES permits issued, reissued or modified will include numeric or non-numeric requirements consistent with the Stage 2 WLAs for each zone. The implementation strategy for the development of NPDES permit effluent limits consistent with the WLAs is discussed at greater length in Appendix 3 of this report.

Reducing point source discharges alone will not be sufficient to achieve the estuary water quality standards. Runoff from contaminated sites is a significant source of PCBs. For these TMDLs, EPA and the states evaluated forty-nine contaminated sites within the estuary watershed (see Appendix 4). The combined loads from these sites are estimated to comprise 57.09% of the loading to Zone 3; 38.04% of the loading to Zone 4 and 46% of the loading to Zone 5 (see Table 7). Contaminated sites make up a much smaller proportion of the loading in Zone 2 – only 0.42% – because of the lack of contaminated sites and the significant influence in this zone of the main stem Delaware River. In order to achieve the reductions required by the TMDLs, EPA and the States would need to undertake a concerted effort using the authorities under CERCLA, RCRA and the related state statutes.

Significant reductions will be required in point and nonpoint sources to the major tributaries. Currently, concentrations of PCBs in the Schuylkill and Delaware Rivers where they discharge to the estuary are approximately 1800 and 1600 picograms per liter, respectively. Even if all the TMDLs are achieved, the water quality criteria in the estuary will not be attained until the concentration in the Schuylkill is reduced to 9.68 picograms per liter and the concentration in the main stem Delaware River falls to 10.72 picograms per liter.

minimization program. The regulation at 40 CFR 122.44(k) allows the use of non-numeric, BMP-based WQBELs where a BMP is determined to be an appropriate means to control pollutants under specified circumstances. Where a permit uses such BMP WQBELs, compliance may be achieved by implementing such requirements.

Although the ocean boundary has a less significant influence on Zone 5 than does the main stem Delaware River, sources contributing to elevated PCB concentrations in the Atlantic Ocean also must be reduced. The concentration of PCBs in ocean water at the estuary boundary currently exceeds the water quality criterion for Delaware Bay by one to two orders of magnitude.

Finally, air concentrations of PCBs in the region currently are two orders of magnitude above the concentration required to achieve equilibrium and halt contributions of PCBs from the air to the water. Air monitoring data collected at several sites in New Jersey, Delaware and Pennsylvania suggest that PCB air concentrations primarily result from local sources. Thus, source reductions must focus on PCBs in the local and regional airshed.

These reductions cannot be achieved overnight. The Commission has created a TMDL Implementation Advisory Committee (IAC), with members from each of the estuary states, the major municipal dischargers and two of the smaller ones, industrial dischargers, and fishery, wildlife and environmental organizations. EPA Regions II and III also will participate, in an advisory role. The IAC will meet over a two-year period to develop creative and cost-effective strategies for achieving load reductions in the short term and attaining water quality standards in the longer term. Notably, some large dischargers already have undertaken studies to track down PCBs on a voluntary basis. However, due to the scope and complexity of the problem that has been defined through development of these TMDLs, achieving the estuary water quality standards for PCBs will take decades.

Additional Information

A notice about the proposed TMDLs for PCBs in the Delaware Estuary was published in the *Federal Register* and in each of the estuary states' registers on September 2, 2003. Additional notices were published in regional newspapers. The notices contained details about the comment period which closed on October 21, 2003, informational meetings and the public hearing for these TMDLs. Details about these events were also provided on the Commission's web site, at <http://www.drbc.net>. EPA received oral testimony from 8 groups or individuals and written comments from 30 groups or individuals from various sectors. After consideration of all data and information contained in the public comments, a document providing responses to these public comments has been prepared and appropriate revisions made to these final TMDLs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. INTRODUCTION | |
| 1.1 Regulatory Background | 1 |
| 1.2 Study Area | 1 |
| 1.3 Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) | 3 |
| 1.4 Applicable Water Quality Standards and Numerical Target for TMDLs | 3 |
| 1.5 Listing under Section 303(d) | 4 |
| 1.6 Pollutant sources, loadings and ambient data | 7 |
| 1.7 Other Required Elements for Establishing TMDLs | 9 |
| 1.7.1 Seasonal variation | 9 |
| 1.7.2 Monitoring Plan | 10 |
| 1.7.3 Implementation Plan | 10 |
| 1.7.4 Reasonable Assurance that the TMDLs will be Achieved | 11 |
| 2. TWO STAGE APPROACH TO ESTABLISHING AND ALLOCATING TMDLs FOR PCBs | |
| 2.1 Background | 12 |
| 2.2 Staged Approach | 12 |
| 3. STAGE 1 APPROACH TO ESTABLISHING TMDLs | |
| 3.1 Background | 13 |
| 3.2 Conceptual Approach | 14 |
| 3.2.1 Guiding Principles | 14 |
| 3.2.2 Modeling Approach | 16 |
| 3.2.3 TMDL Approach | 17 |
| 3.2.4 Model Descriptions and Inputs | 19 |
| 3.3 Procedure for Establishing TMDLs | 23 |
| 3.3.1 Summary | 23 |
| 3.3.2 Step 1 | 25 |
| 3.3.3 Step 2 | 26 |
| 3.3.4 Step 3 | 31 |
| 3.3.5 Step 4 | 35 |
| 4. TMDLs, WLAs and LAs for Total PCBs | |
| 4.1 TMDLs, WLAs and LAs for Penta- PCBs | 39 |
| 4.2 TMDLs, WLAs and LAs for Total PCBs | 45 |
| 4.2.1 Extrapolation from Penta to Total PCBs | 45 |
| 4.2.2 TMDLs, WLAs and LAs for Total PCBs | 45 |
| 4.2.3 Uncertainty Analysis for TMDLs, WLAs and LAs for Total PCBs | 46 |
| 5. REFERENCES | |
| Appendix 1 - Reducing PCB Loadings to the Delaware Estuary: A Staged Approach to Establishing TMDLs | |

Appendix 2 - Individual Wasteload Allocations for NPDES Discharges: Stage 1 TMDLs for Total PCBs for Zones 2 to 5 of the Delaware Estuary

Appendix 3 - Permit Implications for NPDES Dischargers resulting from Stage 1 TMDLs

Appendix 4 - Contaminated Sites and Municipalities with Combined Sewer Overflows (CSOs) that were evaluated as part of the Stage 1 TMDLs

Appendix 5 - Municipalities with Separate Stormwater Sewer Systems (MS4s) that could impact Zones 2 to 5 of the Delaware Estuary

Appendix 6 - Wasteload Allocation Estimates for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s)

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Regulatory Background

Total Maximum Daily Loads or TMDLs are one of the approaches defined in the Clean Water Act (CWA) for addressing water pollution. The first approach of the CWA that was implemented by the U.S. EPA was the technology-based approach to controlling pollutants (Section 301). This approach was implemented in the mid-1970s through the issuance of permits authorized under Section 402 of the Act. The approach specified minimum levels of treatment for sanitary sewage and for various categories of industries. The other water quality-based approach was implemented in the 1980s. This approach includes water quality-based permitting and planning to ensure that standards of water quality established by States are achieved and maintained.

Section 303(d) of the Act establishes TMDLs as one of the tools to address those situations where the technology-based controls are not sufficient to meet applicable water quality standards for a water body (U.S. EPA, 1991). They are defined as the maximum amount of a pollutant that can be assimilated by a water body without causing the applicable water quality standard to be exceeded. The basis of a TMDLs is thus the water quality standard. This standard may be established for the protection of aquatic life, human health through ingestion of drinking water or resident fish, or wildlife. Under Section 303(d), States are required to identify, establish a priority ranking, and to develop TMDLs for those waters that do not achieve or are not expected to achieve water quality standards approved by the U.S. EPA. Federal regulations implementing Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act provide that a TMDL must be expressed as the sum of the individual wasteload allocations for point sources (WLA) plus the load allocation for nonpoint sources (LA) plus a margin of safety (MOS). This definition may be expressed as the equation:

$$TMDL = WLA + LA + MOS$$

1.2 Study Area

Zones 2 through 5 of the Delaware River (Figure 1) have been designated by the Delaware River Basin Commission as that section of the mainstem of the Delaware River and the tidal portions of the tributaries thereto, between the head of Delaware Bay (River Mile 48.2) and the head of the tide at Trenton, New Jersey (River Mile 133.4). Zones 2 to 4 are bordered by the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Zone 5 is bordered by the States of Delaware and New Jersey. Zone 2 encompasses the area from the head of the tide at Trenton to River Mile 108.4. Zone 3 encompasses the area from River Mile 108.4 to River Mile 95.0. Zone 4 encompasses the area from River Mile 95.0 to River Mile 78.8, and Zone 5 encompasses the area from River Mile 78.8 to the head of Delaware Bay.

In 1989, the Delaware River Basin Commission created the Estuary Toxics Management Program to address the impact of toxic pollutants in the tidal Delaware River (also called the Delaware Estuary). The mission of this program was to develop policies and procedures to control the discharge of substances toxic to humans and aquatic biota from point sources discharging to this water body. In 1993, Commission staff identified several classes of pollutants and specific chemicals that were likely to exceed water quality criteria currently being developed under the program. These included polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), volatile organics, metals, chlorinated pesticides, chronic toxicity and acute toxicity. This list was subsequently included in the Delaware Estuary Programs's Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan in 1996.

Beginning in the late 1980's, concern regarding the possible contamination of fish populations that were

rebounding as dissolved oxygen levels improved resulted in a number of investigations of contaminant levels in resident and anadromous fish species. These species included the white perch, channel catfish and striped bass. The studies subsequently identified PCBs and several chlorinated organics at elevated levels (DRBC, 1988; Greene and Miller, 1994; Hauge et al, 1990; U.S. F&WS, 1991 and 1992). These studies and other data collected by DRBC and the states resulted in fish consumption advisories being issued by all three states bordering the Estuary beginning in 1989. These advisories were principally based upon PCB contamination; and to a lesser degree, chlorinated pesticides such as DDT and its metabolites DDE and DDD, and chlordane.

ESTUARY ZONES





Figure1: Water Quality Zones of the Delaware River.

1.3 Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)

Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) are a class of man-made compounds that were manufactured and used extensively in electrical equipment such as transformers and capacitors, paints, printing inks, pesticides, hydraulic fluids and lubricants. Individual PCB compounds called congeners can have up to 10 chlorine atoms on a basic structure consisting of two connected rings of carbon atoms. There are 209 possible patterns where chlorine atoms can occur resulting in 209 possible PCB compounds. PCB compounds can be grouped by the number of chlorine atoms attached to the carbon rings. These groups are called homologs. PCB compounds containing five chlorine atoms, for example, are referred to as the pentachlorobiphenyls or penta-PCBs.



Although their manufacture and use were generally banned by federal regulations in the late 1970s, existing uses in electrical equipment and certain exceptions to the ban were allowed. In addition, PCBs may also be created as a by-product in certain manufacturing processes such as dye and pigment production. PCBs are hydrophobic, sorbing to organic particles such as soils and sediments and concentrating in the tissues of aquatic biota either directly or indirectly through the food chain.

1.4 Applicable Water Quality Standards and Numerical Target for TMDLs

Water quality criteria for toxic pollutants including Total PCBs were adopted on October 23, 1996 by the Commission and are included in Section 3.30 of Article 3 of the Commission's water quality regulations. The criteria do, however, differ between the zones of the estuary depending on the designated uses of the zone. In Zones 2 and 3, use of the water for public water supply after reasonable treatment is a designated use. In these two zones, human health criteria are based upon exposure to PCBs through ingestion of water and fish taken from these estuary zones. In Zone 4 and upper Zone 5 (above River Mile 68.75), use of the water for public water supply is not a designated use. In these two zones, human health criteria are based solely upon exposure to PCBs through ingestion of fish taken from these estuary zones. Current DRBC criteria assume a consumption rate of 6.5 grams per day (~½ pound meal every 35 days) is used in Zones 2, 3, 4, and the upper portion of Zone 5. This rate was the default national rate for freshwater fish consumption utilized in EPA's 1980 methodology for deriving human health criteria, and was used by the States in developing their freshwater water quality criteria. A consumption rate of 37.0 grams per day (~½ pound meal every 6 days) is used in the lower portion of Zone 5. This consumption rate is consistent with the rate utilized by the State of Delaware following a recent evaluation of available information on consumption rates.

Although criteria to protect aquatic life from acute and chronic effects of PCBs and criteria to protect human health from the carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic of PCBs were adopted, the most stringent standards

adopted were based upon protecting human health from the carcinogenic effect of PCBs through ingestion of water and fish taken from these estuary zones (Table 1). The applicable DRBC water quality criteria are therefore:

Table 1: DRBC Water Quality Criteria for Zones 2 to 5 of the Delaware Estuary

| Estuary Zone | Exposure Route | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Water & Fish Consumption | Fish Consumption Only |
| Zone 2 & 3 | 44.4 picograms per liter | |
| Zone 4 and upper Zone 5 | | 44.8 picograms per liter |
| Lower Zone 5 | | 7.9 picograms per liter |

These criteria are currently the same as criteria adopted by State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The DRBC criteria for the lower portion of Zone 5 is also the same as the water quality criteria adopted by the State of Delaware; however, a slightly higher and therefore less stringent criteria was adopted for the upper portion of Zone 5.

As part of the effort to establish TMDLs for total PCBs and to update adopted water quality standards based upon new information, the Commission's Toxic Advisory Committee did consider adopting wildlife criteria for total PCBs and revising the human health criteria for carcinogens. The latter was necessitated by two actions by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: the updating of the cancer potency factor (i.e., slope factor), one of the key elements used to calculate the criterion, in December 1998 (U.S. EPA, 1998); and the issuance of revised guidance on developing human health water quality criteria in October 2000 (U.S. EPA, 2000). In February 2003, the Toxics Advisory Committee recommended adoption of a revised human health criterion for carcinogens Zones 2 through 5, and that the NJ state-wide water quality criterion for total PCBs for the Delaware Estuary (Zones 2 through 6) for the protection of wildlife be adopted following the impending adoption by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection. Refinement of the wildlife criterion based upon site-specific data could then proceed. The Committee also recommended that the Commission consider alternatives to the current risk level of 10^{-6} (another element in the calculation of the human health criterion for carcinogens). On March 19, 2003, the Commission passed a resolution authorizing public participation of the revised human health criteria for carcinogens and directing the Toxics Advisory Committee to initiate development of site-specific wildlife criteria for Zones 2 through 6 of the Delaware River. Since the basis for the TMDLs could be affected by criteria adoption by either the NJDEP or the DRBC, and the TMDLs must be based on the water quality criteria in force when the TMDL is approved, the Commission further directed that the Commission's Executive Director request U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Regions II and II to identify which criteria should be the basis for the TMDLs at this time. In a letter dated April 16, 2003, both U.S. EPA regional offices indicated that the current and applicable DRBC water quality criteria should be the basis for the TMDLs being developed by Commission staff for December 2003.

1.5 Listing under Section 303(d)

Until recently, the attainment of water quality standards for total PCBs could not be measured directly in samples of ambient water so States relied on measurements of contaminants in fish fillet samples collected

from the estuary. This is possible since the amount in fish tissue is related to the water concentration by a factor known as the bioaccumulation factor or BAF. This factor accounts for the uptake and concentration of a contaminant in the tissue either directly from the water or through the target species' food chain. Current and historical concentrations of total PCBs in fillet samples collected from channel catfish in Zones 2 through 5 and white perch collected in Zones 2 through 6 are shown in Figures 2 and 3. While tissue concentrations have declined since the banning in the late 1970s, current levels in both species are approximately 800 to 1000 parts per billion (ppb), two to three orders of magnitude above the level expected to occur when estuary waters are at the water quality standards for total PCBs.

New Jersey was the first state to issue an advisory recommending no consumption of channel catfish in 1989. This was followed in 1990 by Pennsylvania who recommended no consumption of white perch, channel catfish and American eel caught between Yardley, PA above Trenton to the Pennsylvania/Delaware border.




Figure 2: PCB concentrations in fillet samples of channel catfish collected from Zones 2 through 5 of the Delaware Estuary from 1977 to 2001. Units are in micrograms per kilogram or parts per billion (ppb). Graphs provided by Richard Greene, Delaware DNREC.

PCBs in Delaware Estuary White Perch Zones 2 Through 6




Figure 3: PCB concentrations in fillet samples of white perch collected from Zones 2 through 6 of the Delaware Estuary from 1977 to 2001. Units are in micrograms per kilogram or parts per billion (ppb). Graphs provided by Richard Greene, Delaware DNREC.

After conducting additional sampling in the lower tidal river, Delaware issued an advisory in 1994 recommending no consumption of striped bass, white perch, channel catfish and white catfish caught between the Pennsylvania/Delaware border and the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal (C&D Canal). These advisories remained essentially unchanged until 1999, when Pennsylvania recommended limited consumption (one meal per month) of white perch and striped bass, and one meal every two months for channel catfish in the same advisory area. Delaware meanwhile, increased the restrictions on consuming fish caught between the Pennsylvania/Delaware border and the C&D Canal to all fish species, and reduced the recommended consumption of striped bass, white perch, white catfish, channel catfish and American eel to one meal per year. In January 2003, New Jersey issued updated state-wide and water body-specific advisories due to PCB contamination that included Zones 2 through 5. These advisories contained recommended meal frequencies for two levels of lifetime cancer risk (10^{-5} and 10^{-6}), and for high risk individuals (children, infants, pregnant or nursing women, and women of child-bearing age). Recommended consumption (at a risk level of 10^{-6}) of channel catfish in Zones 2 to 4 is 6 meals per year while no consumption of striped bass in Zone 4 and all finfish in Zone 5 is recommended.

The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection subsequently included Zones 2 through 5 of the Delaware River for PCBs in a report entitled “1998 Identification and Setting of Priorities for Section 303(d) Water Quality Limited Waters in New Jersey”, September 15, 1998. By Memorandum of Agreement between U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region II and the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection dated May 12, 1999, the NJDEP agreed to develop, public notice, respond to comments and submit to EPA, Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for PCBs in the Delaware Estuary by September 15, 2003.

This date was subsequently extended to December 31, 2003 in a revised Memorandum of Agreement dated September 16, 2002.

The Delaware Department of Natural Resources & Environmental Control (DNREC) first listed Zone 5 of the Delaware River for toxics in 1996. In 1998, DNREC again listed Zone 5 of the Delaware River, but specifically listed PCBs as a pollutant contributing to the impairment. In Attachment B to a Memorandum of Agreement between the Delaware Department of Natural Resources & Environmental Control and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III dated July 25, 1997, DNREC agreed to complete the TMDLs for Zone 5 by December 31, 2002 provided that funding and certain other conditions were met. The MOA also provided that EPA Region III establish the TMDLs if DNREC was unable to complete the TMDLs by the date set forth in Attachment B. In a Consent Decree between the American Littoral Society, the Sierra Club, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency dated July 31, 1997, the U.S. EPA agreed to establish TMDLs by December 15, 2003 of the year following the state's deadline.

In a Consent Decree between the American Littoral Society and Public Interest Group of Pennsylvania, dated April 9, 1997, EPA agreed to approve or establish TMDLs for all water quality-limited segments listed on the 1996 303(d) list as impaired by sources other than acid mine drainage by April 9, 2007. PADEP listed Zones 2 to 5 of the Delaware River (included in areas E and G of the Pennsylvania State Water Plan) for priority organics including PCBs in both 1996 and 1998. No date has been set by PADEP for completion of the TMDLs for these water quality segments. The TMDLs currently being proposed will satisfy the commitments that resulted from these listings for each respective state.

1.6 Pollutant sources, loadings and ambient data

The basis for the inclusion of Zones 2 through 5 on the Section 303(d) lists of the estuary states was the levels of PCBs observed in fish tissue collected from the estuary. This was necessary since the common analytical method used for ambient water and wastewater had detection limits for total PCBs in the 500 nanogram per liter range. New Jersey was the first state to issue an advisory recommending no consumption of channel catfish in 1989. This was followed in 1990 by Pennsylvania who recommended no consumption of white perch, channel catfish and American eel caught between Yardley, PA above Trenton to the Pennsylvania/Delaware border. After conducting additional sampling in the lower tidal river, Delaware issued an advisory in 1994 recommending no consumption of striped bass, white perch, channel catfish and white catfish caught between the Pennsylvania/Delaware border and the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal C&D Canal.

Loadings of PCBs to the estuary from point sources were first investigated by the Delaware River Basin Commission in 1996 and 1997 (DRBC, 1998a). This study utilized a new analytical methodology (high resolution gas chromatography/high resolution mass spectrometry or HRGC/HRMS) and focused on discharges from five large sewage treatment plants and one industrial facility. The results of the study found effluent concentrations ranging from 1,430 to 45,140 picograms/L during dry weather, and 2,020 to 20,240 pg/L during wet weather. The dry weather sample from the effluent of the industrial facility had a concentration of 10,270 pg/L. In the spring of 2000, the Commission required 94 NPDES permittees to conduct monitoring of their continuous and stormwater discharges for 81 PCB congeners utilizing analytical methods that could achieve picogram per liter detection limits. The results of this monitoring were submitted to the Commission over the next two years, and indicated that loadings to the estuary zones from point sources were significant and of such magnitude to cause the water quality standards to be exceeded. Figures 4 and 5 present the cumulative loadings of total PCBs from continuous point source discharges during dry weather and wet weather, respectively.




Figure 4: Cumulative loadings from continuous point source dischargers when the discharge was not influenced by precipitation (dry weather loadings).




Figure 5: Loadings from continuous point source dischargers when the discharge was influenced by precipitation (wet weather loadings).

Beginning in September 2001, the Commission initiated surveys of the ambient waters of Zones 2 through 5 using the more sensitive HRGC/HRMS method (Method 1668A) and larger sample volumes to obtain data on PCBs adsorbed to particulate matter, PCBs adsorbed to dissolved organic matter and truly dissolved PCBs. Each survey involves sampling on a transect across the river at 15 locations between the C&D Canal and Trenton. A total of nine surveys have been completed to date with a focus on periods of intermediate and high inflows to the estuary. Figure 6 presents the results from surveys conducted in September 2001, May 2002, October 2002 and March 2003. Low flow conditions occurred during the September and October surveys (~3,300 cfs). Intermediate flow conditions (~16,000 cfs) occurred during the May survey, and high flow conditions (36,100 cfs) occurred during the March survey. As indicated in this graph, ambient concentrations of total PCBs based upon the sum of 124 congeners analyzed ranges between 443 and 10,136 pg/L with the highest values generally occurring during lower river inflows.

1.7 Other Required Elements for Establishing TMDLs

1.7.1 Seasonal variation

TMDL regulations at Section 130.32(b)(9) require the consideration of seasonal variation in environmental factors that affect the relationship between pollutant loadings and water quality impacts. Although seasonal variation is usually not as important for TMDLs based upon human health criteria for carcinogens since the duration for this type of criteria is a 70 year exposure, the Stage 1 TMDLs for total PCBs do include seasonal variation in several ways. Due to the interaction of PCBs with the sediments of the estuary, long-term model




Figure 6: Concentrations of 124 PCB congeners at 15 locations in Zones 2 to 5 of the Delaware Estuary during varying flow conditions.

simulations were necessary to both confirm the model parameters established during the short-term calibration, and evaluate the time required for the sediments to reach pseudo steady-state with the overlying water column as loadings of PCBs were reduced.

The model will cycle model inputs from the period February 1, 2002 until January 31, 2003. This one year period is considered to be representative of long-term conditions (see Section 3.2.3.1), and is the same period utilized for long-term, decadal scale model simulations. Use of this one year cycling period, allowed consideration of seasonal variation in model input parameters such as tributary flows, tidal forcing functions, air and water temperature, wind velocity and loadings of penta-PCBs.

1.7.2 Monitoring Plan

The Delaware River Basin Commission has conducted nine surveys of the ambient waters of the Delaware Estuary between September 2001 and April 2003 to provide data for calibrating the water quality model for penta-PCBs that was used to establish the Stage 1 TMDLs. Samples collected during these surveys were analyzed using a more sensitive HRGC/HRMS method (Method 1668A) and larger sample volumes to obtain data at picogram per liter levels. The Commission plans to conduct additional surveys in both Zones 2 to 5 and in Delaware Bay (Zone 6) as part of the effort to calibrate water quality models for the other PCB homologs, and to establish and refine the TMDLs and associated WLAs and LAs for Stage 2. Contingent on available funding, the Commission plans to continue the ambient water surveys on a yearly basis to track the progress in achieving the load reductions and applicable water quality standards for PCBs.

In the spring of 2000, the Commission required 94 NPDES permittees to conduct monitoring of their continuous and stormwater discharges for 81 PCB congeners utilizing analytical methods that could achieve picogram per liter detection limits. The results of this monitoring indicated that loadings to the estuary zones from point sources were significant and of such magnitude to cause the water quality standards to be exceeded. These results have also been used to determine the need for and the frequency of additional monitoring in NPDES permits have been reissued in the last few years. Following approval of the Stage 1 TMDLs, most of the NPDES permittees included in the 2000 monitoring requirements will be required to conduct some additional monitoring using Method 1668A. These monitoring requirements will provide data in future years to assess the progress in achieving the TMDLs.

The Commission is also planning, contingent on available funding, to work cooperatively with the NJDEP and Rutgers University to continue air monitoring at Lums Pond near the western end of the C&D Canal and at a site in the NJ Pinelands which are located east of the estuary. Monitoring data at these sites and at a long-term site at Rutgers University will provide data to assess the long-term trends in regional background concentrations of PCBs (Lums Pond) and in regional concentrations in the estuary airshed.

1.7.3 Implementation Plan

Current EPA regulations do not require an implementation plan to be included with TMDLs. EPA NPDES regulations do require that effluent limitations must be consistent with approved WLAs [40 CFR Part 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B)]. EPA regulations allow the use of non-numeric effluent limits in certain circumstances [40 CFR Part 122.44(K)]. In addition to EPA regulations, the Commission and its signatory parties currently have in place an implementation procedure for utilizing wasteload allocations and other effluent requirements formally issued by the Commission's Executive Director. This procedure has been in use for over 25 years with wasteload allocations for carbonaceous oxygen demand and other pollutants that were developed for discharges to the estuary. Section 4.30.7B.2.c.6) of the Commission regulations requires that WLAs developed by the Commission shall be referred to the appropriate state agency for use, as appropriate, in developing effluent limitations, schedules of compliance and other effluent requirements in NPDES permits.

As part of the implementation strategy, the NPDES permitting authorities believe that it is appropriate for 142 NPDES point source discharges to receive non-numeric WQBELs consistent with the WLAs. It is expected that the non-numeric WQBELs resulting from the Stage 1 WLAs require PCB minimization and reduction programs and additional monitoring using Method 1668A consistent with state and federal NPDES regulations. See Appendix 3 for details on the permit implications of this TMDL. These permit requirements are intended to expedite the reduction in PCB loadings to the estuary while Stage 2 TMDLs and WLAs are being completed.

A unique aspect of the implementation of these TMDLs is the establishment of a TMDL Implementation Advisory Committee (IAC) by the DRBC, which shall be asked to develop creative and cost-effective strategies for reducing PCB loadings and achieving the TMDLs for PCBs in the Delaware Estuary. The IAC will be encouraged to engage in creative, collaborative problem-solving. Its recommendations will be submitted to the Commission, which will consider them in consultation with all regulatory agencies whose approval is required to implement them. Each regulatory agency also will be represented on the IAC. The committee is expected to convene six times a year for two years.

1.7.4 Reasonable Assurance that the TMDLs will be Achieved

Data available to assess whether the TMDLs will be achieved include ambient water quality data collected by the Commission during routine surveys of Zones 2 through 6 of the Delaware River. Effluent quality data and source minimization plans required through NPDES permits issued by state permitting authorities will provide the basis for assessments regarding consistency with the WLAs developed or issued in Stage 1 and Stage 2. Commission regulations also require that the WLAs be reviewed and, if required, revised every five years, or as directed by the Commission. This will ensure that additional discharges of the pollutant or increased non-point source loadings in the future will be considered.

Achieving the reductions in the load allocations for tributaries will require the listing of the tributary on future Section 303(d) lists submitted by the estuary states for those tributaries that are not currently listed for impairment by PCBs, and completion and implementation of TMDLs for PCBs for those tributaries that are already listed as impaired by PCBs. Achieving the load reductions required for contaminated sites will require close coordination with the federal CERCLA programs and state programs overseeing the assessment and cleanup of these sites. In addition, the Commission has broad powers under Article 5 of the Delaware River Basin Compact (Public Law 87-328) to control future pollution and abate existing pollution in the waters of the basin including Section 2.3.5B of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (DRBC, 2002).

2. TWO STAGE APPROACH TO ESTABLISHING AND ALLOCATING TMDLs FOR PCBs

2.1 Background

Developing TMDLs for a complex pollutant in a complex estuarine ecosystem with numerous point and non-point sources is an enormous task requiring substantial levels of effort, funding and time. As discussed above, the deadlines contained in the Section 303(d) lists prepared by the States and approved by the U.S. EPA, Memoranda of Understanding, and Consent Decrees discussed above allocated five years for developing the TMDLs. A coordinated effort to develop the TMDLs was initiated in 2000 when Carol R. Collier, Executive Director of the Delaware River Basin Commission in a letter dated May 25, 2000 requested that U.S. EPA Regions II and III endorse the Commission as the lead agency in developing the TMDLs for PCBs in the Delaware Estuary. In a letter dated August 7, 2000, Region II endorsed the Commission's role as the lead agency to develop the TMDLs. An August 11, 2000 letter from Region III also acknowledge the important role of the Commission while identifying the legal constraints on the date for establishing the TMDLs. On July 26, 2000, the Commission passed Resolution 2000-13 stating that the Commission would continue its ongoing program to control the discharge of toxic substances, including PCBs, to the Delaware Estuary, and would work cooperatively with the signatory parties to the Delaware River Basin Compact and their agencies and affected parties in this effort.

2.2 Staged Approach

The complexity of a TMDL for a class of compounds such as PCBs, the limited time and data available, and the benefits of refining it through time with more data led to a decision to develop the TMDLs for PCBs in two stages consistent with EPA TMDL guidance. A staged approach provides for adaptive implementation through execution of load reduction strategies while additional monitoring and modeling efforts proceed. The approach recognizes that additional monitoring data and modeling results will be available following issuance of the Stage 1 TMDLs to enable a more refined analysis to form the basis of the Stage 2 TMDLs.

In the first stage, TMDLs and individual wasteload allocations were developed for each zone. Stage 1 WLAs were based upon a simplified methodology, while still meeting all of the regulatory requirements for establishing a TMDL. Consistent with the recommendations of an expert panel of scientists experienced with PCB modeling, these TMDLs were extrapolated from penta homolog data using the observed ratio in the Delaware Estuary of the penta homolog to total PCBs (see Section 3.4).

Stage 2 TMDLs, individual WLAs and LAs are targeted for development by December 31, 2005. Once the Stage 2 TMDLs are finalized, EPA expects the WLAs developed in Stage 2 to replace the Stage 1 WLAs. EPA expects the Stage 2 WLAs and LAs to be based on all of the monitoring data obtained through the development of the Stage 2 TMDLs, and the additional modeling that will be performed following the establishment of the Stage 1 TMDLs. Stage 2 TMDLs will also be based on the summation of the PCB homolog groups, without the use of extrapolation. It is anticipated that the Stage 2 WLAs will be based upon a more sophisticated allocation methodology than the Stage 1 WLAs, and will likely reflect application of the procedures set forth in the DRBC Water Quality Regulations.

As described in the documents released in April 2003 (Appendix 1) and following establishment of these TMDLs, the water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs) in NPDES permits that are issued, reissued or modified after the approval date must be consistent with the WLAs. The NPDES permitting authorities believe that these WQBELs will include non-numeric controls in the form of a best management practices (BMP) approach as the most appropriate way to identify and control discharges of PCBs consistent with the Stage 1 WLAs. Federal regulations (40 CFR Part 122.44(k)(4)) allow the use of non-numeric, BMP-based WQBELs in permits.

Guidelines describing appropriate NPDES permitting actions resulting from individual WLAs that may result following the establishment of the Stage 1 TMDLs by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency are presented in Appendix 3. The guidelines include 1) the use of Method 1668A for any monitoring of the wastewater influent and effluent at a facility, 2) development of a PCB minimization plan, and 3) implementation of appropriate, cost-effective PCB minimization measures identified through the plan.

The identification of point source dischargers that are potentially significant sources of total PCBs is a dynamic process that depends on several factors including the availability and extent of PCB congener data for each discharge, the detection limit of the method used to analyze for PCB congeners, the flows used for each discharge, the procedure used to calculate the loadings, the location of the discharge in the estuary, and the proximity and loading of other sources of PCBs. EPA specifically requested comment on the list of significant point source dischargers, and has incorporated those comments, where appropriate, into this document (see Section 3.5). Expectations as to how the NPDES permits may appropriately address these specific WLAs can be found in Appendix 3.

An important component of the staged approach is the assessment and evaluation of options to control non-point sources of PCBs. These sources include contaminated sites (sites covered under CERCLA or RCRA), non-NPDES regulated stormwater discharges, tributaries to the estuary, air deposition, and contaminated sediments (see Section 1.4 and Appendix Tables 4-1). Addressing these sources is particularly important since contaminated sites and non-point stormwater discharges have been identified as the two largest categories of PCB loadings in this TMDL based upon current data and assessment procedures.

3. STAGE 1 APPROACH TO ESTABLISHING TMDLs

3.1 Background

TMDLs for total PCBs are estimates of the loading of the sum of all the PCB homologs that can enter the estuary and still meet the current water quality criteria. TMDLs are, by nature, abstract. They are the *projected*, not the current, loadings from all sources that should result in the achievement of water quality standards at all points in the estuary. Since current concentrations of PCB homologs are 500 times higher than the water quality criteria, the TMDLs and associated individual WLAs and LAs will be proportionately less.

In order to meet standards at all points in the estuary, some parts of the estuary will have to be less than the standard for that portion of the estuary. This is particularly true for these TMDLs in the Delaware Estuary since the water quality standards vary between the zones, and the standard in lower Zone 5 below the Delaware Memorial Bridges is approximately 5 times lower than the standards in Zones 2 to upper Zone 5 (see Section 1.4).

While simplistic approaches can be used to estimate TMDLs, significant effort has been devoted to developing and calibrating a hydrodynamic and water quality model for the Delaware Estuary to be used in establishing PCB TMDLs for this water body (DRBC, 2003a; DRBC, 2003b; DRBC, 2003c). There are several reasons why a more sophisticated approach is appropriate. These reasons include:

1. Zones 2–5 of the Delaware River are significantly influenced by tidal forces producing a 6 foot tidal range at Trenton, NJ and tidal excursions of up to 12 miles. The model incorporates this tidal movement in the hydrodynamic model (DRBC, 2003a).
2. PCBs are hydrophobic, sorb to dissolved, colloidal and particulate carbon, and are transported with carbon molecules and particulates associated with carbon. The model incorporates these characteristics, partitions PCBs to each of these phases, and simulates the concentrations of the 3

- phases in the estuary (DRBC, 2003b).
3. PCBs are a class of chemicals; each having different physical-chemical properties such as volatilization rate and partitioning rate. The model can incorporate these properties for each of the ten homolog groups (DRBC, 2003b).
 4. There are many sources of PCBs enter the estuary at different locations in different amounts and at different times. The model can simulate the spatial and temporal nature of these sources (DRBC, 2003c).
 5. A model can simulate the additional assimilative capacity provided by the burial of PCBs into the deeper layers of the estuary sediments, and the exchange of PCBs in the gas phase in the estuary airshed with the dissolved phase of PCBs in the ambient waters of the estuary (DRBC, 2003b).

3.2 Conceptual Approach

3.2.1 Guiding Principles

The TMDLs require that each source of PCBs including the sediment, air deposition meets water quality criteria by itself and in conjunction with all other sources. The procedure used to establish the TMDLs incorporates these principles by initially determining the concentration or loading from each source category followed by an assessment of the attainment of the water quality standards when loadings from all source categories are considered.

Another principle is that, when the water quality standards are met, additional loading of PCBs to the estuary is dependent on dilution by flows from other sources into the estuary, and the loss of PCBs through fate processes occurring in the estuary. Two of the source categories do not explicitly provide additional flows to the estuary and therefore do not provide assimilation capacity. The two sources are atmospheric dry deposition and gas phase transfer of PCBs, and contaminated sites. Ground and surface water flow from contaminated sites do occur, but these flows have not been adequately characterized and are not included in the current version of the penta-PCB model. As a result, the assimilative capacity for these sources must be obtained from other source categories.

All source categories and sources within categories are not created equally. Reductions in PCB loads in any source category will provide different amounts of assimilative capacity in different areas of the estuary. Figure 7 illustrates this principle for the four boundaries of the penta-PCB model. In this example, each of the boundaries is set at a concentration of 100 milligrams per liter with the resulting model predicting ambient conservative chemical concentrations throughout the estuary. Of the four boundaries, the C&D Canal and the Schuylkill River have the smallest influence on conservative chemical concentrations in the estuary. This influence is also localized to the area where the source enters the estuary. The influence of the ocean boundary at the mouth of Delaware Bay appears to be limited to the Bay and the lower portions of Zone 5 (up to approximately River Mile 65). The Delaware River at Trenton, however, has a significant influence on the estuary conservative chemical concentrations from Zone 2 through Zone 5. Reductions in PCB loadings from the Delaware River at Trenton will therefore provide substantially more assimilative capacity in a larger area of the estuary.




Figure 7: Relative impact of the four boundaries when the conservative chemical concentrations are set at 100 milligrams per liter.

Estuary sediments function as a sink or loss mechanism for PCBs through burial of PCBs that settle to the bottom of the estuary. This small (<1 cm/year) net deposition of particulates provides additional assimilation capacity in the estuary, and is incorporated in the calculation of the TMDLs for each of the zones.

Recent monitoring of air concentrations in the regional airshed surrounding the Delaware Estuary indicate that PCB concentrations are particularly high in the Philadelphia-Camden area, and contribute PCBs to the estuary through dry and wet deposition, and exchange of PCBs in the gas phase (Van Ry et al, 2002 and Figure 8). While the proportional loading of PCBs from dry and wet deposition is explicitly included in the load allocation portion of the TMDLs, the transfer of PCBs in the gas phase with dissolved PCBs in the estuarine waters is not since there will be no significant net exchange between dissolved PCBs in water and gas phase PCBs in the air (i.e., they will reach equilibrium) when water quality standards are achieved. The modeling approach used to develop the TMDLs takes this into account by setting the gas phase air concentrations at the equilibrium concentrations (see Section 3.3.1 and 3.3.5).

The difference between the current gas phase concentrations and the gas phase concentrations when the estuary meets standards, is a significant TMDL implementation issue since water quality standards will not be achieved without reducing the gas phase concentrations to a level where they are in equilibrium with the dissolved PCB concentrations at the water quality standard. Figure 8 illustrates the relative difference between the current gas phase air concentration of penta-PCBs in Zone 3 and the gas phase concentration at equilibrium with the dissolved penta-PCB concentrations when the TMDL is achieved.

Finally, the boundaries of the model which include the head of tide of the tributaries, the C&D Canal, and the mouth of Delaware Bay were assigned concentrations of penta-PCBs in determining the TMDLs and establishing WLAs. Section 4.20.4B.1 of the Commission's Water Quality Regulations specify that in establishing WLAs, the concentrations at the boundaries of the area of interest shall be set at the lower of

actual data or the applicable water quality criteria (DRBC, 1996). Thus for modeling purposes, tributaries or other boundaries cannot exceed the water quality criteria for the zone of the estuary that they enter or border. In developing these TMDLs, both the C&D Canal boundary and the mouth of Delaware Bay boundary were set to 7.9 pg/L. This is the criterion for Zone 5 where the canal enters the mainstem of the Delaware River, and is the current criterion for Zone 6 (Delaware Bay). The current concentrations of PCBs at the mouth of the Bay exceed this value by 2 orders of magnitude, while current concentrations at the C&D Canal boundary exceed this value by almost 3 orders of magnitude. Thus like the gas phase concentrations of PCBs in the air, PCB concentrations at both the C&D Canal and the ocean boundary must also be reduced in order to achieve the water quality standards. The relative influence of these boundaries at the critical compliance location must also be considered in determining the relative importance of the required reductions (see Figure 7).




Figure 8: Atmospheric gas phase penta-PCB concentrations during the one year model cycling period based upon current data and the expected penta-PCB concentrations when the TMDLs are achieved.

3.2.2 Modeling Approach

Several mathematical models are used to develop the TMDLs for PCBs. The first is a hydrodynamic model that was extended to include Delaware Bay (Zone 6). The hydrodynamic model is discussed in Section 3.2.4.1 and fully described in the report entitled “DYNHYD5 Hydrodynamic Model (Version 2.0) and Chloride Water Quality Model for the Delaware River Estuary” (DRBC, 2003a). The water quality models used in this effort included an updated TOXI5 model for chlorides, and a new model for pentachlorobiphenyls (penta-PCBs)(DRBC, 2003b). The hydrodynamic and chloride models are discussed in Section 3.2.4.1 and

3.2.4.1, respectively and described in detail in the report on the hydrodynamic model (DRBC, 2003a). The organic carbon and penta-PCB models are discussed in Section 3.2.4.3 and fully described in the report entitled “PCB Water Quality Model for the Delaware Estuary (DELPCB)” (DRBC, 2003b).

TMDLs are calculated using both the conservative chemical model, and the penta-PCB water quality model run until equilibrium is observed. The model cycles model inputs from the period February 1, 2002 until January 31, 2003. This one year period is considered to be representative of long-term conditions (see Section 3.2.3.1), and is the same period utilized for the decadal scale (74 year) model simulations by HydroQual, Inc.

3.2.3 TMDL Approach

Although the water quality standards are expressed as total PCBs and the TMDLs must be expressed as Total PCBs, the current water quality model only addresses penta-PCBs. As discussed in Section 2.2, the TMDLs for total PCBs are extrapolated from TMDLs for penta-PCBs using the observed ratio in the Delaware River/Estuary of the penta homolog to total PCBs. Therefore, a water quality target for penta-PCBs must be established for use in the TMDL procedures. This target is determined by assuming that the ratio of penta-PCBs to total PCBs is approximately 0.25.

TMDLs for total PCBs for Zones 2 through 5 of the Delaware Estuary are established using a four step procedure. TMDLs are calculated over a one year period (annual median) to be consistent with both the model simulations and the 70 year exposure used for human health criteria. The procedure initially utilizes the conservative chemical model to establish contribution factors (Cfs) for two of the major tributaries to the estuary (the Delaware River at Trenton and the Schuylkill River), and each of the estuary zones. Allowable loadings are then calculated for each of these sources utilizing the CF and the proportion of the water quality target at the critical location allocated to each source. These loadings are used in the conservative chemical and penta-PCB models to establish the assimilative capacity provided by burial of PCBs into the estuary sediments. The gas phase concentrations that would be in equilibrium with the penta-PCB water concentrations when the water quality targets are met are then included in the water quality model. The model is then run to confirm that the water quality targets are still being met.

Following establishment of the TMDLs for each zone, each of the zone TMDLs are apportioned using the current percentage contribution for each of the source categories excluding loads from the Delaware River, Schuylkill River and contaminated sites based upon the respective loadings during the period Feb. 1, 2002 to Jan. 31, 2003 (Table 2, Figure 9)

Table 2: Apportionment of Zone TMDLs to Wasteload and Load Allocations excluding loads from the Delaware River, Schuylkill River and contaminated sites.

| ZONE | WASTELOAD ALLOCATION | LOAD ALLOCATION |
|-------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| 2 | 44.1% | 55.9 % |
| 3 | 78.1% | 21.9 % |
| 4 | 60.8% | 39.2 % |
| 5 | 63.4 % | 36.6 % |




Figure 9: Apportionment of Zone TMDLs in kilograms per year (kg/year) to Wasteload and Load Allocations excluding loads from the Delaware River, Schuylkill River and contaminated sites.

The wasteload allocation portion of the TMDL represents those source categories that are regulated under the NPDES program (point sources, combined sewer overflows or CSOs, and municipal separate storm sewer systems or MS4s). The load allocation portion of the TMDL represents the remaining categories including contaminated sites, non-NPDES regulated stormwater discharges, tributaries and air deposition).

In accordance with the TMDL regulations, a portion of each zone TMDL must be allocated to a margin of safety. The margin of safety (MOS) is intended to account for any lack of knowledge concerning the relationships between pollutant loadings and receiving water quality. Commission regulations also require that a portion of the TMDL be set aside as a margin of safety, with the proportion reflecting the degree of uncertainty in the data and resulting water quality-based controls. The MOS can be incorporated into the TMDL either implicitly in the design conditions under which the TMDL is calculated or explicitly by assigning a fixed proportion of the TMDL. Since the conditions under which the TMDL is determined like tributary flows are related to the long-term conditions and not to design conditions associated with human health water quality standard for carcinogens (such as the harmonic mean flow of tributaries), expression of the MOS as an explicit percentage of each zone TMDL was considered the more appropriate approach. An explicit percentage of 5% was then utilized in the apportionment of the zone TMDLs. Both the apportionment of the zone TMDLs using the current percentage contribution and use of a margin of safety of 5% were recommended by the Commission’s Toxic Advisory Committee.

3.2.4 Model Descriptions and Inputs

3.2.4.1 Hydrodynamic Model

Inputs to the hydrodynamic, conservative chemical and PCB models included daily tributary flows at the two major tributary boundary conditions, the Delaware River at Trenton and the Schuylkill River, and at 20 minor tributaries for the period February 1, 2002 to January 31, 2003. A comparison of the cumulative distribution curve for this one year period to the curve for the period of record for the Delaware River at Trenton (1912 to March 2003) and the Schuylkill River (1934 to March 2003) is presented in Figures 10 and 11, respectively. The figures indicate that the flows occurring during the one year cycling period are a reasonable representation of the flows during the period of record for these two tributaries.

The hydrodynamic model also includes precipitation induced flows for both point and non-point sources. The precipitation pattern occurring during the one year cycling period was compared to historical precipitation records (1872 to March 2003) maintained by the Franklin Institute (2003) to determine the degree to which the precipitation pattern for the one year cycling period was representative of the long term record. This comparison indicated good agreement for both the number and percentage of days when precipitation exceeded 0.01 inches, and the number and percentage of days when precipitation was less than 0.01 inches (Figures 12 and 13). This precipitation data was used to both calculate the flow of each discharge during precipitation events and determine when data collected during precipitation events would be used in loading calculations.

The tidal forcing function in the hydrodynamic model was based upon actual tide data for the one year cycling period. Since the major component of the tidal function has a periodicity of 12.42 hours and minor components with lunar and annual periodicity, this data set was considered representative of long-term tidal conditions. In addition, the expert panel recommended that alternative model inputs based upon design conditions not be used in TMDL simulations in order to maintain any hydrological relationships between the various inputs. For this reason, actual discharge flows for the point sources included in this TMDL determination during the one year cycling period were used rather than design effluent flows such as those specified in Section 4.30.7A.8. of the Commission's Water Quality Regulations or federal NPDES regulations. This is particularly important in the establishment of PCB TMDLs for the Delaware Estuary since the flow from a number of the point sources is significantly influenced by precipitation. For example, design effluent flows for the City of Philadelphia's wastewater treatment plants are approximately 200 million gallons per day, but can double during precipitation events. In addition, procedures have not been developed nor does the Commission's regulations specify procedures to establish design effluent flows for those discharges that are solely driven by precipitation (i.e., stormwater discharges). Such procedures and regulations will be developed for application in the Stage 2 TMDLs for PCBs, if necessary. The similarity of the precipitation pattern observed during the one year cycling period to the long term precipitation record suggests that the precipitation induced flows for both continuous and stormwater discharges used to develop the Stage 1 TMDLs may ultimately serve as design flows for these discharges.




Figure 10: Cumulative distribution curve for the period of record for the Delaware River at Trenton (1912 to March 2003) compared to the period February 1, 2002 to January 31, 2003.




Figure 11: Cumulative distribution curve for the period of record for the Schuylkill River (1934 to March 2003) compared to the period February 1, 2002 to January 31, 2003.

Precipitation Data for Philadelphia, Pa.




Figure 12: Percentile curves for precipitation data (events > 0.01 inches) for Philadelphia, PA from 1872 to March 2003 compared to the period February 1, 2002 to January 31, 2003.




Figure 13: Percentile curves for precipitation data (days with precipitation < 0.01 inches) for Philadelphia, PA from 1872 to March 2003 compared to the period February 1, 2002 to January 31, 2003.

3.2.4.2 Conservative Chemical Water Quality Model

A TOXI5 (water quality) model consisting of 87 water column segments was then linked with the outputs from the calibrated DYNHYD5 hydrodynamic model and calibrated against the chloride concentrations. This model is based upon the U.S. EPA's Water Quality Simulation Program (WASP) Version 5.12., and does not include any fate processes for chlorides or any interaction of the chlorides with the sediment. The main objective in this calibration process was the determination of an advection factor and a set of dispersion coefficients for the water quality model to correctly simulate the dispersive mixing within the Estuary. Review of comparison plots and the results of regression analyses indicated that the model was able to reproduce the temporal and spatial trends, and the magnitude of the chloride concentrations, within a reasonable range throughout the tidal portion of the Delaware River.

3.2.4.3 Penta-PCB and Organic Carbon Water Quality Models

The calibrated hydrodynamic and conservative chemical model are used to drive mass balance models of organic carbon and penta-PCBs (DELPCB). DELPCB is a simulation program enhanced from the U.S. EPA's Water Quality Simulation Program (WASP) Version 5.12, and is fully described in DRBC (2003c). The organic carbon model has two organic carbon state variables and one inorganic solid (IS) as a control state variable. These variables are integrated with the one-dimensional hydrodynamic DYNHYD5 model to dynamically simulate these sorbent variables. The two carbon variables are biotic carbon (BIC), carbon generated internally by phytoplankton, and particulate detrital carbon (PDC) which consists of detritus and other forms of non-living carbon. The model treats the two organic carbon sorbents as non-conservative state variables that are advected and dispersed among water segments, that settle to and erode from benthic segments, and that move between benthic layer segments through net sedimentation.

The model also partitions penta-PCBs into particulate- PCB, truly dissolved-PCB, and dissolved organic carbon (DOC) bound phases treated as individual state variables. The real time model simulates tide-induced flows, and the spatial and temporal distributions of the organic carbon and penta-PCB variables. During the modeling process, using data generated by the hydrodynamic model, DELPCB simulates the spatial and temporal distributions of water quality parameters including BIC, PDC, total penta-PCB, particulate penta-PCB, and truly dissolved PCB, and DOC-bound PCB. The sum of the latter two is total dissolved penta-PCB.

3.2.4.4 Model Inputs

Additional inputs to the models include air and water temperature, wind data and the loadings of penta-PCBs from various source categories for the period February 1, 2002 to January 31, 2003. Water temperature data were obtained from three automatic water quality monitoring stations operated cooperatively by the DRBC and the U.S. Geological Survey at the Ben Franklin Bridge, Chester, PA and Reedy Island. Air temperature and wind speed data were obtained from the National Weather Service at the Philadelphia International Airport station.

Daily loadings of organic carbon and penta-PCBs were estimated for relevant source categories, including contaminated sites, non-point sources, point discharges, atmospheric deposition, and model boundaries, for each day of the one year cycling period. Detailed discussion of load development for each source category is described in Section 2 of the report entitled "Calibration of the PCB Water Quality Model for the Delaware Estuary for Carbon and Penta-PCBs" (DRBC, 2003c).

3.3 Procedure for Establishing TMDLs

3.3.1 Summary

TMDLs for total PCBs for Zones 2 through 5 of the Delaware Estuary are established using a multi-step procedure that incorporated the guiding principles discussed in Section 3.2.1. As discussed in Section 1.4, the existing DRBC water quality standards are used as the basis for the Stage 1 TMDLs. The selection of these standards establishes the transition from a standard of 44.8 pg/L in upper Zone 5 to a standard of 7.9 pg/L in lower Zone 5 as the critical location for ensuring that standards are met throughout the estuary. Standards that are lower than upstream water quality standards typically require ambient water concentrations in upstream waters to be lower than the applicable standards for those waters. In tidal waters such as the Delaware Estuary, downstream waters with less stringent water quality standards can have the same effect on upstream waters depending on the extent of upstream movement during flooding tides. With the use of the existing DRBC water quality standards as the basis for the TMDLs in Stage 1, the critical location occurs where the 7.9 pg/L standard becomes effective (River Mile 68.75, the site of the Delaware Memorial Bridges).

The procedure initially utilizes the conservative chemical model to establish contribution factors for two of the major tributaries to the estuary (the Delaware River at Trenton and the Schuylkill River), and each of the estuary zones. The reasons for utilizing the contribution factor approach and the conservative model are 1) TMDLs are controlled by the value of the standard at the critical location, and 2) computer simulation time is minimized permitting the numerous iterations necessary to perform the procedure (approximately five hours for a 50 year simulation with the penta-PCB water quality model). The factors represent the contribution of each of the six sources in picograms per liter to the concentration of penta-PCBs at the critical compliance location. The loading into each zone is assigned as distributed loadings by utilizing a weighting factor calculated using the surface area of the model segments within the zone. For each of the estuary zones, the contribution factor has the units of pg/L per unit of loading. The unit of loading is relative to magnitude of the water quality standard. For example, conventional pollutants with standards in units of milligrams per liter (parts per million) and toxic pollutants with standards in micrograms per liter (parts per billion), loading is often expressed in kilograms per day. With the standard for PCBs in the picograms per liter range, however, loading is more appropriately expressed in terms of milligrams per day. Different units are used for the two major tributaries since the model calculates the loading of PCBs from these tributaries using the daily flows and the concentration of penta-PCBs. Therefore, the contribution factor for these two sources are expressed in units of pg/L per pg/L of penta-PCBs at the tributary boundary compared to pg/L per 100 mg/day for the loadings from the zones.

TMDLs are calculated in a four step procedure (Figure 14). The four steps are:

1. Calculate the contribution factor for each of the estuary zones and two of the tributary model boundaries to the critical compliance point with the penta-PCB water quality target.
2. Determine the proportion of the water quality target allocated to each of these six sources utilizing the median daily flow contributed by each during the one year model cycling period. Calculate the allowable loadings from each of these sources utilizing the CF and the proportion of the water quality target at the critical location allocated to each source. Then utilize these loadings in the conservative chemical and penta-PCB models to establish the assimilative capacity provided by burial of PCBs into the estuary sediments. Iteratively determine the amount of assimilative capacity (in pg/L) provided by the sediments, and add this concentration to the penta-PCB water quality target. Recalculate the allowable loadings from each of the six sources using this revised water quality target.
3. Utilize the water quality model for penta-PCBs with these allowable loadings to confirm that the sediment concentrations have reached pseudo-steady state, and confirm that the penta-PCB water quality target is met in Zones 2 through 5. Initial




Figure 14: Four Step Procedure for Establishing TMDLs

- penta-PCB conditions in the water and sediments are updated to shorten the simulation time to reach pseudo steady-state in Step 4.
4. Estimate the gas phase concentrations that would be in equilibrium with the penta-PCB water concentrations when the water quality targets are met, include these in the water quality model and then confirm that the water quality targets are still being met. Iteratively adjust the gas phase concentration of penta-PCBs in the air until the water quality target is reached. The air will neither be a source or sink for penta-PCBs when the estuary meets the water quality standard and gas phase concentrations are reduced to the equilibrium concentration.

3.3.2 Step 1

In determining the contribution factor for the two tributary boundaries and the four estuary zones, the boundary of interest is set to 1 pg/L and all other model boundaries except the one of interest are set to zero pg/L. Model simulations are then run for 10 years to ensure that equilibrium conditions are achieved, and the annual median value is then calculated for each model segment in the main stem of the river. Figures 15 through 17 illustrate how the contribution factor is determined for the four model boundaries. These figures indicate the concentration of penta-PCBs at the critical point when a concentration of 1 pg/L is set at the model boundary.

Table 3 lists the contribution factors determined by this analysis for all of the model boundaries and each of the estuary zones.

Table 3: Summary of the contribution factors from the model boundaries and the estuary zones at the criteria critical point (Model segment 24 - River Mile 68.1).

| Estuary Zone/Boundary | Contribution Factor [pg/L] per [100 mg/day] | Contribution Factor [pg/L] per [pg/L] |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| Zone 2 | 1.9668 | - |
| Zone 3 | 2.1428 | - |
| Zone 4 | 2.2813 | - |
| Zone 5 | 0.96704 | - |
| Delaware River @ Trenton | - | 0.5815 |
| Schuylkill River | - | 0.11839 |
| Ocean & C&D Canal | - | - |

3.3.3 Step 2

Once the contribution factors are determined, the next step is to determine the allowable loadings from each of these sources that will still ensure that the water quality target is met at the critical location. The following assumptions are made in determining these loadings:

- The assimilative capacity at the critical location controls the allowable loadings from each source. In concentration units, this assimilative capacity is equal to one-quarter of the applicable water quality standard or 1.975 pg/L of penta-PCBs.
- The influence from ocean (the mouth of Delaware Bay) and the C&D Canal are treated as background. This is based in part upon their minimal influence at the critical location.
- Net burial of PCBs into the sediment results in a loss of PCBs from the system. This removal of PCBs provides assimilative capacity that can be utilized by other sources. At the critical location, this additional assimilative capacity is approximately 0.5 pg/L of penta-PCBs.
- When the concentration of penta-PCBs meets the water quality targets throughout the estuary, the concentration of penta-PCBs in the gas phase will be at equilibrium with the truly dissolved penta-PCBs in the water column, and the net flux of penta-PCBs will be zero. Thus, the air will neither be a source or sink for penta-PCBs when the estuary meets the water quality standard and gas phase are concentrations are reduced to the equilibrium concentration.




Figure 15: Simulated penta-PCB concentrations in the water column when the concentration of the Delaware River at Trenton, NJ is set to 1 picogram per liter.




Figure 16: Simulated penta-PCB concentrations in the water column when the concentration of the Schuylkill River is set to 1 picogram per liter.




Figure 17: Simulated penta-PCB concentrations in the water column when the concentration at the mouth of Delaware Bay and the C&D Canal is set to 1 picogram per liter.

Using the principle that the assimilative capacity of the two tributary boundaries and each of the zones is based upon the inflow provided by each source, the percentage distribution of the assimilative capacity for each of these sources is established. Table 4 presents the flows for each of the sources during the one year model cycling period and the percentage distribution of the assimilative capacity based upon these flows. This distribution percentage is then applied to the penta-PCB water quality target of 1.975 pg/L to establish the contribution of each of the sources in picograms/liter to the target (Table 4). The influence of the mouth of Delaware Bay and the C&D Canal is first removed since this influence is considered background based in part on their minimal influence at the critical location. The additional assimilative capacity provided by the burial of PCBs into the estuary sediments was then estimated by inserting these loads in the conservative chemical and penta-PCB models. The results of this process was that the additional assimilative capacity was estimated to be 0.5 pg/L. This increased the assimilative capacity to 2.2921 pg/L (1.975 pg/L minus 0.183 pg/L for the background influences, plus 0.500 pg/L additional for burial by sediments) at the critical location. The contribution of each of the sources in picograms/liter to the target was then recalculated and used with the contribution factor to establish the allowable concentration or loadings for each of the tributary boundaries and estuary zones, respectively (Table 4).

At this point, a total allowable loading or assimilative capacity of 94.99 mg/day of penta-PCBs for all six sources was calculated. The majority of this loading was assigned to the two tributary boundaries, the Delaware River at Trenton and the Schuylkill River. Figure 18 graphically presents the available assimilative capacity at the critical location and the apportionment to each of the sources and estuary zones. Figure 19 presents the results of simulations using the conservative chemical model demonstrating that the calculated loadings result in attainment of the revised water quality target of 2.475 pg/L.

Table 4: Summary of Steps 1 and 2 of the Procedure for Establishing TMDLs

| Sources of Loadings | Contribution Factor (CF) | Mean Daily Flow During 1 Year Cycling Period | Distribution Percentage | Concentration at the Critical Location | Allowable Concentrations or Loadings. | Allowable Loadings (TMDL) |
|---------------------|---|--|-------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Units | [pg/L] / [pg/L] or [pg/L] / [100mg/day] | | % | pg/L | pg/L or mg/day | mg/day |
| Trenton | 0.581500* | 249.19 | 68.0 | 1.559 | 2.68* | 57.727 |
| Schuylkill | 0.118390* | 45.87 | 12.5 | 0.287 | 2.42* | 9.609 |
| Zone 2 | 1.966800 | 20.79 | 5.7 | 0.130 | 6.61 | 6.613 |
| Zone 3 | 2.142800 | 15.26 | 4.2 | 0.095 | 4.46 | 4.455 |
| Zone 4 | 2.281300 | 16.66 | 4.5 | 0.104 | 4.57 | 4.569 |
| Zone 5 | 0.967040 | 18.57 | 5.1 | 0.116 | 12.02 | 12.016 |
| Sum | | 366.3 | 100 | 2.2921 | - | 94.99 |

* - Units are either [pg/L] / [pg/L] or pg/L.




Figure 18: Graphical presentation of the allocation of the assimilative capacity at the critical location.




Figure 19: Simulated penta-PCB concentrations in the water column when loadings established in Step 1 are used in the conservative chemical model.

3.3.4 Step 3

The next two steps will utilize the water quality model for penta-PCBs to confirm the assimilative capacity that was added due to the loss of PCBs by burial by the sediment, to confirm that sediment concentrations have reached steady-state, and to make final adjustments to account for the exchange of penta-PCBs in the truly dissolved phase with penta-PCBs in the gaseous phase in the estuary airshed.

In this step, the PCB water quality model is run with the initial water column concentrations set to the concentrations described by the final simulation with the conservative chemical model (Figure 19), the loadings from the model boundaries and to each estuary zone that were determined in Step 2, initial penta-PCB concentrations in the sediment, and no air-water exchange of gaseous penta-PCBs. The purpose of this simulation is to determine the sediment concentrations that are in equilibrium with the estuary concentrations that will meet the water quality target of 1.975 pg/L at the critical location. These simulations were run for 50 years to establish the point at which equilibrium was reached between the water column and the sediments. Figure 20 indicates the sediment concentration of penta-PCBs at six locations in the estuary corresponding to a model segment in each of the estuary zones and Delaware Bay. Note that sediment concentrations in all segments reach equilibrium after 20 to 30 years from the assigned initial conditions. The simulated median sediment concentrations at each of the model segments is presented in Figure 21. The amount of assimilative capacity provided by the loss of penta-PCBs to the sediment is illustrated in Figure 22. The figure indicates that the amount of assimilative capacity provided by the sediments varies along the estuary due to the varying burial rates computed by the model. The assimilation capacity provided is about 0.5 pg/L at the critical

location.

The penta-PCB model was then rerun for ten years with the initial sediment conditions set to these values along with the loadings from the model boundaries and to each of the estuary zones to confirm that the water quality target at the critical location was being met. Figure 23 presents a plot of the annual median values during the ninth year of the simulation, confirming that the water quality target is being met. Figure 24 demonstrates that the sediments are in equilibrium during the simulation period.




Figure 20: Temporal plot of penta-PCB concentrations in surface sediment layer during a 100 year simulation using the loads established in Step 2.




Figure 21: Spatial plot of simulated surface sediment concentrations of penta-PCBs in surface sediment layer during a 50 year simulation using the loads established in Step 2.




Figure 22: Spatial plot of the assimilative capacity in pg/L provided by the sediment layer.




Figure 23: Spatial plot of the penta-PCBs in the water column during a 10 year simulation using the loads established in Step 2 and with new sediment initial conditions.




Figure 24: Temporal plot of the concentration of penta-PCBs in the surface sediment layer during a 10 year simulation using the loads established in Step 2 and with new sediment initial conditions.

3.3.5 Step 4

The final step in developing TMDLs for penta-PCBs for Zones 2 through 5 of the Delaware Estuary is to include the exchange of penta-PCBs between the gas phase in the atmosphere and truly dissolved penta-PCBs in the water. In the current model framework, the gas phase air concentrations are assigned, and are not dynamically simulated by the model. However, when the TMDL is achieved there should be close to zero net exchange between the water and air. It was therefore necessary to estimate the gas phase concentration that would be in equilibrium with the water quality targets (Figure 8) and then confirm that the water quality targets are still being met.

The penta-PCB water quality model utilizes the following formula to determine the volatilization rate of a chemical:

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} = \frac{K_v}{D} \left[C_w - \frac{C_A}{H/RT_K} \right]$$

where: K_v = the transfer rate, meters per day
 D = model segment depth in meters
 C_w = truly dissolved fraction of the chemical in water, mg/L
 C_A = atmospheric gas phase concentration, mg/L
 H = Henry's Law Constant, atm-m³/day
 R = universal gas constant
 T_K = water temperature in degrees Kelvin

At equilibrium, the volatilization rate will be zero. Therefore:

$$\left[C_w - \frac{C_A}{H/RT_K} \right] = 0$$

Rearranging this formula to calculate the atmospheric gas phase concentration for penta-PCBs:

$$C_w \times H/RT_K = C_A$$

Figure 25 presents the truly dissolved penta-PCB water concentrations predicted by the model from Step 4 and the corresponding equilibrium air concentrations of gaseous phase penta-PCBs for the one year cycling period.




Figure 25: Back-calculated, equilibrium, median, gas phase penta-PCB concentrations during the one year model cycling period.

The penta-PCB water quality model is then run with the conditions obtained from Step 2 and 3 including the loadings from the model boundaries and to each estuary zone, initial penta-PCB concentrations in the sediment (Figure 24), and with back-calculated, equilibrium, median, gas phase penta-PCB concentrations during the one year model cycling period (Figure 25). The purpose of this simulation is to confirm that the penta-PCB concentrations in the sediments and the penta-PCB gas phase air concentrations are in equilibrium with the estuary concentrations that will meet the water quality target of 1.975 pg/L at the critical location when all fate processes are enabled in the model. These simulations were also run for 100 years to establish the point at which equilibrium was reached between the water column and the sediments. Figure 26 indicates the sediment concentration of penta-PCBs at five locations in the estuary corresponding to a model segment in each of the estuary zones and Delaware Bay. Note that sediment concentrations in all segments reach equilibrium after approximately 20 years. The simulated sediment concentrations at each of the model segments is presented in Figure 27. Figure 28 presents a plot of the annual median values during the 99th and 100th year of the simulation, confirming that the water quality target is being met.




Figure 26: Temporal plot of penta-PCB concentrations in the surface sediment layer during a 100 year simulation with air-water exchange processes enabled.




Figure 27: Spatial plot of penta-PCB concentrations in the surface sediment layer during a 100 year simulation with air-water exchange processes.




Figure 28: Spatial plot of the penta-PCBs in the water column during a 100 year simulation using the loads established in Step 2, new sediment initial conditions, and with air-water exchange processes enabled

4. TMDLs, WLAs and LAs for Total PCBs for Zones 2 to 5

4.1 TMDLs, WLAs and LAs for Penta- PCBs

Table 5 summarizes the calculated TMDLs (allowable loadings) for penta-PCBs for Zones 2 to 5 of the Delaware Estuary that were derived in Section 3.3.5. The loadings from the Delaware River at Trenton and the Schuylkill River are included in the Zone 2 and 4 TMDLs, respectively. The next step is to allocate the zone-specific TMDLs to a wasteload allocation portion or WLA, a load allocation portion or LA, and a margin of safety.

Table 5: TMDLs for penta-PCBs for Zones 2 through 5 of the Delaware Estuary

| Estuary Zone | TMDL (milligrams / day) |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|
| Zone 2 | 64.3400 |
| Zone 3 | 4.4555 |
| Zone 4 | 14.1779 |
| Zone 5 | 12.0157 |
| Sum | 94.9891 |

The Commission's Toxics Advisory Committee has made several recommendations on the policies and procedures to be used to establish these allocations. Federal regulations at 40 CFR Part 130.7(c)(1) require a margin of safety or MOS to be included in a TMDL to account for any lack of knowledge concerning the relationships between pollutant loadings and receiving water quality. Commission regulations also require that a portion of the TMDL be set aside as a margin of safety, with the proportion reflecting the degree of uncertainty in the data and resulting water quality-based controls. The margin of safety can be incorporated either implicitly in the design conditions used in establishing the TMDLs or explicitly by assigning a proportion of each TMDL. Both of these approaches were considered by the Toxics Advisory Committee who recommended that an explicit margin of safety of 5% be assigned in allocating the zone-specific TMDLs. This recommendation was based upon the use of a one year cycling period for the hydrodynamic and water quality model that mimics the period of record for the two major tributaries to the estuary rather than design tributary flows; and the use of tide data, precipitation data and the actual effluent flows that occurred during the one year cycling period. EPA finds these recommendations reasonable and supported by the evidence, and adopted them in these TMDLs. Table 6 presents the MOS allocation for each of the zones as well as the two tributary boundaries. This is necessary since the loadings from these tributaries are part of the PCB loadings to Zones 2 and 4

Table 6: Allocation of the Zone TMDLs to the 5% Margin of Safety

| Sources of Loadings | Contribution Factor (CF) [pg/L] / [pg/L] or [pg/L] / [100mg/day] | TMDL mg/day | MOS mg/day | TMDL - MOS mg/day |
|---------------------|--|----------------|---------------|----------------------|
| Delaware River | 0.581500 | 57.727 | 2.886 | 54.841 |
| Schuylkill River | 0.118390 | 9.609 | 0.48 | 9.129 |
| Zone 2 | 1.966800 | 6.613 | 0.331 | 6.282 |
| Zone 3 | 2.142800 | 4.455 | 0.223 | 4.232 |
| Zone 4 | 2.281300 | 4.569 | 0.228 | 4.341 |
| Zone 5 | 0.967040 | 12.016 | 0.601 | 11.415 |
| Sum | | 94.989 | 4.749 | 90.24 |

The committee recommended that for the Stage 1 TMDLs, the proportion of the TMDLs that are allocated to WLAs and LAs should be based upon the current loadings from the various PCB source categories to each of the zones during the one year cycling period (February 1, 2002 to January 31, 2003) used in the TMDL model simulations. EPA finds these recommendations reasonable and adopted them in these TMDLs.

Prior to allocation of the remaining portion of the TMDL between WLA and LA, the portion of the assimilative capacity allocated to contaminated sites was determined since the assimilative capacity for this source must also be shared between the estuary zones and the two boundary tributaries (see Section 3.2.1). Table 7 presents the load allocated to the contaminated sites by source and the remaining assimilative capacity that must still be allocated.

Table 7: Allocation of the Zone TMDLs to Contaminated Sites

| Sources of Loadings | TMDL - MOS mg/day | % of Total Loading to Zone | Contaminated Site Allocation mg/day | TMDL - MOS - CS |
|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|-----------------|
| Delaware River | 54.841 | - | 0.229 | 54.612 |
| Schuylkill River | 9.129 | - | 3.473 | 5.656 |
| Zone 2 | 6.282 | 0.42 | 0.026 | 6.256 |
| Zone 3 | 4.233 | 57.09 | 2.416 | 1.816 |
| Zone 4 | 4.340 | 38.04 | 1.651 | 2.689 |
| Zone 5 | 11.415 | 46 | 5.251 | 6.164 |
| | 94.989 | - | 13.046 | 77.193 |

The remaining assimilative capacity can now be apportioned to WLAs and the rest of the sources that contribute to the LAs (Table 8). The WLA source categories include the continuous point source NPDES discharges, stormwater discharges permitted under the NPDES program, and combined sewer overflows (CSOs), and municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s).

EPA's regulations require NPDES-regulated storm water discharges to be addressed by the WLA component of a TMDL. Assessing the estimated loading from such discharges is relatively difficult compared to traditional point source discharges, as storm water discharge is typically calculated by quantifying the area of urban and residential land uses in a basin. For this reason, it is important to have updated land use data

and runoff coefficients.

In developing the Stage 1 TMDLs, the existing WLAs were calculated for traditional point source discharges based on effluent concentrations and the actual effluent flows during the one year model cycling period (see Section 3.2.4.1). A November 22, 2002 EPA Memorandum entitled, "Establishing Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Wasteload Allocations (WLAs) for Storm water Source and NPDES Permit Requirements Based on Those WLAs" clarified existing regulatory requirements for municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) connected with TMDLs. Where a TMDL has been developed, the MS4 community must receive a WLA rather than a LA. The Stage 1 TMDL explicitly assigns a portion of each of the zone WLAs to storm water discharges that do not have an individual NPDES permit. Appendix 6 presents the procedure used to develop each of these zone allocations to MS4s and the resulting MS4 loading in milligrams per day (mg/day).

The LA source categories also include the other smaller tributaries, non-point source loads not permitted under the NPDES program, dry and wet atmospheric deposition. Tables 9 and 10 summarize the categories included in the aggregate allocations to WLAs and LAs in each zone, respectively. Table 11 summarizes the allocations to WLAs, LAs and the MOS. Figures 29 to 32 graphically illustrate the proportion allocated.

Table 8: Summary of Zone TMDLs for penta-PCBs and the allocation to the major source categories for PCBs.

| Sources of Loadings | Contribution Factor (CF) | TMDL | MOS | Contaminated Site Allocation | Remaining Allocation | Allocation to Continuous Point Sources | Allocation to CSOs | Allocation to MS4s | Remaining Portion to the rest of LAs |
|---------------------|---|--------|--------|------------------------------|----------------------|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | [pg/L] / [pg/L] or [pg/L] / [100mg/day] | mg/day | mg/day | mg/day | mg/day | mg/day | mg/day | mg/day | mg/day |
| Trenton | 0.581500 | 57.727 | 2.886 | 0.229 | 54.611 | 0.000 | | | |
| Schuylkill | 0.118390 | 9.609 | 0.480 | 3.473 | 5.656 | 0.000 | | | |
| Zone 2 | 1.966800 | 6.613 | 0.331 | 0.026 | 6.256 | 1.241 | 0.006 | 1.511 | 3.498 |
| Zone 3 | 2.142800 | 4.455 | 0.223 | 2.416 | 1.816 | 0.771 | 0.462 | 0.185 | 0.398 |
| Zone 4 | 2.281300 | 4.569 | 0.228 | 1.651 | 2.689 | 0.614 | 0.677 | 0.342 | 1.055 |
| Zone 5 | 0.967040 | 12.016 | 0.601 | 5.250 | 6.165 | 3.132 | 0.182 | 0.592 | 2.259 |
| Sum | | 94.989 | 4.749 | 13.046 | 77.193 | 5.758 | 1.327 | 2.630 | 7.211 |

Table 9: Summary of the Zone WLAs for penta-PCBs and their allocation to source categories.

| Estuary Zone | WLA | NPDES continuous discharging point sources | CSOs | Municipal separate stormwater sewer service |
|--------------|--------|--|--------|---|
| | mg/day | mg/day | mg/day | mg/day |
| Zone 2 | 2.7574 | 1.2408 | 0.0059 | 1.5107 |
| Zone 3 | 1.4180 | 0.7713 | 0.4620 | 0.1847 |
| Zone 4 | 1.6338 | 0.6143 | 0.6772 | 0.3423 |
| Zone 5 | 3.9062 | 3.1319 | 0.1822 | 0.5922 |
| Sum | 9.7155 | 5.7583 | 1.3272 | 2.6300 |

Table 10: Summary of the Zone LAs for penta-PCBs and their allocation to source categories.





| Estuary Zone | LAs | Boundary * | Contaminated Site | Others |
|---------------------|----------------|-------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| | mg/day | mg/day | mg/day | mg/day |
| Zone 2 | 58.3656 | 54.6114 | 0.2557 | 3.4984 |
| Zone 3 | 2.8147 | 0.0000 | 2.4164 | 0.3983 |
| Zone 4 | 11.8351 | 5.6558 | 5.1240 | 1.0554 |
| Zone 5 | 7.5087 | 0.0000 | 5.2501 | 2.2586 |
| Sum | 80.5242 | 60.2672 | 13.0462 | 7.2107 |

* - The boundary in Zone 2 is the Delaware River at Trenton, and the boundary in Zone 4 is the Schuylkill River.

Table 11: Summary of the Zone TMDLs for penta-PCBs and their allocation to WLAs, LAs and a MOS.

| Estuary Zone | TMDL | WLA | LA | MOS |
|---------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| | mg/day | mg/day | mg/day | mg/day |
| Zone 2 | 64.3400 | 2.7574 | 58.3656 | 3.2170 |
| Zone 3 | 4.4555 | 1.4180 | 2.8147 | 0.2228 |
| Zone 4 | 14.1779 | 1.6338 | 11.8351 | 0.7089 |
| Zone 5 | 12.0157 | 3.9062 | 7.5087 | 0.6008 |
| Sum | 94.9891 | 9.7155 | 80.5242 | 4.7495 |

Figures 29 - 32: Distribution of Zone TMDLs to Point sources and CSOs, and the Remainder of the Non-Point Sources (tributary boundary loads, the MOS and the Contaminated Site loading excluded).



4.2 TMDLs, WLAs and LAs for Total PCBs

4.2.1 Extrapolation from Penta to Total PCBs

As discussed in Sections 2.2 and 3.2.2, TMDLs for Total PCBs will be extrapolated from penta homolog data using the observed ratio in the Delaware Estuary of the penta homolog to total PCBs. This approach was recommended by the expert panel established by the Commission due to time limitations and the technical difficulty in developing and calibrating a PCB model for each of the ten PCB homologs. Data available to the panel at that time indicated that the proportion of penta-PCBs to Total PCBs at 15 locations sampled in the estuary ranged between 0.2 and 0.3 (20 to 30% of Total PCBs). Figure 33 presents the ratio of penta-PCBs to Total PCBs for each zone based upon data currently available. EPA finds this extrapolation to be reasonable and supported by the best available data.




Figure 33: Ratio of Penta-PCBs to Total PCBs in ambient water samples collected from 15 sites in the Delaware Estuary during surveys conducted on September 18, 2001, March 15, 2002, April 11, 2002, October 8, 2002 and March 19, 2003. Error bars indicate the minimum and maximum ratios observed at any sampling site during all five surveys.

This data supports the original data and indicates median penta- to total PCB ratios of 0.23, 0.25, 0.25 and 0.23 for Zones 2 to 5, respectively. For Stage 1 TMDLs, a fixed value of 0.25 was used for all zones to scale up the zone-specific TMDLs, WLAs, LAs and MOSs.

4.2.2 TMDLs, WLAs and LAs for Total PCBs

Table 12 summarizes the TMDLs for each estuary zone for total PCBs as well as the allocations to WLAs, LAs and the MOSs.

Table 12: TMDLs, WLAs, LAs and MOSs for Total PCBs for Zones 2 to 5 of the Delaware Estuary.

| Estuary Zone | TMDL | WLA | LA | MOS |
|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | mg/day | mg/day | mg/day | mg/day |
| Zone 2 | 257.36 | 11.03 | 233.46 | 12.87 |
| Zone 3 | 17.82 | 5.67 | 11.26 | 0.89 |
| Zone 4 | 56.71 | 6.54 | 47.34 | 2.84 |
| Zone 5 | 48.06 | 15.63 | 30.04 | 2.40 |
| Sum | 379.96 | 38.86 | 322.10 | 19.00 |

4.2.3 Uncertainty Analysis for TMDLs, WLAs and LAs for Total PCBs

Uncertainty is associated with three elements of the Stage 1 TMDLs: 1) the use of annual median values for determining compliance with the penta-PCB water quality target, 2) the loading of penta-PCBs for each of the source categories that is used to apportion the TMDLs, and 3) the extrapolation of the penta-PCB TMDLs, aggregate and individual WLAs, and LAs to total PCBs.

As discussed in Section 3.2.1, TMDLs are calculated over a one year period (annual median) to be consistent with both the model simulations and the 70 year exposure used for human health criteria. The estuary, however, is dynamic with ambient PCB concentrations being affected by the amount of inflow from the tributaries, the variation in the tides over lunar and annual time scales, changes in both continuous and precipitation-induced wastewater flows, and the prevailing air and water temperature. Thus, ambient PCB concentrations will vary on both a daily and monthly basis about the annual median. The magnitude of this variation can be seen by plotting the annual minimum and annual maximum values that occur during long-term model simulations like those used to check whether a given set of loading assumptions results in compliance with the penta-PCB water quality target at the critical location (see Figure 28). Figure 34 illustrates the uncertainty associated with the use of annual median values by comparing annual minimum and maximum plots of water column concentrations of penta-PCBs during a 100 year simulation. The figure indicates that the annual variation is approximately +15% to -25%.

The uncertainty in the loading estimates for each of the source categories is discussed in Section 2.7 of the model calibration report (DRBC, 2003c). A Monte Carlo analysis was performed to examine and compare the uncertainty for the loading estimates for each PCB source category that were used in the 577 day model calibration period. This analysis indicated that the greatest uncertainty was associated with the tidal non-point source loads (90th and 10th percentiles of loading were 44.82 and 2.28 kilograms, respectively) followed by the contaminated site loads (90th and 10th percentiles of loading were 24.94 and 4.23 kilograms, respectively). Less uncertainty was associated with the loading from point sources (90th and 10th percentiles of loading were 8.53 and 5.16 kilograms, respectively)

The uncertainty in the extrapolation from penta-PCBs to total PCBs is illustrated in Figure 33. This figure indicates that while the zone ratios of penta-PCBs to total PCBs is close to 0.25, the uncertainty associated with the ratios varies between zones with the largest uncertainty occurring in Zone 2 (0.19 to 0.32) and the smallest occurring in Zone 4 (0.24 to 0.28).




Figure 34: Spatial plots of the annual median, annual minimum and annual maximum values of water column penta-PCB concentrations during a 100 year simulation using the TMDL loads.

5. REFERENCES

- Delaware River Basin Commission. 1988. Fish Health and Contamination Study. Delaware Estuary Use Attainability Project. Delaware River Basin Commission. West Trenton, NJ. March 1988.
- Delaware River Basin Commission. 1996. Administrative Manual - Part III, Water Quality Regulations. Delaware River Basin Commission. West Trenton, NJ. October 1996.
- Delaware River Basin Commission. 1998a. Study of the Loadings of Polychlorinated Biphenyls from Tributaries and Point Sources Discharging to the Tidal Delaware River. Delaware River Basin Commission. West Trenton, NJ. June 1998.
- Delaware River Basin Commission. 1998b. Calibration and Validation of a Water Quality Model for Volatile Organics and Chronic Toxicity in the Delaware River Estuary. Delaware River Basin Commission. West Trenton, NJ. December 1998.
- Delaware River Basin Commission. 2003a. DYNHYD5 Hydrodynamic Model (Version 2.0) and Chloride Water Quality Model for the Delaware Estuary. Delaware River Basin Commission. West Trenton, NJ. September 2003.
- Delaware River Basin Commission. 2003b. PCB Water Quality Model for the Delaware Estuary (DELPCB). Delaware River Basin Commission. West Trenton, NJ. September 2003.
- Delaware River Basin Commission. 2003c. Calibration of the PCB Water Quality Model of the Delaware Estuary for Penta-PCBs and Carbon. Delaware River Basin Commission. West Trenton, NJ. September 2003.
- Franklin Institute. 2003. Franklin's Forecast. Accessed 30 July 2003. <http://www.fi.edu/weather>.
- Greene R.W. and R.W. Miller. 1994. Summary and Assessment of Polychlorinated Biphenyls and Selected Pesticides in Striped Bass from the Delaware Estuary. Delaware Department of Natural Resources & Environmental Control. Dover, DE. March 1994.
- Hauge, P., P. Morton, M. Boriek, J. McClain and G. Casey. 1990. Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCBs), Chlordane, and DDTs in Selected Fish and Shellfish From New Jersey Waters, 1986-1987: Results from New Jersey's Toxics in Biota Monitoring Program. New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection. Trenton, NJ. 66pp.
- Van Ry, D.A., C.L. Gigliotti, T.R. Glenn, E.D. Nelson, L.A. Totten, and S.J. Eisenreich. 2002. Wet Deposition of Polychlorinated Biphenyls in Urban and Background Areas of the Mid-Atlantic States. *Envir. Sci. & Tech.* 36(15):3201-3209.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1998. National Recommended Water Quality Criteria; Notice; Republication. Federal Register Vol. 63, No. 237, Pages 68354-68364.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2000. Methodology for Deriving Ambient Water Quality Criteria for the Protection of Human Health (2000). Office of Water. Office of Science and Technology. Washington, D.C. EPA-822-B-00-004. October 2000.
- U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. 1991. Assessment of Organochlorine and Metal Contamination in the Lower Delaware River Estuary (AFO-C91-04). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Environmental Contaminants Division. Annapolis, MD.

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. 1992. Concentrations of Organochlorines and Trace Elements in Fish and Blue Crabs from the Delaware River, Easton to Deepwater. Special Project Report 93-5. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. State College, PA.

Appendix 1

REDUCING PCB LOADINGS TO THE DELAWARE ESTUARY:
A Staged Approach to Establishing TMDLs

Documents distributed at the April 29, 2003 meeting convened by the

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Regions II and III

Delaware River Basin Commission

Delaware Department of Natural Resources & Environmental Control

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection

Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| Reducing PCB Loading in the Delaware River Estuary - General Concepts | 1 |
| Delaware Estuary PCB Stage 1 TMDL Schedule | 3 |
| Staged PCB TMDLs for the Delaware Estuary | 4 |
| Identification of Significant Point Source Dischargers | 8 |
| Reducing Non-NPDES Sources of PCB Loadings to the Delaware Estuary | 11 |

Reducing PCB Loading in the Delaware River Estuary - General Concepts

The September 1996 *Delaware Estuary Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan* (CCMP) identified, among other things, the need to mitigate the impacts of PCBs in the Estuary. Each Estuary state - Delaware, New Jersey and Pennsylvania - has long-standing fish advisories restricting consumption, due in part to the presence of PCBs. Included in the actions recommended by the CCMP was the implementation of 'phased limits on toxic pollutants using the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) approach.'

In response to the Delaware Estuary PCB issue, EPA, the states of Delaware, New Jersey and Pennsylvania and the Delaware River Basin Commission (DRBC) have joined in a comprehensive effort to assess the sources and extent of PCB loading, evaluate its impact on water quality and develop recommendations to mitigate this impact. The regulatory agencies are supported in this effort by an extensive coalition of local governments, industries, environmental interest groups and the general public.

While the development of a PCB TMDL is the center of this effort, each participating agency recognizes that the TMDL monitoring, modeling and allocation analysis must be complemented by a parallel process to evaluate how the TMDL recommendations will be implemented. The goal of these combined processes is a TMDL that is implemented based on a set of coordinated actions to produce water quality improvements and to meet water quality standards.

The general concepts of the plan to reduce PCB loadings to the Delaware River Estuary are:

- A comprehensive assessment of all sources - point source discharges (including regulated stormwater discharges), non-point stormwater sources, air deposition, hazardous waste sites and contaminated sediments - of PCB loads to the Estuary and development of a state-of-the art water quality model to evaluate the impacts of these loads. DRBC has the lead for this work and is supported both by a Technical Advisory Committee and an Expert Panel convened to advise the modeling effort.
- A watershed-based approach to PCB assessment and implementation that will evaluate not just Delaware River main stem conditions but also assess and define the loadings from major tributaries to the Delaware River.
- An approach to incorporate the results of the TMDL into the NPDES permits of dischargers to the Estuary. EPA Regions II and III and the three states are responsible for this task. The permitting approach will be both innovative and flexible while ensuring that reductions in PCB loads are achieved.

- A companion effort that will explore options to achieve PCB reductions from sources other than NPDES dischargers, including air deposition, hazardous waste sites and contaminated sediments. DRBC is taking the lead to identify and quantify the loadings from these sources with support from EPA, the states and other interested parties. Once sources are clearly identified, DRBC will work with all agencies to develop an implementation plan for sources in these categories.
- The promulgation of the TMDL by EPA in two stages. The Stage 1 TMDL will be issued in December 2003 and Stage 2 will be issued in December 2005. The states and DRBC will join in support of EPA in the TMDL public review and promulgation. In the interval between Stage 1 and Stage 2 TMDL promulgation, EPA, the states and DRBC will continue to further refine the TMDL through more detailed, congener-specific monitoring to enhance the TMDL PCB water quality model.
- DRBC will lead an effort to begin an implementation strategy to complement the NPDES permit requirements that will likely focus on voluntary reduction efforts as soon as practical and will be expanded as the TMDL is completed. EPA and the states will support DRBC in these implementation efforts.

The complexity of the science involved in establishing a PCB TMDL, the extensive range of potential sources of PCB contributions and the magnitude of the costs that may be necessary to achieve PCB load reductions to meet the water quality objectives of the Delaware River Estuary compel all agencies and affected parties to work together to meet this challenge. By gaining consensus for the actions that will occur in this effort, EPA, the states and DRBC hope to forge a broad, long-term watershed partnership to achieve water quality standards for PCBs for the Delaware Estuary in an effective and efficient manner.

Delaware Estuary PCB Stage 1 TMDL Schedule

| Activity | Completion Date | 3 rd Q 2002 | 4 th Q 2002 | 1 st Q 2003 | 2 nd Q 2003 | 3 rd Q 2003 | 4 th Q 2003 |
|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| PCB Model | | | | | | | |
| Hydrodynamic Model | Nov 30, 2002 | | | | | | |
| Water Quality Model | Mar 31, 2003 | | | | | | |
| Chloride Model | Dec 31, 2002 | | | | | | |
| Sorbent Model | Mar 31, 2003 | | | | | | |
| Penta-PCB Model | Apr 15, 2003 | | | | | | |
| TMDL Development | | | | | | | |
| Model Runs | Jun 30, 2003 | | | | | | |
| Report Preparation (includes elements of approval package and draft individual WLAs) | Jul 25, 2003 | | | | | | |
| Public Participation of TMDLs | | | | | | | |
| Notice public hearings | Aug 1, 2003 | | | | | | |
| Conduct public hearings | Sep 15, 2003 | | | | | | |
| Prepare response document | Oct 17, 2003 | | | | | | |
| Establish proposed action | Oct 24, 2003 | | | | | | |
| Prepare TMDL approval package | Nov 7, 2003 | | | | | | |
| Transmit proposed action to EPA | Nov 21, 2003 | | | | | | |
| EPA Regions II and III approve TMDLs for the Delaware Estuary | Dec 15, 2003 | | | | | | |

Staged PCB TMDLs for the Delaware Estuary

Overview

- The staged approach to development of total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) for polychlorobiphenyls (PCBs) provides for adaptive implementation through execution of load reduction strategies while additional monitoring and modeling efforts proceed. The approach recognizes that additional monitoring data and modeling results will be available following issuance of the Stage 1 TMDLs to enable a more sophisticated analysis to form the basis of the Stage 2 TMDLs.
- EPA requires that Stage 1 TMDLs meet all TMDL regulatory requirements, including the identification of individual wasteload allocations (WLAs).¹
- Furthermore, NPDES permits issued after the approval of Stage 1 TMDLs must include water quality-based effluent limits (WQBELs) consistent with Stage 1 WLAs.
- DRBC, with state and EPA input, will take the lead in preparing written documentation for Stage 1 TMDLs including WLAs and load allocations (LAs) to facilitate their establishment by EPA by December 15, 2003.
- DRBC, with state and EPA input, will take the lead in preparing written documentation for Stage 2 TMDLs including WLAs and LAs by December 31, 2005. When developing the revised WLAs in Stage 2, DRBC and the States will consider, among other things, the homolog-specific water quality model, the monitoring results from and effectiveness of the dischargers' PCB pollutant minimization programs, and whether further reductions from point sources are needed to attain and maintain applicable water quality criteria.
- DRBC, the individual states (New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Delaware) and EPA will conduct joint public hearings on the proposed TMDLs.
- DRBC, with state and EPA input, will take the lead in preparing the written documentation for the final TMDLs, and in preparing the required Public Responsiveness Documents.
- EPA will establish the Stage 1 TMDLs by December 15, 2003.

¹Consistent with an EPA policy memorandum dated November 22, 2002, it may be reasonable to express allocations for NPDES-regulated storm water discharges from multiple point sources as a single categorical wasteload allocation when data and information are insufficient to assign each source or outfall individual WLAs. The "individual WLAs" and "individual WQBELs" referred to throughout this document are, therefore, for non-storm water point sources.

- The DRBC may utilize all or part of the Stage 1 and Stage 2 TMDLs in assimilative capacity and wasteload allocation determinations in accordance with the Delaware River Basin Compact and the DRBC's regulations.
- The individual states will incorporate these TMDLs into their respective statewide water quality management plans.

TMDLs

- DRBC, the states and EPA will ensure that the Stage 1 TMDLs are technically defensible.
- DRBC, the states and EPA anticipate that the numeric Stage 1 WLAs for individual sources will be based on simplified methodologies. To present these Stage 1 numeric WLAs, DRBC will prepare a table which includes the current loading of each point source based on existing data, the current relative percentage contribution of the PCB loading for each point source by management zone², and the allocation to individual point sources resulting from application of the selected methodology.
- The Stage 1 TMDLs and individual wasteload allocations for total PCBs will be extrapolated from penta homolog data using the observed ratio in the Delaware River/Estuary of penta homolog to total PCBs.
- In approving the Stage 1 WLAs, EPA will clarify the authority of the states to adjust the individual WLAs without further EPA approval as long as the sum of the WLAs in each management zone is not exceeded and reasonable assurance is maintained for the LAs.
- The Stage 2 TMDLs issued on or before December 31, 2005 will contain individual WLAs that replace the Stage 1 WLAs. The Stage 2 WLAs and LAs will be based on all of the monitoring data obtained and modeling performed through the issuance of the Stage 2 TMDLs, and will be based on the summation of the PCB homolog groups, without the use of extrapolation. As such, the WLAs will be precise at the individual discharger level. DRBC, the States and EPA anticipate that the Stage 2 TMDLs will be based upon a more sophisticated allocation methodology than the Stage 1 TMDLs, and will likely reflect application of the procedures set forth in the DRBC Water Quality Regulations.
- Both the Stage 1 and Stage 2 TMDLs will require controls by non-point sources including, but not limited to, implementation of best management practices.
- Based on the Federal regulations for TMDLs currently in place, Stage 2 TMDLs would require EPA approval only if the overall TMDLs by management zone change, or as necessary to demonstrate reasonable assurance for revised LAs.

² The term "management zone" refers to each of the Delaware River Zones 2 through 5.

NPDES Permits

- All permits issued, reissued or modified after the approval of the Stage 1 TMDLs, and prior to the approval of the Stage 2 TMDLs, will include non-numeric WQBELs.
- The use of non-numeric WQBELs for Stage 1 is justified for the following two reasons.

(1) A best management practices (BMP) approach is the most appropriate way to control PCB discharges.

40 CFR 122.44(k)(4) allows the use of non-numeric, BMP-based WQBELs where a BMP approach is the most appropriate means to control pollutants to achieve the goals of the Clean Water Act. PCBs are not used in the industrial processes of the dischargers in the basin; the loading to the Delaware River is thought to be from contaminated hot spots in and around the areas of the dischargers or from unknown sources during the industrial process, either directly from old, leaking equipment or produced as an unwanted byproduct. Eliminating the sources of these PCBs is a more effective and efficient method by which to reduce PCB loading to the Delaware River than wastewater treatment to a numeric limit. A BMP approach that includes sensitive monitoring, pollutant trackdown, and mitigation of contamination is the most appropriate means to protect water quality and achieve the goals of the Clean Water Act.

(2) It will not be feasible to precisely calculate the individual WQBELs in Stage 1.

40 CFR 122.44(k)(3) allows non-numeric, BMP-based WQBELs in permits where it is infeasible to calculate numeric WQBELs. As indicated in the “TMDLs” section above, the Stage 1 individual WLAs will be extrapolated from penta homolog data. The Stage 2 WLAs will be based on the summation of individual PCB homolog groups without the use of extrapolation. Therefore, individual WQBELs in Stage 1 should be non-numeric whereas individual WQBELs in Stage 2 may be numeric.

- For the potentially significant individual dischargers³ of PCBs, the non-numeric WQBELs will require:
 - the use of Method 1668A to characterize the influent and effluent to quantify PCBs;
 - development of a PCB minimization plan; and
 - implementation of appropriate cost-effective PCB minimization measures identified through PCB minimization planning.

³See companion paper “Identification of Significant Point Source Dischargers.”

- For the potentially non-significant individual dischargers of PCBs, the non-numeric WQBEL will require the use of Method 1668A to characterize the influent and effluent in order to quantify PCBs.
- All permits issued, reissued or modified after the approval of Stage 2 TMDLs will include WQBELs consistent with the Stage 2 WLAs.

Water Quality Standards

- TMDLs will, in all cases, be based on the water quality standards in force when the TMDLs are approved.
- Water quality standard development and TMDL development schedules will be closely coordinated to avoid unnecessary work.

Identification of Significant Point Source Dischargers

Significant point source dischargers are defined as:

1. The fewest NPDES permittees with continuous discharges that, when combined, contribute the largest loading of pentachlorobiphenyls (penta-PCBs) during either dry or wet weather, and
2. NPDES permittees with stormwater discharges that have elevated concentrations of penta-PCBs (loadings will be developed following receipt of flows associated with precipitation events).

PCB Loading Estimates

Loading estimates for PCBs were calculated for each of 92 point source dischargers to Zones 2 through 5 of the Delaware Estuary. Concentrations for each discharge were determined by summing (a) the reported results for those penta congeners with detected values and (b) one-half the detection limit for those penta congeners reported as undetected. If multiple samples were collected and analyzed at a discharge, the mean of the sums was used. Loadings were derived by assuming these concentrations and using the design flows for each discharge, when available. Effluent design flows were calculated utilizing the guidelines for industrial and municipal dischargers outlined in DRBC's Water Quality Regulations. The calculations were performed using effluent flow data dating from prior to 2000. Effluent design flows are being recalculated to reflect current discharge data, and are being developed for those discharges for which an effluent design flow was not previously calculated. Revised data regarding concentrations are being incorporated in the calculations on an on-going basis. Therefore, loadings estimates are continually being refined as new data become available. Facilities with discharges consisting of solely non-contact cooling water have not been included in this analysis.

The identification of significant point source dischargers is a dynamic process that depends on several factors including the availability and extent of PCB congener data for each discharge, the flows used for each discharge, the procedure used to calculate the loadings, the location of the discharge in the estuary, and the proximity and loading of other sources of PCBs. As a result, **the list of significant point source dischargers is subject to change both prior to December 2003 and during the development of the Stage 2 TMDLs.**

The following graphs reflect the use of the procedure and data available as of the date noted on each graph. Figure 1 presents the fewest continuous discharges with the largest PCB loadings during non-precipitation influenced events (dry weather). Figure 2 presents the fewest continuous discharges with the largest PCB loadings during precipitation-influenced events (wet weather).

Figure 1






Figure 2



Stormwater Concentrations

The following graph indicates stormwater discharges with the highest concentrations of penta-PCBs.



Permit Expiration Dates for Dischargers Provisionally Identified as Significant Point Sources

The following table lists the permit expiration dates for the 16 point source dischargers identified as significant sources of PCBs using the procedures and data described above. **This list is expected to change as additional information becomes available.**

| Name | NPDES No. | Permit Expiration Date |
|--|-----------|------------------------|
| Motiva | DE0000256 | August 31, 2002 |
| Philadelphia Water Dept. – Northeast Plant | PA0026689 | July 7, 2005 |
| Philadelphia Water Dept. – Southwest Plant | PA0026671 | July 7, 2005 |
| Philadelphia Water Dept. – Southeast Plant | PA0026662 | July 7, 2005 |
| City of Wilmington | DE0020320 | June 30, 2005 |
| Camden County MUA | NJ0026182 | May 31, 2005 |
| DELCORA | PA0027103 | May 22, 2005 |
| Dupont – Chambers Works | NJ0005100 | January 31, 2004 |
| Gloucester County UA | NJ0024686 | April 30, 2004 |
| Hamilton Township | NJ0026301 | July 31, 2006 |
| City of Trenton | NJ0020923 | October 31, 2006 |
| Metachem | DE0020001 | June 30, 2003 |
| U.S. Steel | PA0013463 | December 8, 2005 |
| Valero Refining | NJ0005029 | March 31, 2006 |
| National Railroad Passenger Corp. (AMTRAK) | DE0050962 | December 31, 2004 |
| Boeing Corp. | PA0013323 | January 7, 2007 |

Reducing Non-NPDES Sources of PCB Loadings to the Delaware Estuary

Air

- DRBC will seek funding sources to conduct monitoring to identify local sources, and to establish air monitoring sites for long term / regional trend monitoring.
- DRBC, EPA, and the states will work to identify local sources of airborne PCBs.
- EPA will determine projections of the long term trends for regional air concentrations of PCBs. EPA will assess existing regulatory programs for removal of other pollutants to determine if comparable airborne PCB reductions can be anticipated on a regional basis.

Tributaries

- DRBC will seek funding to continue tributary monitoring to identify tributaries adding a significant load of PCBs to the Delaware Estuary, and refine the loading estimates for those tributaries.
- The individual states will add the tributaries contributing significant loadings of PCBs to the estuary to their Section 303(d) lists for 2004, if not already listed.
- The individual states will reevaluate the priority of the TMDL development for those tributaries with significant PCB loadings that are already on the respective state's Section 303(d) lists.

Hazardous Waste Sites

- EPA will estimate PCB loads for Superfund National Priority List and Removal Response sites that have significant PCB contamination and close proximity to the estuary.
- The individual states will provide comparable PCB load estimates for state lead cleanup sites that have significant PCB contamination and close proximity to the estuary.
- DRBC will coordinate and utilize load estimates as part of the overall PCB TMDL effort for the Delaware Estuary.
- These sites will receive a categorical allocation in the load allocation developed for the Stage 1 TMDL. This load allocation will be updated as the analysis is refined, subsequent site reviews are made and remediation work proceeds. EPA will engage in discussions on the subject of TMDL/Superfund interface and the appropriate means to achieve WQS.

Non-point Stormwater Runoff (non-NPDES regulated sources)

- DRBC will develop stormwater monitoring plans and seek stable funding sources to conduct monitoring of stormwater entering the Delaware Estuary.
- DRBC, EPA, and the states will work to identify significant local sources of PCBs in stormwater.
- DRBC, EPA, and the states will work to establish BMPs to minimize discharge of PCBs from stormwater runoff.
- EPA and the states will work to elevate the priority for the remediation of significant stormwater discharges containing PCBs.

Contaminated Sediments

- DRBC, EPA, the states and other agencies will work to identify PCB hot spots in sediments in the Delaware Estuary.
- DRBC, EPA, the states and other agencies will work to identify strategies to address sediment contamination, which may potentially include removal as part of an alternative allocation strategy (i.e., pollutant trading approach).

Appendix 2

Individual Wasteload Allocations for NPDES Discharges: Stage 1 TMDLs
for Total PCBs for Zones 2 to 5 of the Delaware Estuary

Appendix Table 2-1: Individual wasteload allocations for the point source discharges except CSOs and MS4s.

| Serial No. | Serial No. per Zone | Facility Name | NPDES | DSN | ZONE | RM | Model Segment | Potential Group (category) | Current Loadings (Sept. 2003) mg/day | Pent-PCBs WLA mg/day | Total PCBs WLA mg/day |
|------------|---------------------|--|-----------|------|------|-------|---------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 1 | Morrisville WWTP | PA0026701 | 001 | 2 | 132.9 | 76 | 2 | 65.566 | 0.057280 | 0.229120 |
| 2 | 2 | Trenton | NJ0020923 | 001 | 2 | 132.2 | 75 | 1 | 243.612 | 0.212825 | 0.851301 |
| 3 | 3 | PSEG-Mercer | NJ0004995 | 441A | 2 | 130.4 | 74 | 2 | 0.000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 |
| 4 | 4 | PSEG-Mercer | NJ0004995 | 441C | 2 | 130.4 | 74 | 1 | 5.010 | 0.004377 | 0.017508 |
| 5 | 5 | MSC Pre Finish Metals | PA0045021 | 001 | 2 | 130.1 | 74 | 2 | 0.646 | 0.000564 | 0.002256 |
| 6 | 6 | Hamilton Township | NJ0026301 | 001 | 2 | 128.0 | 73 | 2 | 220.791 | 0.192889 | 0.771555 |
| 7 | 7 | Yates Foil | NJ0004332 | 001B | 2 | 128.0 | 73 | 2 | 0.070 | 0.000061 | 0.000244 |
| 8 | 8 | Yates Foil | NJ0004332 | 002A | 2 | 128.0 | 73 | 2 | 0.000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 |
| 9 | 9 | Bordentown Sewerage Authority | NJ0024678 | 001 | 2 | 128.0 | 71 | 2 | 26.292 | 0.022969 | 0.091877 |
| 10 | 10 | U.S. Steel | PA0013463 | 002 | 2 | 127.4 | 71 | 1 | 61.390 | 0.053632 | 0.214527 |
| 11 | 11 | U.S. Steel | PA0013463 | 103 | 2 | 127.0 | 71 | 1 | 10.056 | 0.008785 | 0.035141 |
| 12 | 12 | U.S. Steel | PA0013463 | 203 | 2 | 127.0 | 71 | 1 | 3.787 | 0.003308 | 0.013234 |
| 13 | 13 | Exelon-Fairless | PA0057088 | 001 | 2 | 126.6 | 71 | 2 | 0.000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 |
| 14 | 14 | Waste Management Grows Landfill | PA0043818 | 001 | 2 | 125.5 | 70 | 2 | 1.182 | 0.001033 | 0.004131 |
| 15 | 15 | Lower Bucks County Municipal Authority | PA0026468 | 001 | 2 | 121.9 | 69 | 2 | 129.179 | 0.112854 | 0.451417 |
| 16 | 16 | Florence Township | NJ0023701 | 001 | 2 | 121.4 | 68 | 2 | 15.682 | 0.013700 | 0.054802 |
| 17 | 17 | GEON Company (Burlington) Polyone | NJ0004235 | 001A | 2 | 120.3 | 68 | 2 | 15.051 | 0.013149 | 0.052595 |
| 18 | 18 | Bristol Borough | PA0027294 | 001 | 2 | 118.7 | 66 | 2 | 29.383 | 0.025669 | 0.102677 |
| 19 | 19 | US Pipe & Foundry | NJ0005266 | 002A | 2 | 118.1 | 66 | 1 | 0.807 | 0.000705 | 0.002821 |
| 20 | 20 | City of Burlington | NJ0024660 | 002 | 2 | 117.6 | 64 | 2 | 46.336 | 0.040480 | 0.161921 |
| 21 | 21 | PSEG-Burlington | NJ0005002 | WTPA | 2 | 117.4 | 64 | 1 | 0.929 | 0.000812 | 0.003246 |
| 22 | 22 | Rohm&Haas-Bristol | PA0012769 | 009 | 2 | 117.1 | 64 | 1 | 5.710 | 0.004988 | 0.019952 |
| 23 | 23 | Burlington Township | NJ0021709 | 001 | 2 | 117.0 | 64 | 2 | 34.901 | 0.030490 | 0.121961 |

| Serial No. | Serial No. per Zone | Facility Name | NPDES | DSN | ZONE | RM | Model Segment | Potential Group (category) | Current Loadings (Sept. 2003) mg/day | Pent-PCBs WLA mg/day | Total PCBs WLA mg/day |
|------------|---------------------|---|-----------|------|------|-------|---------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 24 | 24 | Colorite Polymers | NJ0004391 | 002A | 2 | 117.0 | 64 | 2 | 0.008 | 0.000007 | 0.000030 |
| 25 | 25 | Colorite Polymers | NJ0004391 | 003A | 2 | 117.0 | 64 | 2 | 0.740 | 0.000646 | 0.002585 |
| 26 | 26 | Bristol Township | PA0026450 | 001 | 2 | 116.8 | 64 | 2 | 34.732 | 0.030342 | 0.121370 |
| 27 | 27 | Beverly Sewerage Authority | NJ0027481 | 001 | 2 | 114.7 | 63 | 1 | 18.890 | 0.016503 | 0.066010 |
| 28 | 28 | Delran Sewerage Authority | NJ0023507 | 001 | 2 | 110.8 | 60 | 2 | 37.419 | 0.032691 | 0.130762 |
| 29 | 29 | Mt. Holly Municipal Utilities Authority | NJ0024015 | 001 | 2 | 110.8 | 61 | 2 | 54.904 | 0.047965 | 0.191862 |
| 30 | 30 | Mt. Laurel Municipal Utilities Authority | NJ0025178 | 001A | 2 | 110.8 | 60 | 2 | 67.433 | 0.058911 | 0.235646 |
| 31 | 31 | Riverton Borough | NJ0021610 | 001 | 2 | 110.8 | 61 | 1 | 3.853 | 0.003366 | 0.013464 |
| 32 | 32 | Willingboro Municipal Utilities Authority | NJ0023361 | 001 | 2 | 110.8 | 61 | 2 | 123.392 | 0.107798 | 0.431194 |
| 33 | 33 | AFG Industries | NJ0033022 | 001A | 2 | 109.6 | 59 | 1 | 10.258 | 0.008962 | 0.035848 |
| 34 | 34 | AFG Industries | NJ0033022 | 002 | 2 | 109.4 | 59 | 2 | 0.092 | 0.000080 | 0.000321 |
| 35 | 35 | Hoeganaes Corp. | NJ0004375 | 001A | 2 | 109.4 | 59 | 2 | 0.330 | 0.000288 | 0.001151 |
| 36 | 36 | Hoeganaes Corp. | NJ0004375 | 003A | 2 | 109.4 | 59 | 2 | 0.000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 |
| 37 | 37 | Cinnaminson Sewerage Authority | NJ0024007 | 001 | 2 | 108.9 | 59 | 1 | 27.980 | 0.024444 | 0.097778 |
| 38 | 38 | Riverside Sewerage Authority | NJ0022519 | 001 | 2 | 108.8 | 59 | 1 | 124.107 | 0.108423 | 0.433693 |
| 39 | 1 | Palmyra Borough | NJ0024449 | 001 | 3 | 107.7 | 58 | 2 | 19.235 | 0.005384 | 0.021536 |
| 40 | 2 | Rohm&Haas-Philadelphia | PA0012777 | 001 | 3 | 106.1 | 56 | 2 | 15.974 | 0.004471 | 0.017885 |
| 41 | 3 | Rohm&Haas-Philadelphia | PA0012777 | 003 | 3 | 106.1 | 56 | 1 | 2.175 | 0.000609 | 0.002435 |
| 42 | 4 | Rohm&Haas-Philadelphia | PA0012777 | 007 | 3 | 106.1 | 56 | 2 | 0.003 | 0.000001 | 0.000003 |
| 43 | 5 | NGC Industries | NJ0004669 | 001A | 3 | 104.4 | 55 | 2 | 1.528 | 0.000428 | 0.001710 |
| 44 | 6 | PWD-NE | PA0026689 | 001 | 3 | 104.1 | 55 | 1 | 1238.662 | 0.346711 | 1.386845 |
| 45 | 7 | Citgo Petroleum | NJ0131342 | 001A | 3 | 103.4 | 55 | 2 | 0.012 | 0.000003 | 0.000014 |
| 46 | 8 | Exelon-Delaware | PA0011622 | 001 | 3 | 101.2 | 52 | 2 | 0.044 | 0.000012 | 0.000049 |
| 47 | 9 | Exelon-Delaware | PA0011622 | 002 | 3 | 101.2 | 52 | 1 | 0.655 | 0.000183 | 0.000733 |
| 48 | 10 | Exelon-Delaware | PA0011622 | 004 | 3 | 101.2 | 52 | 2 | 0.011 | 0.000003 | 0.000013 |

| Serial No. | Serial No. per Zone | Facility Name | NPDES | DSN | ZONE | RM | Model Segment | Potential Group (category) | Current Loadings (Sept. 2003) mg/day | Pent-PCBs WLA mg/day | Total PCBs WLA mg/day |
|------------|---------------------|--|-----------|------|------|-------|---------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 49 | 11 | Exelon-Delaware | PA0011622 | 006 | 3 | 101.1 | 52 | 2 | 0.000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 |
| 50 | 12 | CCMUA | NJ0026182 | 001 | 3 | 98.0 | 49 | 1 | 818.459 | 0.229093 | 0.916372 |
| 51 | 13 | PWD-SE | PA0026662 | 001 | 3 | 96.8 | 49 | 1 | 657.721 | 0.184101 | 0.736405 |
| 52 | 1 | Coastal Mart / Coastal Eagle Point Oil | NJ0005401 | 003A | 4 | 94.7 | 48 | 2 | 0.006 | 0.000002 | 0.000007 |
| 53 | 2 | Coastal Mart / Coastal Eagle Point Oil | NJ0005401 | 001A | 4 | 94.3 | 48 | 2 | 55.368 | 0.014863 | 0.059451 |
| 54 | 3 | Metro Machine | PA0057479 | DD2 | 4 | 93.2 | 44 | 1 | 49.040 | 0.013164 | 0.052656 |
| 55 | 4 | Metro Machine | PA0057479 | DD3 | 4 | 93.1 | 44 | 2 | 17.845 | 0.004790 | 0.019161 |
| 56 | 5 | Kvaerner | PA0057690 | 019 | 4 | 92.8 | 44 | 1 | 0.100 | 0.000027 | 0.000108 |
| 57 | 6 | Kvaerner | PA0057690 | 021 | 4 | 92.8 | 44 | 1 | 0.100 | 0.000027 | 0.000108 |
| 58 | 7 | Kvaerner | PA0057690 | 012 | 4 | 92.7 | 44 | 1 | 22.608 | 0.006069 | 0.024275 |
| 59 | 8 | Kvaerner | PA0057690 | 047 | 4 | 92.5 | 45 | 2 | 0.005 | 0.000001 | 0.000005 |
| 60 | 9 | Sunoco-GirardPoint | PA0011533 | 015 | 4 | 92.5 | 45 | 2 | 99.167 | 0.026620 | 0.106481 |
| 61 | 10 | Sunoco-PointBreeze | PA0012629 | 002 | 4 | 92.5 | 46 | 2 | 75.899 | 0.020374 | 0.081496 |
| 62 | 11 | PWD-SW | PA0026671 | 001 | 4 | 90.7 | 43 | 1 | 1020.466 | 0.273932 | 1.095729 |
| 63 | 12 | Ausimont | NJ0005185 | 001A | 4 | 90.7 | 43 | 1 | 0.840 | 0.000225 | 0.000902 |
| 64 | 13 | Ausimont | NJ0005185 | 002A | 4 | 90.7 | 43 | 1 | 0.077 | 0.000021 | 0.000082 |
| 65 | 14 | Chevron | NJ0064696 | 001A | 4 | 90.5 | 43 | 2 | 0.157 | 0.000042 | 0.000169 |
| 66 | 15 | Colonial Pipeline | NJ0033952 | 001A | 4 | 90.5 | 43 | 2 | 0.087 | 0.000023 | 0.000094 |
| 67 | 16 | BP Paulsboro | NJ0005584 | 002A | 4 | 89.6 | 43 | 2 | 0.352 | 0.000095 | 0.000378 |
| 68 | 17 | BP Paulsboro | NJ0005584 | 003A | 4 | 89.4 | 43 | 2 | 7.006 | 0.001881 | 0.007522 |
| 69 | 18 | GCUA | NJ0024686 | 001 | 4 | 88.4 | 43 | 1 | 113.497 | 0.030467 | 0.121868 |
| 70 | 19 | Air Products | NJ0004278 | 001A | 4 | 88.2 | 42 | 2 | 10.041 | 0.002695 | 0.010782 |
| 71 | 20 | Valero Refining | NJ0005029 | 001A | 4 | 87.7 | 42 | 1 | 99.473 | 0.026702 | 0.106809 |
| 72 | 21 | Hercules | NJ0005134 | 001A | 4 | 87.5 | 42 | 1 | 4.120 | 0.001106 | 0.004424 |
| 73 | 22 | Greenwich Township | NJ0030333 | 001 | 4 | 87.0 | 42 | 2 | 12.110 | 0.003251 | 0.013003 |

| Serial No. | Serial No. per Zone | Facility Name | NPDES | DSN | ZONE | RM | Model Segment | Potential Group (category) | Current Loadings (Sept. 2003) mg/day | Pent-PCBs WLA mg/day | Total PCBs WLA mg/day |
|------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|------|------|------|---------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 74 | 23 | Dupont-Repauno | NJ0004219 | 007 | 4 | 86.6 | 42 | 1 | 1.433 | 0.000385 | 0.001538 |
| 75 | 24 | Dupont-Repauno | NJ0004219 | 001A | 4 | 85.6 | 38 | 1 | 80.773 | 0.021682 | 0.086730 |
| 76 | 25 | Boeing | PA0013323 | 002 | 4 | 85.4 | 38 | 1 | 158.353 | 0.042508 | 0.170032 |
| 77 | 26 | Boeing | PA0013323 | 016 | 4 | 85.4 | 38 | 1 | 0.149 | 0.000040 | 0.000160 |
| 78 | 27 | Tinicum Township | PA0028380 | 001 | 4 | 85.4 | 40 | 1 | 15.450 | 0.004147 | 0.016590 |
| 79 | 28 | Boeing | PA0013323 | 001 | 4 | 85.2 | 38 | 1 | 29.068 | 0.007803 | 0.031212 |
| 80 | 29 | Boeing | PA0013323 | 003 | 4 | 85.2 | 38 | 1 | 0.404 | 0.000108 | 0.000433 |
| 81 | 30 | Boeing | PA0013323 | 007 | 4 | 85.2 | 38 | 1 | 0.235 | 0.000063 | 0.000252 |
| 82 | 31 | Boeing | PA0013323 | 008 | 4 | 85.2 | 38 | 2 | 0.018 | 0.000005 | 0.000019 |
| 83 | 32 | Exelon-Eddystone | PA0013716 | 001 | 4 | 85.2 | 38 | 1 | 0.064 | 0.000017 | 0.000069 |
| 84 | 33 | Exelon-Eddystone | PA0013716 | 005 | 4 | 85.2 | 38 | 1 | 0.509 | 0.000137 | 0.000546 |
| 85 | 34 | Exelon-Eddystone | PA0013716 | 007 | 4 | 85.2 | 38 | 2 | 0.000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 |
| 86 | 35 | Exelon-Eddystone | PA0013716 | 008 | 4 | 85.2 | 38 | 2 | 0.000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 |
| 87 | 36 | Kimberly Clark | PA0013081 | 029 | 4 | 83.2 | 36 | 1 | 0.086 | 0.000023 | 0.000092 |
| 88 | 37 | DeGussa-Huls Corp. | PA0051713 | 001 | 4 | 82.2 | 36 | 2 | 9.063 | 0.002433 | 0.009731 |
| 89 | 38 | DELCORA | PA0027103 | 001 | 4 | 80.6 | 34 | 1 | 309.423 | 0.083061 | 0.332244 |
| 90 | 39 | ConocoPhillips | PA0012637 | 002 | 4 | 80.2 | 34 | 2 | 0.000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 |
| 91 | 40 | ConocoPhillips | PA0012637 | 006 | 4 | 80.2 | 34 | 2 | 0.029 | 0.000008 | 0.000032 |
| 92 | 41 | ConocoPhillips | PA0012637 | 007 | 4 | 80.2 | 34 | 1 | 0.511 | 0.000137 | 0.000549 |
| 93 | 42 | ConocoPhillips | PA0012637 | 008 | 4 | 80.2 | 34 | 1 | 0.111 | 0.000030 | 0.000119 |
| 94 | 43 | Harrison Township-Mullica Hill | NJ0020532 | 001 | 4 | 79.8 | 79 | 2 | 6.093 | 0.001636 | 0.006543 |
| 95 | 44 | Safety Kleen | NJ0005240 | 001A | 4 | 79.8 | 79 | 2 | 7.440 | 0.001997 | 0.007989 |
| 96 | 45 | Safety Kleen | NJ0005240 | 002A | 4 | 79.8 | 79 | 1 | 3.512 | 0.000943 | 0.003772 |
| 97 | 46 | Swedesboro | NJ0022021 | 001 | 4 | 79.8 | 79 | 2 | 3.296 | 0.000885 | 0.003539 |
| 98 | 47 | ConocoPhillips | PA0012637 | 101 | 4 | 79.6 | 34 | 2 | 0.000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 |

| Serial No. | Serial No. per Zone | Facility Name | NPDES | DSN | ZONE | RM | Model Segment | Potential Group (category) | Current Loadings (Sept. 2003) mg/day | Pent-PCBs WLA mg/day | Total PCBs WLA mg/day |
|------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|-----------|------|------|------|---------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 99 | 48 | ConocoPhillips | PA0012637 | 201 | 4 | 79.6 | 34 | 2 | 48.580 | 0.013041 | 0.052163 |
| 100 | 49 | Logan Township | NJ0027545 | 001 | 4 | 79.5 | 34 | 2 | 12.114 | 0.003252 | 0.013007 |
| 101 | 50 | Solutia | NJ0005045 | 001 | 4 | 79.2 | 34 | 2 | 12.228 | 0.003282 | 0.013130 |
| 102 | 1 | General Chemical | DE0000655 | 001 | 5 | 77.9 | 33 | 2 | 0.000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 |
| 103 | 2 | Geon Company (Pedricktown) Polyone | NJ0004286 | 003 | 5 | 75.9 | 32 | 2 | 0.011 | 0.000007 | 0.000030 |
| 104 | 3 | Geon Company (Pedricktown) Polyone | NJ0004286 | 001A | 5 | 74.9 | 32 | 2 | 1.690 | 0.001135 | 0.004542 |
| 105 | 4 | Dupont-Edgemoor | DE0000051 | 001 | 5 | 73.2 | 31 | 1 | 32.214 | 0.021641 | 0.086564 |
| 106 | 5 | Dupont-Edgemoor | DE0000051 | 004 | 5 | 72.2 | 31 | 1 | 0.153 | 0.000103 | 0.000412 |
| 107 | 6 | Conectiv-Edgemoor | DE0000558 | 041 | 5 | 71.8 | 31 | 2 | 0.008 | 0.000005 | 0.000020 |
| 108 | 7 | City of Wilmington | DE0020320 | 001 | 5 | 71.6 | 31 | 2 | 1297.745 | 0.871802 | 3.487207 |
| 109 | 8 | Carney's Point | NJ0021601 | 001 | 5 | 71.3 | 25 | 2 | 10.265 | 0.006896 | 0.027584 |
| 110 | 9 | AMTRAK | DE0050962 | 003 | 5 | 70.7 | 30 | 1 | 2.002 | 0.001345 | 0.005378 |
| 111 | 10 | AMTRAK | DE0050962 | 004 | 5 | 70.7 | 30 | 1 | 35.822 | 0.024065 | 0.096259 |
| 112 | 11 | Penns Grove Sewer Authority | NJ0024023 | 001 | 5 | 70.7 | 28 | 1 | 23.206 | 0.015589 | 0.062357 |
| 113 | 12 | Dupont-ChamberWorks | NJ0005100 | 001A | 5 | 69.8 | 25 | 1 | 138.476 | 0.093026 | 0.372103 |
| 114 | 13 | Dupont-ChamberWorks | NJ0005100 | 662A | 5 | 69.8 | 25 | 1 | 102.854 | 0.069096 | 0.276383 |
| 115 | 14 | Conectiv-Deepwater | NJ0005363 | 003A | 5 | 69.1 | 24 | 2 | 0.000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 |
| 116 | 15 | Conectiv-Deepwater | NJ0005363 | 005 | 5 | 69.1 | 24 | 2 | 0.035 | 0.000024 | 0.000094 |
| 117 | 16 | Conectiv-Deepwater | NJ0005363 | 006 | 5 | 69.1 | 24 | 2 | 0.006 | 0.000004 | 0.000017 |
| 118 | 17 | Conectiv-Deepwater | NJ0005363 | 017 | 5 | 69.1 | 24 | 1 | 0.284 | 0.000191 | 0.000763 |
| 119 | 18 | Dupont-ChamberWorks | NJ0005100 | 011A | 5 | 68.9 | 24 | 2 | 0.004 | 0.000003 | 0.000010 |
| 120 | 19 | Dupont-ChamberWorks | NJ0005100 | 013A | 5 | 68.9 | 24 | 2 | 0.000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 |
| 121 | 20 | Pennsville Sewerage Authority | NJ0021598 | 001 | 5 | 65.1 | 23 | 1 | 63.353 | 0.042559 | 0.170237 |
| 122 | 21 | OxyChem | DE0050911 | 001 | 5 | 62.2 | 81 | 1 | 1.798 | 0.001208 | 0.004831 |
| 123 | 22 | OxyChem | DE0050911 | 002 | 5 | 62.2 | 81 | 1 | 0.168 | 0.000113 | 0.000453 |

| Serial No. | Serial No. per Zone | Facility Name | NPDES | DSN | ZONE | RM | Model Segment | Potential Group (category) | Current Loadings (Sept. 2003) mg/day | Pent-PCBs WLA mg/day | Total PCBs WLA mg/day |
|------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|-----------|------|------|------|---------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 124 | 23 | Conectiv-DelawareCity | DE0050601 | 016 | 5 | 61.9 | 22 | 2 | 0.123 | 0.000082 | 0.000330 |
| 125 | 24 | Conectiv-DelawareCity | DE0050601 | 033 | 5 | 61.9 | 22 | 2 | 0.005 | 0.000003 | 0.000012 |
| 126 | 25 | Conectiv-DelawareCity | DE0050601 | 034 | 5 | 61.9 | 22 | 2 | 0.015 | 0.000010 | 0.000040 |
| 127 | 26 | Metachem | DE0020001 | 002 | 5 | 61.9 | 22 | 1 | 1.713 | 0.001151 | 0.004604 |
| 128 | 27 | Metachem | DE0020001 | 003 | 5 | 61.9 | 22 | 1 | 2.176 | 0.001462 | 0.005848 |
| 129 | 28 | Metachem | DE0020001 | 001 | 5 | 61.5 | 21 | 2 | 81.182 | 0.054537 | 0.218147 |
| 130 | 29 | Motiva | DE0000256 | 001 | 5 | 61.5 | 21 | 2 | 0.000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 |
| 131 | 30 | Motiva | DE0000256 | 601 | 5 | 61.5 | 21 | 1 | 0.000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 |
| 132 | 31 | Kaneka Delaware Corp. | DE0000647 | 001 | 5 | 61.4 | 21 | 2 | 2.266 | 0.001522 | 0.006089 |
| 133 | 32 | Formosa Plastics | DE0000612 | 001 | 5 | 61.3 | 21 | 2 | 4.885 | 0.003281 | 0.013126 |
| 134 | 33 | Motiva | DE0000256 | 101 | 5 | 61.0 | 21 | 1 | 2843.225 | 1.910027 | 7.640108 |
| 135 | 34 | Delaware City STP (New Castle Co.) | DE0021555 | 001 | 5 | 60.1 | 18 | 2 | 4.085 | 0.002744 | 0.010976 |
| 136 | 35 | City of Salem | NJ0024856 | 001 | 5 | 58.8 | 15 | 2 | 10.062 | 0.006760 | 0.027038 |
| 137 | 36 | Port Penn STP (New Castle Co.) | DE0021539 | 001 | 5 | 54.8 | 12 | 2 | 0.487 | 0.000327 | 0.001308 |
| 138 | 37 | PSEG-HopeCreek | NJ0025411 | 461A | 5 | 52.0 | 11 | 2 | 0.000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 |
| 139 | 38 | PSEG-HopeCreek | NJ0025411 | 461C | 5 | 52.0 | 11 | 1 | 0.915 | 0.000614 | 0.002457 |
| 140 | 39 | PSEG-HopeCreek | NJ0025413 | 462A | 5 | 52.0 | 11 | 2 | 0.011 | 0.000007 | 0.000029 |
| 141 | 40 | PSEG-Salem | NJ0005622 | 485 | 5 | 51.0 | 77 | 2 | 0.000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 |
| 142 | 41 | PSEG-Salem | NJ0005622 | 489 | 5 | 51.0 | 77 | 1 | 0.984 | 0.000661 | 0.002644 |

Appendix 3

Permit Implications for NPDES Dischargers resulting from Stage 1 TMDLs for PCBs

The staged approach to establishing TMDLs for PCBs for Zones 2 to 5 of the Delaware Estuary that was presented to interested parties in April 2003 by the regulatory agencies described appropriate NPDES permitting actions that would result following the establishment of the Stage 1 TMDLs by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The criteria that were presented at that time utilized a cumulative loading approach to identify those discharges with the largest loading of penta-PCBs. The criteria have been expanded and refined since that time to include the quality of the penta-PCB data used to develop the loading estimates for the NPDES dischargers.

Approach:

NPDES dischargers (excluding CSOs and MS4s) were divided into two groups based upon the type of analytical method used to measure the 19 penta-PCB congeners, and the number of the penta-PCB congeners that were detected. Five criteria are considered in classifying NPDES point discharges into two groups.

The criteria for grouping the discharges is as follows:

1. Method used:
 - a. 1668A
 - b. 8082A
2. Discharge consists principally of non-contact cooling water.
3. If Method 1668A was used, the data was submitted at the detection limits specified in the method:
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
4. Average number of detected penta congeners per sampling event:
 - a. 4 or greater
 - b. Less than 4
5. Calculated loadings
 - a. A discharge using Method 1668A with lower detection limits which is one of a group of discharges whose total cumulative loading is less than 10% of the zone waste load allocation.

Group 1

1. All discharges, except non-contact cooling water discharges, which have detected 4 or more penta PCB congeners per sampling event regardless of the method used and detection limits achieved, with the exception of those discharges using Method 1668A at the method specified detection limits whose cumulative loadings are less than the 10 percent of zone WLAs.

Group 2

1. All discharges with less than 4 congener detected per sampling event.
2. All discharges which have detected 4 or more penta PCB congeners per sampling event using Method 1668A at the method specified detection limits whose cumulative loadings are less than the 10 percent of zone WLAs.
3. All non-contact cooling water, regardless of the number of penta congeners detected, method used, or detection limits.

Permit Requirements:

Federal regulations implementing the NPDES program at 40 CFR Part 122.44(k)(4) allow the use of non-numeric, Best Management Practices-based WQBELs where a BMP approach is the reasonably necessary means to control pollutants to achieve the goals of the Clean Water Act. The uncertainty associated with several elements of the current TMDL development process including the PCB loadings calculations, the model inputs, and the extrapolation from penta-PCBs to total PCBs support this approach for Stage 1. EPA recommends that the groups receive the following permit requirements consistent with state and federal NPDES permit regulations.

- Group 1 - Permit requirements will include waste minimization and reduction programs and additional monitoring with Method 1668A. Both requirements will be performed concurrently, and will be imposed when permit is reissued or modified. DRBC may also impose the requirements.

- Group 2 - Permit requirements will include waste minimization and reduction programs (WMRP) and additional monitoring with Method 1668A. Monitoring will be performed in the first two years to confirm the presence and concentration of PCB congeners followed by the WMRP in the third year if the monitoring results confirm the concentrations and associated loading estimates for penta-PCBs, or result in loading estimates for other PCB homologs that exceed the individual WLAs for total PCBs for the discharge.

It is recommended that both requirements will be imposed when permit is reissued or modified. DRBC may also impose the requirements for selected discharges (i.e., non-contact cooling water discharges).

Note: Dischargers in both Groups are receiving individual WLAs. Therefore, the sum of all individual WLAs plus the aggregate WLA for CSOs will equal the proportion of the TMDL for each zone that is allocated to WLAs (Zone WLA).

EPA specifically requested comment and additional information during the public comment period regarding the assignment of discharges to each group. Based upon the comments received, no changes to the group assignments were necessary. The draft TMDL document utilizes data from point discharges that were submitted by April 2003. Some dischargers utilized method 1668A for analysis, however the data reported did not adhere to method detection limits specified by the method. Therefore all dischargers which utilized method 1668A were required to re-submit data at the detection limits specified by the method. As of the April date, some dischargers had resubmitted the data, however, there remained a group of dischargers who did not provide the data by April 2003. Many of these dischargers have provided data since April and the resubmitted data has been used to generate revised loadings and number of penta congeners detected (Appendix Tables 3-2 to 3-5). The resubmitted data had essentially two effects. It typically increased the number of detected congeners and changed the loadings estimates for the discharges.


There are however, a small number of dischargers which utilized method 1668A for which we have not received resubmitted data as of September 11, 2003.

As indicated at that time, the identification of significant point source dischargers is a dynamic process that depends on several factors including the availability and extent of PCB congener data for each discharge, the flows used for each discharge, the procedure used to calculate the loadings, the location of the discharge in the estuary, and the proximity and loading of other sources of PCBs. As a result, the list of point source dischargers is subject to change both prior to December 2003 and during the development of the Stage 2 TMDLs.


Appendix Tables 3-2 to 3-5 list the discharges assigned to each group as of September 11, 2003. Individual discharges from combined sewer overflows (CSOs) and municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) have not been included in the tables. Table 9 lists the categorical allocation by zone to these two sources. Individual wasteload allocations for the point source dischargers included in the Stage 1 TMDLs are also listed in each table.

Appendix Table 3-1: Distribution of NPDES Discharges to each group in each zone of the Delaware Estuary.

| | Number of Discharges | | | | |
|---------|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | Zone 2 | Zone 3 | Zone 4 | Zone 5 | Total |
| Group 1 | 13 | 5 | 25 | 17 | 60 |
| Group 2 | 25 | 8 | 25 | 24 | 82 |
| Total | 38 | 13 | 50 | 41 | 142 |



Appendix Figure 3-1: Selection process for permit requirements for NPDES discharges using Method 8082A.



Appendix Figure 3-2: Selection process for permit requirements for NPDES discharges using Method 1668A.

Appendix Table 3-2: Data used to assign the permit requirements for NPDES discharges in Zone 2.

| Serial No. | Facility Name | DRBC ID | RM | # of DW SAMPLES | # of WW SAMPLES | Analytical Method 1668a | Submitted data at Method 1668A detection limits | Avg. # of congeners per sampling event (Sept 2003) | Non-Contact Cooling water | Current Loadings (Sept. 2003) mg/day | Cumulative loading percentage to WLA | Potential Group (category) |
|------------|---|----------------|-------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | Trenton | NJ0020923-001 | 132.2 | 3 | 3 | Yes | Yes | 11.2 | No | 243.612 | * | 1 |
| 2 | PSEG-Burlington | NJ0005002-WTPA | 117.4 | 3 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 10.3 | No | 0.929 | * | 1 |
| 3 | U.S. Steel | PA0013463-103 | 127.0 | 5 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 9.7 | No | 10.056 | * | 1 |
| 4 | U.S. Steel | PA0013463-002 | 127.4 | 3 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 9.5 | No | 61.390 | * | 1 |
| 5 | U.S. Steel | PA0013463-203 | 127.0 | 2 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 9.3 | No | 3.787 | * | 1 |
| 6 | Rohm&Haas-Bristol | PA0012769-009 | 117.1 | 3 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 9.0 | No | 5.710 | * | 1 |
| 7 | Riverside Sewerage Authority | NJ0022519-001 | 108.8 | 2 | 0 | No | N/A | 7.0 | No | 124.107 | * | 1 |
| 8 | Beverly Sewerage Authority | NJ0027481-001 | 114.7 | 1 | 0 | No | N/A | 7.0 | No | 18.890 | * | 1 |
| 9 | PSEG-Mercer | NJ0004995-441C | 130.4 | 1 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 7.0 | No | 5.010 | * | 1 |
| 10 | AFG Industries | NJ0033022-001A | 109.6 | 1 | 0 | No | N/A | 6.0 | No | 10.258 | * | 1 |
| 11 | US Pipe & Foundry | NJ0005266-002A | 118.1 | 0 | 2 | No | N/A | 5.0 | No | 0.807 | * | 1 |
| 12 | Cinnaminson Sewerage Authority | NJ0024007-001 | 108.9 | 3 | 3 | No | N/A | 4.0 | No | 27.980 | * | 1 |
| 13 | Riverton Borough | NJ0021610-001 | 110.8 | 1 | 0 | No | N/A | 4.0 | No | 3.853 | * | 1 |
| 1 | GEON Company (Burlington) Polyone | NJ0004235-001A | 120.3 | 1 | 1 | No | N/A | 3.5 | No | 15.051 | * | 2 |
| 2 | Willingboro Municipal Utilities Authority | NJ0023361-001 | 110.8 | 3 | 0 | No | N/A | 3.0 | No | 123.392 | * | 2 |
| 3 | Hamilton Township | NJ0026301-001 | 128.0 | 3 | 0 | No | N/A | 2.7 | No | 220.791 | * | 2 |
| 4 | Bristol Borough | PA0027294-001 | 118.7 | 3 | 3 | No | N/A | 2.3 | No | 29.383 | * | 2 |
| 5 | City of Burlington | NJ0024660-002 | 117.6 | 3 | 0 | No | N/A | 2.0 | No | 46.336 | * | 2 |
| 6 | Bristol Township | PA0026450-001 | 116.8 | 3 | 3 | No | N/A | 1.5 | No | 34.732 | * | 2 |
| 7 | AFG Industries | NJ0033022-002 | 109.4 | 0 | 1 | No | N/A | 1.0 | No | 0.092 | * | 2 |
| 8 | Mt. Holly Municipal Utilities Authority | NJ0024015-001 | 110.8 | 3 | 0 | No | N/A | 0.7 | No | 54.904 | * | 2 |
| 9 | Delran Sewerage Authority | NJ0023507-001 | 110.8 | 3 | 0 | No | N/A | 0.3 | No | 37.419 | * | 2 |
| 10 | Burlington Township | NJ0021709-001 | 117.0 | 3 | 0 | No | N/A | 0.3 | No | 34.901 | * | 2 |
| 11 | Florence Township | NJ0023701-001 | 121.4 | 3 | 0 | No | N/A | 0.3 | No | 15.682 | * | 2 |
| 12 | Lower Bucks County Municipal Authority | PA0026468-001 | 121.9 | 3 | 3 | No | N/A | 0.2 | No | 129.179 | * | 2 |

| Serial No. | Facility Name | DRBC ID | RM | # of DW SAMPLES | # of WW SAMPLES | Analytical Method 1668a | Submitted data at Method 1668A detection limits | Avg. # of congeners per sampling event (Sept 2003) | Non-Contact Cooling water | Current Loadings (Sept. 2003) mg/day | Cumulative loading percentage to WLA | Potential Group (category) |
|------------|--|----------------|-------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 13 | Bordentown Sewerage Authority | NJ0024678-001 | 128.0 | 3 | 3 | No | N/A | 0.2 | No | 26.292 | * | 2 |
| 14 | Mt. Laurel Municipal Utilities Authority | NJ0025178-001A | 110.8 | 3 | 0 | No | N/A | 0.0 | No | 67.433 | * | 2 |
| 15 | Morrisville WWTP | PA0026701-001 | 132.9 | 3 | 0 | No | N/A | 0.0 | No | 65.566 | * | 2 |
| 16 | Waste Management Grows Landfill | PA0043818-001 | 125.5 | 1 | 0 | No | N/A | 0.0 | No | 1.182 | * | 2 |
| 17 | MSC Pre Finish Metals | PA0045021-001 | 130.1 | 1 | 0 | No | N/A | 0.0 | No | 0.646 | * | 2 |
| 18 | Hoeganaes Corp. | NJ0004375-001A | 109.4 | 1 | 1 | No | N/A | 0.0 | No | 0.330 | * | 2 |
| 19 | Hoeganaes Corp. | NJ0004375-003A | 109.4 | 0 | 1 | No | N/A | 0.0 | No | 0.000 | * | 2 |
| 20 | Exelon-Fairless | PA0057088-001 | 126.6 | 3 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 9.0 | Yes | 0.000 | * | 2 |
| 21 | PSEG-Mercer | NJ0004995-441A | 130.4 | 3 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 6.3 | Yes | 0.000 | * | 2 |
| 22 | Colorite Polymers | NJ0004391-003A | 117.0 | 1 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 2.0 | No | 0.740 | 65.9 | 2 |
| 23 | Colorite Polymers | NJ0004391-002A | 117.0 | 1 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 4.0 | No | 0.008 | 0.7 | 2 |
| 24 | Yates Foil | NJ0004332-002A | 128.0 | 0 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 2.0 | No | 0.000 | 0.0 | 2 |
| 25 | Yates Foil | NJ0004332-001B | 128.0 | 1 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 0.0 | No | 0.070 | 6.3 | 2 |

RM: River Mile

DW: Dry Weather

WW: Wet Weather

* Cumulative loading percentages to Zone WLA (minus portions to CSOs and MS4) are shown up to 100 percent.

Appendix Table 3-3: Data used to assign the permit requirements for NPDES discharges in Zone 3.

| Serial No. | Facility Name | DRBC ID | RM | # of DW SAMPLES | # of WW SAMPLES | Analytical Method 1668a | Submitted data at Method 1668A detection limits | Avg. # of congeners per sampling event (Sept 2003) | Non-Contact Cooling water | Current Loadings (Sept. 2003) mg/day | Cumulative loading percentage to WLA | Potential Group (category) |
|------------|------------------------|----------------|-------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | PWD-NE | PA0026689-001 | 104.1 | 3 | 3 | Yes | Yes | 10.5 | No | 1238.662 | * | 1 |
| 2 | CCMUA | NJ0026182-001 | 98.0 | 3 | 3 | Yes | Yes | 10.0 | No | 818.459 | * | 1 |
| 3 | Exelon-Delaware | PA0011622-002 | 101.2 | 3 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 9.7 | No | 0.655 | 92.5 | 1 |
| 4 | PWD-SE | PA0026662-001 | 96.8 | 3 | 3 | Yes | Yes | 9.7 | No | 657.721 | * | 1 |
| 5 | Rohm&Haas-Philadelphia | PA0012777-003 | 106.1 | 1 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 7.0 | No | 2.175 | * | 1 |
| 1 | NGC Industries | NJ0004669-001A | 104.4 | 1 | 1 | No | N/A | 0.0 | No | 1.528 | * | 2 |
| 2 | Palmyra Borough | NJ0024449-001 | 107.7 | 1 | 0 | No | N/A | 0.0 | No | 19.235 | * | 2 |
| 3 | Exelon-Delaware | PA0011622-006 | 101.1 | 3 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 9.3 | Yes | 0.000 | * | 2 |
| 4 | Rohm&Haas-Philadelphia | PA0012777-001 | 106.1 | 3 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 3.8 | No | 15.974 | * | 2 |
| 5 | Citgo Petroleum | NJ0131342-001A | 103.4 | 1 | 0 | Yes | No | 0.0 | No | 0.012 | * | 2 |
| 6 | Rohm&Haas-Philadelphia | PA0012777-007 | 106.1 | 1 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 6.0 | No | 0.003 | 0.4 | 2 |
| 7 | Exelon-Delaware | PA0011622-004 | 101.2 | 0 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 11.0 | No | 0.011 | 1.8 | 2 |
| 8 | Exelon-Delaware | PA0011622-001 | 101.2 | 0 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 12.0 | No | 0.044 | 7.5 | 2 |

RM: River Mile

DW: Dry Weather

WW: Wet Weather

* Cumulative loading percentages to Zone WLA (minus portions to CSOs and MS4) are shown up to 100 percent.

Appendix Table 3-4: Data used to assign the permit requirements for NPDES discharges in Zone 4.

| Serial No. | Facility Name | DRBC ID | RM | # of DW SAMPLES | # of WW SAMPLES | Analytical Method 1668a | Submitted data at Method 1668A detection limits | Avg. # of congeners per sampling event (Sept 2003) | Non-Contact Cooling water | Current Loadings (Sept. 2003) mg/day | Cumulative loading percentage to WLA | Potential Group (category) |
|------------|------------------|----------------|------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | Dupont-Repauno | NJ0004219-007 | 86.6 | 0 | 1 | No | N/A | 12.0 | No | 1.433 | * | 1 |
| 2 | Exelon-Eddystone | PA0013716-001 | 85.2 | 0 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 12.0 | No | 0.064 | 14.2 | 1 |
| 3 | Dupont-Repauno | NJ0004219-001A | 85.6 | 3 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 11.5 | No | 80.773 | * | 1 |
| 4 | Boeing | PA0013323-002 | 85.4 | 1 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 11.5 | No | 158.353 | * | 1 |
| 5 | Kvaerner | PA0057690-019 | 92.8 | 0 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 11.0 | No | 0.100 | 57.0 | 1 |
| 6 | Kvaerner | PA0057690-021 | 92.8 | 0 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 11.0 | No | 0.100 | 73.3 | 1 |
| 7 | Boeing | PA0013323-001 | 85.2 | 1 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 11.0 | No | 29.068 | * | 1 |
| 8 | PWD-SW | PA0026671-001 | 90.7 | 3 | 3 | Yes | Yes | 10.8 | No | 1020.466 | * | 1 |
| 9 | Valero Refining | NJ0005029-001A | 87.7 | 4 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 10.6 | No | 99.473 | * | 1 |
| 10 | Exelon-Eddystone | PA0013716-005 | 85.2 | 0 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 10.0 | No | 0.509 | * | 1 |
| 11 | Ausimont | NJ0005185-001A | 90.7 | 0 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 10.0 | No | 0.840 | * | 1 |
| 12 | Boeing | PA0013323-003 | 85.2 | 0 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 9.0 | No | 0.404 | * | 1 |
| 13 | Boeing | PA0013323-016 | 85.4 | 0 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 8.0 | No | 0.149 | 97.5 | 1 |
| 14 | Boeing | PA0013323-007 | 85.2 | 0 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 8.0 | No | 0.235 | * | 1 |
| 15 | Tinicum Township | PA0028380-001 | 85.4 | 3 | 3 | Yes | Yes | 8.0 | No | 15.450 | * | 1 |
| 16 | Safety Kleen | NJ0005240-002A | 79.8 | 0 | 1 | No | N/A | 7.0 | No | 3.512 | * | 1 |
| 17 | Kvaerner | PA0057690-012 | 92.7 | 3 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 7.0 | No | 22.608 | * | 1 |
| 18 | DELCORA | PA0027103-001 | 80.6 | 3 | 3 | Yes | Yes | 6.7 | No | 309.423 | * | 1 |
| 19 | GCUA | NJ0024686-001 | 88.4 | 5 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 6.4 | No | 113.497 | * | 1 |
| 20 | ConocoPhillips | PA0012637-008 | 80.2 | 0 | 1 | No | N/A | 6.0 | No | 0.111 | * | 1 |
| 21 | Metro Machine | PA0057479-DD2 | 93.2 | 4 | 0 | No | N/A | 6.0 | No | 49.040 | * | 1 |
| 22 | Hercules | NJ0005134-001A | 87.5 | 1 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 6.0 | No | 4.120 | * | 1 |
| 23 | Kimberly Clark | PA0013081-029 | 83.2 | 0 | 2 | Yes | Yes | 5.5 | No | 0.086 | 40.6 | 1 |
| 24 | ConocoPhillips | PA0012637-007 | 80.2 | 0 | 1 | No | N/A | 5.0 | No | 0.511 | * | 1 |
| 25 | Ausimont | NJ0005185-002A | 90.7 | 1 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 5.0 | No | 0.077 | 26.7 | 1 |

| Serial No. | Facility Name | DRBC ID | RM | # of DW SAMPLES | # of WW SAMPLES | Analytical Method 1668a | Submitted data at Method 1668A detection limits | Avg. # of congeners per sampling event (Sept 2003) | Non-Contact Cooling water | Current Loadings (Sept. 2003) mg/day | Cumulative loading percentage to WLA | Potential Group (category) |
|------------|--|----------------|------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | ConocoPhillips | PA0012637-006 | 80.2 | 0 | 1 | No | N/A | 3.0 | No | 0.029 | * | 2 |
| 2 | Coastal Mart / Coastal Eagle Point Oil | NJ0005401-003A | 94.7 | 0 | 1 | No | N/A | 2.0 | No | 0.006 | * | 2 |
| 3 | ConocoPhillips | PA0012637-002 | 80.2 | 3 | 1 | No | N/A | 1.5 | Yes | 0.000 | * | 2 |
| 4 | ConocoPhillips | PA0012637-101 | 79.6 | 3 | 1 | No | N/A | 1.0 | Yes | 0.000 | * | 2 |
| 5 | Swedesboro | NJ0022021-001 | 79.8 | 1 | 0 | No | N/A | 1.0 | No | 3.296 | * | 2 |
| 6 | Logan Township | NJ0027545-001 | 79.5 | 1 | 1 | No | N/A | 1.0 | No | 12.114 | * | 2 |
| 7 | Safety Kleen | NJ0005240-001A | 79.8 | 3 | 0 | No | N/A | 0.7 | No | 7.440 | * | 2 |
| 8 | Metro Machine | PA0057479-DD3 | 93.1 | 3 | 0 | No | N/A | 0.7 | No | 17.845 | * | 2 |
| 9 | Chevron | NJ0064696-001A | 90.5 | 1 | 0 | No | N/A | 0.0 | No | 0.157 | * | 2 |
| 10 | Harrison Township-Mullica Hill | NJ0020532-001 | 79.8 | 1 | 0 | No | N/A | 0.0 | No | 6.093 | * | 2 |
| 11 | DeGuessa-Huls Corp. | PA0051713-001 | 82.2 | 1 | 0 | No | N/A | 0.0 | No | 9.063 | * | 2 |
| 12 | Air Products | NJ0004278-001A | 88.2 | 1 | 0 | No | N/A | 0.0 | No | 10.041 | * | 2 |
| 13 | Greenwich Township | NJ0030333-001 | 87.0 | 1 | 0 | No | N/A | 0.0 | No | 12.110 | * | 2 |
| 14 | ConocoPhillips | PA0012637-201 | 79.6 | 3 | 0 | No | N/A | 0.0 | No | 48.580 | * | 2 |
| 15 | Coastal Mart / Coastal Eagle Point Oil | NJ0005401-001A | 94.3 | 3 | 0 | No | N/A | 0.0 | No | 55.368 | * | 2 |
| 16 | Exelon-Eddystone | PA0013716-008 | 85.2 | 4 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 11.8 | Yes | 0.000 | * | 2 |
| 17 | Exelon-Eddystone | PA0013716-007 | 85.2 | 3 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 11.7 | Yes | 0.000 | * | 2 |
| 18 | Solutia | NJ0005045-001 | 79.2 | 3 | 0 | Yes | No | 1.3 | No | 12.228 | * | 2 |
| 19 | Colonial Pipeline | NJ0033952-001A | 90.5 | 0 | 1 | Yes | No | 0.0 | No | 0.087 | * | 2 |
| 20 | BP Paulsboro | NJ0005584-002A | 89.6 | 0 | 1 | Yes | No | 0.0 | No | 0.352 | * | 2 |
| 21 | BP Paulsboro | NJ0005584-003A | 89.4 | 1 | 0 | Yes | No | 0.0 | No | 7.006 | * | 2 |
| 22 | Sunoco-PointBreeze | PA0012629-002 | 92.5 | 3 | 3 | Yes | No | 0.0 | No | 75.899 | * | 2 |
| 23 | Sunoco-GirardPoint | PA0011533-015 | 92.5 | 3 | 3 | Yes | No | 0.0 | No | 99.167 | * | 2 |
| 24 | Kvaerner | PA0057690-047 | 92.5 | 0 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 10.0 | No | 0.005 | 0.8 | 2 |
| 25 | Boeing | PA0013323-008 | 85.2 | 0 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 13.0 | No | 0.018 | 3.7 | 2 |

Appendix Table 3-5: Data used to assign the permit requirements for NPDES discharges in Zone 5.

| Serial No. | Facility Name | DRBC ID | RM | # of DW SAMPLES | # of WW SAMPLES | Analytical Method 1668a | Submitted data at Method 1668A detection limits | Avg. # of congeners per sampling event (Sept 2003) | Non-Contact Cooling water | Current Loadings (Sept. 2003) mg/day | Cumulative loading percentage to WLA | Potential Group (category) |
|------------|------------------------------------|----------------|------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | AMTRAK | DE0050962-003 | 70.7 | 0 | 3 | Yes | Yes | 12.3 | No | 2.002 | * | 1 |
| 2 | AMTRAK | DE0050962-004 | 70.7 | 0 | 3 | Yes | Yes | 12.0 | No | 35.822 | * | 1 |
| 3 | OxyChem | DE0050911-002 | 62.2 | 0 | 3 | Yes | Yes | 11.0 | No | 0.168 | 16.8 | 1 |
| 4 | Conectiv-Deepwater | NJ0005363-017 | 69.1 | 0 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 11.0 | No | 0.284 | 25.9 | 1 |
| 5 | PSEG-Salem | NJ0005622-489 | 51.0 | 1 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 11.0 | No | 0.984 | 86.5 | 1 |
| 6 | Metachem | DE0020001-003 | 61.9 | 0 | 4 | No | N/A | 9.5 | No | 2.176 | * | 1 |
| 7 | Metachem | DE0020001-002 | 61.9 | 0 | 3 | No | N/A | 9.3 | No | 1.713 | * | 1 |
| 8 | Dupont-Edgemoor | DE0000051-004 | 72.2 | 0 | 3 | Yes | Yes | 9.0 | No | 0.153 | 11.5 | 1 |
| 9 | Dupont-Edgemoor | DE0000051-001 | 73.2 | 3 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 8.7 | No | 32.214 | * | 1 |
| 10 | Dupont-ChamberWorks | NJ0005100-662 | 69.8 | 3 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 8.7 | No | 102.854 | * | 1 |
| 11 | Dupont-ChamberWorks | NJ0005100-001 | 69.8 | 3 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 8.0 | No | 138.476 | * | 1 |
| 12 | Motiva | DE0000256-101 | 61.0 | 3 | 3 | Yes | Yes | 7.5 | No | 2843.225 | * | 1 |
| 13 | OxyChem | DE0050911-001 | 62.2 | 3 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 7.0 | No | 1.798 | * | 1 |
| 14 | Penns Grove Sewer Authority | NJ0024023-001 | 70.7 | 1 | 0 | No | N/A | 7.0 | No | 23.206 | * | 1 |
| 15 | PSEG-HopeCreek | NJ0025411-461C | 52.0 | 1 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 5.0 | No | 0.915 | 55.1 | 1 |
| 16 | Motiva | DE0000256-601 | 61.5 | 3 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 5.0 | No | 0.000 ** | * | 1 |
| 17 | Pennsville Sewerage Authority | NJ0021598-001 | 65.1 | 3 | 0 | No | N/A | 4.7 | No | 63.353 | * | 1 |
| 1 | Carney's Point | NJ0021601-001 | 71.3 | 3 | 0 | No | N/A | 2.7 | No | 10.265 | * | 2 |
| 2 | General Chemical | DE0000655-001 | 77.9 | 3 | 3 | No | N/A | 2.2 | Yes | 0.000 | * | 2 |
| 3 | Port Penn STP (New Castle Co.) | DE0021539-001 | 54.8 | 1 | 0 | No | N/A | 1.0 | No | 0.487 | * | 2 |
| 4 | Metachem | DE0020001-001 | 61.5 | 3 | 3 | No | N/A | 1.0 | No | 81.182 | * | 2 |
| 5 | City of Wilmington | DE0020320-001 | 71.6 | 3 | 3 | No | N/A | 0.8 | No | 1297.745 | * | 2 |
| 6 | Geon Company (Pedricktown) Polyone | NJ0004286-003 | 75.9 | 0 | 1 | No | N/A | 0.0 | No | 0.011 | * | 2 |
| 7 | Geon Company (Pedricktown) Polyone | NJ0004286-001A | 74.9 | 1 | 0 | No | N/A | 0.0 | No | 1.690 | * | 2 |
| 8 | Kaneka Delaware Corp. | DE0000647-001 | 61.4 | 1 | 1 | No | N/A | 0.0 | No | 2.266 | * | 2 |
| 9 | Delaware City STP (New Castle Co.) | DE0021555-001 | 60.1 | 1 | 0 | No | N/A | 0.0 | No | 4.085 | * | 2 |

| Serial No. | Facility Name | DRBC ID | RM | # of DW SAMPLES | # of WW SAMPLES | Analytical Method 1668a | Submitted data at Method 1668A detection limits | Avg. # of congeners per sampling event (Sept 2003) | Non-Contact Cooling water | Current Loadings (Sept. 2003) mg/day | Cumulative loading percentage to WLA | Potential Group (category) |
|------------|-----------------------|----------------|------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 10 | Formosa Plastics | DE0000612-001 | 61.3 | 1 | 0 | No | N/A | 0.0 | No | 4.885 | * | 2 |
| 11 | City of Salem | NJ0024856-001 | 58.8 | 3 | 0 | No | N/A | 0.0 | No | 10.062 | * | 2 |
| 12 | PSEG-HopeCreek | NJ0025411-461A | 52.0 | 3 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 9.7 | Yes | 0.000 | * | 2 |
| 13 | Dupont-ChamberWorks | NJ0005100-013 | 68.9 | 3 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 9.3 | Yes | 0.000 | * | 2 |
| 14 | PSEG-Salem | NJ0005622-485 | 51.0 | 3 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 9.0 | Yes | 0.000 | * | 2 |
| 15 | Motiva | DE0000256-001 | 61.5 | 3 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 8.7 | Yes | 0.000 | * | 2 |
| 16 | Conectiv-Deepwater | NJ0005363-003A | 69.1 | 1 | 0 | Yes | Yes | 8.0 | Yes | 0.000 | * | 2 |
| 17 | Dupont-ChamberWorks | NJ0005100-011 | 68.9 | 1 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 11.0 | No | 0.004 | 0.1 | 2 |
| 18 | Conectiv-DelawareCity | DE0050601-033 | 61.9 | 0 | 3 | Yes | Yes | 11.7 | No | 0.005 | 0.3 | 2 |
| 19 | Conectiv-Deepwater | NJ0005363-006 | 69.1 | 0 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 12.0 | No | 0.006 | 0.5 | 2 |
| 20 | Conectiv-Edgemoor | DE0000558-041 | 71.8 | 0 | 3 | Yes | Yes | 10.7 | No | 0.008 | 0.7 | 2 |
| 21 | PSEG-HopeCreek | NJ0025411-462A | 52.0 | 0 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 0.0 | No | 0.011 | 1.0 | 2 |
| 22 | Conectiv-DelawareCity | DE0050601-034 | 61.9 | 0 | 4 | Yes | Yes | 11.5 | No | 0.015 | 1.5 | 2 |
| 23 | Conectiv-Deepwater | NJ0005363-005 | 69.1 | 0 | 1 | Yes | Yes | 10.0 | No | 0.035 | 2.6 | 2 |
| 24 | Conectiv-DelawareCity | DE0050601-016 | 61.9 | 0 | 3 | Yes | Yes | 11.7 | No | 0.123 | 6.6 | 2 |

RM: River Mile

DW: Dry Weather

WW: Wet Weather

* Cumulative loading percentages to Zone WLA (minus portions to CSOs and MS4) are shown up to 100 percent.

** Flow is set to zero in the loading calculation because DSN 601 is an upstream monitoring point of DSN 101.

Appendix 4

Contaminated Sites and Municipalities with Combined Sewer Overflows (CSOs)
that were evaluated as part of the Stage 1 TMDLs

Appendix Table 4-1: Contaminated Sites evaluated as part of the Stage 1 TMDLs and their estimated Penta-PCB Load.

| <u>Facility</u> | <u>Daily penta-PCB Load (kg/day)</u> | <u>Estimate Prepared by</u> |
|---|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Castle Ford - DE-192 | 1.4374E-06 | EPA |
| Forbes Steel & Wire Corp. - DE-165 | 5.1989E-06 | EPA |
| Rogers Corner Dump - DE-246 | 1.0465E-04 | EPA |
| Industrial Products - DE-030 | 5.1129E-05 | EPA |
| Chicago Bridge and Iron - DE-038 | 3.2768E-03 | EPA |
| ABM-Wade, 58th Street Dump - PA-0179 | 1.9739E-06 | EPA |
| O'Donnell Steel Drum - PA-0305 | 3.4939E-07 | EPA |
| Conrail-Wayne Junction - PA-215 | 2.3043E-03 | EPA |
| CONRAIL, Morrisville Lagoons - PA-441* | 5.4056E-06 | EPA |
| Pennwalt Corp. - Cornwells Heights - PA-0031* | 3.1227E-07 | EPA |
| Front Street Tanker - PA-2298 | 1.9914E-06 | EPA |
| 8th Street Drum - PA-3272 | 8.9655E-07 | EPA |
| East 10th Street Site - PA-2869 | 1.0076E-02 | EPA |
| Metal Bank - PA-2119 | 9.9092E-05 | EPA |
| Lower Darby Creek Area Site - PA-3424 | 1.8481E-04 | EPA |
| Roebing Steel Co. | 4.9609E-05 | EPA |
| Bridgeport Rental & Oil Services (BROS) | 5.8140E-04 | EPA |
| Dana Transport Inc. | 3.8523E-08 | EPA |
| Harrison Avenue Landfill | 6.2542E-03 | EPA |
| Metal Bank groundwater pathway | 9.8312E-07 | DRBC |
| AMTRAK Former Refueling Facility | 1.3182E-03 | DNREC |
| Gates Engineering | 6.8226E-10 | DNREC |
| AMTRAK Wilmington Railyard | 1.6238E-03 | DNREC |
| Diamond State Salvage | 0.0000E+00 | DNREC |
| NeCastro Auto Salvage | 1.2867E-05 | DNREC |
| Hercules Research Center | 4.6121E-06 | DNREC |
| Dravo Ship Yard | 5.3216E-05 | DNREC |
| DP&L/Congo Marsh | 2.7290E-07 | DNREC |
| American Scrap & Waste | 7.4230E-04 | DNREC |
| Pusey & Jones Shipyard | 1.6033E-06 | DNREC |
| Delaware Car Company | 0.0000E+00 | DNREC |
| Bafundo Roofing | 1.5692E-04 | DNREC |
| Kreiger Finger Property | 1.5828E-04 | DNREC |
| Clayville Dump | 0.0000E+00 | DNREC |
| Electric Hose & Rubber | 8.8694E-05 | DNREC |
| Penn Del Metal Recycling | 1.1407E-04 | DNREC |
| E. 7th Street North & South | 5.7992E-05 | DNREC |
| Delaware Compressed Steel | 6.2877E-06 | DNREC |
| Newport City Landfill | 0.0000E+00 | DNREC |
| DuPont Louviers – MBNA | 9.5516E-08 | DNREC |
| North American Smelting Co. | 1.2821E-05 | DNREC |
| RSC Realty | 3.4113E-05 | DNREC |
| AMTRAK CNOC | 0.0000E+00 | DNREC |
| Wilmington Coal Gas – N | 2.2378E-06 | DNREC |

| <u>Facility</u> | <u>Daily penta-PCB Load (kg/day)</u> | <u>Estimate Prepared by</u> |
|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| Del Chapel Place | 2.2515E-06 | DNREC |
| Kruse Playground | 1.0643E-06 | DNREC |
| Budd Metal | 6.3450E-06 | DNREC |
| Fox Point Park Phase II | 1.1708E-04 | DNREC |
| Bensalem Redev LP (Elf Atochem) | 1.7561E-05 | PADEP |

Appendix Table 4-2: Municipalities or Regional Authorities with Combined Sewer Overflows (CSOs) that were evaluated as part of the Stage 1 TMDLs

| Municipality/Regional Authority | NPDES Nos. | Zone |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| City of Philadelphia Water Department | PA0026662 PA0026671 PA0026689 | 2, 3 and 4 |
| Camden County Municipal Utilities Authority | NJ0108812 NJ0026182 | 3 and 4 |
| Delaware County Regional Authority (DELCORA) | PA0027103 | 4 |
| City of Wilmington | DE0020320 | 5 |

Appendix 5

Municipalities in Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania,
designated as Phase II Separate Stormwater Sewer Systems (MS4s)
within urbanized areas in the Delaware River Watershed

Appendix Table 5-1: Municipalities with Separate Stormwater Sewer Systems that have the potential to be included in the waste load allocation (LA) for PCBs for Zones 2 to 5 of the Delaware Estuary.

| <u>STATE</u> | <u>COUNTY NAME</u> | <u>MUNICIPALITY NAME</u> | <u>STATE</u> | <u>COUNTY NAME</u> | <u>MUNICIPALITY NAME</u> |
|--------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| DE | KENT | CAMDEN TOWN | | | |
| DE | KENT | DOVER CITY | NJ | ATLANTIC | BUENA BORO |
| DE | KENT | KENT COUNTY | NJ | ATLANTIC | BUENA VISTA TWP |
| DE | NEW CASTLE | NEWARK CITY | NJ | BURLINGTON | BEVERLY CITY |
| | NEW CASTLE/DE | | NJ | BURLINGTON | BORDENTOWN CITY |
| DE | DOT | ARDEN | NJ | BURLINGTON | BORDENTOWN TWP |
| DE | NEW CASTLE/DE DOT | ARDENTOWN | NJ | BURLINGTON | BURLINGTON CITY |
| DE | NEW CASTLE/DE DOT | ARDENCROFT | NJ | BURLINGTON | BURLINGTON TWP |
| DE | NEW CASTLE/DE DOT | BELLEFONTE | NJ | BURLINGTON | CHESTERFIELD TWP |
| DE | NEW CASTLE/DE DOT | DELAWARE CITY | NJ | BURLINGTON | CINNAMINSON TWP |
| DE | NEW CASTLE/DE DOT | ELSMERE | NJ | BURLINGTON | CINNAMINSON TWP |
| DE | NEW CASTLE/DE DOT | MIDDLETOWN | NJ | BURLINGTON | DELANCO TWP |
| DE | NEW CASTLE/DE DOT | NEWPORT | NJ | BURLINGTON | DELTRAN TWP |
| DE | NEW CASTLE/DE DOT | NEW CASTLE | NJ | BURLINGTON | EASTAMPTON TWP |
| DE | NEW CASTLE/DE DOT | ODESSA | NJ | BURLINGTON | EDGEWATER PARK TWP |
| DE | NEW CASTLE/DE DOT | TOWNSEND | NJ | BURLINGTON | EVESHAM TWP |
| DE | NEW CASTLE/DE DOT | CITY OF | NJ | BURLINGTON | EVESHAM TWP |
| | | WILMINGTON | NJ | BURLINGTON | FIELDSBORO BORO |
| DE | KENT | WYOMING TOWN | NJ | BURLINGTON | FLORENCE TWP |
| | | | NJ | BURLINGTON | HAINESPORT TWP |
| | | | NJ | BURLINGTON | LUMBERTON TWP |
| | | | NJ | BURLINGTON | MANSFIELD TWP |
| | | | NJ | BURLINGTON | MAPLE SHADE TWP |
| | | | NJ | BURLINGTON | MEDFORD LAKES BORO |
| | | | NJ | BURLINGTON | MEDFORD TWP |
| | | | NJ | BURLINGTON | MOORESTOWN TWP |
| | | | NJ | BURLINGTON | MOORESTOWN TWP |
| | | | NJ | BURLINGTON | MOUNT HOLLY TWP |

| <u>STATE</u> | <u>COUNTY NAME</u> | <u>MUNICIPALITY NAME</u> | <u>STATE</u> | <u>COUNTY NAME</u> | <u>MUNICIPALITY NAME</u> |
|--------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| NJ | BURLINGTON | MOUNT LAUREL TWP | NJ | CAMDEN | GIBBSBORO BORO |
| NJ | BURLINGTON | MOUNT LAUREL TWP | NJ | CAMDEN | GIBBSBORO BORO |
| NJ | BURLINGTON | NEW HANOVER TWP | NJ | CAMDEN | GIBBSBORO BORO |
| NJ | BURLINGTON | NORTH HANOVER TWP | NJ | CAMDEN | GLOUCESTER CITY |
| NJ | BURLINGTON | PALMYRA BORO | NJ | CAMDEN | GLOUCESTER CITY |
| NJ | BURLINGTON | PALMYRA BORO | NJ | CAMDEN | GLOUCESTER TWP |
| NJ | BURLINGTON | PEMBERTON BORO | NJ | CAMDEN | GLOUCESTER TWP |
| NJ | BURLINGTON | PEMBERTON TWP | NJ | CAMDEN | HADDON HEIGHTS BORO |
| NJ | BURLINGTON | RIVERSIDE TWP | NJ | CAMDEN | HADDON TWP (EAST) |
| NJ | BURLINGTON | RIVERTON BORO | NJ | CAMDEN | HADDON TWP (NORTH) |
| NJ | BURLINGTON | SHAMONG TWP | NJ | CAMDEN | HADDON TWP (SOUTH) |
| NJ | BURLINGTON | SOUTHAMPTON TWP | NJ | CAMDEN | HADDONFIELD BORO |
| NJ | BURLINGTON | SPRINGFIELD TWP | NJ | CAMDEN | HI-NELLA BORO |
| NJ | BURLINGTON | TABERNACLE TWP | NJ | CAMDEN | LAUREL SPRINGS BORO |
| NJ | BURLINGTON | TABERNACLE TWP | NJ | CAMDEN | LAWNSIDE BORO |
| NJ | BURLINGTON | WESTAMPTON TWP | NJ | CAMDEN | LINDENWOLD BORO |
| NJ | BURLINGTON | WILLINGBORO TWP | NJ | CAMDEN | MAGNOLIA BORO |
| NJ | BURLINGTON | WOODLAND TWP | NJ | CAMDEN | MERCHANTVILLE BORO |
| NJ | BURLINGTON | WRIGHTSTOWN BORO | NJ | CAMDEN | MOUNT EPHRAIM BORO |
| NJ | CAMDEN | AUDUBON BORO | NJ | CAMDEN | OAKLYN BORO |
| NJ | CAMDEN | AUDUBON PARK BORO | NJ | CAMDEN | PENNSAUKEN TWP |
| NJ | CAMDEN | BARRINGTON BORO | NJ | CAMDEN | PINE HILL BORO |
| NJ | CAMDEN | BELLMAWR BORO | NJ | CAMDEN | PINE HILL BORO |
| NJ | CAMDEN | BERLIN BORO | NJ | CAMDEN | PINE VALLEY BORO |
| NJ | CAMDEN | BERLIN TWP | NJ | CAMDEN | RUNNEMEDE BORO |
| NJ | CAMDEN | BERLIN TWP | NJ | CAMDEN | SOMERDALE BORO |
| NJ | CAMDEN | BROOKLAWN BORO | NJ | CAMDEN | STRATFORD BORO |
| NJ | CAMDEN | CAMDEN CITY | NJ | CAMDEN | TAVISTOCK BORO |
| NJ | CAMDEN | CHERRY HILL TWP | NJ | CAMDEN | VOORHEES TWP |
| NJ | CAMDEN | CLEMENTON BORO | NJ | CAMDEN | VOORHEES TWP |
| NJ | CAMDEN | COLLINGSWOOD BORO | | | |

| <u>STATE</u> | <u>COUNTY NAME</u> | <u>MUNICIPALITY NAME</u> | <u>STATE</u> | <u>COUNTY NAME</u> | <u>MUNICIPALITY NAME</u> |
|--------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| NJ | CAMDEN | VOORHEES TWP | NJ | GLOUCESTER | DEPTFORD TWP |
| NJ | CAMDEN | VOORHEES TWP | NJ | GLOUCESTER | EAST GREENWICH TWP |
| NJ | CAMDEN | WINSLOW TWP | NJ | GLOUCESTER | ELK TWP |
| NJ | CAMDEN | WINSLOW TWP | NJ | GLOUCESTER | ELK TWP |
| NJ | CAMDEN | WINSLOW TWP | NJ | GLOUCESTER | ELK TWP |
| NJ | CAMDEN | WOODLYNNE BORO | NJ | GLOUCESTER | FRANKLIN TWP |
| NJ | CAPE_MAY | CAPE MAY POINT BORO | NJ | GLOUCESTER | GLASSBORO BORO |
| NJ | CAPE_MAY | DENNIS TWP | NJ | GLOUCESTER | GLASSBORO BORO |
| NJ | CAPE_MAY | LOWER TWP | NJ | GLOUCESTER | GREENWICH TWP |
| NJ | CAPE_MAY | LOWER TWP | NJ | GLOUCESTER | HARRISON TWP |
| NJ | CAPE_MAY | MIDDLE TWP | NJ | GLOUCESTER | LOGAN TWP |
| NJ | CAPE_MAY | WEST CAPE MAY BORO | NJ | GLOUCESTER | LOGAN TWP |
| NJ | CAPE_MAY | WOODBINE BORO | NJ | GLOUCESTER | MANTUA TWP |
| NJ | CUMBERLAND | BRIDGETON CITY | NJ | GLOUCESTER | MONROE TWP |
| NJ | CUMBERLAND | COMMERCIAL TWP | NJ | GLOUCESTER | MONROE TWP |
| NJ | CUMBERLAND | DEERFIELD TWP | NJ | GLOUCESTER | MONROE TWP |
| NJ | CUMBERLAND | DOWNE TWP | NJ | GLOUCESTER | NATIONAL PARK BORO |
| NJ | CUMBERLAND | FAIRFIELD TWP | NJ | GLOUCESTER | NEWFIELD BORO |
| NJ | CUMBERLAND | GREENWICH TWP | NJ | GLOUCESTER | PAULSBORO BORO |
| NJ | CUMBERLAND | HOPEWELL TWP | NJ | GLOUCESTER | PITMAN BORO |
| NJ | CUMBERLAND | LAWRENCE TWP | NJ | GLOUCESTER | SOUTH HARRISON TWP |
| NJ | CUMBERLAND | MAURICE RIVER TWP | NJ | GLOUCESTER | SOUTH HARRISON TWP |
| NJ | CUMBERLAND | MILLVILLE CITY | NJ | GLOUCESTER | SWEDESBORO BORO |
| NJ | CUMBERLAND | SHILOH BORO | NJ | GLOUCESTER | WASHINGTON TWP |
| NJ | CUMBERLAND | STOW CREEK TWP | NJ | GLOUCESTER | WASHINGTON TWP |
| NJ | CUMBERLAND | UPPER DEERFIELD TWP | NJ | GLOUCESTER | WASHINGTON TWP |
| NJ | CUMBERLAND | VINELAND CITY | NJ | GLOUCESTER | WENONAH BORO |
| NJ | GLOUCESTER | CLAYTON BORO | NJ | GLOUCESTER | WEST DEPTFORD TWP |
| NJ | GLOUCESTER | DEPTFORD TWP | NJ | GLOUCESTER | WEST DEPTFORD TWP |
| NJ | GLOUCESTER | DEPTFORD TWP | NJ | GLOUCESTER | WESTVILLE BORO |

| <u>STATE</u> | <u>COUNTY NAME</u> | <u>MUNICIPALITY NAME</u> | <u>STATE</u> | <u>COUNTY NAME</u> | <u>MUNICIPALITY NAME</u> |
|--------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| NJ | GLOUCESTER | WOODBURY CITY | NJ | SALEM | OLDMANS TWP |
| NJ | GLOUCESTER | WOODBURY CITY | NJ | SALEM | PENNS GROVE BORO |
| | | WOODBURY HEIGHTS | NJ | SALEM | PENNSVILLE TWP |
| NJ | GLOUCESTER | BORO | NJ | SALEM | PILESGROVE TWP |
| NJ | GLOUCESTER | WOOLWICH TWP | NJ | SALEM | PITTSGROVE TWP |
| NJ | GLOUCESTER | WOOLWICH TWP | NJ | SALEM | QUINTON TWP |
| NJ | MERCER | HAMILTON TWP | NJ | SALEM | QUINTON TWP |
| NJ | MERCER | TRENTON CITY | NJ | SALEM | SALEM CITY |
| NJ | MERCER | TRENTON CITY | | | UPPER PITTSGROVE |
| NJ | MERCER | WASHINGTON TWP | NJ | SALEM | TWP |
| NJ | MONMOUTH | ALLENTOWN BORO | | | UPPER PITTSGROVE |
| NJ | MONMOUTH | MILLSTONE TWP | NJ | SALEM | TWP |
| NJ | MONMOUTH | UPPER FREEHOLD TWP | NJ | SALEM | WOODSTOWN BORO |
| NJ | OCEAN | JACKSON TWP | | | |
| NJ | OCEAN | JACKSON TWP | | | |
| NJ | OCEAN | JACKSON TWP | | | |
| NJ | OCEAN | LACEY TWP | | | |
| NJ | OCEAN | MANCHESTER TWP | | | |
| NJ | OCEAN | PLUMSTED TWP | | | |
| NJ | SALEM | ALLOWAY TWP | | | |
| NJ | SALEM | ALLOWAY TWP | | | |
| NJ | SALEM | CARNEYS POINT TWP | | | |
| NJ | SALEM | ELMER BORO | | | |
| NJ | SALEM | EL SINBORO TWP | | | |
| | | LOWER ALLOWAYS | | | |
| NJ | SALEM | CREEK TWP | | | |
| | | LOWER ALLOWAYS | | | |
| NJ | SALEM | CREEK TWP | | | |
| | | LOWER ALLOWAYS | | | |
| NJ | SALEM | CREEK TWP | | | |
| NJ | SALEM | MANNINGTON TWP | | | |

| <u>STATE</u> | <u>COUNTY NAME</u> | <u>MUNICIPALITY NAME</u> | <u>STATE</u> | <u>COUNTY NAME</u> | <u>MUNICIPALITY NAME</u> |
|--------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| PA | BUCKS | BENSALEM TWP. | PA | BUCKS | UPPER MAKEFIELD TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | BRISTOL BORO | PA | BUCKS | UPPER SOUTHAMPTON TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | BRISTOL TWP. | PA | BUCKS | WARMINSTER TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | BUCKINGHAM TWP. | PA | BUCKS | WARRINGTON TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | BUCKS COUNTY | PA | BUCKS | WARWICK TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | CHALFONT BORO | PA | BUCKS | WEST ROCKHILL TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | DOYLESTOWN BORO | PA | BUCKS | WRIGHTSTOWN TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | DOYLESTOWN TWP. | PA | BUCKS | YARDLEY BORO |
| PA | BUCKS | EAST ROCKHILL TWP. | PA | CHESTER | AVONDALE BORO |
| PA | BUCKS | FALLS TWP. | PA | CHESTER | BIRMINGHAM TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | HILLTOWN TWP. | PA | CHESTER | CALN TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | HULMEVILLE BORO | PA | CHESTER | CHARLESTOWN TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | IVYLAND BORO | PA | CHESTER | CHESTER COUNTY |
| PA | BUCKS | LANGHORNE BORO | PA | CHESTER | COATESVILLE CITY |
| PA | BUCKS | LANGHORNE MANOR BORO | PA | CHESTER | DOWNINGTOWN BORO |
| PA | BUCKS | LOWER MAKEFIELD TWP. | PA | CHESTER | EAST BRADFORD TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | LOWER SOUTHAMPTON TWP. | PA | CHESTER | EAST BRANDYWINE TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | MIDDLETOWN TWP. | PA | CHESTER | EAST CALN TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | MORRISVILLE BORO | PA | CHESTER | EAST FALLOWFIELD TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | NEW BRITAIN BORO | PA | CHESTER | EAST GOSHEN TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | NEW BRITAIN TWP. | PA | CHESTER | EAST MARLBOROUGH TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | NEWTOWN BORO | PA | CHESTER | EAST PIKELAND TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | NEWTOWN TWP. | PA | CHESTER | EAST VINCENT TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | NORTHAMPTON TWP. | PA | CHESTER | EAST WHITELAND TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | PENNDDEL BORO | PA | CHESTER | EASTTOWN TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | PERKASIE BORO | PA | CHESTER | FRANKLIN TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | PLUMSTEAD TWP. | PA | CHESTER | HONEYBROOK TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | SELLERSVILLE BORO | PA | CHESTER | KENNETT SQUARE BORO |
| PA | BUCKS | SILVERDALE BORO | PA | CHESTER | KENNETT TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | SOLEBURY TWP. | PA | CHESTER | LONDON BRITAIN TWP. |
| PA | BUCKS | TULLYTOWN BORO | PA | CHESTER | LONDON GROVE TWP. |

| <u>STATE</u> | <u>COUNTY NAME</u> | <u>MUNICIPALITY NAME</u> | <u>STATE</u> | <u>COUNTY NAME</u> | <u>MUNICIPALITY NAME</u> |
|--------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| PA | CHESTER | MALVERN BORO | PA | CHESTER | WESTTOWN TWP. |
| PA | CHESTER | MODENA BORO | PA | CHESTER | WILLISTOWN TWP. |
| PA | CHESTER | NEW GARDEN TWP. | PA | DELAWARE | ALDAN BORO |
| PA | CHESTER | NEW LONDON TWP. | PA | DELAWARE | ASTON TWP. |
| PA | CHESTER | NEWLIN TWP. | PA | DELAWARE | BETHEL TWP. |
| PA | CHESTER | PARKESBURG BORO | PA | DELAWARE | BROOKHAVEN BORO |
| PA | CHESTER | PENN TWP. | PA | DELAWARE | CHADDS FORD TWP. |
| PA | CHESTER | PENNSBURY TWP. | PA | DELAWARE | CHESTER CITY |
| PA | CHESTER | PHOENIXVILLE BORO | PA | DELAWARE | CHESTER HEIGHTS BORO |
| PA | CHESTER | POCOPSON TWP. | PA | DELAWARE | CHESTER TWP. |
| PA | CHESTER | SADSBURY TWP. | PA | DELAWARE | CLIFTON HEIGHTS BORO |
| PA | CHESTER | SCHUYLKILL TWP. | PA | DELAWARE | COLLINGDALE BORO |
| PA | CHESTER | SOUTH COATESVILLE BORO | PA | DELAWARE | COLWYN BORO |
| PA | CHESTER | SPRING CITY BORO | PA | DELAWARE | CONCORD TWP. |
| PA | CHESTER | THORNBURY TWP. | PA | DELAWARE | DARBY BORO |
| PA | CHESTER | TREDYFFRIN TWP. | PA | DELAWARE | DARBY TWP. |
| PA | CHESTER | UPPER OXFORD TWP. | PA | DELAWARE | DELAWARE COUNTY |
| PA | CHESTER | UPPER UWCHLAN TWP. | PA | DELAWARE | EAST LANSDOWNE BORO |
| PA | CHESTER | UWCHLAN TWP. | PA | DELAWARE | EDDYSTONE BORO |
| PA | CHESTER | VALLEY TWP. | PA | DELAWARE | EDGEMONT TWP. |
| PA | CHESTER | WALLACE TWP. | PA | DELAWARE | FOLCROFT BORO |
| PA | CHESTER | WEST BRADFORD TWP. | PA | DELAWARE | GLENOLDEN BORO |
| PA | CHESTER | WEST BRANDYWINE TWP. | PA | DELAWARE | HAVERFORD TWP. |
| PA | CHESTER | WEST CALN TWP. | PA | DELAWARE | LANSDOWNE BORO |
| PA | CHESTER | WEST CHESTER BORO | PA | DELAWARE | LOWER CHICHESTER TWP. |
| PA | CHESTER | WEST GOSHEN TWP. | PA | DELAWARE | MARCUS HOOK BORO |
| PA | CHESTER | WEST GROVE BORO | PA | DELAWARE | MARPLE TWP. |
| PA | CHESTER | WEST PIKELAND TWP. | PA | DELAWARE | MEDIA BORO |
| PA | CHESTER | WEST SADSBURY TWP. | PA | DELAWARE | MIDDLETOWN TWP. |
| PA | CHESTER | WEST VINCENT TWP. | PA | DELAWARE | MILLBOURNE BORO |
| PA | CHESTER | WEST WHITELAND TWP. | PA | DELAWARE | MORTON BORO |

| <u>STATE</u> | <u>COUNTY NAME</u> | <u>MUNICIPALITY NAME</u> | <u>STATE</u> | <u>COUNTY NAME</u> | <u>MUNICIPALITY NAME</u> |
|--------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| PA | DELAWARE | NETHER PROVIDENCE TWP. | PA | MONTGOMERY | GREEN LANE BORO |
| PA | DELAWARE | NEWTOWN TWP. | PA | MONTGOMERY | HATBORO BORO |
| PA | DELAWARE | NORWOOD BORO | PA | MONTGOMERY | HATFIELD BORO |
| PA | DELAWARE | PARKSIDE BORO | PA | MONTGOMERY | HATFIELD TWP. |
| PA | DELAWARE | PROSPECT PARK BORO | PA | MONTGOMERY | HORSHAM TWP. |
| PA | DELAWARE | RADNOR TWP. | PA | MONTGOMERY | JENKINTOWN BORO |
| PA | DELAWARE | RIDLEY PARK BORO | PA | MONTGOMERY | LANSDALE BORO |
| PA | DELAWARE | RIDLEY TWP. | PA | MONTGOMERY | LIMERICK TWP. |
| PA | DELAWARE | ROSE VALLEY BORO | PA | MONTGOMERY | LOWER FREDERICK TWP. |
| PA | DELAWARE | RUTLEDGE BORO | PA | MONTGOMERY | LOWER GWYNEDD TWP. |
| PA | DELAWARE | SHARON HILL BORO | PA | MONTGOMERY | LOWER MERION TWP. |
| PA | DELAWARE | SPRINGFIELD TWP. | PA | MONTGOMERY | LOWER MORELAND TWP. |
| PA | DELAWARE | SWARTHMORE BORO | PA | MONTGOMERY | LOWER POTTS GROVE TWP. |
| PA | DELAWARE | THORNBURY TWP. | PA | MONTGOMERY | LOWER PROVIDENCE TWP. |
| PA | DELAWARE | TINICUM TWP. | PA | MONTGOMERY | LOWER SALFORD TWP. |
| PA | DELAWARE | TRAINER BORO | PA | MONTGOMERY | MARLBOROUGH TWP. |
| PA | DELAWARE | UPLAND BORO | PA | MONTGOMERY | MONTGOMERY TWP. |
| PA | DELAWARE | UPPER CHICHESTER TWP. | PA | MONTGOMERY | NARBERTH BORO |
| PA | DELAWARE | UPPER DARBY TWP. | PA | MONTGOMERY | NORRISTOWN BORO |
| PA | DELAWARE | UPPER PROVIDENCE TWP. | PA | MONTGOMERY | NORTH WALES BORO |
| PA | DELAWARE | YEADON BORO | PA | MONTGOMERY | PENNSBURG BORO |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | ABINGTON TWP. | PA | MONTGOMERY | PERKIOMEN TWP. |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | AMBLER BORO | PA | MONTGOMERY | PLYMOUTH TWP. |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | BRIDGEPORT BORO | PA | MONTGOMERY | RED HILL BORO |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | BRYN ATHYN BORO | PA | MONTGOMERY | ROCKLEDGE BORO |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | CHELTENHAM TWP. | PA | MONTGOMERY | ROYERSFORD BORO |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | COLLEGEVILLE BORO | PA | MONTGOMERY | SALFORD TWP. |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | CONSHOHOCKEN BORO | PA | MONTGOMERY | SCHWENKSVILLE BORO |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | EAST GREENVILLE BORO | PA | MONTGOMERY | SKIPPAK TWP. |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | EAST NORRITON TWP. | PA | MONTGOMERY | SOUDERTON BORO |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | FRANCONIA TWP. | PA | MONTGOMERY | SPRINGFIELD TWP. |

| <u>STATE</u> | <u>COUNTY NAME</u> | <u>MUNICIPALITY NAME</u> |
|--------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| PA | MONTGOMERY | TELFORD BORO |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | TOWAMENCIN TWP. |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | TRAPPE BORO |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | UPPER DUBLIN TWP. |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | UPPER FREDERICK TWP. |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | UPPER GWYNEDD TWP. |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | UPPER HANOVER TWP. |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | UPPER MERION TWP. |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | UPPER MORELAND TWP. |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | UPPER PROVIDENCE TWP. |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | UPPER SALFORD TWP. |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | WEST CONSHOHOCKEN BORO. |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | WEST NORRITON TWP. |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | WHITEMARSH TWP. |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | WHITPAIN TWP. |
| PA | MONTGOMERY | WORCESTER TWP. |
| PA | PHILADELPHIA | PHILADELPHIA CITY |
| PA | PHILADELPHIA | PHILADELPHIA COUNTY |

Appendix 6

Wasteload Allocation Estimates for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s)

A November 22, 2002 EPA Memorandum entitled, “Establishing Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Wasteload Allocations (WLAs) for Storm water Source and NPDES Permit Requirements Based on Those WLAs” clarified existing regulatory requirements for municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) connected with TMDLs, i.e. that where a TMDL has been developed, the MS4 community must receive a WLA rather than a LA. In the draft TMDL document, EPA identified two options for assigning MS4 WLAs. This Appendix outlines the method used to assign each zone with a single categorical WLA for multiple point sources of storm water discharges.

EPA’s regulations require NPDES-regulated storm water discharges to be addressed by the WLA component of a TMDL. In order to estimate the portion of the Load Allocation (LA) that corresponds to separate storm sewer systems (MS4) so that these MS4 allocations could be converted to Wasteload Allocations (WLAs) we considered the land uses within each zone, downstream of the tributary monitoring locations. In order to be consistent with the WLAs, we only considered MS4’s likely to discharge to the mainstem Delaware or tidal portions of tributaries. Since delineated MS4 service areas have not been identified for many communities, we assumed that approximately 90% of areas categorized as *High Intensity Residential* area, and 70% of areas categorized as either *Low Intensity Residential* or *Commercial / Industrial / Transportation* are served by MS4 systems. We assumed that the entire PCB load associated with MS4s would correspond to the Non-Point Source Runoff category previously defined. Appendix Figure 6-1 below shows the Non-Point Source area contributing to each Zone. Zone 6 is not included in this analysis, since no Zone 6 WLAs are being developed as part of this TMDL.

Appendix Figure 6-1. Non-point Source Areas by Zone.



In order to determine what portion of Non-Point Source Runoff volume corresponds to MS4 service areas, we computed both MS4 and non-MS4 runoff volumes for the 19 month continuous simulation period using the methodologies contained in *Urban Hydrology for Small Watersheds, Technical Release 55*, Soil Conservation Service (currently, Natural Resources Conservation Service), June 1986. Appendix Table 6-1 below shows the computation of the composite Curve Number (CN) for both the MS4 and non-MS4 areas by zone. Land use categories corresponding to wetlands and open water were not included in the calculation of composite CNs.

Appendix Table 6-1. Computation of Composite Curve Numbers for MS4 and Non-MS4 Areas by Zone.

| | Land Use Value | Land Use Category | area (m ²) | CN | % MS4 | MS4 Area (m ²) | Non-MS4 | | Composite | | Composite | |
|---------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|----|--------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|-------------------|------------|--|
| | | | | | | | Area (M2) | CN x MS4 Area | MS4 CN | CN x Non-MS4 Area | Non-MS4 CN | |
| zone 2 | 21 | Low Intensity Residential | 149,942,000 | 80 | 70.00% | 104,959,400 | 44,982,600 | 8,396,752,000 | | 3,598,608,000 | | |
| | 22 | High Intensity Residential | 35,470,900 | 90 | 90.00% | 31,923,810 | 3,547,090 | 2,873,142,900 | | 319,238,100 | | |
| | 23 | Commercial/Industrial/Transportation | 51,066,300 | 94 | 70.00% | 35,746,410 | 15,319,890 | 3,360,162,540 | | 1,440,069,660 | | |
| | 32 | Quarries/Strip Mines/Gravel Pits | 13,057,200 | 95 | 0.00% | 0 | 13,057,200 | 0 | | 1,240,434,000 | | |
| | 33 | Transitional | 3,193,340 | 91 | 0.00% | 0 | 3,193,340 | 0 | | 290,593,940 | | |
| | 41 | Deciduous Forest | 110,273,000 | 76 | 0.00% | 0 | 110,273,000 | 0 | | 8,380,748,000 | | |
| | 42 | Evergreen Forest | 3,564,690 | 76 | 0.00% | 0 | 3,564,690 | 0 | | 270,916,440 | | |
| | 43 | Mixed Forest | 52,161,800 | 76 | 0.00% | 0 | 52,161,800 | 0 | | 3,964,296,800 | | |
| | 81 | Pasture/Hay | 180,362,000 | 79 | 0.00% | 0 | 180,362,000 | 0 | | 14,248,598,000 | | |
| | 82 | Row Crops | 54,280,000 | 82 | 0.00% | 0 | 54,280,000 | 0 | | 4,450,960,000 | | |
| | 85 | Urban/Recreational Grasses | 8,976,360 | 79 | 0.00% | 0 | 8,976,360 | 0 | | 709,132,440 | | |
| | | 662,347,590 | | | 172,629,620 | 489,717,970 | 14,630,057,440 | 84.75 | 38,913,595,380 | 79.46 | | |
| zone3 | 21 | Low Intensity Residential | 43,022,200 | 80 | 70.00% | 30,115,540 | 12,906,660 | 2,409,243,200 | | 1,032,532,800 | | |
| | 22 | High Intensity Residential | 52,358,200 | 90 | 90.00% | 47,122,380 | 5,235,820 | 4,241,014,200 | | 471,223,800 | | |
| | 23 | Commercial/Industrial/Transportation | 37,042,800 | 94 | 70.00% | 25,929,960 | 11,112,840 | 2,437,416,240 | | 1,044,606,960 | | |
| | 32 | Quarries/Strip Mines/Gravel Pits | 104,987 | 95 | 0.00% | 0 | 104,987 | 0 | | 9,973,765 | | |
| | 33 | Transitional | 8,749 | 91 | 0.00% | 0 | 8,749 | 0 | | 796,149 | | |
| | 41 | Deciduous Forest | 8,324,080 | 76 | 0.00% | 0 | 8,324,080 | 0 | | 632,630,080 | | |
| | 42 | Evergreen Forest | 67,075 | 76 | 0.00% | 0 | 67,075 | 0 | | 5,097,685 | | |
| | 43 | Mixed Forest | 2,448,720 | 76 | 0.00% | 0 | 2,448,720 | 0 | | 186,102,720 | | |
| | 81 | Pasture/Hay | 1,076,110 | 79 | 0.00% | 0 | 1,076,110 | 0 | | 85,012,690 | | |
| | 82 | Row Crops | 1,238,450 | 82 | 0.00% | 0 | 1,238,450 | 0 | | 101,552,900 | | |
| | 85 | Urban/Recreational Grasses | 2,780,200 | 79 | 0.00% | 0 | 2,780,200 | 0 | | 219,635,800 | | |
| | | 148,471,571 | | | 103,167,880 | 45,303,691 | 9,087,673,640 | 88.09 | 3,789,165,349 | 83.64 | | |
| zone4 | 21 | Low Intensity Residential | 118,875,000 | 80 | 70.00% | 83,212,500 | 35,662,500 | 6,657,000,000 | | 2,853,000,000 | | |
| | 22 | High Intensity Residential | 30,808,700 | 90 | 90.00% | 27,727,830 | 3,080,870 | 2,495,504,700 | | 277,278,300 | | |
| | 23 | Commercial/Industrial/Transportation | 65,573,900 | 94 | 70.00% | 45,901,730 | 19,672,170 | 4,314,762,620 | | 1,849,183,980 | | |
| | 32 | Quarries/Strip Mines/Gravel Pits | 1,148,050 | 95 | 0.00% | 0 | 1,148,050 | 0 | | 109,064,750 | | |
| | 33 | Transitional | 4,413,330 | 91 | 0.00% | 0 | 4,413,330 | 0 | | 401,613,030 | | |
| | 41 | Deciduous Forest | 143,833,000 | 76 | 0.00% | 0 | 143,833,000 | 0 | | 10,931,308,000 | | |
| | 42 | Evergreen Forest | 4,900,350 | 76 | 0.00% | 0 | 4,900,350 | 0 | | 372,426,600 | | |
| | 43 | Mixed Forest | 46,163,000 | 76 | 0.00% | 0 | 46,163,000 | 0 | | 3,508,388,000 | | |
| | 81 | Pasture/Hay | 98,138,200 | 79 | 0.00% | 0 | 98,138,200 | 0 | | 7,752,917,800 | | |
| | 82 | Row Crops | 37,478,300 | 82 | 0.00% | 0 | 37,478,300 | 0 | | 3,073,220,600 | | |
| | 85 | Urban/Recreational Grasses | 15,321,200 | 79 | 0.00% | 0 | 15,321,200 | 0 | | 1,210,374,800 | | |
| | | 566,653,030 | | | 156,842,060 | 409,810,970 | 13,467,267,320 | 85.87 | 32,338,775,860 | 78.91 | | |
| zone5 | 21 | Low Intensity Residential | 86,418,600 | 80 | 70.00% | 60,493,020 | 25,925,580 | 4,839,441,600 | | 2,074,046,400 | | |
| | 22 | High Intensity Residential | 12,247,500 | 90 | 90.00% | 11,022,750 | 1,224,750 | 992,047,500 | | 110,227,500 | | |
| | 23 | Commercial/Industrial/Transportation | 48,787,700 | 94 | 70.00% | 34,151,390 | 14,636,310 | 3,210,230,660 | | 1,375,813,140 | | |
| | 32 | Quarries/Strip Mines/Gravel Pits | 5,088,940 | 95 | 0.00% | 0 | 5,088,940 | 0 | | 483,449,300 | | |
| | 33 | Transitional | 1,818,800 | 91 | 0.00% | 0 | 1,818,800 | 0 | | 165,510,800 | | |
| | 41 | Deciduous Forest | 151,311,000 | 76 | 0.00% | 0 | 151,311,000 | 0 | | 11,499,636,000 | | |
| | 42 | Evergreen Forest | 8,114,110 | 76 | 0.00% | 0 | 8,114,110 | 0 | | 616,672,360 | | |
| | 43 | Mixed Forest | 62,097,600 | 76 | 0.00% | 0 | 62,097,600 | 0 | | 4,719,417,600 | | |
| | 81 | Pasture/Hay | 141,668,000 | 79 | 0.00% | 0 | 141,668,000 | 0 | | 11,191,772,000 | | |
| | 82 | Row Crops | 198,928,000 | 82 | 0.00% | 0 | 198,928,000 | 0 | | 16,312,096,000 | | |
| | 85 | Urban/Recreational Grasses | 18,823,700 | 79 | 0.00% | 0 | 18,823,700 | 0 | | 1,487,072,300 | | |
| | | 735,303,950 | | | 105,667,160 | 629,636,790 | 9,041,719,760 | 85.57 | 50,035,713,400 | 79.47 | | |

Using the composite CNs for MS4 and Non-MS4 areas and daily 24-hour precipitation totals, we computed daily runoff volumes. The daily 24-hour precipitation totals are daily means of the recorded totals from the Wilmington, Philadelphia, and Neshaminy precipitation gages. As indicated in Appendix Table 6-2 below, only storm events exceeding the computed initial abstraction (Ia) for each area result in runoff. Similarly, only days with measurable precipitation are included in Appendix Table 6-2. We summed the total runoff depth for the 19-month continuous simulation period and multiplied by the area to compute a total runoff volume. We computed the percentage of the total volume associated with the MS4 areas by dividing the MS4 runoff volume by the total of the MS4 and Non-MS4 runoff volumes. The percentage of the MS4 runoff volume is shown at the bottom of Appendix Table 6-2 below.

Appendix Table 6-2. Computation of Runoff Volume Generated by MS4s.

| | | Zone 2 | | Zone 3 | | Zone 4 | | Zone 5 | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | | MS4 | Non-MS4 | MS4 | Non-MS4 | MS4 | Non-MS4 | MS4 | Non-MS4 |
| CN | | 84.75 | 79.46 | 88.09 | 79.46 | 88.09 | 83.64 | 85.87 | 79.47 |
| Area (m ²) | | 172,629,620 | 489,717,970 | 103,167,880 | 45,303,691 | 156,842,060 | 409,810,970 | 105,667,160 | 629,636,790 |
| Area (ft ²) | | 1,858,169,693 | 5,271,280,154 | 1,110,489,775 | 487,644,849 | 1,688,233,818 | 4,411,168,398 | 1,137,391,800 | 6,777,353,740 |
| S | | 1.80 | 2.58 | 1.35 | 2.58 | 1.35 | 1.96 | 1.65 | 2.58 |
| Ia | | 0.36 | 0.52 | 0.27 | 0.52 | 0.27 | 0.39 | 0.33 | 0.52 |
| Date | Precip. (in) | Runoff (in) | | | | | | | |
| 9/4/2001 | 0.72 | 0.060 | 0.015 | 0.112 | 0.015 | 0.112 | 0.047 | 0.075 | 0.015 |
| 9/10/2001 | 0.02 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 9/14/2001 | 0.63 | 0.036 | 0.005 | 0.077 | 0.005 | 0.077 | 0.027 | 0.047 | 0.005 |
| 9/20/2001 | 0.31 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 9/21/2001 | 0.13 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 9/24/2001 | 0.27 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 9/25/2001 | 0.22 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 2/21/2003 | 0.20 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 2/22/2003 | 1.96 | 0.751 | 0.515 | 0.936 | 0.515 | 0.936 | 0.696 | 0.809 | 0.515 |
| 2/23/2003 | 0.30 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 2/27/2003 | 0.02 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 2/28/2003 | 0.05 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 3/2/2003 | 0.83 | 0.099 | 0.035 | 0.165 | 0.035 | 0.165 | 0.082 | 0.118 | 0.035 |
| 3/5/2003 | 0.34 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.003 | 0.000 | 0.003 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 3/6/2003 | 0.60 | 0.029 | 0.003 | 0.066 | 0.003 | 0.066 | 0.021 | 0.039 | 0.003 |
| 3/13/2003 | 0.04 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 3/16/2003 | 0.04 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 3/17/2003 | 0.04 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 3/20/2003 | 1.55 | 0.472 | 0.293 | 0.620 | 0.293 | 0.620 | 0.429 | 0.518 | 0.294 |
| 3/21/2003 | 0.08 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 3/26/2003 | 0.27 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 3/28/2003 | 0.03 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 3/29/2003 | 0.34 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.003 | 0.000 | 0.003 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 3/30/2003 | 0.20 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Runoff (in) | | 4.997 | 2.397 | 7.866 | 2.397 | 7.866 | 4.293 | 5.818 | 2.399 |
| Runoff (ft) | | 0.416447206 | 0.199708498 | 0.655529917 | 0.199708498 | 0.655529917 | 0.357726343 | 0.484831079 | 0.199887138 |
| Runoff (ft3) | | 773,829,578 | 1,052,719,443 | 727,959,270 | 97,386,821 | 1,106,687,774 | 1,577,991,140 | 551,442,894 | 1,354,705,843 |
| % of Runoff from MS4 | | 42% | | 88% | | 41% | | 29% | |

The current MS4 loads for the cycling one year period are calculated using the runoff volume ratio as shown in Appendix Table 6-2 and non-point source runoff loads. Then, proportions of MS4 loads to total loads are calculated. Note that the total loads are defined as sum of point and non-point source loads excluding Trenton and Schuylkill boundary and contaminated site loads for this calculation. The existing MS4 load proportions are summarized in Appendix Table 6-3.

Appendix Table 6-3. Existing loads and proportions of MS4 loads by Zone for the cycling one year period.

| Estuary Zone | NPS plus MS4 Loads | MS4 Loads | Total Loads* | Proportion of MS4 loads to Total Loads* |
|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| | | | (Point plus Non-Point sources) | % |
| | kg/365days | kg/365days | kg/365days | |
| 2 | 1.545 | 1.545 x 42 % = 0.649 | 2.688 | 24.15 |
| 3 | 0.275 | 0.275 x 88 % = 0.242 | 2.376 | 10.17 |
| 4 | 1.186 | 1.186 x 41 % = 0.486 | 3.820 | 12.73 |
| 5 | 1.129 | 1.129 x 29 % = 0.327 | 3.409 | 9.61 |

* Total loads, indicated here, are defined excluding Trenton and Schuylkill boundary and contaminated sites loads.

Appendix Table 6-4 shows the Zone TMDLs excluding Trenton and Schuylkill boundary loads. In addition, the Table contains Zone specific MOS, allocations to contaminated site loads and allocatable portion to the rest of point and non-point source categories. The allocations to MS4s are calculated by proportion of MS4 loads to Total Loads shown in Appendix Table 6-3 and Allocatable portion to the rest of categories shown in Appendix Table 6-4. Summary of categorical WLAs and LAs are presented in Table 9 and Table 10 of the main text.

Appendix Table 6-4. Summary of the Zone TMDLs for penta-PCBs excluding Trenton and Schuylkill boundaries.

| Estuary Zone | TMDL | MOS | Contaminated Site | Allocatable | Allocations to MS4s |
|-----------------|--------|--------|----------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | portion to the rest of categories | |
| | mg/day | mg/day | mg/day | mg/day | mg/day |
| Zone 2 | 6.613 | 0.331 | 0.026 | 6.256 | 1.511 |
| Zone 3 | 4.455 | 0.223 | 2.416 | 1.816 | 0.185 |
| Zone 4 | 4.569 | 0.228 | 1.651 | 2.689 | 0.342 |
| Zone 5 | 12.016 | 0.601 | 5.250 | 6.165 | 0.592 |