

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD  
LAHONTAN REGION**

**MEETING OF APRIL 12-13, 2006  
TRUCKEE, CALIFORNIA**

**ITEM:** 1

**SUBJECT:** EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

**DISCUSSION:** The Executive Officer's report includes the following:

- Enclosure 1: Report on Status of Standing Items  
(April 2006)
- Enclosure 2: Executive Officer's Written Report  
(April 2006)
- Enclosure 3: Notification of Spills (Pursuant to  
Section 13271, California Water Code  
and Section 25180.7, California  
Health and Safety Code)
- Enclosure 4: Notification of Closure of  
Underground Storage Tank Cases  
(Pursuant to Article 11, Division 3,  
Chapter 16, Title 23, California Code  
of Regulations)

# **ENCLOSURE 1**

## **Report on Status of Standing Items** (April 2006)

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY  
CONTROL BOARD  
LAHONTAN REGION**

**REPORT ON STATUS OF STANDING ITEMS**

**April 2006**

The Regional Board has requested that it be kept informed of the status of a number of issues. The following table lists the items, the reporting frequency and where the report can be found.

ISSUE	REPORT FREQUENCY	STATUS/COMMENT
Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 14	Monthly	Item 8 of April 2006 EO Report
Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 20	Monthly	Item 7 of April 2006 Report
Tahoe Municipal Permit	Annually	Due May 2006* Board Meeting
Searles Valley Minerals Operations - Compliance Status	Semi-Annual	Due September 2006 Board Meeting
Mojave River/El Mirage Dairy Issues	Semi-Annual	Due September 2006 Board Meeting
Status of Basin Plan Amendments	Semi-Annual	Due September 2006 Board Meeting
Status of Grants	Semi-Annual	Due September 2006 Board Meeting
Wetland Restoration Progress in Mono County	Annually	Due November 2006 Board Meeting
Caltrans Statewide General Permit/Tahoe Basin	Annually	Due November 2006 Board Meeting

\*The Municipal Permit renewal in October 2005 requires annual reports every March.

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Board Meeting Month</u>
<i>Quarterly</i>	January, April, July, & October.
<i>Bi-Monthly</i>	Varied
<i>Semi-Annual</i>	March & September
<i>Annually</i>	Varied

## **ENCLOSURE 2**

### **Executive Officer's Written Report** (April 2006)



Lahontan Regional Water Quality  
Control Board



# EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

April 2006

## NORTH BASIN

1. *Update on Schedule for Basin Plan Amendments – Lake Tahoe Shorezone Amendments – Lauri Kemper*

The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, (TRPA) must act on its Shorezone Plan before the Water Board will consider amending the Basin Plan to be consistent with revisions proposed by the TRPA. In the March 2006 Executive Officer's Report, I reported that TRPA would consider changes in April. TRPA has received a number of requests to postpone final hearings and adoption until Summer 2006. TRPA now plans to release its final Environmental Impact Statement and its proposed package of ordinance changes sometime in mid-April. The TRPA Governing Board will consider adoption or postponement at a public hearing scheduled for May 24, 2006. Staff will be reviewing TRPA's responses to our staff's comments and will be preparing comments on the proposed ordinances before the May Governing Board meeting. I would like to rely on TRPA's proposed monitoring and mitigation measures, if sufficient, to address potential water quality impacts. Otherwise, staff will develop additional measures for consideration.

2. *Pacific Gas and Electric Company Hinkley Compressor Station, San Bernardino County— Lisa Dernbach*

PG&E continues to work on corrective actions for addressing chromium in groundwater at the Hinkley Compressor Station.

In July 2004, the Water Board adopted waste discharge requirements for the treatment of extracted groundwater containing chromium. Application of the extracted groundwater to alfalfa fields at a dairy farm, using a subsurface drip irrigation system, hexavalent chromium in the applied water is converted to trivalent chromium in soil. The project's purpose is to control plume migration. Recent monitoring data from the dairy farm shows that migration of the plume in a northerly direction has ceased and levels of total chromium in groundwater at the treatment site have been reduced to below the drinking water standard of 50 micrograms per liter. Other monitoring data, however, shows that the plume is now migrating in a northwest direction, outside the capture zone of extraction wells at the dairy farm.

To address continued plume migration, PG&E recently submitted a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) to re-start treatment of chromium in groundwater at the Ranch Land

Treatment Unit, located south of the dairy farm. The project previously operated for five years before being turned off in 2001 when chromium was detected in air emissions from the sprinkler irrigation system. To reduce the creation of mist that could contain hexavalent chromium, PG&E proposes to replace the sprinkler system with a drag drip system. This project and a CEQA document are scheduled to be on the Board's September 2006 meeting agenda.

PG&E has also proposed an in-situ (in the ground) bioremediation pilot study project in the central plume area. The proposed project builds upon the successful results of a small-scale in-situ remediation project completed in 2005. The new project will inject lactate, whey, and emulsified vegetable oil into wells lined up cross gradient to the groundwater flow direction. The environment created by the reactants will convert soluble hexavalent chromium to trivalent chromium. The trivalent chromium is expected to precipitate out and bind to aquifer particles. If the first phase of the project, extending 200 feet across the plume, is successful, the project will be expanded across the entire plume width at that location, (1,800 feet), to form a "biobarrier" for hexavalent chromium migration. A public hearing for the project and CEQA document is scheduled for the June 2005 Water Board meeting.

PG&E also plans to submit a ROWD to the Water Board for clean up of the chromium source area at the compressor station. Past clean up actions included excavating the former ponds where chromium-containing effluent was discharged. However, hexavalent chromium in concentrations in the thousands of micrograms per liter remains in the capillary fringe and pore spaces in the vadose zone, providing a

continuous source of pollution. PG&E plans to propose in-situ remediation in the source area using the same food-grade reactants proposed in the central plume area. This project is scheduled for the Board's November 2006 meeting.

I plan to circulate a Fact Sheet in April 2006 to inform the public about the above-mentioned upcoming projects. In addition, Water Board Staff is planning to hold a public meeting in Hinkley in May 2006.

Finally, I plan to amend the cleanup and abatement order that was last issued to the Discharger in 2001. The amended order will set deadlines for PG&E to fully contain plume migration, begin remediation in the source area, propose full-scale remediation for the central plume area, and submit the results of a chromium background study.

### ***3. Introduction to Project Management for the TMDL Program —Kim Gorman***

Several Regional Board TMDL Staff attended the newly developed TMDL Project Management Training Course, offered by the UC Davis, Extension on February 8 and 9, 2006. The training course is based upon the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK) 2004 Guide<sup>©</sup>, which was developed by the Project Management Institute, and is considered a global standard.

The course provided a conceptual framework, and a series of tools for successful TMDL project management. The conceptual framework covered nine management knowledge areas: scope, time, cost, quality, human resources, communications, risk, and procurement. Worksheet templates and exercises were provided as a tool to guide staff in

developing management plans for each knowledge area.

According to the PMBOK guide, TMDL project management may require between 20-40% of overall project time. However, proper project management can save time and increase success rate by identifying and evaluating a variety of constraints that will need to be addressed during development.

The initiation and closing phases of the TMDL project were identified as two of the most important phases of project management. Successful execution of these "bookend" phases is extremely important for holding a project together. During the initiation phase, the PMBOK Guide strongly recommends drafting a project charter, to get stakeholder agreement and buy-in early in the development of the project—both within and outside the Regional Board. It was stressed that the closing phase may be most important where a transfer plan must be developed for a different staff unit at the regional Board to implement the TMDL.

The group identified the TMDL transfer to an already overworked regulatory unit as the biggest area of concern. Balancing TMDL implementation with WDR, NPDES, and NPS workloads will be a great challenge.

**4. *US Forest Service Lake Tahoe Basin Management (LTBMU) Unit Heavenly Creek Demonstration Project – Erika Lovejoy***

The LTBMU is proposing to conduct a demonstration project to determine if certain low-impact equipment can be used within stream environment zones with minimal impacts. Their long-term goal is to be able to use low ground pressure, "innovative technology" equipment in SEZs within the

Lake Tahoe Basin for the purpose of fuels hazard reduction. Staff is working diligently with the LTBMU to ensure the study design and monitoring plan are adequately peer reviewed and that the potential impacts are mitigated. Staff has recommended a phased approach to the 23-acre project. Segments of the project area will be treated and monitored for soil compaction and other disturbance. If unacceptable levels of soil and non-target vegetation disturbance is occurring, the project will be halted. The project is proposed to take place in late summer or fall and will likely be completed within 30 days.

The LTBMU intends to begin their environmental review process within the next two months, and hopes to conduct the project in the fall. Monitoring will last at least one year. After the project is completed, the Board may be presented with a decision on potential policy changes regarding the use of heavy equipment within SEZs.

**5. *Draft Fuel Reduction and Forest Restoration Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin – Erika Lovejoy***

The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) hired consultants to compile all of the individual Fire Plans for local Fire Districts throughout the Lake Tahoe Basin. The Draft Fuel Reduction and Forest Restoration Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin (Plan) contains recommendations for "future desired conditions" for forests in the Lake Tahoe Basin, fuels reduction treatments, and potential policy changes. Another key element of the Plan is a proposal to create an interagency organization dedicated to addressing fuels hazard reduction and fire safety issues. The organization would administer funding, and help local fire

districts and fire management agencies plan their work.

TRPA is holding three meetings from March - April to get public comment, mostly from interested agencies. TRPA hopes to use the plan to get additional Federal and State funding for implementation. Water Board staff will be participating in the public meetings and will submit written comments to TRPA regarding potential water quality issues associated with proposed treatments and policy changes.

**6. *Joint Workshop between California Air Resources Board and State Water Resources Control Board – Douglas F. Smith***

On February 9, 2006, the SWRCB and the California Air Resources Board (ARB) held a first-ever joint workshop at the Cal EPA building in Sacramento. The workshop focused on hearing different speakers from across California present information on various issues concerning atmospheric deposition of pollutants into California's waters.

Regional Board staff presented a preliminary estimate of the annual pollutant loads being deposited into Lake Tahoe from the five source categories:

Source	Nitrogen	Phosphorus	Particulates
Shoreline Erosion	2 (1%)	2 (5%)	550 (8%)
Groundwater	55 (16%)	5 (13%)	0
Stream Channel Erosion	100 (30%)	25 (64%)	1300 (18%)
Uplands (watershed model)			3800 (53%)
Atmospheric Deposition	180 (53%)	7 (18%)	1500 (21%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	337	39	7150

The Lake Tahoe Atmospheric Deposition Study (LTADS), conducted by ARB, estimated the annual direct deposition rate of nitrogen, phosphorus, and particulates into Lake Tahoe. Direct deposition is significant because Lake Tahoe surface area accounts for almost one-third of the entire Tahoe basin watershed area. Comparing the LTADS direct loading estimates to the other sources, atmospheric deposition of nitrogen may account for half of the annual load and atmospheric deposition of particulates (<20 microns) may input a quarter of the annual load.

Further research by ARB is needed to refine LTADS gross estimate of annual direct deposition and to quantify the emission sources, such as vehicle exhaust, wood smoke and road dust. Because atmospheric deposition of nitrogen, phosphorus, and particulates directly to Lake Tahoe is significant, it is imperative to analyze and quantify the emission sources so effective control strategies can be developed, implemented, and monitored.

The Lake Tahoe TMDL is being developed through research, such as LTADS, to quantify the pollutant loading and determine the needed pollutant reductions. The



Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) and Region 6 are working on the Lake Tahoe "Clarity" TMDL, while the US Forest Service is updating its Forest Plan and TRPA updates its Regional Plan. This four agency collaborative effort, called "Pathway", is a multi-year plan to review and align goals, plans and standards for a common and united voice in the Tahoe basin. The Pathway efforts are now focusing on developing strategies to achieve the common goals. TRPA is the only agency in the Pathway effort that maintains regulatory authority to address direct atmospheric deposition to Lake Tahoe. However, TRPA lacks resources and technical expertise in the air quality arena to adequately address the direct atmospheric deposition issues to Lake Tahoe. The local environmental health and air quality departments currently only address human health-related issues.

We are encouraging the ARB to partner with the Pathway process to assist in developing viable strategies for reducing atmospheric deposition of pollutants to Lake Tahoe. Implementation of the strategies will also require improved coordination between ARB, TRPA, and the Water Board to better regulate atmospheric pollutants to meet the Tahoe TMDL. The Water Board may be able to regulate the indirect deposition of atmospheric pollutants within the upland areas through its existing NPDES Storm Water Program, but the Water Board is unable to control the direct deposition. If ARB does not have authority for regulating direct atmospheric deposition of clarity pollutants in the Tahoe basin, then legislation may be needed to provide this authority to achieve the Lake Tahoe Clarity water quality standard.

## SOUTH BASIN

**7. Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 20 & City of Los Angeles World Airports, Palmdale Water Reclamation Plant, Compliance Status - Jehiel Cass**

Waste Discharge Requirements – Effluent is disposed from the Palmdale Water Reclamation Plant by two methods; land spreading and applying recycled water to support crop growth. The areas that may be used for land spreading and agricultural reuse are defined in the District's Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs). The WDR require that effluent can only be disposed to the agricultural reuse areas at the crop agronomic rates. All remaining effluent must be disposed in the land spreading areas. During 2005, the District completed installing center pivot irrigation systems in all land spreading areas so that limited crop production now occurs in these areas to remove some nitrogen.

The District reports that 484 million gallons of effluent was disposed in the agricultural reuse areas in 2005 above agronomic rates. That was a violation of the WDRs. This volume contained approximately 79 tons of nitrogen based upon a 2005 average total nitrogen concentration of 39.2 mg/L in the effluent. Normal crop irrigation practices in the agricultural reuse areas allow for about 10% of the water to be applied over the crop needs to leach the soil root zone of unwanted salts. Water Board staff are evaluating information provided by the District to determine how much nitrogen escaped the root zone of the agricultural reuse areas in 2005 through deep percolation and what amounts are from normal soil leaching.

The District provided the following reasons for why land spreading was conducted in the agricultural re-use areas in 2005. In the first quarter, heavy rainfall saturated the land spreading areas and any additional effluent disposed there would have resulted in runoff leaving the site. In the second quarter, portions of the land spreading area were not available because new center pivots were being constructed there and a late crop harvest in recycled water fields prevented irrigation for crop growth. In the fourth quarter 2005, the land spreading areas of Section 9 were not able to absorb as much effluent as earlier years because the land clearing and leveling work to install new center pivots caused a decrease in the soils infiltration capacity. The District is planning to use a soil ripper in the land spreading areas to increase percolation rates and prevent the need to over apply effluent in the agricultural reuse areas.

Cease and Desist Order – There is no other new information to report regarding the District's Compliance with the Cease and Desist Order.

Cleanup and Abatement Order – the District and Airport are installing groundwater extraction wells as an Interim Measure for cleaning up nitrate polluted groundwater. This is a requirement of the Cleanup and Abatement Order and a Resolution adopted by the Regional Board in April 2005. That Resolution also required the District to submit an evaluation of additional options to remediate degraded groundwater back to naturally occurring background nitrate levels of less than 2 mg/L without exacerbating groundwater overdraft. Water Board and

District staff met on March 3, 2006 to discuss this requirement. The District intends to submit a report by April 13, 2006. The report will: a) provide a summary of options previously evaluated results of the evaluation and, b) evaluate new options that consume less water than originally proposed, c) identify data needed to fully evaluate the new options and d) describe an implementation schedule.

A table of reports required by the Enforcement Orders and submittal status is included at the end of this report.

A table of reports required by the Enforcement Orders and submittal status is included at the end of this report.

**8. *Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 14 (Lancaster), Status of Compliance with Cease and Desist Order and Waste Discharge Requirements – Curt Shifrer***

Cease and Desist Order – There is no other new information since the last status report to report regarding the District's Compliance with the Cease and Desist Order.

Recycled Water for Crop Irrigation at Agriculture Site No. 1

The District has submitted a Report of Waste Discharge for its proposed membrane bioreactor (MBR) plant and for recycled water use for irrigation at a new area called Agricultural Site No. 1. Board staff is preparing tentative Waste Discharge Requirements for public circulation. Board staff is evaluating if the District's 2020 Facilities Plan EIR adequately analyzed the potential impacts of this reuse. Staff will be meeting with District staff to resolve outstanding issues. Through operation of the MBR plant to produce more tertiary treated water for reuse, the District will increase its ability to divert more water away from Piute Ponds as required by the Cease and Desist Order.

# **ENCLOSURE 3**

## **Notification of Spills** (Unauthorized Waste Discharges) (April 2006)

**EO'S Monthly Report**  
**02/16/06 - 03/15/06**  
**Unauthorized Waste Discharges**

**COUNTY: NEVADA**

Discharger/Facility	Location	Basin	Regulated Facility	Substance Discharged	Hazardous?	Spill Date	Discharge Volume	Description of Failure	Discharge To	Prop 65	Status
Truck accident	Westbound I-80, 1-2 miles west of Floriston	N	N	Diesel	N	2/22/2006	approx. 75 gallons	Release from a 120-gallon saddle tank due to puncture.	Ground and culvert (contained)	N	Pumped out storm drain. No further action recommended.

**COUNTY: PLACER**

Discharger/Facility	Location	Basin	Regulated Facility	Substance Discharged	Hazardous?	Spill Date	Discharge Volume	Description of Failure	Discharge To	Prop 65	Status
North Tahoe PUD	1300 Regency Way, Tahoe Vista	N	Y	Raw sewage	N	3/6/2006	approx. 100 gallons	NTPUD responded to report at 10:40 am on March 6, 2006. Sewage was coming from a manhole at the above address and flowing down the street and into a roadside ditch.	Roadside ditch	N	NTPUD removed 4.5 - 8 inch rocks from sewer line, vactored materials from pipe, flushed with clean water and repeated vactoring, sprayed chlorine solution on contaminated area. No further action recommended.

**COUNTY: SAN BERNARDINO**

Discharger/Facility	Location	Basin	Regulated Facility	Substance Discharged	Hazardous?	Spill Date	Discharge Volume	Description of Failure	Discharge To	Prop 65	Status
Kinder Morgan	Basin Road, between Baker and Barstow	S	N	Hydraulic Fluid	N	2/24/2006	2.5 Gallons	Hose on crane snapped and substance leaked.	Ground	N	Spill was contained with absorbant material. Soil was excavated and removed. Cleanup complete. No further action recommended.

**COUNTY: SAN BERNARDINO**

Discharger/Facility	Location	Basin	Regulated Facility	Substance Discharged	Hazardous?	Spill Date	Discharge Volume	Description of Failure	Discharge To	Prop 65	Status
UPRR / Locomotive	200 N. Avenue H, Barstow	<input type="checkbox"/> S	<input type="checkbox"/> N	Oil	<input type="checkbox"/> N	2/25/2006	150 Gallons	Locomotive had mechanical failure and spilled oil.	Ground	<input type="checkbox"/> N	Cleanup complete. No further action recommended.
BNSF / Barstow Diesel Service Facility	200 N. Avenue H, Barstow	<input type="checkbox"/> S	<input type="checkbox"/> N	Diesel/ Lube Oil	<input type="checkbox"/> N	3/10/2006	50 Gallons	Ruptured pipe from an unknown locomotive resulted in release.	Ground	<input type="checkbox"/> N	Spill report requested. Further action pending receipt of report.
UPRR / Locomotive	Mile post marker 161 on the Cima subdivision, Barstow	<input type="checkbox"/> S	<input type="checkbox"/> N	Rust Prohibitors (Oil water mixture)	<input type="checkbox"/> N	3/13/2006	20 Gallons	Substance was released from two locomotives.	Ground	<input type="checkbox"/> N	Cleanup complete. No further action recommended.

# **ENCLOSURE 4**

## **Notification of Closure of Underground Storage Tank Cases (April 2006)**

**CASE CLOSURE REPORT**  
**August 2005**  
 State of California  
 Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board

Date Closure Issued	Site Name	Site Address	Case Number	Case Type	Remaining Groundwater Concentrations above Water Quality Objectives (in ug/L)	Remaining Soil Concentrations (in mg/Kg)	Distance from Site to Nearest Receptor	Remedial Methods Used
No closures issued during March								

**Notes:**

TPHd = Total petroleum hydrocarbons quantified as diesel

TPHg = Total petroleum hydrocarbons quantified as gasoline